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Background to the Study

Literature and language teaching are linked since literature, itself, is language and often is used in support of language learning (Widdowson, 1983). Since there is no commonly shared view about a single broad aim of instruction in literature and different literature curricula may have quite different objectives, it is necessary to take those different objectives into account in teaching and testing student performance in literary study (Stern, 1991).

A number of alternative objectives have been offered for the teaching of literature. The following are the most prominent:

1. A fundamental goal of literature study, as Sage (1987) defines it, is pleasure. As enjoyment plays an important role in any learning process, literature can be a potentially useful aid to the language teacher. The student's pleasure in a literary text does not clash with aims of learning, on the contrary, it facilitates learning. Hence, the teacher's success in teaching literature may depend on the extent to which students carry with them beyond the classroom an enjoyment and love for literature which is renewed as they continue to engage with literature throughout their lives.

2. Literature study provides insight into universal human experiences (Purves, 1990). Literature portrays the full variety of human concerns and needs and expresses the most significant ideas and sentiments of human beings. Literature represents a means by which readers can be put in touch with a range of expression -often of universal value and validity- over geographical area and historical time. In other words, by introducing students to world works as an educative experience, literature adds to students' knowledge of commonalities in human experience.

3. Literature study is culture study (Seelye, 1991). The imagined world of a literary work in which characters from many social backgrounds are depicted, gives the out-
of-culture reader a feel for the codes that structure another society. Teaching literature enables students to understand and appreciate cultures and ideologies different from their own in time and space, and to come to perceive tradition of thought, feeling and artistic form within the heritage the literature of such cultures endows.

4. Literature study helps students gain linguistic competence. Literature, as Sage (1987) puts it, provides data in which lexical and grammatical items are contextualized and made memorable. Moreover, Carter and Long (1990) argue that one of the main reasons for a teacher's orientation towards a "language model" for teaching literature is to demonstrate what "oft was thought but ne'er so well expressed", that is, to put students in touch with some of the more subtle and varied creative uses of the language. Students can learn to see the significance of the writers' linguistic and rhetorical choices in classroom discussions of specific linguistic and rhetorical clues in the text and thereby develop their ability to talk and write more clearly.

5. Literature study stimulates personal growth (Purves, 1990). The reading of literature can be an intense personal experience. Helping students to read literature more effectively is helping them to grow as individuals as well as in their relationships with the people and institutions around them. To encourage personal growth, the teacher has to stimulate and enliven students in the literature class by selecting texts to which students can respond and in which they can participate imaginatively. In this way she helps students to stimulate their creative and literary imagination and develop their appreciation of literature.

Just as there are alternative views as to the objectives for teaching literature, there are different views as to the purposes and means for the testing of academic literary study. Many feel that literature should not be tested at all (Johannessen, 1995). Such views have suppressed discussion of better versus poorer ways of
evaluating literary understanding. As a result we have seen increasing attention to the
testing of writing and reading which reflect new initiatives in the teaching of writing
and reading, whereas the same period has not seen parallel growth of new initiatives
in the testing of literature (Johannessen, 1995). This is unfortunate. It is also
unfortunate because a richer understanding of the testing of literature can help
teachers, teacher educators, test makers, and English curriculum specialists refine
their understanding of literature and the ways it might be taught. In simple terms, the
central principle of testing is that we should test what we have taught, or as
Finocchiaro and Sako (1983) put it: "Testing helps to determine whether the teaching
methods and techniques are in fact producing learning and which aspects of these are
in need of revision" (p. 38). However, a 'good test' depends on clear identification of
target competence, and target competence is a mixture of goals and ideals. In her
article on assessing literature Spiro (1991) provides cautions about literature testing:

In the language test, the fully-operational native speaker can provide a
model for target competence. Even if there is little consensus as to its
components, at least there is debate. The literature test, however, lacks
such a model. There is no notion of the 'ideal' literary scholar, no
'performance' which clearly indicates literary success. The literature class,
for example, does not aim to produce a class of poets or philosophers...
Nor is it always clear whether skills, knowledge or something quite other
is the goal of the literature test (cited in Brumfit, 1991, p.16).

Because of this difference in type, the literature test cannot be measured by the same
criteria as the language test.

Facing these difficulties, Carter and Long produced a seminal paper on the
issues of testing in the study of literature (Carter & Long, 1990). The positions
underlying this paper were later expanded into a book (Carter & Long, 1992). The
Carter/Long position is that the testing of literature has been too long focused on what
they call "conventional questions". These are the questions that typically are found in
the Cambridge First Certificate, Cambridge Proficiency Examinations, for example.
Carter and Long contrast such questions with what they call "language-based
questions”. Language-based questions are those that engage respondents in personal and text-focused responses. Such responses are not only truer to the work, Carter and Long maintain, but also provide the basis for language development for students of literature who are also L2 students of the language. Helping teachers to understand and develop their own capacities for generating language-based questions will also focus teachers on more language-based approaches to the teaching of literature. All of these are desirable consequences of a more language-based, less conventional approach to the testing of literature.

Hughes (1990) notes better testing can stimulate better teaching. Carter and Long (1990) also claim that as such language-based tests develop they will have a beneficial "backwash" effect by influencing teaching methods and approaches in a positive manner. Since language-based approaches to the teaching of literature have been extensively developed in recent years, Carter and Long argue that additional or alternative testing procedures which are more language-based should be focused on. While appreciating the value and importance of "conventional tests" of literary and language skills, they think that it is difficult to argue that the questions on conventional tests do much to develop language competence.

