CHAPTER 3

Standardization and Model

3.1 The Review of the Literature… Continued

So far I have examined the variations that have occurred in English in India due to the status it occupies and the roles it plays. This chapter will look at the aspect of standardization and the concept of model framing and how they can be applied to IE.

3.1.1 English Separated by Distances

Thousands of differences can occur in a variety, which has blossomed far away from its land of birth, from its mother variety. Dylan Thomas claimed in Crystal (1997) that BE and AE were two cultures “separated” by the barriers of a common language. Webster made a similar claim in his Dissertations on the English Language (1789 in Crystal 1997). Giving reasons for the USA to have developed a distinctive “American standard”, he said it was impractical to continue with the British model as England was at “too great a distance to be our model”. In India, the issue of implementing an indigenous model in formal language teaching situation should have crossed almost every teacher’s mind whether or not they agree with the concept. It is a sociolinguistic reality that in diaglossic societies one language variety called the “high variety” serves the functions of formal communication whereas another variety called a “low variety” is used for intimate and informal interaction (Ryan and Gyles 1982:4). A mindset that BE is that “high variety” prevails among the educated elite who disregard the need of the masses, judging language
standards on the scale of the variety's proximity to BE. They consider the low varieties of 
IE are meant for bonding purposes, not for the academics and formal functions. Before 
we go into the different aspects of availability or formulation of model(s) we need to 
once again have a look at what is meant SE, by standardization or standard language.

3.1.2 Meaning of Standard English

The word 'standard' in the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* by AS Hornby (1996) 
is explained as “something considered by an authority or by general consent as a basis of 
comparison/ a rule or principle that is used as a basis for judgement”. A standard variety 
is generally associated with the educated. Trudgill and Hannah (1982:1-2) refer to SE as 
“the variety of the English language which is normally employed in writing and normally 
spoken by ‘educated’ speakers of the language. The term Standard English often refers to 
grammar and vocabulary (dialect) but not to pronunciation (accent)...”. There has been a 
mono-centric view about English that only one particular form is “correct” and others 
“wrong” and this training has been imparted to its teachers, Nelson (1995:273).

When speaking of SE, linguists essentially refer to its morphology, syntax, lexis and 
phonology. It is said that Syntax does not change much as it is a force of cohesion in 
society and helps to bond communities even with vast differences. We can note this in 
our comparison of BE with IE and of BE with AE where the syntactic differences are 
minimal just as morphological differences are insignificant. Lexicon is referred to as the 
force of division, subject to maximum growth and change. When we talk of IE, the first 
examples of differences from BE one can recall belongs to this aspect of language. 
Phonology is considered the marker of identity, which distinguishes one class from
another, one regional dialect from another. For instance, the vernacular/regional influxes on people’s second language are often marked. Generally, the educated metropolitan/cosmopolitan/public school acquired English accent does not give away any regional/MT influences.

Standard language derives its brand name from the fact that it is used in education, print, officialdom and high culture society. Standard language is different from language standard, which indicates the level of proficiency. It has been described by Trudgill (1974) as:

that variety of English which is usually used in print, and which is
normally taught in schools to non-native speakers learning the language
...it is also the variety, which is spoken by educated people and used in
news broadcasts...

It was never formally standardized but evolved gradually. Used by the educated class all over the UK and patronized by the aristocracy—it became the most widely accepted form of the English language. It has a world-recognized codified grammar and vocabulary. No doubt it has its own regional differences in the form of standard AE and various others but there is:

A general consensus among educated people, and in particular among
those who hold powerful and influential positions, as to what is SE and
what is non-standard English, as it were imposed from over the range of
regional dialects, and for this reason can be called a superposed variety of
language (Trudgill 1974).
While SE can be spoken with any regional accent, the English accent, known as RP, is associated only with SE. It is a ‘non-localized’ accent, which developed mainly in the English public schools and was the prescriptive model for all BBC announcers until recently. It is of some interest to note here that RP is spoken by only three percent of the English population. It is prescribed to foreign learners because it is the most widely understood accent and the best described and recorded.

3.1.3 History of Standard English

Standardization of language and the use of a model in the society came to occupy a vital core of human existence, once formal education became the norm. Before reformulating/recommending standardization, it is worth it to take a brief historical perspective of SE. English as we know it today has a short history of around three centuries. In 1775, William Perri, a lexicographer, compiled The Royal Standard English Dictionary. Through this dictionary he desired to bring together all users into “a uniform and unifying vocabulary” (Mc Arthur 1998). This was the first dictionary to publicize itself with the phrase, ‘Standard English’. The next in line was Oxford English Dictionary, brought out in 1836.

