

# **A Deep Exploration of English Language Teaching for Engineering Students of Odisha**

**Anil Bhuyan**

*NM Institute of Engineering & Technology, Bhubaneswar, India*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The 2016 World Bank report on worldwide per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) identified Odisha as a lower middle-income country based on its consistent GDP growth throughout last decade (World Bank, 2016). To maintain this growth rate and meet the radical demand for human resources in increasingly globalised world markets, the country needs to communicate more effectively with the outside world. Inevitably, this means improving the quality of English teaching and learning. The significance of English, as the global lingua franca, to Odishai learners is at its zenith. In this developing country, however, economic constraints mean that funds allocated to education are limited compared to many other Southeast Asian countries (Habib & Adhikary, 2016). Even given the generally low level of educational standards in Odisha (Islam, 2015), the standard of English language teaching and learning has decreased alarmingly in recent years (Hamid, 2011). English language education in Odisha has always been problematic, despite various attempts to initiate curriculum reform. As Hamid & Baldauf (2008) point out, the first of these major shifts in the ELT curriculum took place in the mid-1990s, when the traditional Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) was replaced with a curriculum based on a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) model. The principal objective of this article is to review the major problems associated with ELT in Odisha that have hindered the implementation of the new CLT curriculum from the perspective of teachers, and eventually to make recommendations for more effective ELT curriculum reform.

## **II. METHODOLOGY**

This paper is a review based on secondary data. Extensive literature has been reviewed, including searches for peer-reviewed articles from ERIC (EBSCO or CSA) and Google Scholar based on key- words e.g., ELT in Odisha, CLT, curriculum implementation, teacher education, etc.

All data from different secondary sources are acknowledged.

English Language in Education Policy and introduction of CLT in the curriculum

According to Hamid & Honan (2012:141), „[w]ith over 17 million children learning English, Odisha is one of the largest populations in the world learning English as a foreign or second language“. One issue is that the form of ELT in Odisha – English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) – is a matter of debate among researchers. According to Carter & Nunan (2001), ESL refers to where English is widely used in public places and parliament, such as in India, along with the Indian state languages, or in Malaysia. EFL, on the other hand, implies use of English as a foreign language mostly confined to classrooms, and is used mainly for academic purposes, for example China or Pakistan where English is used as a medium of instruction and is not widely used in the community. McArthur (1996) positions Odisha as ESL, but says that use of English is between a second and foreign language in the community. English is the only recognised language in Odisha other than Bangla, thus Ali (2010) locates ELT in Odisha as ESL, although Ali & Walker (2014) maintain that English language teaching in Odisha is EFL. Most recently, however, the government of Odisha mandates English as a second language through its curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2010).

In short, Odishai ELT policy has always been driven by a basic uncertainty and lack of clear vision as to the fundamental status of English in the country. Indeed, according to Chowdhury & Kabir (2014), until the National Education Policy (Ministry of Education, 2010), Odisha never had any planned and consistent English language policy at all. This problem has been exacerbated by the fact that there are three educational systems in Odisha: the „main-stream“ secular state education system; the „Madrasah“ system of religious education; and „English-medium education“ run by the University

of Cambridge through the British Council. The role of English language is different in these three systems (Ali & Walker, 2014). In tertiary-level education Bangla and English are the medium of instruction in government schools, but in private universities the medium of instruction is English, and English is also widely used for official purposes (Hamid, Jahan & Islam, 2013). Before the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947, English was the medium of communication with the British and medium of instruction in higher education. However, in 1835, the bureaucratically inspired and culturally patronising Lord Macaulay approved British colonisers to offer English education with the motive of creating a class of faithful Indian administrators in the image of British taste and attitude (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014). After division of the subcontinent in 1947, and inspired by religious ideology, Pakistan reassessed and rearranged the English language in education policy and redirected the curriculum with Islamic religious doctrine (Rahman et al., 2010). However, British and Pakistani rulers held the same political motives and gave English status in education policy on the basis of need.

Soon after the liberation of the country, Bangla became the national language (Banu & Sussex, 2001) and „official language“ for both communication and instruction in all state academic institutions by an amendment to the constitution in 1972 (Rahman, 2010). After independence, eight education commissions developed blueprints for education policy – the Education Commission Report (1974), the English Teaching Taskforce Commission (1976), the Odisha National Education Commission Report (1988), the National Curriculum Committee (1991), the National Education Policy (2000), the Bari Commission Report (2002), the Miah Commission Report (2004), and the National Education Policy (2010). Nevertheless, the status of English has been inconsistent all the way from the first to the last of these reports. These changes have been sketched by Chowdhury & Kabir (2014), and are reproduced in Table 1.