A survey conducted by Akyel and Yalcin (1990) to evaluate the present state of literature teaching in the English departments of high schools in Istanbul, Turkey supports the Carter/Long view. This study demonstrated the fact that a careful analysis of learner needs is usually neglected in teaching literature, that is, students do not benefit as they should from language-based activities which are aimed at contextualizing their knowledge of language patterns through use of literary texts as models. At the university level, the Carter/Long argument is particularly critical to those who teach literature to ELT majors, since one of the primary justifications for such teaching is to help these learners in their language development. In their article "Teaching literature in EFL classes: Tradition and innovation" Carter and Long
underline the centrality of the medium of language to literature and suggest "language-based test-types". Thus, by exploring the nature of exam questions in literature, I want to examine differences, if any, in how literature is taught and tested at the university level in Turkey with English Language and Literature (ELL) majors as contrasted with how literature is taught and tested with English Language Teaching (ELT) majors.

Purpose of the Study

It is necessary to link the different test question design features to the different teaching situations around the world, as well as to different curricular priorities in different countries. It appears that in Turkey the educational system is wavering between modern and traditional approaches to teaching literature (Akyel & Yalcin, 1990). It seems appropriate then to examine how literature teachers feel about alternative test question-types, particularly how they respond preferentially to test question-types which Carter and Long classify as "conventional" versus those they classify as "language-based". The study asked literature teachers to examine sample literature test-questions and to indicate their own preferences for use of these different question-types with their own student populations.

Research Questions

I have chosen to examine test item types from literature courses at the university level. At this level, literature courses are offered to both ELL and ELT majors and the tests to be analyzed will be of both ELL and ELT majors. In this study, my intention is to seek answers to the following questions:

1. What are the preferences of literature teachers, of both ELL and ELT majors, with respect to literature test question-types?
2. Do teachers of ELT students make more use of language-focused exam questions than do teachers of ELL majors?
Significance of the Study

The results of this study will demonstrate what type of test questions the teachers at English Language and Literature (ELL) Departments and English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments in Turkey might prefer to use. Although the teachers in both ELL and ELT departments encourage their students to reach an upper level in L2 proficiency in a four-year period, the strategies in reaching this aim differ. ELL students start English Literature and History classes in the first year of their studies assuming that they are proficient enough to handle university studies in English. However, ELT students are taught English language in the first year of their studies through Grammar, Speaking, Writing and Listening classes in the curriculum and start literature and history classes in the following years. Moreover, ELT students mainly concentrate on language teaching methodology classes since they are being trained as language teachers. ELL students, on the other hand, concentrate on literature and language content, and are required to have a special teaching certificate if they want to work as language teachers after they graduate.

By highlighting alternative literature-test question-types, the study will open for reflection and discussion current practice and future possibilities for the teaching of literature in Turkey. Furthermore, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of "conventional" approaches versus "language-based" approaches in testing literature will help Turkish literature teachers of the new generation to develop new styles and strategies in teaching and testing literature.
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter the issues introduced in the first chapter will be expanded and enlarged upon. This chapter is divided into two major sections. My starting point is a
examination of the set of assumptions which justify literature study as a resource for language teaching. How the study of literature is used in language teaching is considered in the same section. Second, the interaction between testing and teaching is discussed. Approaches used in testing literature are outlined and compared. The model of test-types that I am using as a focus for the study is that of Carter and Long (1990). Since this study attempts to validate and test the assumptions of Carter and Long, the review on literature testing is built almost wholly on the Carter/Long model.

Teaching Literature and Teaching Language

Literature as a Resource

Literature can be a special resource for personal development and growth, as discussed in the first chapter; greater sensitivity and self-awareness and greater understanding of the world is encouraged through literature. It can also supply many linguistic opportunities to the language teacher and learner and allow many of the most valuable exercises of language learning to be based on material capable of stimulating great interest and involvement. One can not imagine appreciation of literary texts without appreciation of the language in which they are constructed. If, in practice, reading a literary text involves some sort of engagement by the reader beyond simply being able to understand the meanings of the utterances in the text, then one needs to ask how this engagement is acquired. Traditional practice has been to include discussion and analysis of literary texts in class, and to assume that learners will in some way 'catch' the ability to read appropriately from the process of discussion and analysis in a random way. In many institutions, the selection of texts is
determined more by tradition or the interests of the teachers than by deliberate choice of those texts which are most suitable for the needs of the learners. This is likely to happen if the teaching and examining approaches focus more on knowledge about literature than knowledge of literature.

Knowledge about literature means accumulating facts about literary contexts, dates, authors, literary terms, names of conventions, and so forth (Carter & Nash, 1990). It does not automatically lead to a more responsive reading or to a fuller interpretation of a text. Courses which involve extensive surveys of literary history and teaching methods which rely on lectures, may help students to pass the required examinations, but they do little to develop language competence or literary enjoyment for the majority of students. There is usually little concern with how to read literature for oneself and to learn how to make one's own meanings. The outcome for students is that they come to rely on authorities 'outside' themselves (e.g., teachers or books of literary criticism). Students with good memories do well under such a system. Such methods do not bear any systematic relation to the development of language skills in students, and those teaching literature in this way would probably deny that literature and language study can be successfully integrated.

Knowledge of literature is perhaps better expressed in terms of enjoyment and personal growth (Carter & Nash, 1990). The teacher who wishes to engage students in literature aims to encourage a personal reading of literary texts and strives to select teaching methods which lead to active involvement in reading particular texts rather than to a passive reception of information about the texts. Emotional and experiential involvement assumes a knowledge of literature which is not conveyed by survey lecture courses about literature; such involvement is more likely to be gained by activity-based, student-centered approaches which aim for a high level of personal response.
It is obvious that we must draw a distinction between reading texts and literature study (Widdowson, 1985). If we see the teaching of literature as more than simply the use of literary texts in the classroom, we shall have to confront the implications of the notion of literary competence. The student should be able to read the target language with a certain facility before undertaking a study of the literature (Akyel & Yalcin, 1990). Facility is important; otherwise, the study of a literary text is an exercise in decoding or deciphering. The student becomes engrossed in discovering what the author is saying without being able to analyze why or how it is said. This is an issue, as well, of text selection. As Widdowson (1983) puts it: language learners need to be exposed to selections at their own level of language competence. Interest and language accessibility rather than literary tradition should be the guiding principles of text selection.