In the 19th century most writers did not even think of dialects as English, advocating the use of only the specialized and elevated SE as the medium of expression in their works, says Bailey (1991:04) quoting an anonymous writer. According to him, “... since the 18th century, there has been a tendency to regard the minority usage of upper-and middle-class life, education, publishing, law, administration, and government, as more proper, polite, legitimate, and real than anything used by other English-speakers, whoever and wherever
they night be.” Authorities like Samuel Johnson very clearly stated their dislike for the “shaky, shifty, unscheduled language of the masses” standing by the cause of “only with good English”.

What Johnson stated in a categorical manner stayed prevalent in the mid-twentieth century too. SE entrenched itself in society as well as in the academics.

Later in support of SE appeared the most influential British grammatical work called A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (Harlow Longman 1985) by Randolf Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Ian Svartvik.

In contrast, the past two decades have seen the emergence of a new model, where English is regarded as a group of dialects. We observe it has come a long way since 1836 when an anonymous writer did not consider dialects as English except for the SE. It observes SE as a group of dialects, the standard dialect, “as first among equals”. The standard dialect “has evolved for just such purposes—the only variety tailored for print”, remarks Mc Arthur (1998:111).

3.1.4 King’s English/ Queen’s English

During the Industrial Revolution the terms “Standard Language” and “Language Standard” became popular and SE got to be used almost synonymously with the King’s English/ Queen’s English, the language of the royal court, which was given as the model during the days of the Empire. It served as the essential guide to written English, printed on the cover of The King’s English by Francis G Fowler, et al, published by the OUP. Initially a 1906 publication, it continued to occupy shelf space with fresh reprints, ie 1931,1973.
3.1.5 Definition of Good English

However, in 1927 we observe another point of view regarding SE. Wyld quotes from John Marray’s book, *A Short History of English*, that SE was not a uniform language, but existed in several different forms or dialects. Few years later CL Wren (1949) added to his definition of English that good English is the English of the educated classes used without self-consciousness. ... He further adds that the answer to what is good English is what educated speakers say, thus taking the descriptive, not the prescriptive approach to language standardization. This observation can be considered a landmark statement, which paved the way for the formation and spread of a democratic attitude to language.

As recently as November 2002, David Crystal in the British Council Newsletter gives a more expansive view of descriptive model making. He says:

> We need to realize that what we say and how we say it, is manifestation of our cultures and our cultural assumptions and a reflection of the way our thinking is culturally patterned.

He is of the opinion that SL users should experiment with English because then English will give birth to “more new styles” which will extend the capacity and scope of the language. He is of the opinion that each culture will have to control “Standard English...”. He feels one can find ‘educated’ English in quality newspapers and become fluent in some kind of local English even if not many people follow it outside the area.

These remarks help us to study the changing attitudes towards SE, and also references made to possible sources of SE within one’s milieu. A closer look at different models is in place here.
3.1.6 Definition of a Model

Webster's third new International Dictionary (Springfield Mars, 1966) defines 'model' as a theoretical projection in detail of a possible system of human relationships. The fundamental grounds covered by a model are the detailed presentations of a system involving activities of human beings. Even though a little way back in times I would like to bring in Ferguson's (1962:4) view here:

A single accepted norm of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary is used for all levels of speaking and writing .... The technological requirements of mass communication, and especially those of mass distribution, require that spelling, morphology and syntax be uniform.

Here the interests of the society and dissemination of information in a single, unified code are the primary concern, and not the fact that there is an innate desire in every human being to express themselves and that will always affect change. There is no single definition of the model, fluid in nature.

Just as in the area of pronunciation, in the case of grammar too, the British model has enjoyed a distinct pedagogical advantage over others as it has been well defined and laid out, visited and revisited with the latest changes incorporated in books on it. However, like the British pronunciation the British grammar is no longer taken as the ultimate word in the discipline of English. Jean D Souza (1988), while examining interaction strategies in South Asian languages and their implications for teaching English internationally, comments on the "acculturation" of grammar. According to her in cultures where English has been institutionalized one cannot have an "exonormative standard" because "this will
result in a mismatch between language and grammar of culture". Therefore, the grammar of a culture is viewed as a crucial, significant area, when attempting the definition of the grammar of a language variety, in use in a particular region.

One cannot aim for just one level of communicative competence but must accommodate several layers of it. This will enhance teacher understanding of pedagogic and linguistic truths like deviations, errors, mistakes, author-specific liberties, etc in a less judgmental manner. As established by her through a study, in SL situation, speakers have adapted English to suit the grammar of their culture. They possess sufficient competence in their variety to communicate for their requirements. It is pointless to expect them to develop native-like competence since they do not need to interact with the natives. On a similar line of thought the past few decades have witnessed a favourable attitude growing towards indigenous varieties of English. Kachru (1976) observes that:

...although the prescriptive norms still exert their force, understandably,

there is a sizeable and growing segment of teachers and learners who believe that the model of instruction should be an Indian Variety of English.

