CHAPTER I

Deteriorating Standards of English in India: A Concern

The British rule, which lasted nearly three centuries, left behind not only a race of Anglo-Indians but an Anglo-Indian language, too. “What started with puccah and rupiah with the advent of the British Empire since mid 17th century has now become a cult” (Indian Express August 27, 1991). English in India has always been in the process of Indianization but it has done this so extensively and rapidly only since 1947 when its native speakers left the country. To meet the needs of the society, personal, inter-personal and institutional, it has evolved unusual usages which some refer to as deviants, a pejorative term, and some as variants, a natural occurrence—both respectable and acceptable—and also as “arbitrary creations” (Verma 1982). It is not inferior or superior to British English (BE) or American English (AE) but is “different” and our very own (Subrahmaniam 1977:23). Kamla Das, a modern Indian poet, has put across her sentiments about it very honestly and assertively:

The language I speak
Becomes mine
Its distortions its queerness
All mine, mine alone,
It is half English, half Indian
Funny perhaps, but it is honest
It is human as I am human
Don’t you see?
(Summer in Calcutta)
1.1 The Research Problem

While there has been a widespread use of English in India, there has also been a rapid downfall in its standards. Fifty years ago, one would rarely come across a graduate unable to hold a conversation in English or write an application. In the present times, though English Compulsory courses are aimed at making the millions English-literate, the truth is far from it. One of the causes can be ascertained as the absence of a model the learners would feel comfortable with. English is still taught through Shakespeare and Milton. In his debut novel, *English August* (1988), Upamanyu Chatterjee, raises the query: What is Milton doing in Meerut? This research is directed towards exploring the possibility of evolving an indigenous model of English for pedagogic purposes by standardizing Indian variants of English. It examines the attitude of those concerned towards the concept of a new model for teaching purposes. It targets the English Compulsory classes, as they can be the biggest beneficiaries of such a move. After examining the related issues of variations of English and standardization it takes up an extensive study involving members of the academia and media to assess the relative worth of the proposal of framing a model of Indian English (IE).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Even after receiving ten years of English education, an Indian graduate, often, cannot produce a single correct sentence, written or spoken. What ails the English language teaching programmes in India is no mystery to most of us engaged in the profession of imparting education in schools and colleges. Navel-gazing, stormy debates at
English Language Teaching (ELT) forums and researches across the nation have together stripped open the chaos our education system has become in general and the English education in particular though there is no denying the fact that we have pockets of excellence of education concentrated mainly in the urban India.

The absence of an indigenous pedagogic model, and appropriately designed materials, shortage of competent teachers, faulty testing system, long spells of absenteeism indulged in by students in institutions, loosely constructed academic sessions with frequent spells of holidays, teacher apathy on account of poor remuneration, etc, are some of the causes behind the falling standards of English. There are many reasons, each as significant as the other, but this study focuses on the absence of an indigenous pedagogic model for IE.

English in India has been changing all along but it has not done as much as in the past two or three decades. Having penetrated deeper into the soil since then, it has developed and assimilated new features of lexis and syntax, unusual collocations, different registers and stylistic nuances, which remain unique to other communities of English. So widespread is their growth that it is difficult to pick up a piece of any literature published here and not find an Indian variant in it. In contrast, if we pick up the prescribed books of some of the undergraduate English Compulsory courses, we discover that the language and its use are very different from the modern usage. A number of vocabulary items do not quite mean what they stand for today, the syntax is peculiar (as in poetry), the presence of unusual collocations, archaic idioms, set in earlier centuries amidst alien lands are enough to baffle a semi-literate undergraduates of the English Compulsory class.
Awe-struck with such a model of English imposed on them, most learners switch off and resort to guides which simplify the process of passing exams for them but fail to equip them with the required skills of English. This study looks at such variants of IE from the point of view of standardizing the variety. Before recommending such a step, the study explores the field to elicit opinion of those who are closely involved with the growth of the language. Through an extensive survey involving various questions, this study aims to present the views of those involved closely with the English language in India, on the incorporation of Indian variants in the pedagogic model, specifically for the undergraduate level of learners.

1.2.1 Variations of English

English as it exists in today’s India can be divided into three broad areas of variations: in terms of region, proficiency and situation. BE co-exists here with several variations, providing interesting options to most concerned, but creating a chaos for teachers, learners, examiners and examinees. Errors, variants, deviants, creativity, poetic license and purity are terms freely tossed around which stand for non-BE items. Lack of agreement/ uniformity/ consistency in marking a variant right or wrong is a subject of debate as much as assessing causes of the falling standards of English in India.

George Bernard Shaw, the British playwright of the late 19th century, made some incisive remarks on the English language. Initially just a keen observer of it, he grew into a serious commentator of it by the late 19th century. Though his interests lay chiefly in the spoken aspect of English, he expressed concern over its written form, too. He said that English was very difficult to learn and was experienced so by foreigners and the English
alike. He records this view in the preface to his play, Pygmalion (1912), “The English have no respect for their language, and will not teach their children to speak it. They cannot spell it because they have nothing to spell it with”, said he.

He observed that the English had no orderly system but an old foreign alphabet (the Roman Alphabet) to spell their words with. In the alphabet, only the consonants, not all of them, had a one to one corresponding relationship with the sound system and practically none of the vowels had any uniformity in depicting definite sounds. Observing this he remarked, no man could teach himself what it should sound like from reading it.

Nearly a century since then, the Indian society in general and its teachers of English in particular have begun to deliberate over the decline in its standards. We have arrived at this juncture due to more reasons than one. Over-sightedness in framing policies related to teaching English, ill-framed objectives, mismanagement of curricula and course design, lack of trained and motivated teaching staff, neglect of language development and teaching materials/testing instruments have all contributed to the dismal standards of English in post-independence India.

Even after half a century since the British left India, we have failed to standardize the changes that have occurred in English and evolve a pedagogic model to teach English. The government of India, the state governments, the policy framers and most of the course designers are not even aware of the fact that there exists a variety called IE, which needs to be developed and polished. IE and similar new Englishes exist is more than obvious in the statement made by John Burgh, the then Director General of the British Council, in his keynote address at a conference in September 1984 in London. In the
foreword to the report “English in the World” (ed Quirk and Widdowson 1985 in Mc Arthur 1998:55) Burgh recognizes the new Englishes adding that there is:

* A general insistence on the plural form ‘English Literatures’.
* A fascinating ferment in the development of ‘Englishes’ (that is varieties of English) worldwide.

Gradually, IE and other varieties of English are beginning to get recognized as “New Englishes”, “Institutionalized Varieties”, etc. Some of these varieties like IE need reworking on their teaching plans and teaching tools. Their teachers need training in tackling the day to day problems related to its widespread use. And the foremost concern emerges to be the absence of a Model.