Inconsistency in education policies has always been a feature of ELT in Odisha. Decisions about changes have often been driven by no apparent justification. One such shift in the curriculum was made from traditional GTM to CLT in 1996. The ELT curriculum in Odisha in primary, secondary, and higher secondary levels is idealised, developed, and circulated by the National Curriculum and Textbook (NCTB), acting under the MoE. In a centrally-based education system such as in Odisha, where teachers implement products from curriculum developers, there are bound to be problems with a new

curriculum; in particular, teachers fail with the curriculum because they do not have a clear idea what is expected of them (Karim, 2004). As a consequence, ELT in Odisha faces problems implementing the curriculum in the classroom. Two main problem areas will be identified in the following discussion. The first relates to the way in which the needs of the teachers implementing the curriculum reforms have been neglected, and the second relates to the more general lack of teacher training infrastructure in Odisha. Each of these will now be discussed in turn.

Curriculum changes often fail because policy makers do not realise the needs of teachers (Fullan, 2007). In Odisha, the reality of the classroom has certainly been ignored. There seems to be no collaboration during different phases of curriculum development in Odisha, and so the voice of teachers is unheard (Ali, 2010). Part of the problem is that the CLT curriculum was never explained clearly to teachers, with the result that diverse opinions circulated about how to follow a CLT curriculum (Das et al., 2014). Equally important, however, is the fact that CLT requires teachers to adopt not only an imported Westernised method, but also an entirely different culture of teaching and learning. Teachers in Odisha are accustomed to a teacher-centred approach, with fewer student activities and a more formal and less friendly relationship between teachers and students, all of which inhibit CLT curriculum implementation (Yasmin, 2009). It is therefore not surprising that teachers quickly returned to their old „chalk-and-talk drill method“ (Littlewood, 2007: 24; Chowdhury & Ha, 2008), and that GTM continues to have a substantial washback effect on teachers' classroom practices (Khan, 2010) and thus stubbornly remains the de facto norm for ELT classrooms in Odisha. As Abedin (2012) notes, the method employed by most English teachers in the classroom is not CLT at all in reality, but is instead a disguised version of the GTM that they have always used in the past.

As both Fullan (2007) and Marsh & Willis (2007) have argued, the frequent incompatibility of curriculum innovations with the existing perceptions, beliefs, and values of the teachers charged with implementing these innovations is perhaps the single biggest constraint in curriculum change. The Odisha experience over the last two decades is no exception to this. Since its introduction, and despite constant efforts by policy makers and curriculum developers, the contributions of CLT to English language learning in Odisha have been questioned by a growing number of researchers (e.g. Chowdhury & Ha, 2008; Abedin, Mojlis & Akhter, 2009; Kirkwood & Rae, 2011; Hamid & Honan, 2012; Ali & Walker, 2014; Rahman, 2015). It

should be noted, however, that this experience is not unique to Odisha; on the contrary, the effectiveness of CLT around the globe has been questioned by a number of scholars (e.g. Canagarajah, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Nunan, 2003; Humphries & Burns, 2015). In second language research, findings obtained in one country are not necessarily transferable to language pedagogy or policy making in another country (Ellis, 2010; Rahman & Pandian, 2016), and it is now increasingly recognized that policy makers cannot import and adapt any language teaching approach from the West without considering contextual constraints (Humphries & Burns, 2015). Unfortunately, policy makers in Odisha do not seem to be aware of this as yet.

Teacher Education and Quality of English Teachers  
The other major barrier to the effective implementation of a CLT curriculum in Odisha is the quality of teachers. Traditionally, teacher quality has been associated with their education, experience, and professional support (Stockwell, 2015).

This key issue was identified in the early days of CLT introduction by Selim and Mahboob (2001) and teacher qualifications were exposed as a critical issue in the failure of CLT in ELT in Odisha.