Most teaching learning operations of language require a point of reference, a model that serves like an authority in deciding right from wrong or filtering out the less appropriate usages from out of the more appropriate ones. A model is a system, which defines rules and patterns, governs pronunciation, spelling, grammar, and describes lexical elements and discoursal features. Since the word model is being considered in reference to teaching-learning situations, it should be called a ‘pedagogic’ model and such a model is always prescriptive in nature even if its formulation has been governed by the descriptive ideology of linguistics. As quoted earlier, a pedagogic model is described as an idealized
or simplified language system, which is based on the language used by educated speakers of a particular variety. It does not capture individual preferences. A model is very closely associated with the social, political, economic system of the world and the nation for which it is being considered. It carries the “beliefs and behaviors of the speakers of this model”. This results in the model investing power or/ and prestige in its followers. It can also have contrary effects and arouse resentment. A model is a tool that is well or poorly suited to the task it performs. It is regarded as a thing of beauty to be preserved and protected. It stands as the symbol of a group’s pride and unity.

It should be easily accessible and therefore calls for codification and spread through dictionary, educational materials and resources and with recognized proficiency measurement instruments, says Petzold (2002:422-426).

3.1.7 Indian English and Standardization

From the points of view proposed by Petzold and supported by Kachru (1996) and a Nigerian linguist, Bamgbose (1998:5), a variety is ripe for standardization if the variants are popular and adequate to meet a community’s needs and it has a sizeable literature to its credit. IE meets all the three criteria and calls for standardization. In the post-independence India, the educated classes and masses have learnt to associate more closely with each other with IE playing the instrument of bonding. BE is no longer a matter of pride for a lot of us nor should it be regarded as the sole symbol of linguistic prestige. If anything, it is a symbol of bondage, not bonding. We have reams of materials depicting English the way Indians use it; all we need to do is compile them. We also need to compile dictionaries, which is a challenging task, but not an impossible one.
Nesfield, Fowler, Jesperson and Wren's teaching tools, the symbols and carriers of BE, have outlived their utility and validity in the English Compulsory classroom. IE has been able to build up a sizeable following on the other hand. In a study quoted in Kachru in *English as a World Language: South Asian English*, the undergraduates’ preference for BE was at 68 percent and for IE, 23 percent. That of the Faculty was at 67 percent for BE and 27 percent for IE. For a variety, which is struggling to find its feet, it is an achievement. But the idea is not to calculate our achievements. It is to solve the classroom problems of teaching-learning-testing.

### 3.1.8 International Models

Since English is spread across the world, there is concern expressed by experts regarding pedagogic models and materials at every forum of English teaching, around the world. Proposed models like World English (WE) International English (IntE) Global English (GE) have been floated from time to time. There are not many takers for them, as these Englishes are derived from geo-political causes and concerns not from the womb of time and maturation of the organic entity called English. These concerns are in consonance with the Western/European diaspora, which began in the 16th century. To solve the problems concerning our masses waiting to become English-literate, we have to find the solutions within our system rather than have international agencies imposing their viewpoints on us on how we can teach our children to speak and write.

If we examine English in the light of Darwin’s theory of evolution, we discover it to be a progeny of west Germanic, whose grandmother is known as Proto-Indo-European. In such a model, the grandmothers and mothers have reproduced except for the daughters
who remain barren or are being denied the right to reproduce the various English babies, the right accorded to only the “legitimate” ones, ie AE, Canadian English, AsE, etc.

Introducing WE, IntE, GE would be a contrived act and it would be unacceptable to most Indians, as language is not just a means of communication but the subject matter itself. It is a referant for loyalties and animosities, an indicator of social statuses and personal relationships, a marker of situations and topics as well as of the societal goals and the large-scale value-laden arenas of interaction that typify every speech community. We have to therefore cast the symbol of colonial yoke, ie BE.

The controversy prevails among those who hold the cause of “new” Englishes and those who favour retention of BE. Linguists like Kachru feel that ‘a pragmatic approach’ is warranted and that a ‘mono-model’ approach for English in the context of the world is neither applicable nor realistic. The “purists” are against the pragmatics standards and fret over the issue of international intelligibility.