Using Literature with the Language Learner

Linguistic enrichment, one of the aims of literature study, has been increasingly a goal of literature teachers in their literature classes, and language-based approaches to the teaching of literature have been extensively developed (Spiro, 1993). Consequently, a closer integration of language and literature in the ELT classroom has been sought since this will help students in achieving their main aim - which is to improve their knowledge of, and proficiency in, English. But proponents of a language-based approach vary in their goals. Some focus not on the reading of literature itself, but rather on how to use literature for language practice. Literary texts are seen as a resource which provide stimulating language activities. The advantages of using literary texts for language activities are that they offer a wide range of styles and registers, that they are open to multiple interpretations and hence provide opportunities for classroom discussion, and that they focus on interesting and motivating topics to explore in the classroom (Duff & Maley, 1989).
Another type of language-based approach to using literature focuses on techniques and procedures which are concerned more directly with the study of the literary text itself. The aim here is to provide the students with the tools they need to interpret a text and to make critical judgements of it (Carter & McCarthy, cited in Cook & Seidlhofer, 1995).

Finally, there are those who argue that students are not always ready to undertake critical analysis of a text, but that certain language-based study skills can act as important preliminary activities to studying literature (Brumfit & Carter, 1986). Many of these study skills will provide a way of bridging the gap between language study and the development of more literary-based skills. Students might be encouraged to reach an advanced level of oral and written competence by means of the literary texts chosen, so the literary texts can be treated both as 'art' and as a resource for language development.

Certainly literature teachers are not always aware of the existence of the above language-based approaches to the teaching of literature. A survey conducted by Ayse Akyel and Eileen Yalcin (1990) evaluated the present state of literature teaching in Turkey. One of the areas that was investigated in the survey focused on whether there was agreement in principle on the major goals of literature teachers. According to the results the teachers were divided into three groups. One of the teacher groups (5 out of 22) advocated the inclusion of a language-based approach to literature in their programs. Another group (3 out of 22) focused on one objective, which was to enable students to reach a proficiency level at which they could pass university English entrance examinations. However, among the stated aims of the last group of literature teachers (14 out of 22), there was no mention of the development of language competence at all. It can be inferred from Akyel and Yalcin's research that for a majority of literature teachers, a whole range of strategies, drawn mainly from the language teaching classroom, are not being applied to the teaching of reading.
literature in a second or foreign language. This means that standard EFL procedures such as cloze, prediction, creative writing, rewriting, role-play, and so forth are not deployed for purposes of opening up a literary text and releasing its meanings. According to Shuman (1994) such language-based, student-centered activities aim to involve students with a text, to develop their perceptions of it and to help them explore and express those perceptions.

Testing Literature

Teaching and Testing

It is necessary to link the tendencies in testing to the very different teaching situations around the world, for such situations also determine how and why literature is taught and examined (Carter & Long, 1992). For example, in some countries (e.g., England) English literature is taught to native speakers within cultural contexts in which the students themselves live. In other countries (e.g., Singapore) literature in English is taught to bilingual or second language learners in a context in which English has institutionalised status. In other countries (e.g., Turkey) literature in English is taught in the context of advanced courses in English as a foreign language. Each of these contexts will necessitate different priorities in terms of what counts as literature in English and in terms of which models of literature teaching and testing are appropriate.

Since there is no "best" teaching method, neither is there only one best approach to testing (Rudman, 1989). Each has certain advantages and limitations. Valette (1977) states that there are three types of literature tests: objective tests, essay tests and oral tests. An objective-test item (whether a multiple-choice or a direct question) is designed to elicit a specific response. The student's response, therefore, will be either clearly right or clearly wrong. An objective test can measure knowledge of authors, works and content, vocabulary, ability to analyze specific features of a text
and to draw comparisons between works. However, it can not test accuracy of student expression, ability to interpret a literary section, and ability to organize an essay and draw a valid conclusion. Similarly, the limitations of the essay-type test must also be taken into account. First, those who express themselves well in the target language often obtain a high score although their ideas are mediocre. Second, many essay tests sample only a limited amount of the material that has been covered. Finally, essay tests are difficult to score reliably. Another test type is the oral test. Oral tests are part of the comprehensive examinations for the master's and doctor's degrees. Oral literature tests favour the students who express themselves fluently in the target language. Like the essay tests, they are difficult to score with complete reliability, but they have an advantage over essay tests in which students may camouflage their ignorance by including only those elements they are sure of.

For Spiro (1993), literature questions are divided into two main categories: questions that do not typically require contact with text and questions that do require contact with text. Among the questions which do not require contact with text are essay questions while those requiring contact with text are context questions and critical appreciation questions.

Carter and Long (1992) claim that the present systems of testing students in literature courses are not particularly sophisticated and are in need of careful revision and reformulation, and in many respects modes of testing have fallen behind developments in classroom practice and lead to demotivation among teachers and students. Especially in the context of second and foreign language teaching it seems desirable for literature examinations to become more language-based.

In the following section we shall consider two approaches in teaching and testing literature entitled "conventional approaches" and "language-based approaches" by Carter and Long (1990). The discussion will include analysis of related test question-types. While appreciating the value and importance of conventional
question-types, we shall more closely examine the alternative question-types which are more obviously language based.

**Approaches in Testing Literature**

Carter and Long (1990) would prefer making 'attention to language' a central part of the testing process in which learners become more actively involved in close analysis of literary texts. However, many literature examinations operate according to a rigid formula which does not truly assess the literary competence teachers want to develop in their students. Some teachers examine literature by eliciting standard, conditioned, or 'prepared' responses. These typical literature questions do not reflect current thinking about language or literature study.

Carter and Long (1990 and 1992) define two major literature test question categories: conventional and language-based. They describe three sub-categories within each of these categories. I now turn to a description of the Carter/Long literature test question model.