### 1.2.2 Lack of an Indigenous Model

Over the past two decades, democratization of language has brought in terms like ‘unacceptable’ and ‘inappropriate’ in place of ‘wrong’, ‘non-standard’ in place of ‘substandard’, and so on. However, the use of polite terms has not made the task of teachers any simpler. The innumerable variations created thanks to the demands of different situations, registers, mediums within their own spatio-cultural peculiarities, have put the teaching community in a quandary in distinguishing the acceptable from the non-acceptable or the appropriate from the inappropriate. As Das (1982) states:

> There has been no comprehensive study of any of these varieties.

Papers have been published and seminars have been organized on Indian English, but the explicitness, systematicness, and objectivity one expects from linguistic description have not been
achieved.

However, even in the absence of a definite model, efficient language learners can attain a high level of competence and learn to switch their gears to suit the roles they play in different situations (Verma 1988). In other words, despite being presented different variations in the classroom and the environment, good language learners can manipulate registers and modulate their levels to converge to the expectations of the situation. Verma claims that successful bilinguals can keep their languages apart while communicating but by and large such users possess an English medium educational background.

The learners I am concerned with in this study are the ones from the vernacular medium of educational stream. Though on average they have been through seven years of orientation in English through the English Compulsory courses, a majority of them stay incompetent in using the language fluently or coherently at the undergraduate level. They study English as one of the several subjects. The linguistic input can prove beneficial to them if they have an updated indigenous model of English, which captures the language in its authentic form of existence. In short, they need a definite model, as they are unable to constantly readapt themselves to changing socio-cultural needs.

1.2.3 Concept of a Model

Most teaching learning operations of language require a point of reference—a ‘model’, which serves as an authority in ascertaining the appropriateness of a usage. A model is a system that defines rules and patterns, governs pronunciation, spelling, grammar, and describes lexical elements and discoursal features. Such a model is carried in a set-up in the form of dictionaries, grammar books, manuals, specimens of literature of different
genres and subjects in the form of books, audio/ videotapes and other software.

Standardization is an artificial process a language variety is put through in order to evolve a model. Since it is considered in the context of teaching/ learning operations, such a model may be called a pedagogic model, one of the main concerns of this study. And such a model is almost always prescriptive in nature.

Language use stimulates creativity. The urge to express experiences leads one into experimenting with language, moulding and reshaping it, rendering it into a new realization. At times language items are looked at as arbitrary, idiosyncratic features. But in many contexts these features show systematic use with wider yet not total acceptability. In such situations, the formulation/ reformulation of a model becomes mandatory. We should not overlook the fact that if digression in language is a natural phenomenon, standardization is a pedagogic truth, which, by maintaining uniformity in use, ensures a higher degree of intelligibility.

Various factors influence the selection of a model for pedagogic purposes. The utility of the language in a given context becomes an important deciding factor. The motivation to learn English in India is of the “instrumental” variety and not “integrative” (Lambert & Gardner 1972). While the former indicates utilitarian purposes, ie securing a job, pursuit of studies, etc, the latter aims at complete merger with the culture concerned. The attitude of the users towards a given variety also affects the decision of selection of the model. While some varieties enjoy high prestige value, eg Standard British English (SBE), most non-native localized varieties tend to be stigmatized. The availability of a well-codified language and extensively laid out materials in the variety is yet another important criterion in choosing the pedagogic model. Besides, the role of a given language at the
local/ regional/ national and international level is of great significance. English is used by over 1.2-1.5 billion people the world over, nearly a quarter of the humanity (Crystal 1997). The debate over considering the adoption of a mono-model versus poly-model approach in teaching/ learning programmes goes on. Questions regarding the need and possibility of an international codification and the practicality and viability of such suggestions are raised at every linguistic forum. International English, Nuclear English, Utilitarian English are not just hollow terms but concepts well under way to realization. The question is how sensible it is to accommodate a poly-model approach in the name of democracy and utility. Will it not affect intelligibility? On the other hand, will not a mono-model approach kill the very spirit of a vibrant variety at the altar of uniformity? Besides, how feasible are all these concepts in the first place?

1.2.4 Need for a Pedagogic Model

The authorities in India consider English to be a subject as homogeneous as geography or biology. In reality, English is not a homogeneous entity but exists in multiple forms, such as BE, IE, Australian English (AsE), AE, etc. Therefore, is it possible for English in India to continue to follow the rules of the English language prescribed in Wren and Martin’s books of grammar and dictionaries published by international publishing houses located on foreign shores? Can we expect our students of English Compulsory courses, who form the majority of undergraduate learners of English, to follow the model given by Shakespeare and Keats and produce contemporary English? Do we not need to evolve a model of our own, contemporary and rooted in our own culture? To teach them to
communicate in English in India, we certainly need a pedagogic model of our own. Ruth Petzold (2002: 422-426) explains the concept of a pedagogic model:

A pedagogical model is an idealized or simplified language system that tries to capture the language that is common among educated speakers of the variety... it is more or less accessible and usable according to whether it has been codified and used in dictionaries, educational materials, and resources and has recognized proficiency measurement instruments.

If we intend to standardize a variety, it should be the one used by the “educated speakers” in India.

1.2.5 Indian English

Indian English is a cover term for that variety of English, which is used by a large number of educated Indians as a Second Language (SL), meaning it is used in communication at the intra-national level in day to day dealings. As a result of nativization, BE in India has developed a range of varieties. Nativization has occurred due to interference with regional languages (contact varieties), intentional and unintentional, and due to acquisitional inadequacies (speech continuum). Not yet standardized, it has come to be referred to as IE at international forums of linguistics, in international journals of linguistics and about everywhere in the national scenario.

Transplanted in the Indian soil more than 4000 miles away from its native land England, English has absorbed the predominant local culture as well as the sub-cultures in the approximately 300 years of its existence here.
Variations had begun to occur due to varied reasons. The earliest to be recorded are in *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Colloquial Words and Phrases and of Kindred Terms* (Yule & Burnell 1903). In 1972, RK Bansal and JB Harrison published a manual of speech and phonetics called *Spoken English for India*, classifying Indian variants of spoken English. The book became popular, not its concepts.

Although not yet standardized, IE is quite intelligible both within and outside India. Indians are aware of the fact that the variety of English they use is quite different from BE. Parashar (1991) conducted a survey asking three hundred and fifty subjects to evaluate their own variety of English. 76.5 percent of them called it, “The kind of English spoken by educated Indians”.

As English cohabited with the vernacular languages, it adapted itself to the local needs, got mauled and mutilated by its learners, acquired a designated status in the government/education policies, and also got manipulated by creative writers in their attempt to capture local cultural nuances through it. Many of those writers took it to international forums winning laurels. One reason why Arundhati Roy was awarded the Booker Prize in 1997 for her debut novel, *The God of Small Things*, was her linguistic inventiveness. A recent ‘codified’ manifestation of IE is *Indian English Supplement* in *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* by AS Hornby, OUP, 1996.