But such problems can be worked out. A good example is that of Chinese which has three times as many native speakers as English. However, people using different dialects of Chinese (of which Mandarin is the most popular) do not always find each other intelligible. Similarly, how can BE expect to enjoy international intelligibility, and why should it? Quirk (1989:20) in the Kingman report expresses concern over the excess of emphasis being given to the bath-water ie, regional, social, ethnic variants of English by undervaluing the baby which is SE in the name of “idealistic, humanitarian, democratic... reasons”. So what does the baby look like over which purists like Quirk fret so much?
3.1.9 Importance of Standard English

We are aware that SE is a particular dialect of English, the only non-localized dialect of global currency without significant variation, universally accepted as the appropriate educational target in teaching English, which may be spoken with an unrestricted choice of accent.

(i) It provides a way of accounting for a range of observable distinctions and attitudes.

(ii) It offers a label for the grammatical and lexical components, at least of the teaching core undertaken by the profession of teaching English, whether as the MT or as a FL or SL.

(iii) It constitutes the unifying element within the enormous diversity of the English language, in Smith (1983).

And these statements are not disputed. SE has served all these purposes with much elan.

But one cannot overlook the fact that English as an international unifying factor is of less concern than English as an instrument of personal relationships and group solidarity. In the case of IE and similar Englishes it is the latter that is of prime importance. Honey (in Tikoo 1991:23-26) is very critical of new Englishes. He says, SE carries an implicit message of correctness but new Englishes do not. SE is a host to linguistic parasites, new Englishes are parasites, SE is codified, new Englishes are not. SE is the language of the wider society, new Englishes of a narrow particular society. Just one statement should be enough for the host of derogatory remarks made by Honey. IE is a nativized variety BE is
foreign to its first generation users in India. Codification can be worked out later to take care of other problems.

The 19/20th century model of English finds its evolutionary roots in the courtly, literary and Chaucery (administrative) level of the East Midland dialect to begin with, which was in vogue in England from the 15th century onwards. The spoken form of this ‘good English’ evolved by the 19th century into what Daniel Jones in 1917 called ‘Public School Pronunciation’, and in 1925 ‘Received Pronunciation’ (RP), and in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and usage into ‘Received Standard (English), a term given by Henry Cecil Wylds.

How a particular variety shot into ascendance of “high” levels can be understood under six categories, says Mc Arthur (1998). They are politics, communication, literature, religion, technology, and industrialization.

Politics:

The rise of the nation state saw the development of a particular language or a variety/dialect much in use by the centre of power. Writers, merchants, the academia, all of them associated with it and fostered its progress. London used it and Oxford, Cambridge, and public schools linked themselves with it. The masses and foreigners who came in contact with it regarded that “high” variety as the standard form and adopted it to show loyalty and class. But that is history. We are now a democratic society with a vision and resources of our own. We need to define our own norms and live by them.

Communication:

English, a Germanic language, witnessed a very direct and radical kind of Latinization 16th century onwards. Some linguists have criticized the practice advocating the return of
English to ‘Saxon English’ and/ or to the use of ‘plain English’ with minimum adoption of classical words. Communication demands simple, direct, contemporary English which IE carries the potential of.

**Literature:**

The Greek literary trends had a strong presence. But materials like *The Matter of British* (legends of King Arthur, *The Round Table*, and *The Holy Grail*) gave English literature its own “high” language, style, theme, allusions, etc. However, the British literature does not hold ground in modern India. It is a universal heritage and has influenced people’s thoughts and dialogues, shaped their sensibility for long enough. In the present times, the Indian model for graduates should acquire and concretize its own appearance and identity, its own vigour and manifestations (materials) to represent the Indian reality otherwise the Indian educational materials will continue to hang like an auxiliary branch of Native English (NE). To do so we have to first recognize its distinctive properties, then promote the stabilization of a pan-Indian standard based on materials such as literary works (Indian), radio, TV productions, Indian newspapers and magazines, and teacher-learner interactions in classroom. Agnihotri (1994) suggests, “... a child must be exposed to as large a, quantity and variety of language in action as possible...”

Another study conducted, quoted in Agnihotri (1994:271) reveals that 47 percent Indians wanted ordinary IE as the preferred model of English, out of the choice given of varieties like AE, BE, etc. We have come a long way since the days of Kachru’s study when only 27 percent Indians wanted IE.
Religion:

The Reformation oriented the new bourgeoisie to read the Bible in their own MT. So scriptures were translated from Hebrew and Greek, bypassing Latin, into English which influenced the language. As it was essentially the missionaries who looked after the education in British India, at least for the elite classes, members of these classes got associated with the Christian faith and traditions and with the western thought.