**Conventional Approaches to Literature Test Question-types**

*"Paraphrase and context" type*

In such questions, examinees are asked to paraphrase a text extract in the form of a commentary. Equally common, students can be required to identify the examples of metaphors, similes or other literary "tropes" in the text. However, their significance or effectiveness are not typically asked for. According to Carter and Long, examinees should be asked to comment on the originality of the trope rather than simply glossing it. Also, paraphrase and context type of questions force the examinees to translate the text. In doing so, they take the risk of using a more elevated phrase which avoids a genuine interpretation of a text.

Here is an example of a paraphrase and context question; it is a form of question which occurs frequently in literature examinations in many parts of the world:
(from Shakespeare's *Othello* Act III iii.)

O, beware, my lord, of jealousy;
It is the green-eyed monster, which doth mock
The meat it feeds on ...

1. Who is speaking in this extract?
2. How many other characters are present in the scene and who are they?
3. What has just happened in this scene?
4. What happens next?
5. Rewrite the second and the third lines into modern English.
6. Do these lines contain a) metaphor b) simile c) personification? Give examples.

"Describe and discuss" type.

In such questions a general essay is invited from students in which they have to comment on what happens to a character with some discussion of reasons for an action. Those questions are descriptive and plot-based questions, so students with good memories favor such questions since they are asked for recall or retention of information from the original text. Such questions are common in University of Cambridge First Certificate examinations. Here are two representative examples:

(from George Orwell's *Animal Farm*)

'Describe Snowball and explain what happens to him.'

(Cambridge First Certificate, June 1987)

(from J. B. Prestley's *An Inspector Calls*)

'What does Mrs Birling find out about her son, and what are her feelings about this?'

(Cambridge First Certificate, December 1986)

"Evaluate and criticize" type.

These types of questions require a more critical approach to the text, and sometimes the candidate is invited to evaluate the relative success of the writer in conveying his attitude towards a particular scene or character. As in the case of
'describe and discuss' questions, the focus is on plot and character. Carter and Long argue that students consider characters in plays, novels, and poems as psychological (rather than textual) entities and the characters' behaviours are explored from the point of view of a common sense knowledge of human nature.

Here is an example:

(from D.H.Lawrence's Selected Tales)

'Illustrate from the stories how Lawrence's attitude to his characters is often a mixture of ridicule and compassion.'

(Cambridge Proficiency, December 1987)

Not unexpectedly, preparation for such examinations is supported by a minor industry of "slim" books which advise students how to pass the questions in the exams. Most typically, context questions are spotted and suitable paraphrases provided to be learned; or plot and character behaviour summaries are provided for purposes of retelling, usually together with a set of past and predicted questions; or extracts from literary critics are supplied in order to prepare for questions which elicit a more evaluative commentary, and once again Carter and Long argue that the students can quote the preparation guide analyses or pass them off as their own opinions.

Disadvantages of Conventional Question-types

The nature of such conventional question types raises a number of issues concerning what is being tested in literature examinations. First, in many examinations students are encouraged to concentrate on the sequence of events in a text rather than on the text as a whole. Second, such questions can be answered if the candidate has read only a translation or even a simplified version of the text. Thirdly, the reliance on the essay mode may provide too much encouragement to retell plots and formulate 'borrowed judgements'. It is difficult to argue that such test-types do much to develop language competence, to improve interpretive skills, or to afford
Language-based approaches to literature are designed to develop sensitivity to language and the ability to interpret the creative uses of that language in the establishment of meaning (Carter & Nash, 1990). Language-based approaches used in literature classes aim to elicit students' personal responses to and close readings of literary texts and more language-based approaches to literature testing, in fact, encourage more open and personal responses to literature. It is obvious that for Carter and Long language-based approaches are less concerned with the literary text as a product and are more concerned with processes of close reading. Students need to be able to identify with the experiences, thoughts and situations depicted in the text. They need to be able to discover the kind of pleasure and enjoyment which comes from making the text their own and interpreting it in relation to their own knowledge of themselves and of the world they inhabit (Carter & Long, 1992). A critical point to bear in mind here is that a reader who is involved with the text is likely to gain most benefit from exposure to the language of literature. Carter and Long believe that this involvement with a literary text can be a vital support and stimulus for language development.

In the following sections, three main language-based test-types will be illustrated with reference to the same poetic text. Comment on the poet or poem will not be invited. Again, this analysis is based on Carter and Long (1990). Essay writing is not required. It is, however, presumed that the poem will have been previously encountered in the classroom and that some class discussions of its possible meanings have taken place.

Ageing Schoolmaster

And now another autumn morning finds me
With chalk dust on my sleeve and in my breath
Preoccupied with vague, habitual speculation
On the huge inevitability of death.
Not wholly wretched, yet knowing absolutely
That I shall never reacquaint myself with joy,
I sniff the smell of ink and chalk and my mortality
And think of when I rolled, a gormless boy,
And rollicked round the playground of my hours.
And wonder when precisely tolled the bell
Which summoned me from summer liberties
And brought me to this chill autumnal cell
From which I gaze upon the april faces,
That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves.
And yet I feel no pitch or prick of envy
Nor would I have them know their sentenced selves.
With careful effort I can separate the faces,
The dull, the clever, the various shapes and sizes,
But in the autumn shades I find I only
Brood upon death, who carries off all the prizes.

Vernon Scannell

"General comprehension" type.

The following four questions seek to determine general comprehension:

a. What is the mood of the schoolmaster/narrator?

b. He says in line 5 that he is 'not wholly wretched'.
   Where in the poem does he seem 'wretched', and where does he seem relatively happy?

c. What evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?

d. Is there any evidence in the poem as to the age of the schoolmaster? To what extent do you think that this is important?

The aim of the questions of the 'General Comprehension Type' is to enable students to react to the general situation or themes enacted in the text. The questions lay "a basis for subsequent exploration but still require close reference back to the text as the starting point for ideas and perceptions" (cited in Carter & Long, 1990, p. 219).

"Text focus" type.