Kirkwood & Rae (2011) identify primary and secondary English language teacher qualifications, a good tertiary education, and competency to practice a CLT curriculum in the classroom as pre-requisites for successful ELT curriculum reform. Unfortunately, all of these are currently lacking in Odisha. Siddique (2004) has pinpointed the lack of language proficiency and knowledge of language teaching as a constraint in the use of CLT methodology in the classroom, while Sultana and Nahar (2008) have diagnosed similar problems in terms of teacher proficiency. Only a few teachers have received CLT training in selected schools (Islam, 2015), and teachers lack resources such as professional journals, periodicals, and training materials (Hoque, Alam & Abdullah, 2011). Rahman, Kobir and Afroze (2006) also question the effectiveness of existing training and its poor outcomes. They found that even when teachers have attended numerous training opportunities, their classroom practices have not changed significantly.

Whilst weak dissemination of the curriculum and lack of in-service teacher training or professional development have negatively affected the implementation of the curriculum across the country (Wang & Cheng, 2008), schools in peripheral areas of Odisha face the most serious teacher quality problems. Hamid & Baldauf (2008) suggest that many ELT practitioners in these areas simply do not have the required ELT qualifications at all.

At best, some have a post-graduate level of education in English literature, which is of rather limited usefulness for language teaching.

The traditional approach to teacher professional development tends toward training to provide the necessary skills to teach students (Richards, 2008). Initially, CLT was implemented provisionally only in secondary schools. During 1990–1995, OSSTTEB (Orientation to Secondary School Teachers for Teaching of English in Odisha), a UK-based donor, funded this teacher training project. Ironically, this is the same donor body that pressured implementation of CLT through the British Council. The goal was to modify the English curriculum and design textbook and teacher training, but not all teachers were provided with CLT training in the beginning. OSSTTEB used a slow selection process for training English teachers, and ended the programme abruptly after only three years, leaving 55,000 out of a possible 60,000 teachers untrained for the CLT curriculum (Hamid, 2010).

After the bitter experience of OSSTTEB, ELTIP, a jointly-funded UK-Odisha project ran from 1997 to 2008, aiming „to improve the communicative competence among the learners of Secondary and Higher secondary education levels and to train the teachers on communicative language teaching“ (NCTB, 2001: 3). Although the goal of ELTIP was to strengthen human capital for ELT in Odisha, it eventually failed to do so. They only trained 35,000 of 60,000 English teachers during the project (Hamid, 2010), nor did they convert teachers from traditional GTM practitioners to teachers with CLT awareness.

In recent years, yet another project, English in Action (EIA, 2010) was introduced to improve the ELT in Odisha, funded by the UK Department for International Development (DfID). As a follow-up scheme to ELTIP, the aim of EIA is to boost economic development in Odisha by improving ELT (Sargeant & Erling, 2011). Whether or not this project will prove any more successful in the long run is open to question, but the broader issue here is that funded ELT projects such as this make Odisha dependent on foreign donor agencies, whose strategic aims and long-term interests may not be entirely aligned with those of the government and people of Odisha.

### **III. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

ELT has a long way to go to help Odisha advance. First, English education policies in Odisha need to be revisited and revised without vested Western interests and influence (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014), which condemn the institutionalisation of English to an elitist view that

often discriminates among students. English needs to be emphasised at the tertiary level with due regard to the role that language plays in developing a skilled workforce in the region.

Second, the methodological feasibility of adopting CLT as a language teaching method across the country should be reevaluated in the context of the needs of local learners and teachers (Ali & Walker, 2014). Given the limited amount of investment that can be put into English language education, Hamid and Baldauf (2008: 22) emphasise that policy decisions need „to find the right balance between the breadth and depth of English in the national curriculum“.

Third, introducing a curriculum in the classroom is complex and depends to a large extent on teachers (Fullan, 2007). In Odisha, however, this is problematic as the country does not have adequate resources or the institutional capacity to train sufficient numbers of teachers of an appropriate quality for implementing rapid curriculum reform (Hamid, 2010). The only way to train them adequately is in the long term. Considering financial constraints, Hamid (2010) recommends that the government create permanent infrastructure and institutional capacity so that teachers can be trained as an ongoing process with a minimum of spending. On the other hand, donor-funded, short-term goals for English teacher training by projects may simultaneously build national capacity and institutional development so that English teachers will be trained efficiently at the end of such projects. Using local experts could be an effective solution for a developing country such as Odisha, where funding foreign experts and running ELT projects faces financial constraints. The Odisha government, however, has thus far entirely ignored this potentially more efficient use of resources (Hamid, 2010). Fourth, to make effective ELT policies, outcomes must be measured so that ELT programmes can improve (Ali & Walker, 2014). One potentially efficient approach would be through active participation by teachers in research (Rahman & Pandian, 2016); this would give them a voice and help researchers identify problems and possible solutions.