Technology:

When the printing press started in the mid-fifteenth century, it standardized a lot of things like the shape of symbols, formats, page sizes, orthographies, etc. The press was taken seriously by everybody and it started to influence the language of scriptures, literature, law, administration, and education. It gave a relatively stable script standard, which was used for decades by clerks in London. The conventions with some variations are followed even today establishing homogeneous international print standard of English.

Industrialization:

The standardized processes and products of the printing press signaled that language could be fixed, like its metal—like the formats of texts, sizes of pages, boxes that transported books. By this time people had got it fixed in their mind that print-based standardization was fixed and therefore good for academics. However, several linguists are of the view that we have to go beyond the horizon of a monolithic model, artificially frozen in time.
3.1.10 Need for a Multi-Model Society

A consensus is gradually building up towards a multi-model society regarding English. Its chief crusaders are Kachru, Petzold, Mc Arthur, etc. Mc Arthur (1998) says that the new models are not trying to weaken or destroy the old model but they intend to complement it. The subject, ie usages, is so large that one model alone cannot contain or carry it forward. Even if a number of linguists are anti- the multi-model theory, the plural, non-linear models are actually emerging, ie Singapore English, IE, Nigerian English, etc. The monolithic linear model used as SE language by newspapers and airports is getting displaced. The new models are thriving and they reflect the prevalence of the democratic approach. Pluralism has now become an integral part of the English language and literature. When there is a repertoire of cultures and literatures, surely a monolithic model cannot carry it (Teaching World English, Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics 15 (1) 1989).

All this had been predicted by Sinclair (1988) when he announced that “powerful new models of English” will be functional without having received any assistance from native speakers.

The idea is to focus on the fact that these Englishes with little native speaker help are being used as the chief languages. Sinclair declares that these varieties will “derive authority from an impressive group of scholars and administrator”. And there will be thousands of experts on the language who will teach it but not be native speakers.

Then there is no reason as to why IE cannot and should not be formally codified and introduced as a model. Sinclair’s words have turned out to be true. Today, IE has scholars, writers, teachers and average users to carry it forward.
3.1.11. Evolving a Model

A model for pedagogic purposes should essentially capture the language that exists in the environment. This way, the approach to the formulation of a model is descriptive. Most learners come to an English classroom with very clearly thought out needs, which are generally linked to communications in contemporary times. Widdowson (1984:7) questions the belief that the best models of language teaching will come from formal descriptions of languages and says that “the main business of Applied Linguistics should be the establishing of appropriate concepts or models of language in the pedagogic domain without prejudging the issue by supposing that a relevant model of language must inevitably derive from a formal model of linguistic description in a technical sense.”

Applied linguistics should collect data from society, from actual use. We have to make a stabilized model but not a stagnant one (Tottle in Greenbaum 1977:206).

It is the youth we are dealing with and let us have it straight before us, they detest still waters.

Quirk (1978) proposed Nuclear English as the model. For this act, NE needs to be simplified. Once simplified Nuclear English can play the role of an international auxiliary to connect the world. Nuclear English should be easier and faster to learn. Should be adequate with a provision for extension of further learning of the language. As per Quirk:

(a) It should have “communicative adequacy” where the learner can express a large number of communicative needs.

(b) It should be “amenable to extension” where the models under ESP can be learnt. “...the lexical and
grammatical properties of Nuclear English must be a subset of the properties of full English" (1978.1), eg, "she used to work here, didn’t she?" can become “is that so?”—a tag common to all questions and no penalty to be imposed for not using various auxiliary verbs (modals) for the tag questions. He accepts that “native speaker English is too costly and perhaps even unattainable”.

Yet another proposal is of evolving Utilitarian English as a model—a very functional variety of English where the needs of the users are highly limited. In such models the aesthetic and stylistic features will get undermined. In sheer desperation, Lal (1964 in Mehrotra 1982) remarks:

Queen’s English is absurd for our purposes, correct English is insufferably Nesfieldian and dull. What is needed is imaginative break—through English, the kind no one speaks in India, but conditions being ideal, would.

Standardization happens in association with three basic features: form, function, acceptance. What is needed is to prepare a corpus of usages of IE. This cataloguing, after passing certain tests, can be codified. A set of norms needs to be formed which will distinguish the correct from wrong. The codification should be able to meet all the requirements of the community. Such usages should get accepted within the speech community. The model should be found in the form of dictionaries, grammars, style manuals and prototype types. Such a model’s acceptance is perpetuated via social institutions and experts, such as government, schools, literature, linguists, grammarians and the mass media (Aghayes 1988). It is the written communication variant, which is more likely to be standardized than the oral one. Standardization, says Fishman (1971), is
a character of the social treatment of a variety, not a property of the language variant itself. While Chomsky (1965:29) does not take the socio-pragmatic aspect of language into regard, Hymes (1972:277-78) goes to include temporal, spatial, interpersonal, topical, and rhetorical aspects of communicative competence as part of the package along with grammatical competence. Cultural appropriateness is an essential aspect in language standardization, says Hymes.