It is a well established fact that in a heterogeneous society such as India, people bring in linguistic, regional, social, racial and socioeconomic diversities. Such inputs blend with each other in different proportions to form different combinations effecting changes in a language in use. In the case of English, the transfer of elements from the user’s mother tongue (MT), the culture of conversation, communicative and social strategies adopted,
innovative elements and writing styles of the local culture have contributed towards its nativization in India.

Even within a variety such as IE, there are varying degrees of Englishes measured on the grade chart, from pidgin English to metropolitan educated English. Non-native varieties such as IE are particularly prone to being scrutinized and judged by a vertical hierarchy of competence. In India, if we have pidgin English being used by tourist guides, restaurant waiters and taxi-drivers, we also have a variety associated with the very elite in England being used by a few. Macaulay’s brother-in-law, Charles Tevelyan, once remarked (1994: 46-47 in Agnihotri 1997:26) that the elite group, the class of educated Indians, spoke:

... purer English than we speak ourselves, for they take it from the purest models, they speak the language of the Spectator, such English as is never spoken in England.

One may have a condescending approach to examining the low standard varieties within IE but it needs to be acknowledged that they exist and are thriving not very far away from the varieties of educated speakers of IE. However, when it comes to evolving a pedagogic model we need to base it on a higher graded English, used by the metropolitan/cosmopolitan English-educated Indian. BE models have outlived their utility and validity in India. While many elements and features of BE sound incongruous, IE has sprouted their replacements which serve the needs of the local population. They now expect inclusion in the classroom through a well-formulated model—indigenous in nature. A number of phenomenal changes have occurred in IE. They are more than visible everywhere, on the Internet and other latest electronic media forms, and they
abound in borrowings from Indian languages. Span (2001:53) reports information from a site called India World, which carries labels such as “Samachar, a Khoj” “Khel: Indian Cricket”, not to miss the web-sites like www.samachar.com and www.khoj.com and the highly controversial www.tehelka.com. The trends these days favour the attitude of going ethnic, at least while in one’s own country. Sandra Tawake examines bilinguals' creativity in literature (2003) while quoting Ashcroft, Tiffins (1989: 7-8):

The imperial (of British Empire) education system installs a standard version of the imperial language as norm and marginalizes all variants and impurities the medium through which language then becomes perpetuated.

As per Tawake, the imperial variety continues to perpetuate power through its presence in the centres of power, not according respectability to hybridization, variant dialects, insisting on the standard code, ie Standard British English (SBE). She adds, “However such power is rejected when an effective post colonial voice emerges.”

As obvious, such statements are made in support of and to provide validity to realities such as “hybridization” and “variant dialects”, the byproducts of the language of an imperial power. The thesis focuses on this aspect of linguistics, ie to establish the importance of the practice of language in use versus the standard code handed down to us as a legacy of the imperial rule. The choice of imposing SBE has long been advocated by “traditionalism... and perceptions of its being the authentic vehicle of great literature and the exponent of the values” (Honey 1995). But it amounts to linguistic chauvinism of the variety (BE). Kachru demands “linguistic liberation” for the non-native varieties. However, it is easy to propose such an idea but difficult to realize it. To change or to even
update the model of a language is like needling the core of a group’s identity. Since language establishes connectivity with one’s entire life, we tend to cling to old practices, governed by the instinct to conform to social expectations. Therefore, for a fresh model of a long established language to actually prosper, it is essential that it come into widespread practice, particularly amongst the elite, and get adopted by those in the business of English language teaching. Also, the model has to find acceptability everywhere in the society for which it is framed. Since English is learnt in the classroom in India, the new model must find active participation in every aspect of teaching and learning. Such a view is further established by Savingnon who quotes Berger 1968, Smith 1970 and Savingnon 1997 (in World Englishes, 22 (1), 2003). She says that the classroom is a:

...social context. Language is inseparable from individual identity and social behaviour. Language defines a community, a community in turn, defines the forms and uses of language.

This statement supports my argument that a variety adopted by a community will undergo changes to meet the needs of that community even if it must part ways with its mother variety. In the same breath Savingnon (in Tawake WE 22 (1) 2003) quotes Kinginger (2002) on how teachers develop interpretative skills for evaluating discourses, proving the desire to extend beyond the mother variety. She recommends the use of newspapers for collection of primary data on lexical innovations, which can be compiled as a dictionary.

To grasp the issues involved in the formulation and implementation of a model, it is essential to get an overview of the post independence English language teaching scenario.
It will provide us an insight into what ails English in India and how it can be treated.

1.2.6 Causes of Deteriorating Standards

In colonial India, English had an elitist entity. There were few Indians who received formal education and it was in the classroom where they learnt English through formal instruction. Post independence, the Indian government framed the policy of universalization of education where English became a core area of the educational programmes, compulsory for every student. In an attempt to go for the quantity, ie to strike roots among the masses, the English language began to lose its grip over ‘quality control’. The standards of acquisition and expression began to deteriorate. Such a state produced masses of people, who had been through formal courses of English but had not learnt to use it effectively. Consequently, the issue of deteriorating standards in teaching/learning programmes, particularly at the college level, became a matter of serious concern for the policy framers, course/ syllabus designers, materials producers, teachers, students, the society and the market. When we ponder over the matter, we can attribute several causes to the near failure of the system of English teaching in India.

After the independence, the government of India framed a policy under which every child was to be given education. The regional languages had to serve as the mediums of instruction through the school years. Apart from the privately owned schools, which had the liberty to choose English as the medium of instruction, all government schools were to follow Hindi and the vernaculars to teach a majority of courses (a handful of model schools in certain areas such as Chandigarh, New Delhi, certain parts of the north east,
etc, were exempted). Due to this, the students’ grasp of English remained weak. Such students found studies in college difficult when subjects like science and maths were taught in English. Teachers often switched over to the local languages when students failed to comprehend the content and the instructions given in English. To supplement the instructions received in vernaculars or to undo the harm that hit their expression due to use of vernaculars, students resorted to guides and keys, which were more often than not produced badly in terms of language and content.

Besides, since every child had to be almost overnight brought within the folds of education (in 1961 there were 33.5 million children in middle schools), the schools needed a large number of teachers. Thousands of teachers recruited in such a rush were not adequately qualified, nor were they competent in teaching and often not even motivated enough to teach. They themselves did not possess an expected level of command over English. Therefore, whatever they passed on to their students resulted in poor standards of acquisition of the language.

Presently, in all the government schools of Punjab, it is the social science teachers who teach English irrespective of whether or not they know English. Overlooking this, the chief minister has announced English to be made a compulsory subject right from class I (in Punjab Education Policy 2003).

The policy of ‘education for all’ drew students from every level of society, a majority of them from homes with no previous history of education. They were often put together in the same school, the same class, the same section with those who were from homes of educated parents and grandparents. Such mixed-ability groups made the task of the usually untrained and hardly qualified teachers even more challenging. The shortage of
teachers prompted large classes and handling such classes to teach language skills required a different kind of training, techniques and materials. Unfortunately, the schools lacked in all respects.