The purpose of the following questions is not to test comprehension but to see to what extent the learner is able to make inferences and to get some insight into the way in which s/he analyses a poem in the process of deducing meaning from it. The clues for this may be lexical, syntactic, or the result of making backward-forward
connections within the poem as a whole which make the language "special" in a given section. Carter and Long ask literature teachers to note how various features of language work together in this type of questions, while requiring little writing and none of the general discussion of the literary essay. Here is an example:

- What phrases are used to refer to the pupils?
- What is the 'chill autumnal cell'? (line 12)
- What other phrases in the poem could be linked to the 'autumnal cell'?
- The poet says, 'I shall never reacquaint myself with joy'. What, in the poem, was his former 'joy'?
- 'h' above refers to a formal phrase. What other phrase is noticeably formal? What is corresponding informal?
- In what way are the children 'sentenced'? (line 16)
- Rewrite the first stanza in prose, beginning 'One autumn morning I couldn't help thinking about...'
- 'One autumn morning' / 'Now another autumn morning': How is the effect of these two phrases different?
- Comment on any features of syntax, lexis, in lines 4-12 which make the language deviant.
- Comment on any features of syntax, lexis, (or other features) in lines 4-12 which make the language special or deviant?
- 'Gormless' (line 8) suggests 'stupid, not alert, unperspective, mindless'. What words in the poem contrast with this?

"Personal response and impact" type.

The main aim of the following questions is to attempt to measure a student's imaginative response to the text and to encourage use of the language directly in order to register that response. Also, such questions are designed to be more "open" and to help candidates make connections between the text and potential 'real world' outcomes.

- Write a short note to a friend on the character of the schoolmaster, imagining you are: a) a colleague b) a pupils of his.
- There are three components in the poem—the schoolmaster/narrator, the pupils, and death. How do the three link together?

According to Carter and Long these last two 'task-based' questions are more inventive, and require more extended writing, with 'p' being the more 'productive' of the two and 'q' being closer to the conventional forms of literary analysis. The questions are not
simply information-seeking; the principal goal is to put the student inside the text so that it can be recreated in terms of a personal response - an individual rather than a rehearsed account of the impact the text has on the reader.

Advantages of Language-based Question Types

According to Carter/Long there are a number of apparent advantages to language-based test-types. Firstly, the above sets of questions are designed as part of a range of items. They should be seen as interrelated in a progressive sequence and therefore cumulative in their effect. Secondly, the questions lead to a point where the learner is invited to respond freely and to relate the text to contexts of real experience. Literature typically has been examined in ways which elicit standard, conditioned, or 'prepared' responses. Finally, language-based approaches have underlined the centrality of the medium of language to literature. Attention to language can be made a central part of a process in which learners become more actively involved while reading and negotiating their way through the process of making meanings from the text. In this way, experience of literature rather than knowledge about literature is primary. Such questions highlight how literature classes can also support student language development. Language classes can form links with direct engagement with literature. A further valuable outcome of such language-based tests is that they can have a beneficial backwash effect by suggesting methods and approaches which focus on literary language study.

Conclusion

As more language-based approaches to literature teaching develop, there are increasing dangers of disjuncture between teaching processes and the kind of product required by examinations. A consequent loss of validity can result in that tests will not appear a reasonable outcome of classroom activities. So it is vital that the focus of literature teaching and literature testing be synchronized.
In this study, the testing strategies of literature teachers at the university level will be examined in order to see whether language-based testing (per Carter and Long) is ongoing in Turkey. Through delivering ranking formats to the literature teachers in the departments of English Language and Literature (ELL), and English Language Teaching (ELT) their personal preferences will be discussed demonstrating whether they tend to prefer conventional or language-based approaches in testing literature.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore preferences in test question types among teachers of literature. The study investigated and analyzed the data obtained from a ranking exercise administered to literature teachers of English Language and Literature (ELL) and English Language Teaching (ELT) majors at Turkish universities. A preference ranking format involving examples of six literature question types was developed and administered to teachers. In this study it was hypothesized that teachers teaching literature in ELT departments might favor the three types of questions which Carter and Long designate as "language-based" questions while teachers in ELL departments might favor more "conventional-type" questions. The teacher rankings aimed to find out what kind of preferences literature teachers have for literature test question-types and whether literature teachers of ELT majors have different preferences for particular types of exam questions from literature teachers of ELL majors. An underlying question is to determine whether teachers of ELT students make more use of language-based exam questions than do teachers of ELL majors.

Subjects

The subjects were teachers of literature in English Language and Literature (ELL) and English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments of the major universities located in Istanbul and Ankara. These teachers were chosen for the following reasons: For admission as ELL and ELT majors in the universities of Istanbul and Ankara candidates are required to gain 'high' scores in the University Entrance Exam (OSYS). Since the universities in Istanbul and Ankara select the 'most successful' students in the OSYS it was assumed that ELT and ELL majors in those universities get the 'best'
education. It was decided to conduct the survey with the literature teachers in the eleven Literature and ELT departments of those eight universities to examine what comprises "best" literature teaching and testing in Turkey today.

The total number of teacher subjects was originally thirty-six; three teachers from each of 12 departments (i.e., 5 ELL and 7 ELT). However, only 33 teachers out of thirty-six took part in the study because there were no literature teachers available in the ELT Department of Bosphorus University as ELT students in this university are given literature classes by the literature teachers of the ELL department in the same university (see Table 1). Twenty-six of the participating teachers were ELL graduates and the remaining seven teachers graduated as ELT majors. The subject teachers were randomly selected although they were required to have a minimum of three years of experience in their field. The subject teachers' average years of experience was fourteen. Twenty-one of the participating subjects had a PhD degree, another eight teachers had their MA and the remaining four teachers had a BA degree. Among the subjects, four were between the ages of 25-30, ten teachers were between the ages of 30-35, and nineteen of the teachers were in the 35 and over-year-old age group. Three literature teachers of ELL majors at Bilkent participated in pilot-testing the study. Fifteen literature teachers in 5 ELL departments, and eighteen literature teachers in 6 ELT departments completed the revised ranking exercises. All of the teachers were asked to present sample exam questions which demonstrated what type exam questions they prefer asking in the literature tests they give in their classes. The aim of collecting the teachers' own exam questions was to analyze whether teachers used more language-based or conventional questions. However, none of the teachers agreed to present their own test questions for reasons of test confidentiality.
Table 1

Subjects of the Study (N = 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Bosphorus Uni.</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>Istanbul Uni.</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marmara Uni.</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ankara Uni.</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilkent Uni.</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazi Uni.</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hacettepe Uni.</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Uni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 33

**Note.** N=Total Number of Subjects, n=Number of Subjects, Dept=Department, Uni=University, ELL=English Language and Literature, ELT=English Language Teaching.