From the point of view of such statements it is more than obvious that BE is quite out of sync in the Indian environment.

A standard language is like a superposed variety, which serves as a marker, distinguishing the particular variety by explaining its uniqueness. It unifies and scales a community that follows it and enhances their prestige as well as that of the language as it offers a model for correct usage to the speakers and other learners. It recognizes the formulation of a model as a marathon task.

3.1.12 Problems of Standardization

Apprehensions are expressed regarding a local model chiefly in respect to their lexical items. It is apprehended that the property of meaning may change so much that the variety may become unintelligible, even unrecognizable. Lopez-Ortega (1985:64 in Patil 1994) comments that in literary discourse of some African and Asian writers the deviations are deep and the metaphor, image and symbol are deeply rooted in the culture. Such an act makes the use of English appear like it were at a surface structure. Patil advocates that one should not “negotiate between the processes of standardization and localization.”
Such responses are typical from people from outside the variety. Many of them look at such variations as encroachment or adulteration of the variety they guard as gatekeepers.

3.1.13 Standard English ...Continued

SE is meaningful as a concept, one that exists in the written language. It comes with a skill which people apply the rules in all details. It is valued very highly in the world by the users of English. Yet, we need to remember that there is no centralized authority in SE. In any debate, one needs to go by consensus rather than by the word of any one person or manual, as none can boast of complete knowledge. Books given to us by Fowler, Nesfield, Wren and Martin and later Greenbaum and others are tools of teaching, not an authority unto themselves. Tsui and Bunton (2001) show that participants when arguing on a point of dispute regarding English arrive at a consensus on the basis of ‘naturalness’, usage, native speaker usage and dictionaries. This entire exercise makes SE come across as one perpetuating a complex sense of authority.

SE is a learned skill, says Gupta (2001) where there may not be an absolute agreement. She says that the concept of SE is idealized rather than real—a realistic assessment of SE does not tie to any location. One is bound to find ‘errors’ in the British print media and the examination sheets of students, as anywhere else in a developing country. To ascertain what is SE, we look for real life models in people, native and non-native. Therefore the very basis of comparing new Englishes, eg, IE with SE as the yardstick is fallacious.
3.1.14 English Teaching in India: Why Literature

English teaching in India suffers with dichotomies. Though most of the policy-framers and teachers are convinced that the essential role of English in India is communication, we continue to teach the language by educating our learners in “the literature and thought of England”. Macaulay introduced it with a sense of conviction that the western ideas were superior to the oriental learning. Although we no longer entertain such notions, we continue to teach English through British/ American literary works, given our mindset. We have de-colonized ourselves politically but not mentally. Such literary texts, as mentioned above, do not lend themselves well to a skills-based pedagogy. In British India, anthologies of English poets, playwrights and short story writers were aimed at introducing learners to the best literature and culture in the world in order to humanize them. But memorization of essays, idioms and paradigms of grammar rules along with reproduction of ideas given by British writers do not teach them communication. Literature is always culture-specific. The social structures, their morality and spirituality are so closely bound in a literary text that in order to appreciate the texts, one has to first associate with its culture. Teachers and learners have to struggle hard to first locate the poem in its social, political and literary context, interpret its environment and ambience, most often even rewind the clock to historical times rather than learn to comment on the contemporary politics, crime, sports and finance in equally contemporary language. The whole exercise becomes counter-productive (Nagpal in Agnihotri 1995:90). In the early 19th century, most of the course design was done by the missionaries, who put “the Bible, Paley’s *Natural Theology*, Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, Bacon’s *Novum Organum*, Plato’s *Dialogue*, etc in the syllabus. In the mid-nineteenth century a standard course in
English comprised a set of poems from Richardson's selection from the British Poets, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, *Iliad* by Homer, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, *Othello* and *Macbeth*, Addison's *Essays*, Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, etc. The British have left, the missionaries have nativized themselves, and India has witnessed a proliferation of good Indian writings in English in the form of literature, newspapers/magazines, softwares of electronic media and now even the new media, ie the Internet, but the English Compulsory courses continue to ride high on the British classics.