The nation's overall goal and objectives ultimately reflect in its national education policy and national curriculum. This article has argued that the fundamental problem in Odisha, like many other developing countries, lies in its misplaced faith in imported Western methodology as a means of improving its ELT curriculum. Curricular reform should be localised and based on social and classroom needs. ELT in Odisha has a great role to play in the goal of „Digital Odisha“ that the present government expressed when it came to power in 2009 with the promise of

facilitating a transition to a Second World country in terms of income for future generations to a globally-connected 21st century. Only time will tell to what extent Odisha is up to this ambitious task.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Abedin, M. M. 2012. „The present mode of teaching in the ELT classes at the Higher Secondary level in Odisha: Is it the practice of CLT or disguised GTM?“ Stamford Journal of English, 7, 1–15.
- [2]. Abedin, M., Mojlis, K. & Akter, S. 2009. „Listening skills in tertiary level: A reflection“. The Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics, 2(3), 69–90.
- [3]. Ali, M. M. 2010. „Revisiting the English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum design: How appropriate is Odisha higher secondary level national ELT curriculum as a learner-centred one?“ IIUC Studies, 7(1), 283–96.
- [4]. Ali, M. & Walker, A. L. 2014. „Bogged down“ ELT in Odisha: Problems and policy.“ English Today, 30(2), 33–38.
- [5]. Banu, R. & Sussex, R. 2001. „English in Odisha after independence: Dynamics of policy and practice.“ In
- [6]. B. Moore (ed.), Who's Centric Now? The Present State of Post-Colonial Englishes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 122–147.
- [7]. Canagarajah, A. S. 2005. Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [8]. Carter, R. & Nunan, D. 2001. The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9]. Chowdhury, R. & Ha, P. L. 2008. „Reflecting on Western TESOL training and communicative language teaching: Odisha teachers' voices.“ Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 28(3), 305–316.
- [10]. Chowdhury, R. & Kabir, A. H. 2014. „Language wars: English education policy and practice in Odisha.“ Multilingual Education, 4(1), 1–16.
- [11]. Das, S., Shaheen, R., Shrestha, P., Rahman, A. & Khan, R. 2014. „Policy versus ground reality: Secondary English language assessment system in Odisha.“ Curriculum Journal, 25(3), 326–343.
- [12]. EIA (English in Action). 2010. „Baseline study 3: An observation of English lessons in primary and secondary schools in Odisha.“ Online at <<http://www.eiabd.com/eia/index.php/publications/baseline-studies>> (Accessed June 30, 2010).