In addition to this, the teachers were sometimes whisked away for extra work like elections, celebrations and exhibitions, which added to the problems arising out of already inadequate teaching hours allotted to English. On top of all this, learners were often not accountable to class attendance. Such irregularity in following classes further aggravated the situation.

Adding to the problems of dealing with human resources and their management are the problems resulting from poor curriculum planning, badly-designed courses, unscientific teaching techniques and a faulty system of testing and evaluation, not to talk of the poorly maintained infrastructure and equipment.

Given all this, Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujrat, Delhi, West Bengal (about to), etc have revised their policies (2003) on teaching English and school education in the government sector. School education is witnessing a shift where English has become a compulsory subject in junior classes. The Jammu and Kashmir government has gone to the extent of making English the medium of instruction at the primary level.

Unfortunately, literacy levels and the standards of education are measured on the basis of English education even though they are not one and the same, in the words of Harsh Dev Singh, State Education Minister, Jammu and Kashmir. It is the truth that in the Indian education system, the assessment of the quality of education is closely linked with the quality of proficiency in English. In June 2002, English replaced the staunch Urdu medium of the schools in Jammu and Kashmir (TOI, June 15, 2003:14). The conclusion
is that even if a state is not prepared to meet the challenge of English education, it adopts it to project high-level literacy rates. Beneath the upbeat sounding policies mentioned above, most of the infrastructural support remains unattended to.

At the level of curriculum design, rarely is a comprehensive plan evolved. Most policy framers as well as those implementing them are not even aware of the need to examine the language afresh. The variety IE does not exist for them and even if some ELT experts recommend it, it is brushed aside and the age-old BE model is given a rerun by the board.

Trudgill records this controversy (2002:129-135) in succinct words:

Like African English Indian English (Ind Eng.) is beset by the problems of norms. There is no general agreement as to whether the standard should be strictly Eng Eng (British English) or whether Ind Eng forms (especially in grammar) which are used by the majority of educated speakers and can also be found in Newspapers should be accepted in the Indians standard.

Regarding English teaching, objectives are rarely framed, and in certain states, if they do get outlined, they rarely present a realistic picture. A needs analysis, which should be mandatory to every curriculum planning and course design, is seldom conducted. Piecemeal planning of the syllabi and methodologies results in dated content with the evaluation system displaying no focus or sense of direction. English is treated like any content-oriented subject and taught that way. There is practically no co-relation between the objectives of teaching English, the books, the teaching methodologies and the testing and evaluation system. Finally, there is no practice of feedback from the students and the society, particularly the market which can provide updated insights to the policy framers.
curriculum designers, material producers, teachers and paper-setters who can in turn evaluate the entire teaching-learning programme of English. The entire programme, as a matter of fact, exhibits utter disregard for the model used in the classroom, bereft of the reality outside the classroom. The model which is the basis of the syllabus, the teaching tools and the testing instruments are almost always overlooked. This happens due to the controversies surrounding IE. Hardly any formal attempts have been made to standardize it, which means to codify it in the form of a model. The British model of English has reigned supreme as “sacrosanct” and continues to do so, in the capacity of the guiding light to many a confused teacher—the model, which the nation continues to revere and impose on the new generations even though it has lost its validity in the present times, at least in the entirety of its existence. Because even in England the land of its origin, it does not live in the form it is followed in here. Therefore, it has become more of a burden in its present shape rather than a facilitator. The puritans label usages which do not fit into the sacrosanct model as “corrupt”, “low class”, “deviants”, and even “errors”. This attitude is hardly healthy for the new generations, which use English in nearly every domain by choice as well as under compulsion. If we want to acknowledge their creativity, which grows with language, then we cannot tear away the variants that float in the atmosphere around them. If we curb the natural growth, what we get at the end of it is a synthetic state-managed language, which is usually not conducive to the growth of imagination. No doubt, IE at present is a mass of slippery usages, but it is not without a system of its own. We need to evolve a model rather than let those involved in teaching English grope blindfolded in the classroom. The teachers, the paper-setters, the examiners
and the students/examinees look for a model—somewhat stable in nature—to minimize ambiguities.

Since nothing remains static, we must accept the dynamics of change, the multiplicity of existence and the fluidity of language any variety experiences. We need to evolve dynamic models and also change our materials, a depiction of the model, from time to time. Updating the model and its reconstruction are the incidental phenomena of the changes that take place constantly in a society. The teacher needs a model and needs to have a sound knowledge of the system of any language. In Agnihotri’s words (1995:296), a teacher:

...should be thoroughly read in an update description (as scientific a description as possible) of the language, he is professing to teach. He should be aware of its current standard usage so as to dispel any doubts about the correctness or otherwise of any expressions.

It would therefore prove to be a great service to the academic community of English if a model is constructed. Yet another reason why the model would be appreciated is because the BE model is highly prescriptive and such models are not considered acceptable in pedagogic settings. Needs analysis surveys reveal that learners take up English classes with the expectations of learning communication relevant to contemporary times. In that case we need descriptive models which are a record of the systems of a language as it exists in the present times. It is this plea that the present thesis addresses itself to. To collect relevant data from the environment, so that it can be used to prepare appropriate courses for classroom use. As put by Richards, Platt & Webber (1984:15), Applied Linguistics uses information from fields like sociology, psychology, anthropology and
information theory as well as from Linguistics to develop theoretical models of language use which are further used in syllabus design, language planning, etc.

Once the exercise to record socially realistic data including the variants of language for the construction of a model begins, we need to pose the following questions, vis-a-vis the variants, which variants can be regularized? In reply to this question, Kachru (1988) states:

They should be variants, which are the result of the new 'un-English' linguistic and cultural setting where the English language is used: they are the result of a production process which marks the typical variety specific features; and it is systematic within a variety, and not idiosyncratic.

His view is also based on the belief that there is a pool of models for English, “the localized innovations (English) have pragmatic bases, and that the English language now belongs to all those who use it”.