What gets overlooked is that for an average learner, learning English through the classics becomes more difficult because of the unusual use of language set in ancient times. They are enough to baffle a learner who cannot even write one straight sentence. Often the learners at the basic level of English get caught in the multiple layers of meaning, ie textual, metaphoric/idiomatic, philosophical, etc. Cracking a literary text involves an experienced hand in a particular variety of English, ie BE, as the meaning is generally elusive, the language archaic at times, the form not always conventional. Learners not competent enough in English find it difficult to understand the texts. "The superstructure is more weighty than the foundation can support", says Halliday et al 1964:184 (in Agnihotri 1995). Jesperson illustrates the same point by giving examples of how creative writers take liberty with language—they “split their infinitives, dangle their particles, double their negatives or use prepositions to end sentences with” while tackling matters of emotions and social traditions rather than thinking of students of language and minding their grammar while writing. Mahadevan (1980 in Agnihotri 1995:180) makes a note of how “much of what Shakespeare wrote is ungrammatical. And he did not write that way out of caprices, but for the fact that the English language did not have to, and
would not have put up with a Panini. While teaching literature, we are concerned with the background of the writer, his era, plot, characters, philosophy, etc, whereas in a language classroom we foreground vocabulary, usage, communication skills, pronunciation, etc. Knowledge gets foregrounded in a literature class, skills in a language class. Learners at a lower level of proficiency are also ill-equipped to tackle hyper-semanticized words, just as they are to tackle the syntax of poetry. A good example of minimal role of literary studies in teaching of English is that of China. "... foreign languages are studied as weapons in the revolutionary struggle and the teaching material for at least the first three years are based on life and thought in China, not in a foreign country. The students learn to talk about the Chinese countryside, to sing songs in honour of Chairman Mao and the party." They learn to talk to visitors from abroad about their culture. It is the advanced level students who strengthen their English with texts from other countries. Ferguson (1975:4 in Agnihotri 1995).

"The teaching of English must be embedded in the indigenous contexts and geared to the local needs" (Mehrotra in Agnihotri 1995:112).

There are various subjects like geography, maths, botany and aeronautics, which can be used to teach English. Literature can be a good tool to learn English but only in a limited way. Literature is good for vocabulary building but they are not much help in teaching contemporary usages. As Pattison puts it:

To read Shakespeare is a very good reason for learning English, but
he is not a model for learning contemporary English.
Only the modern literary works, that too not all of them, carry contemporary usages. However, the media, especially the print media, not only carries contemporary usages, it also carries contemporary thoughts and facts.

3.1.15 English Teaching in India: Why Not Media

The poor performance of students even in writing a simple job application or reading a newspaper after ten years of English is often attributed to a faulty “education policy, uncongenial learning environment, first generation learners, foreign language learning, dearth of ‘reading materials, outdated syllabi, methodology and examinations’” (Sood in Agnihotri 1995:167). We can add to it, ill-designed testing and evaluation instruments. It is the absence of an appropriate indigenous model, to be carried forward by appropriate teaching materials, as represented in the BA II English Compulsory syllabus is what I am focusing on in this study. This is in the light of departures of English from the mother variety and their standardization, which need representation in the syllabus.

To standardize any language variety for pedagogic purposes, it is important that it be brought to print. It is believed that the English we know as SBE became so only when it began to be printed and spoken by the educated elite. Scholars “preferred a single stable English to a mass of slippery barbarous Englishes ...” (Mc Arthur 1998). Technology too cast its influence on the authority of the printed word, establishing it as the standardized form. The printed press made its presence felt in the Rhine valley in the mid-fifteenth century. As mentioned earlier, it triggered “the process of standardization of various elements of print like metal type, uniform look formats, page size, orthographies for the
major vernaculars and usage in the literary, scriptural legal, administration and educational areas," says Mc Arthur (1998).

Since then, the printed word of the newspapers has always stood as an authority to refer to when in doubt in language matters. Newspapers, more than TV and radio, are considered dependable sources of acceptable usages. They are also considered to carry appropriate language for learners of English, appropriate and standard apart from printing errors, etc. The style of newspaper is generally simple, informal and adaptable. Newspapers are intentionally written in plain everyday English. They also sample economy of language use and effacing in communication (Davidson 1998). He adds, we choose the written word over the spoken because speech is essentially made of ephemeral, temporal sequences of fairly seamless vocal sounds, in context-bound, face to face communication, while writing by contrast, consists of fixed, linear sequences of discrete visual marks, in potentially context-free and more or less remote communication, as quoted earlier in the study.