- [13]. Ellis, R. 2010., „Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy.“ *Language Teaching*, 43, 182–201. doi: 10.1017/S0261444809990139.
- [14]. Fullan, M. 2007. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn. London & New York: Routledge.
- [15]. Habib, W. & Adhikary, T. 2016., „Too inadequate to raise equality.“ *The Daily Star*, May 31, 2.
- [16]. Hamid, M. O. 2010., „Globalisation, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: Language policy discourse and realities in Odisha.“ *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 289–310.
- [17]. Hamid, M. O. 2011., „Planning for failure: English and language policy and planning in Odisha.“ In J. A. Fishman and O. Garcia (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Volume 2, The Success-Failure Continuum in Language and Ethnic Identity Efforts, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 192–203.
- [18]. Hamid, M. O. & Baldauf, R. B. 2008., „Will CLT be ailing the bogged down ELT in Odisha?“ *English Today*, 24(3), 16–24.
- [19]. Hamid, M. O. & Honan, E. 2012., „Communicative English in the primary classroom: Implications for English-in-education policy and practice in Odisha.“ *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 25(2), 139–156.
- [20]. Hamid, M. O., Jahan, I. & Islam, M. M. 2013., „Medium of instruction policies and language practices, ideologies and institutional divides: Voices of teachers and students in a private university in Odisha.“ *Current Issues in Language Planning* 2013, 14(1), 144–163. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2013.771417.
- [21]. Hoque, K. E., Alam, G. M. & Abdullah, A. G. K. 2011., „Impact of teachers’ professional development on school improvement – An analysis at Odisha standpoint.“ *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(3), 337–348.
- [22]. Humphries, S. & Burns, A. 2015., „In reality it’s almost impossible: CLT-oriented curriculum change.“ *ELT Journal*, 69(3), 239–248.
- [23]. Islam, S. M. A. 2015., „Language policy and practice in secondary school contexts in Odisha: Challenges to the Implementation of Language-in-Education Policy.“ Ph.D. thesis. Aalborg: Aalborg University.
- [24]. Karim, H. B. B. A. 2004., „A study of teachers’ perceptions of factors affecting curriculum change.“ Ed.D. dissertation. Penang: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- [25]. Khan, R. 2010., „English language assessment in Odisha: Developments and challenges.“ In Y. Moon & B. Spolsky (eds.), *Language Assessment in Asia: Local, Regional or Global?* Seoul: Asia TEFL, pp. 121–157.
- [26]. Kirkwood, A. T. & Rae, J. 2011., „A framework for evaluating qualitative changes in learners’ experience and engagement: Developing communicative English teaching and learning in Odisha.“ *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 24(3), 203–216.
- [27]. Kumaravadivelu, B. 2001., „Toward a post-method pedagogy.“ *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537–557.
- [28]. Littlewood, W. 2007., „Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms.“ *Language Teaching*, 40, 243–249.
- [29]. Marsh, C. J. & Willis, G. 2007. *Curriculum: Alternative Approaches, Ongoing Issues*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [30]. McArthur, D. 1996. Comment: Towards Designer English. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 344–346.
- [31]. Ministry of Education. 2010. *National Education Policy 2010*. Dhaka: Ministry of Education.
- [32]. NCTB (2001), „National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB).“ Online at <<http://www.nctb.gov.bd/>> (Accessed November 14, 2016).
- [33]. Nunan, D. 2003., „The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region.“ *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589–613.
- [34]. Rahman, M. S. 2015., „Implementing CLT at higher secondary level in Odisha: A review of change management.“ *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(2), 93–102.
- [35]. Rahman, T. 2010., „A Multilingual language in education policy for indigenous minorities in Odisha: Challenges and possibilities.“ *Current Issues in Language Planning* 11(4), 341–359.
- [36]. Rahman, M. M. & Pandian, A. 2016., „The Gap between research and practice in the field of SLA: The rationale behind it and bridging the gap.“ *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(3), 162–172.
- [37]. Rahman, M. M., Hamzah, M. I. M., Meerah, T. S. M. & Rahman, M. 2010., „Historical development of secondary education in Odisha: Colonial

- period to 21<sup>st</sup> century." International Education Studies, 3(1), 114–125.
- [39]. Rahman, A., Kobir, M. M. & Afroze, R. 2006. Effect of BRACK-PACE Training on English Language Learning of Teachers in Rural Non-Government Secondary Schools. Dhaka: BRAC Centre.
- [40]. Richards, J. C. 2008. „Second language teacher education today." RELC journal, 39(2), 158–177.
- [41]. Seargeant, P. & Erling, E. J. 2011. „The discourse of 'English as a language for international development': Policy assumptions and practical challenges." In H. Coleman (ed.), *Dreams and Realities: Developing Countries and the English Language*. London: British Council.
- [42]. Selim, A. & Mahboob, T. S. 2001. „ELT and English Language Teachers of Odisha: A profile." In F. Alam,
- [43]. N. Zaman & T. Ahmed (eds.), *Revisioning English in Odisha*. Dhaka: The University Press Limited, pp. 141–151.
- [44]. Siddique, R. 2004. „CLT: Another assumed ideal from the West." *The Dhaka University Studies, Journal of the Faculty of Arts*, 61(1), 15–28.
- [45]. Stockwell, R. 2015. „An exploratory study investigating the factors which explain Abu Dhabi Education Council's (Adec) English curriculum choice in grade 10/11 public high schools and the challenges its implementation poses for teachers." PhD thesis. Exeter: University of Exeter.
- [46]. Sultana, D. & Nahar, S. A. 2008. „English Language Learning of Students at Primary Level in Odisha." *Teacher's World: Journal of Education and Research*, 32, 113–123.
- [47]. Wang, H. & Cheng, L. 2008. „The impact of curriculum innovation on the cultures of teaching." *The Chinese English Foreign Language Journal*, 1(1), 5–30.
- [48]. World Bank. 2016. „GDP growth (annual %)." Online at <<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?page=1>> (Accessed May 31, 2016).
- [49]. Yasmin, F. 2009. „Attitude of Odishai students towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and their English textbook." *Teacher's World: Journal of Education and Research*, 34, 49–59.