However, many have argued against the notion of regional/local varieties of the non-native kinds on the plea that a divergent growth will result in mutual unintelligibility. Yet many linguists do not find this to be a cause of worry. In reference to this, Bhatia comments that a majority of learners are more likely to operate within their own native contexts rather than in an English-speaking native context. Steve points out (in Bhatia 1994) that:

... the goal is not to learn English to participate in the Anglo-social Semiotic, but to transfer the native social Semiotic on to the English base and thus nativize it as an effective means of communication for that culture, without reference to the Anglo culture in Asia and Africa...
1.2.7 Formulation of the Model

The formulation of a model amounts to codifying the language that is considered ideal and exemplary in the form of dictionaries and grammar books. The language thus codified is generally limited to lexis or vocabulary, compiled as a dictionary with illustrations and meaning, usage and pronunciation, spelling and idioms, etc. Additionally grammar books are written to include and illustrate the rule-governed language structures of morphology, i.e. word formation and syntax, and sentence formation. But in modern times, we need to give an extended entity to the word “model”. A language is not limited to its orthography, lexis, morphology and syntax alone. Learners and teachers need models of ideal or near ideal speaking/ writing formats/ genres and styles, all represented through relevant content. The content should generally speaking be wedded to the socio-linguistic, socio-political and socio-cultural environment of the learners. Collectively, all the above mentioned components represent the model of a language variety. So far, very few attempts have been made to codify grammatical characteristics of IE, leave alone its stylistic features. It is difficult to differentiate a variant from an apparent mistake. It is for such reasons that people prefer to adhere to the native model—however unrealistic it may have become. It is amazing to note that the codified representations of native English, ie BE, such as Fowler’s Modern English Usage are from South Asia. Nesfield’s grammar and also the one by Jespersen are followed a lot more in South Asia than England. Yet, the fact remains that several South Asian features are distinct from the native variety and thrive outside the classroom in the media and social domains. They are not codified and are not likely to get a nod from a prescriptive teacher, despite the fact that the trends are
in favour of the corpus-oriented grammar. If we accept the extended meaning of “model” to include the samples of texts, which carry the codified spelling, vocabulary, punctuation, word and sentence formation rules, genres, formats, styles and use of skills like speaking and writing, then we need to examine the other related aspects. It will be mandatory for us to assess the materials, which are the carriers of the model, i.e. the recommended books in teaching/learning situations. In other words, books are the natural corollary of the recommended model.

1.2.8 Current Model of English Compulsory Courses

As stated earlier, the books used to teach English Compulsory at the college level are generally dull and boring, representing a model of English which could be interpreted to be 50 to 500 years old or even more. At this stage, it is in place to examine what the carriers of the model of English come across as. As stated earlier, they are and they should be regarded as an extension of the model in question and therefore the model itself.

It is generally accepted that the role of English in India is mainly communication, yet we continue to teach English through “literature and thought of England” introduced by Macaulay. He did it out of sense of conviction: on the premise that oriental learning was inferior to English literature. But we continue to do it on the basis of misplaced assumptions or due to “the status quo syndrome” (Agnihotri 1997). To understand the root of the problem, Agnihotri conducted a study which revealed:

... the teaching of English language and literature had degenerated over the past few decades... in spite of 5-10 years of English in schools most of our students
failed to use English in any meaningful way.

One of the most important reasons behind this degeneration is the quality of materials sampling the model used to teach English. The English Compulsory courses generally comprise an anthology of poems drawn from British literature, a novel by Charles Dickens or Jane Austen or a collection of essays and stories from British settings, again by some ancient writers, additionally, some grammar and composition writing tasks.

Considering that the aim of teaching a language under compulsory courses is "to equip learners with linguistic competence, that is the internalization—covertly or subconsciously—of the grammatical rules of a language" then why should students be given heavy doses of literary works? Such an act results in many difficulties. For to begin with in the study of British literature, we need to decode archaic expressions like "thine" and odd structures like:

Folly such as yours,

Grac’d with a sword, and worthier of fan,

Has made, what enemies could ne’er have done,

Our arch of empire, steadfast but for you,

A mutilated structure, soon to fall.

(William Cowper in an anthology titled Vibrant Muse, a prescribed textbook for BA I Compulsory English, Panjab University (PU)). Such an exercise involves simplifying the text, interpreting it, decontextualizing it to apply its language to modern times and distant places. As if that was not enough, the learners must relate to the summer of Britain and the ceremony of baptizing, etc. The entire exercise becomes a rigmarole of sorts where a learner is expected to crawl into the web of British socio-cultural setting of a bygone era.
instead of learning the language people use in the contemporary times in their own setting. The net result is that they stay precisely where they were when they started the course. Let us accept that appreciating literature involves a certain kind of orientation which most of our learners don’t have. It needs an understanding of the culture, the history, the philosophy, etc of the characters and the setting of the texts. As per Brumfit (1985:18 in Agnihotri 1995:95), “Literary competence is an interesting combination of linguistic, socio-cultural, historical and semiotic awareness.”

One has to be able to enjoy and create literature in addition to interpreting the complexities of experiences, which together form “literary competence”. In a way, literature teaching begins where language teaching leaves off. And yet literature is taught in classes in the belief that teaching literary texts will result in acquisition of language. In the World Language Report (1961:62 in Tikoo 1991) the following remark finds a mention: “Students who cannot understand simplified English textbooks have to read Lamb, Hazlitt, etc.”

The classical approach to selecting teaching materials prevalent in the colonial times continues to be a dominating factor through the present times. We don’t even take into account the emotional maturity and the social background of the average learner. Most learners can hardly sustain a five minute dialogue in passably good English or write a leave application in correct English and they are made to read Chaucer, Bacon, Shelley, Dryden, Wordsworth, Shaw, TS Eliot, etc. The learners can barely think coherently in English while the teacher discusses the concept of the Greek tragic hero in Shakespeare’s plays and the vision of beauty Browning talks about. The result, the learners rarely read and re-read the original texts, a recommended way of learning language and get away by
reading simplified texts called guides and dishing out readymade answers to the twenty odd correctly guessed questions in the final examinations. And all this rests upon misplaced notions of language testing. To begin with, they do not test the communicative skills, which should be the philosophy underlying English Compulsory courses. Besides, there is no co-relation between the method of teaching and the technique of testing. Such a literature is referred to as canonical literature, which excludes all vernaculars and is recognized as a “great” and “serious” source of classical works (Krishnaswami & Sriraman in Agnihotri 1995).

As stated earlier and illustrated right above, such books can hardly be good enough as models for students of English Compulsory classes whose chief aim is to learn communication in English in the contemporary social structure. But the way courses are designed, it amounts to approaching the skills and knowledge of English needed for communication in a roundabout way. First approaching the often dated language, cracking unusual use of language, deciphering an unfamiliar socio-cultural setting and simplifying all this to make some sense out of it, and finally attempting to learn the simplified language.

Even to the students from the English medium schools, such books come across as banal and boring. Due to this, such students hardly participate in discussion in the class, which is geared towards practice in the skill of speaking. Generally belonging to the middle class, they have grown up with Enid Blyton, Hardy Boys, Nancy Drew and Mills & Boons. They speak that kind of language and not the language of Bacon, Johnson, Keats and Pope, say Sriram and Krishnaswami (in Agnihotri 1995).
1.2.9 Call for a Change of Model

On the issue of changing the model of teaching English Compulsory, Sriraman and Krishnaswami (1995) recommend Reader's Digest, Science Digest, Your World, etc, while expressing apprehension that if such materials are suggested they will be dismissed as newspaper stuff. Due to such a mindset non-canonical literature stays out of the classroom. Materials like films, TV, magazines, which are more natural, realistic, contemporary and lively in use of language within day to day contexts, are kept away from the classroom. There are experts of ELT who even favour textbooks which carry graffiti, posters, advertisements, newspapers, etc.