In order to standardize a language for pedagogic purposes, a particular dialect or a combination of dialects/ varieties of a particular language can be selected. This selection is then officially recognized as the only language variant, which is legitimated by the government of a nation. It is further used in the school system, the public media, literature and government. This may be somewhat imposing in nature reflective of the prescriptive mode of standardization. But this is usually the process practised. Linguists, lexicographers, language teachers, journalists and publishers are the professionals who exercise an unwritten authority over providing validity and promotion to the selected variety/ ies. Without the institutional support of such professionals and organizations a
variety cannot strike roots. It is through use in educational programmes, business transactions, publications that the standardized variety finds its nourishment and spread. Learning of the standardized variety in school gets reinforced with application in the real world. Kachru (in Tickoo 1991:213) further presents the argument that the input a language learner receives from the environment is in the shape of form. The strategies of use come from the peer group, teachers, family, social circle and the media. Mass media can lead to homogenization of not only a language use but of a culture as well.

**As stated earlier, a model has four stages to it: selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance** (Hudson 1980:33 in Tickoo: 1991). The media, especially the newspapers, can be made the primary natural source for selection of usages and corpus creation for the model.

Post-codification, the media also serves as an ideal vehicle for elaboration and popularization of the variety by using the language in topics of national and international interest.

Media is a recommended source as it is easy to obtain samples of interest and value from it. Media generally has multiple originators passing through certain standards of quality control. Media represents all kinds of discourse and offers a variety of styles. Different newspapers can also provide similar text types with different viewpoints. This is so because at a time they generally deal with the same topics and use similar language. Gorlarch (1995:65) endorses it by saying they can also be compared worldwide in respect to events they deal with. They also sample language that is close to the local written form. This happens because just as the media shapes public opinion, the society moulds its language by demanding certain standards and styles. We have an example of such a
procedure in the case of Singapore English which studied/ codified English by collecting the loan words from Hokkien. Such a model is evident of “systematicity as opposed to hypothesized model. Dictionaries, on the other hand, have a bias towards literary texts and archaism, not towards spoken text and modernism”, says Gorlarch (1995: 665). Singapore dictionaries looked for contemporary poetry, prose, plays, newspapers written in English to form the new canon and new authority for SL learners and there is no reason why we cannot initiate the process for IE. Only that we should depend more on print media for samples of good IE for the preparation of the model. Korean English belonging to the expanding circle also began codification in 1998 when it completed one hundred and fifteen years of education in English. Many Englishes are doing that if they have not done it already. What follows is a list of dictionaries prepared by Englishes of the outer/ expanding circle.

- Dictionary of Trinbagoman: Creative and Scholarly Dictionary of English of Trinidad and Tobago

- Dictionary of Jamaican English: Fred Cassidy is one of the editors.

Proposals are on for the following:

- Dictionary of West African English (DWAE). It is a compilation of a dictionary to reflect their varieties by focussing on departures from SBE

- Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage by Richard Allsopp.
3.1.16 Standardizing the Media Way

The media also behaves like the gatekeeper of uniformity in language rules. This can be discovered in the way the US media practises it. A stylebook guards all media offices and personnel referred to as a kangaroo court with a hanging Judge. The Associated Press (AP), United Press International (UPI) “joint stylebook” is the ultimate authority to the media world. They are influential as almost all the US daily newspapers subscribe to the two wire services. “...it serves as a common denominator, striving for norms that will prove acceptable to thousands of editors and millions of readers across the nation....”

The teletypesetter, introduced in 1951, led directly to the first “joint stylebook”, the device automatically set AP and UPI material in type. The two books of the joint stylebook are *The Associated Press Stylebook and Libel Manual*: AP, New York (new edition) 1997 edited by Howard Agione and *The UPI Stylebook*, UPI, New York (new edition) 1977 edited by Bobby Ray Miller. The strictures recorded are the same but carry different examples. There is information on abbreviations, punctuation, grammar, spelling, names and proper usage of words. Those not covered can be referred to in Webster’s *New World Dictionary Second College Edition*, and if that fails then there are instructions to consult Webster’s Third New International Dictionary. *There’s Never Choice*, says Metcalf (in Greenbaum 1985). He further adds:

Newspaper style distinguishes itself from academic and book publishing style by its simplicity informality and adaptability... if a newspaper appears to be written in plain everyday English, that is no accident, but the intent of the stylebook.
3.1.17 Concluding Remarks

Baumgardner (1987) recommends the use of newspapers to teach English in Pakistan, claiming they are “homegrown” in their language and content. They are sensitive to the local taste. Even though newspapers are a form of institutional discourse, they speak in a style befitting interpersonal communication, addressing the individual in a one-to-one manner. They participate actively in the political, social, economic, cultural aspects of life of a reader by constructing an illusion of informality, familiarity, friendliness. When we talk of language for communication, they are the sources, which come very close to our aims of teaching English. Since the English in our newspapers has got nativized, it is time to observe it, polish it and go to the last point of the procedure of model making (after selection, codification and expansion), gauge its acceptance.
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