Instruments

A rank order type of response technique was used in this study. Examples of six question-types - two questions per type - often asked in literature classes were delivered to the subject teachers. They were asked to rank these six examples in order of their own preference. The aim of the rankings was to find out global preferences for test question-types among teachers of literature for English Language and Literature (ELL) and English Language Teaching (ELT) majors. The 33 subjects were
asked to rank order six different sets of question-types, each set contained two sample questions. The subjects carried out the ranking by numbering question sets from 1 to 6, with 1 = "I am most likely to ask" and 6 = "I am least likely to ask" (6) in a literature exam. Three of the six question sets were language-based question-types and the other three were conventional question-types often asked in literature tests. The classification and examples for language-based and conventional test question-types were adapted from Carter and Long (1990).

Validity and Reliability of Data

Sample questions were adopted or created so as to provide realistic examples of literature test-questions representing both language-based and conventional examining approaches. Validity was verified by checking question examples against literature test-questions found in standardized examinations. As well, six university professors of literature were asked to examine the test-questions for validity of wording and categorization. The ranking formats were presumed to be reliable because, they were pilot-tested five times. After each pilot testing necessary modifications were made to ensure that the questions were clear and the design was appropriate for the research questions. Subject teachers from each institution were randomly selected, although great attention was given to select experienced teachers with at least three years of experience in literature teaching.

Procedure

This study was inspired by the Carter and Long (1990) article on literature-testing strategies. As I wanted to examine the nature of test questions in teaching and testing literature in Turkey, I decided to use the Carter/Long test question categories and test question samples verbatim as the research materials for this study. The procedure for this study proved somewhat more detailed and painstaking than
originally anticipated. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss this phase of the study in some detail and in order of the resultant procedural steps and their rationale.

1. (Pilot test #1) On April 6, 1996, during a seminar held in Private Bahcesehir High School in Istanbul, the researcher, as session presenter, introduced the six different question-types of the Carter/Long model to 28 high school literature teachers. Preferences for test question-types were solicited from attending teacher participants. The teachers commented on the question-types and the appropriacy of the content to the labelling of the questions. This was a first "pilot testing" using the original questions and question labels as presented by Carter and Long (1990). This piloting indicated some poorly-stated and ambiguous language in the questions per Carter/Long. The teachers reported that they had difficulty in matching the question samples with the labels of the question-types, stating that the category labellings were not clearly related to the content of the questions. A second point that the teachers found confusing was that the Carter and Long test questions were based on different texts, representing different examples of literary genres. That is, the questions in one group referred to a play, the questions representing another test question-type referred to two novels, other questions referred to a single poem, and another question-type used short stories as the text (see Appendix A). No revisions were made regarding the original Carter and Long question-type samples as a result of the first pilot-testing. However the questions-types were not presented in the same order as Carter and Long (1990) presented them (i.e., first, conventional question-types and second, language-based question-types). The questions-types were given randomly without attempting to categorize them as "conventional" or "language-based".

2. (Pilot test #2) Using the same questions, a second pilot-testing was conducted among university literature teachers on April 10, 1996. The six question-types were piloted with three literature teachers at Bilkent University in the Department of English Language and Literature. However, in the second piloting, the questions were
presented such that the first three question-types represented "conventional" and the
last three types represented "language-based" approaches (as Carter and Long (1990)
presented them). No labels for question-types were given in order to prevent
difficulty, confusion or bias in matching the question samples with the labels. The
teachers reported that what they found confusing was the fact that the number of
questions representing each type differed from one another and for some of the
questions a text was supplied and for others no text was supplied (see Appendix B).
The participants felt that the "no text" questions would favor students with a good
memory. For all of these reasons, the original questions proposed by Carter and Long
were edited and reorganized, and modified for a third pilot-testing.

3. (Pilot test #3) There appears to be an assumption by Carter and Long that the
labelling of the test-question categories is universal, or at least transparent, to teachers
of literature. It seemed difficult to test preference for teacher use of test question-
types without examining to what degree there is agreement on the categorization of
test question-types and the transparency of the labels which Carter and Long give to
these categories. One aim of the third pilot-testing was to determine how individual
literature test-questions were perceived and categorized. An attempt to look at the
issue of categorizing and examining of literature test-questions was made in the
following manner: firstly, an equal number of question samples were chosen for each
question-type (i.e., two questions each for six different question-types), and all the
questions, 12 in total, were re-worked so as to refer to the same text (see Appendix C
for question samples). The poem chosen by Carter and Long (i.e., Ageing
Schoolmaster) for exemplifying language-based test question-types was examined
using all six different question-types. For half of the question-types the original
("language-based") questions, as presented by Carter and Long, were used and for the
other half of the question-types, some new sample ("conventional") questions were
created. No changes were made in the labels for the question-types. The revised test-
question materials comprising six sets of two test-questions each (i.e., 2 questions per question-type) was constructed on April 15, 1996. To test the reliability of question categorization and the appropriacy and transparency of category labelling, the following procedure was used.