All such non-traditional, non-canonical materials carry variants of English and conform less and less to the traditional models of English like SBE. Some linguists and other keepers of BE/AE express concern over the incorporation of the latest variants, styles, formats, etc in the pedagogic model. They feel it will establish a cleavage between Indian and British English and cause a gap of intelligibility between the two varieties. There are linguists who have called for a check on such practices. Chelliah (2001:169) quotes Sood and Bright—(n.d.:6):

... Indian English which will have so many expressions and peculiarities characteristic of our people that it will be unintelligible to an Englishman. That should not be allowed to happen; something must be done to arrest this process by collecting such expressions as have become current, by analyzing the manner in which they have come into existence, and by trying to avoid them.
Kachru and Quirk have been entangled in a debate over IE since the mid-80's. While Kachru validates IE as an entity in its own right and recommends its propagation in the academia, Quirk shows his reservations about it. Quirk proposes Nuclear English, which is marked with simplification of the language. It exhibits mediation between the grammar of the native variety and communicative needs of the non-native people (in Pride: 1982). He is adamant on imposing the variety of a minority community over large sections of population across the world simply because the variety originated in England and shared the glory of the British Empire. He does not realize that when the masses learn English, they utilize the resources of their first language due to the shortage of infrastructure, different settings from the native variety and a sense of complacency that they can get along well with life with the local usage.

On the other side of the fence, we have linguists like Kachru, Christesen, Ahulu, etc, who strongly support the cause of the non-native varieties recommending that they need to evolve their own models. Christesen (1992) says, it is not proper to write off non-native circumstances and the concerns expressed by the teachers. Keeping in mind the realities of the classrooms in the third world countries and evidence provided by the teachers, she says it is the local varieties that should be taught if we must teach English to the zillions.

If English had remained elitist, if it had remained within the preserves of just a few earmarked domains, we could have continued with the BE model, keeping Indian variants at bay. As we employ English in every domain, eg. education, law, government, journalism, commerce, literature and drama, deviation/ diversification of the British variety is inevitable. BE cannot and should not be used as the yardstick to judge other varieties which are growing to answer the local needs. Rather than worrying about
displeasing the native speakers, we need to encourage the local varieties by extending recognition to them.

Ahulu too records his protest (1994):

Attempts to account for such forms (variants) have produced arguments to account for such concepts as error analysis (cf. Bolinger & Sears 1981; Clark & Clark 1977, Corder 1973), interlanguage (Selinker 1972; Corder 1981), fossilization (Robins 1980; Lyons 1968), and competence (Palmer 1984; Huddleston 1976; Lyons 1977b; Hymes 1971).

To be taken up in later chapters, all these concepts present the non-native varieties in a poor light. Linguists like Kachru and Ahulu have pleaded the case of evolving an endonormative standard for vocabulary and syntax in societies where English is a SL. But generally, when such concerns are expressed, the debates end with meager grants doled out to accommodate selective non-native changes under specific classifications and sub-categories. While some variants are considered intelligible, some are not and dismissed straight away. Even within these two categories, some are stigmatized while others are held in prestige, for eg. names of dishes, musical instruments, etc which are provided legitimacy. These items are the result of the interplay between two or more languages/varieties, and language and society, says Fishman (1968:29). Continuing on the same note, he adds:

Interaction between languages is a reality, not an aberration. We have to remember that any theoretical framework for a language has to be ‘socially realistic’ (corroborated by Firth, Halliday, Hymes and Labov 1978:2).
Despite their puritan ideas it can be assumed that not many linguists will step forward to moot the idea of removing a language variety from the society as they are aware that a language derives meaning from its interplay with the society concerned. This explains how semantic shifts occur within a language, the varieties separated by time, space or both, as is the case of BE and IE:

...A social reality (or a ‘culture’) is itself an edifice of meaning—a semiotic construct. In this perspective, language is one of the semiotic systems that constitute a culture; (in Agnihotri 1994:33). The model framed and adopted should be valid in terms of the sociolinguistic realities, functional realities, pragmatic realities and attitudinal realities.

Debates abound regarding the issue of whether or not we should have an Indian model, pushing aside the British one. And in case we must have an Indian model, how can we go about formulating it. The answer is simple, the task difficult—but not impossible. Once we have decided on a descriptive model over a prescriptive, we have already settled certain conflicts. For a descriptive model, we need to appoint bodies which can engage in research, preparing a corpus of lexical items, syntactic differences, stylistic variations, etc. What can be accepted or rejected and how it can be sampled and taken to the classroom can be worked out subsequently. There are various proposals on this starting with the rigid ones to the entirely liberated, some of which to be looked into in later chapters.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

The study has four stages to it:
1.3.1 Analysis of BA II English Compulsory Course

To give a focus to the study, I have selected BA II English Compulsory course of the PU to examine the model it uses. In this section I will scrutinize the various components of the course, ie the objectives underlying the course, the syllabus (Appendix 1 Syllabus 2003), the model; the extension of the model presented by the books and the examination scheme (Appendix 2 Examination Paper 2002).

Target group: BA II English Compulsory Course

The main issue this study attempts to examine is the need for an indigenous model to teach our students to use English for functional/communicative purposes. The BA II Compulsory English course has been taken up as a sample to assess the composition of the model used and its relevance in the present day education system of English. Further, to study whether or not it needs to be replaced by a modern pedagogic model, and if linguists, teachers, students and journalists find the fresh usages of IE acceptable in the classroom.

If we examine the Report of the Education Commission of India we get an overview of the modern elite thinking on the issue of English in Education (1966:15):
For a successful completion of the first degree course, a student should possess an adequate command of English, be able to express himself with reasonable ease and felicity, understand lectures in it, and avail himself of its literature. Therefore adequate emphasis will have to be laid on its study as a language right from the school stage. English should be the most useful ‘library language’ in higher education and our most significant window on the world.

The objectives stated above are meant for every undergraduate with the following expectations that they:

(i) will come to possess a reasonable competence in comprehension and expression of English.
(ii) will have developed fairly sharpened listening skills.
(iii) will be able to make use of the literature available in English to acquire knowledge of the world (not just British literature, that too pertaining to fiction, poetry, drama alone).

A study made by Muhammed Aslam (in Agnihotri 1995) quotes reasons given by learners for studying English Compulsory. Heading the list of reasons is the need to “read English newspapers and magazines”.