The 12 test questions were put on 12 separate slips of paper. Six literature instructors at Bilkent University, three instructors of American Literature and three instructors of English Language and Literature were independently given the slips containing the twelve questions and were asked to sort them into six piles of two questions each using criteria which they deemed most appropriate. The instructors were not asked to make any modifications. They were then given the Carter and Long labels for the test question types and asked to modify their sort according to their understanding of these labels. The intent of this exercise was to determine: a) if literature instructors' classification (sort) of literature test question-types agreed with that proposed by Carter and Long and; b) if the Carter/Long labelling of test question-types was meaningful to other teachers of literature and/or if this labelling would influence the bases on which they classified the sample literature test question-types. Results showed almost universal agreement in grouping the six question samples which Carter and Long define as "conventional" and almost no agreement (with Carter and Long or with each other) on grouping the six question samples which Carter and Long define as "language-based". When later given the Carter and Long classification labels, the respondents said they did not find the labels meaningful or helpful in sorting the question-types. Thus, although Carter and Long offer samples and a system of categorizing and labelling of literature-test question-types, it appears that literature teachers may not agree with the categorization or find the labelling interpretable. This finding reinforces the view that literature teachers have a variety of individual, personalized perspectives on literature which appears to influence their classification of literature test question-types.
4. (Pilot test #4) On April 18, 1996, a preference ranking of the modified version - based on the third piloting- of the Carter/Long test questions and labels was piloted with the same three literature teachers at Bilkent University in the Department of English Language and Literature again (see pilot test #2). The teachers participating in the pilot-testing agreed that they found the labelling of the question sets confusing and not appropriate to the content. On the basis of this piloting and discussions, the questions were again edited for greater clarity and cohesion (see Appendix D). In the editing, one of the question sets (i.e., "general comprehension" type) which was originally labelled as "language-based" by Carter and Long was recategorized as "conventional", and a question set (i.e., "evaluate and criticize") originally labelled "conventional" by Carter and Long was recategorized as "language-based".

5. (Pilot test #5) On April 22, 1996, a final piloting was conducted by my thesis advisor and a senior American literature professor at Bilkent University in the Department of American Literature to review the questions, question groupings and question labels used in the previous pilotings. As a result of this exercise one category was partially re-labelled (i.e., "Evaluate and Discuss"); one Carter and Long category was eliminated (i.e., "Text Focus"), and one category was created (i.e., "Comment and Criticize"). Table 2 indicates the result of this final editing, classifying and labelling exercise.

6. During the first and the second week of May 1996, the actual study was conducted. Five ELL and six ELT departments at the universities in Istanbul and Ankara were visited and the final version of the test question sets were preference-ranked by 33 literature teachers in their home institutions. It was determined not to indicate the Carter-Long question set labels with the six sets of sample test question items, since these had proved distracting and confusing in all pilot trials. Results were collected by May 3, 1996. The subjects were asked to consider the six question sets and to rank
order them in terms of preference for use in their own literature classes, with 1 = "I am most likely to ask" and 6 = "I am least likely to ask".

Table 2

Recategorization of Question-types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Paraphrase and Context Type</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1. Paraphrase and Context Type</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe and Discuss Type</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2. Describe Type</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate and Criticize Type</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>3. General Comprehension Type</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General Comprehension Type</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>4. Evaluate and Discuss Type</td>
<td>LBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Text Focus Type</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>5. Comment and Criticize Type</td>
<td>LBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal Response and Impact Type</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>6. Personal Response and Impact Type</td>
<td>LBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CA = Conventional Approach, LBA = Language-based Approach.

Data Analysis

Since this was a quantitative research study, variability techniques were used in analyzing the data. The results of the subjects' preference rankings are shown as means of ranks by groups. Comparison of groups (ELL vs ELT) and of test question-types (conventional vs language-based) are displayed and analyzed. Variability provides information on the spread of behaviours among the subjects of the research. In this study, it specifically indicates the degree of homogeneity or heterogeneity of subjects with respect to ranking preferences. In the following chapter, analysis of data is presented in detail.
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS OF STUDY

Introduction

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the data collected from the teacher subjects in English Language and Literature (ELL) Departments and English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments at the university level with respect to their preferences for literature test question-types. Thirty-three teachers from 8 different universities which are situated in Istanbul and Ankara preference-ranked examples from six literature-test question-types adapted from the model Carter and Long proposed in 1990. Fifteen of those teachers were teaching literature in ELL Departments and the remaining 18 were teaching literature in ELT Departments.

In analyzing the data, the ranking responses of all teachers were summed and frequency and percentage of rank responses for each question-type were calculated and displayed in tables. From the data, the mean ranks for each of the six question types were determined for each type of the two groups. Tables and figures were designed to display the ranking data. Tables include data from both groups so that comparisons of the results for teachers in ELL Departments and ELT Departments are possible.

Analysis of Preference Rankings

One set of ranking materials was administered to all literature teachers in ELT Departments in the universities situated in Istanbul and Ankara. The materials comprised instructions, a complete poem -Ageing Schoolmaster- by Vernon Scannell, and six sets of test questions (two questions per set) based on the poem. The poem was on one page and the six question sets on two pages following. Subjects were asked to read the poem and inspect all test question sample sets. After this they were asked to rank the six question sets in terms of the criteria "most likely to ask in my class" (represented by "1") to "least likely to ask in my class" (represented by "6").
The materials given to the teachers were all in English, and results from all subjects are analyzed and discussed together.

In analyzing the rankings, each item, following Carter and Long (adapted) was categorized as either "conventional" or "language-based". Three question-types represented each category. The question-types representing the "conventional" category were: Paraphrase and Context Type, Describe Type, and General Comprehension Type, and the question-types representing the "language-based" category were: Comment and Criticize Type, Personal Response and Impact Type, and finally, Evaluate and Discuss Type. The following table (Table 3) shows the distribution of the question-type items within the categories.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sets of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Conventional Approach</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language-based Approach</td>
<td>T4, T5, T6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. T* = Type of exam question; T1 = Paraphrase and Context Type, T2 = Describe Type, T3 = General Comprehension Type; T4 = Comment and Criticize Type, T5 = Personal Response and Impact Type, T6 = Evaluate and Discuss Type.