If we examine the objectives spelt out for the BA-II year Compulsory English course of PU by exploring the preface of the prescribed book, “Harvest of Harmony”, and by scrutinizing the Final Examination question papers, we discover that the model, the materials and the tests, nowhere, include the skill of speaking, as if it were not a part of linguistic expression. The test papers of the past five years exhibit that only the skills of written expression are tested, not those of spoken expression, as no marks are allotted to
the testing of speaking and listening. Therefore, the clearly spelt out objective of training students to “understand lectures” is never tested. And once something is not tested, we know most students and even some teachers tend to overlook it in the programme. “Literature” that the students are able to avail themselves of is confined to an anthology of poems of which at least 80 percent of the portion was written 100-400 years ago and only 3 out of its 25 works are by Indian poets. And this section gets 35 percent weight in the final examination paper. The editor of the anthology spells out the objectives as:

(i) to train and refine the taste of the young
(ii) to make them emulate virtuous actions
(iii) to give them noble thoughts and feelings
(iv) to help them see beauty in man and nature
(v) to experience the richness of human life

None of the objectives state the importance of acquisition of linguistic skills needed for communication. Such works do not acquaint the students with current language usages. Instead, they make the task of acquiring communicative abilities difficult due to outdated and alien usage, alien settings and unusual use of language, not fit for an English Compulsory class.

This leaves us with 65 percent weight of which 15 percent marks are again squandered over a book by a British writer, Jane Austen, titled *Pride and Prejudice*, written nearly two centuries ago (1813).

Needless to say that the language and settings of the work will be alien to the students, grappling with elementary English. The model of the language, i.e., the early 20th century English the book offers, has little relevance in today’s English Compulsory course. Out
of the 50 marks left, another 10 percent are wasted on idioms, hackneyed as ever (Appendix II Question Paper BA II 2002).

Only 20 percent marks are utilized for useful activities such as letters, composition writing and translation. The other 20 percent marks left out of the total strength are partially useful as the model samples modern usage except that they are presented in decontextualized settings and therefore do not excite much learning. But from the point of view of English language learning for an English Compulsory class of undergraduates, the language here too is not fresh enough. The trouble is that the dictionaries followed and the paradigms of grammatical structures contained in the grammar books along with the idioms prescribed do not always relate to the local contexts.

1.3.2 Examining Related Aspects of the Study: Queries

They explore the various issues related to examining the departures of English from its mother variety in some detail and the need for their standardization for the Indian classroom setting. (Review of the Literature Chapters 2 & 3).

1.3.3 Attitudinal Survey: Section A

At this stage I have collected samples drawn from real life situations, which represent the model of English in print in the newspapers. I seek the opinion of the subjects selected in this Attitudinal Survey on whether or not they would be willing to accept these items in the classroom, ie if such items can be incorporated in the descriptive model for the undergraduates studying English Compulsory. The analysis of such a study should be able to indicate if those concerned with English are prepared for the shift towards an
Indian variety of English as it is found in the communicative sectors of our society, away from the British variety.

1.3.4 Attitudinal Survey: Section B

At this stage I have put together excerpts from various sources, ie the current course materials of BA II year English Compulsory as well as writings from other sources, modern in nature, as an alternative to the current course books. The subjects are expected to record their attitude to the excerpts in this Attitudinal Survey.

Note:

For stages 1.3.3 and 1.3.4 I have prepared a questionnaire, which will help me conduct the attitudinal survey. A questionnaire is considered an effective mode of collecting opinions. It is a scientific instrument of measurement and a well-tried and tested medium of study involving fieldwork.

1.3.5 New Model Based on Print Media

It is clearly obvious from the analysis given above that at least 80 percent of the question paper assumes the SBE model. Such samples of the model in practice, ie the BE model, could be quite in place in a BA English Honours course or in a MA English course or even a BA Elective English course. But they have little place in general English courses where they are expected to serve as teaching tools of communicative language. As a matter of fact, we need models of English which are presented not merely through literary works but are drawn from the entire range of disciplines such as science,
humanities, law, medicine, mass media, etc. And there are many linguists and ELT teachers who share this view like Sriraman & Krishnaswamai (in Agnihotri 1995):

We need to evolve dynamic models, (meant as samples of language)...

aimed at the development of the students' ability to reason well within
and across multiple domains. The samples should be from humanities
and science, media ...

"It is wrong to dub students as poor learners on the basis of low proficiency shown in English. There are any number of graduates of computer science, statistics, social sciences, etc who do well in these areas but are low in linguistic competence in English.

As a matter of fact it is important to use a modern indigenous model in a range of contexts, starting with getting one's work done to introspecting and expressing one's philosophy of life. The mushroom growth of English teaching shops and tutorial academies shows that students need the language in its modern avatar for job interviews, business correspondence, polite conversation, etc. Mastering the prescribed literary texts, as the sole purpose of English Compulsory courses needs to be replaced as such objectives and the via media adopted are fossils of the colonial era.

One needs to look deeper into the controversy surrounding the use of textbooks in an English Compulsory course. As stated earlier, literary texts, the usual recommended materials, carry meaning in a camouflaged presentation through the use of metaphors, similes, etc. Literature typically indulges in innovation and deviations of form and texts.

As Nagpal puts it (in Agnihotri 1995: 94-95), "... literature is about adopting innovative ways in expression. Language aims at preparing learners in the communicative acts of language."
Yet another difficulty faced by learners is that most of them are from the middle classes and the lower classes. The heavily classical elements of the teaching tools do not gel with the culture they bring to the classroom. They would be able to learn much better through the instruments of ‘popular culture’ of which newspapers and magazines are crucial components. The ideas, aspects and topics, which appear in the newspapers, are common knowledge to learners from the masses. They can easily develop communicative abilities like interpretation, expression and negotiation through them, says Panaghat (in Agnihotri 1995:191).

The books, samples of the model, should be treated as practice materials and not an end in themselves. Excerpts from the media can be used to equip learners with linguistic skills and a rich diction, which is contemporary. In testing, their application and not the reproduction of language should be included. It should be so open-ended that no crib writer can predict probable questions and answers. The model of English should be packaged with what is happening in the society, which will invigorate the learners to think for themselves. The model, modern in its outlook and relevant in its approach and style, will encourage learners to read intelligently, respond critically and write creatively. Such abilities once honed will ensure further application of language outside the academia. The textbooks can be good launch pads to expand the range of a language variety.

Verma (in Agnihotri 1994) while recommending English Compulsory course from the 4th grade to BA, making it a twelve year programme, calls for entirely language-oriented courses. He feels that literature courses in English should be provided for separately, to be treated just like courses in philosophy or chemistry. A literature course is a separate
discipline no doubt with some overlap with English language teaching tools, but it shares entirely different concerns and emphases. He recommends a model that will utilize the synergy of various samples of expressions in the classroom. Language learning deals with creative construction not just literary sensibility and the model samples should provide for the appropriate stimuli.

From time to time linguists and teachers of English in India have tried to attract the attention of the authorities concerned with English language education to a five-point plan for its improvement, which is:

(i) to re-define the goals and objectives of English teaching in relation to its use
(ii) to prepare a pedagogic model
(iii) to construct materials
(iv) to train teachers
(v) to evolve a model of language teaching–learning which will shift emphasis from “coverage of portion” to “command of language” paradigm.

This five point plan bears close resemblance with the four point plan Kachru suggests (ET 16:6 in Kachru 1983) to improve the falling standards. What follow are the options given by him as I interpret them:

(i) Models for teaching English, eg endonormative or exonormative and the issue of varieties within a variety; ie whether the standards come from within a community or are derived from an outside source.

(ii) Methods of teaching, eg pragmatically unjustifiable claims of universality for teaching techniques and methods when every community is unique and has particular requirements.
(iii) Motivations for learning and teaching English, eg, integrative versus instrumental, whether one wishes to join the ‘club’ or simply to use the ‘tool’.

(iv) Motivations and syllabus design, eg, communicative approach versus other approaches; contextual appropriateness of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and ESP in the outer circles.

As presented by Kachru, the policy framers in consultation with educationists of English from the field need to consider English education in India. The Indian variety of English has attained a vibrant presence in almost every domain. We need to consider whether we will use a model based on it, an endonormative model, or continue with the British model, an exonormative one. The determination of goals or motivation will guide selection of materials and methods.

So far, I have raised the issue of challenging the British model of English in use in the English Compulsory courses and replacing it with an Indian variety along with its innovations. I have also assumed that the attitude of teachers, here the distributors and students, here the consumers of the variations will be positive towards accepting it and implementing it in the classroom. I have also assumed the consent of journalists/ writers, here the producers/ marketing people who create or/ and publish variations and thus propel their sale of the variants. It is crucial to find out what is the attitude of the distributors, the consumers and the producers/ marketing personnel.

If we decide to sideline the European literary texts, in our attempt to search for a pedagogic model, we will need to introduce and propagate the Indian model through literature of different fields produced in India. Newspapers of the national level, modern
in letter and spirit, can certainly serve as the starting point in compiling practice course books at the undergraduate level. Similarly, magazines of repute such as Reader's Digest, India Today, etc, can provide excellent resource material for the college level learner. As Amritvalli puts it (in Agnihotri 1995):

Just as in our everyday life we gather information from a variety of media sources, so also the language classroom is now opened up to let in the newspapers, and radio programme or audiocassettes and the television....

Once we have decided upon framing a model of our own, we need to think of its implementation and propagation. A model usually has four stages: selection, codification elaboration and acceptance. Besides education, different forms of mass media become the vehicles through which a model of language can be popularized and gradually accepted. Media and society usually grow together and they are both dependent on each other for their growth. Mass media, which comprises newspapers, magazines, radio, TV and films, are carriers of what a community thinks, feels and lives out. In this manner mass media embodies the needs and expressions of a culture. The word mass stands for the society as a large group. Since communication and culture are tied to each other's needs, mass media is influenced by the society it serves, both in language and ideas. In turn, mass media influences the society's expression and attitude. Therefore, it is an appropriate area to select elements of model from and after the codification in the form of dictionaries, grammar books and textbooks, an equally appropriate vehicle to spread the model and gain acceptance for it. Among the various forms of media, the print media best serves our purpose as even amidst welcome fluidity in language it offers some amount of
stability. For centuries, the printed word of the print media has served as the touchstone of standardization. So much regard was shown to the print-based standardization that a language 'fixed' in this way has become for many the only real kind of language and the only kind to be used in schools. Keeping such realities in mind, I have drawn samples from the print media, which records the changes happening in the society. The media tries to use the language of the masses for the masses. Therefore, the attempt should be made to select linguistic elements from the print media. The print media is preferred over the audio-vedio media as speech is usually casual and simply too transient. It 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, says Davidson (1998). Therefore, the written word, despite being subject to constant evolution, has some stability and is preferred for model making.

1.3.6 Theoretical Framework... Continued

So far in this chapter I have raised some of the issues connected with the evolution of an indigenous model for teaching English in India. The stage is divided among those who are for the introduction of an indigenous model and those against it. If an indigenous model is formulated, it will amount to putting aside the British model handed down by the colonial masters. Most of the texts which sample SBE need to be replaced with texts which carry the language, as it is used in the dynamics of the real life situations in India. A change such as this will pave the way for improving the standards of acquisition of
English among students as it will further stimulate several changes in teacher training, teaching techniques, testing, and most of all, learner orientation.

When considering a model, the functions, the form and the acceptance of the variety are examined to ascertain the feasibility of the entire operation. What is important to consider in the present context is the attitude of the people dealing closely with English towards the change over to an indigenous model of the descriptive variety.

On the basis of the discussion so far, I would like to frame certain questions, which need to be examined in the thesis. The first few questions in 1.3.2 are in relation to the related aspects of the study. They will get answered as I course through The Review of the Literature (Chapters 2 and 3), the questions for Sections A and B (1.3.3 and 1.3.4) will form the basis of the Survey, which is the main enquiry of this thesis. This way the role of the initial questions is to provide necessary information and this portion is beyond the scope of this investigation. The questions of Sections A and B attempt to investigate the concerns raised in this thesis and prove/disprove the hypothesis.

**Examining Related Aspects of the Study**

Ques 1 How have the historical and contemporary status and the role played by English in India affected the composition of the language? Can these aspects considered together influence the attitude of people towards accepting the changing face of English in India?

Ques 2 What is understood by standardization?
Ques 3 Why do we need standardization of English for teaching purposes?

Ques 4 Why do we need an indigenous pedagogic model? How is it evolved?

Ques 5 Why should we select variants from print media to incorporate in the pedagogic model?

Section A Examining the Core Issues of the Study to be Taken up.

Ques 1 What is the attitude of those associated with English language towards accepting variants of IE? (Table 1)

Ques 2 Which variant of the Survey is the most acceptable and which the least? (Table 2)

Ques 3 What is the comparative acceptance of each element/aspect of the variety? (Table 3)

Ques 4 How does age influence the comparative acceptance of the variants? (Table 4)

Ques 5 How does the gender affect the comparative acceptance of variants? (Table 5)

Ques 6 How do the different professional/vocational backgrounds influence the comparative acceptance of the variants of IE? (Table 6)

Ques 7 How do the different professional/vocational backgrounds influence the comparative acceptance of the variants in the

*Lexical Category (Table 7),

*Grammatical Category (Table 8) and
Section B Examining the Other Concerns of the Study

Ques 8 What is the attitude of the respondents towards the inclusion of model samples from different sources:

* Early 20th century fiction British and current newspapers (Table 10),

* 17th century British poetry and current newspaper (Table 11),

* Early 20th century fiction British and modern Indian writing in English fiction (Table 12),

* Translated Indian fiction modern and Indian modern writing in English fiction (Table 13).

The hypothesis is framed to research the attitude of those associated with the teaching, learning and producing/propelling (publishing) Indian variants English. It assumes that they will favour the formulation of a pedagogic model, based on the Indian variety of English.
1.4 Hypothesis

Departures have taken place in English in India from the mother variety, ie British English due to which there is need to formulate an indigenous model for pedagogic purposes and people closely associated with it will favour the concept.

********