Considering those two categories (i.e., "Conventional Approach" and "Language-based Approach"), literature teachers were asked to choose the question-types representing either the conventional or language-based category as more likely or less likely to be asked in their exams.
Category I: Conventional Approach

T1. Paraphrase and Context Type

From which I gaze upon the April faces
That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves,
And yet I feel no pinch or prick of envy
Nor would I have them know their sentenced selves.

These lines are taken from Scannell's *Aging Schoolmaster*.

1. Do they contain any examples of the following figures of speech?
   a) simile  b) metaphor  c) personification

2. Do they contain any examples of the following kinds of sound patterning?
   a) rhyme  b) alliteration  c) assonance

Fig 1. Sample of "Paraphrase and Context Type" question.

In these questions, as shown in Fig 1, students are expected to identify some literary tropes (e.g., simile, metaphor, personification) and sound patterns (i.e., rhyme, alliteration, assonance) used in the poem. Data concerning the ranking of Paraphrase and Context Type is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>ELL teachers (N=15)</th>
<th></th>
<th>ELL.T teachers (N=18)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  | 15  | 100.00 | 18  | 100.00 |

Note. Ranking: 1 = most likely to ask, 6 = least likely to ask.
9 ELL teachers out of fifteen (60%) ranked "Paraphrase and Context" type of test-questions are less likely to be asked in their classes, because according to the criteria rankings #1,2 and 3 indicated "more likely to ask", and rankings #4,5 and 6 indicated "less likely to ask". ELT teachers were split (10 teachers vs 8 teachers) between those who thought "Paraphrase and Context" type of questions are less likely or more likely to be asked in their classes.

T2. Describe Type

1. Describe the schoolmaster's feelings about his students in Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*.

2. Describe the schoolmaster in Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*.

*Figure 2.* Sample of "Describe Type" question.

In these questions students were asked to describe the main character and his feelings referring to the whole of the poem (as shown in Figure 2). Data concerning the ranking of Paraphrase and Context Type is shown in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2. Describe Type (N=15)</th>
<th>ELT teachers (N=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Ranking: 1= most likely to ask, 6= least likely to ask.
It appears in Table 5 that 60 percent of the ELL teachers (9 out of 15) said that "Describe Type" of questions were less likely to be asked in their classes, whereas 50% of the ELT teachers thought that "Describe Type" questions were less likely to be asked.

T3. General Comprehension Type

1. In the first stanza the poet/narrator says that he is 'not wholly wretched'. Referring to the whole of the poem, where in the poem does he seem 'wretched', and where does he seem relatively happy?

2. Referring to the whole of the poem, what evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?

Figure 3. Sample of "General Comprehension Type" question.

As illustrated in Figure 3, in these questions the students were expected to demonstrate general understanding of the text and its tone. The results of the data concerning "General Comprehension Type" questions are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>ELL teachers (N=15)</th>
<th>ELT teachers (N=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ranking: 1= most likely to ask, 6= least likely to ask.
The results above exhibit near consensus between the groups. Both of the
groups of teachers found "General Comprehension Type" questions more likely to be
asked in a literature test. When the distribution of the percentages is examined, it can
be seen that 80% of the ELL teachers (12 out of 15) and 71% of the ELT teachers (13
out of 18) indicated "General Comprehension" type of questions as more likely to be
asked in their classes.

**Category 2: Language-based Approach**

**T4. Comment and Criticize Type**

1. A critic commented that Scannell’s poem *Ageing Schoolmaster* captured the atmosphere of a
classroom truly and honestly. Do you agree/disagree? Why/why not?

2. Consider the two passages "gaze upon the april faces" and "gleam before me like apple ranged on
shelves". Has the poet chosen images that complement or contradict each other? Support your position.

---

**Figure 4. Sample of "Comment and Criticize Type" question.**

In these test questions, (Figure 4) examinees are asked to criticize sometimes a critic
of the literary work or sometimes make their own criticism about the work revealing
their personal commentary at the same time. Table 7 shows the subjects rank
preferences for the "Comment and Criticize" type of question.
Table 7

Comment and Criticize Type (T4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>ELL teachers (N=15)</th>
<th>ELT teachers (N=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ranking: 1= most likely to ask, 6= least likely to ask.

When the responses of the two groups were analyzed (Table 7), it is seen that the preferences of the two groups were widely different from each other. While 11 ELL teachers out of 15 (73% of the ELL teachers) were more likely to ask "Comment and Criticize" questions, 13 ELT teachers out of 18 (72% of the ELT population) thought that "Comment and Criticize" questions were less likely to be asked in their classes.

T5. Personal Response and Impact Type

1. Write a short paragraph about the character of the schoolmaster, imagining you are a) a colleague b) a pupil of his.

2. The schoolmaster speaks of "this chill autumnal cell". What might your images be if you were an ageing schoolmaster brooding upon death?

Figure 5. Sample of "Personal Response and Impact Type" question.
The questions in this set focus response on analogies which can be drawn between the text and the student’s knowledge of the world (Figure 5). In the following table (Table 8), subjects’ rank-preferences for "Personal Response and Impact" type of literature test-questions are shown.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELL teachers (N=15)</th>
<th>ELT teachers (N=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ranking: 1 = most likely to ask, 6 = least likely to ask.

Table 8 shows that the distribution of percentages between the two groups was dissimilar. Among the ELL teachers, 86% of them ranked the "Personal and Impact Type" of questions as less likely to ask. However, 45% of the ELT teachers ranked "Personal Response and Impact" questions as more likely to ask. A slightly higher percentage of ELT teachers (55%) thought they were less likely to ask this question-type in their exams.
T6. Evaluate and Discuss Type

1. Samuel Johnson says "Any piece of artwork should invite the reader to relate the text to contexts of real experiences". Referring to Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*, discuss this idea and explain.

2. Discuss the theme of 'death' in Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*.

Figure 6. Sample of "Evaluate and Discuss Type" question.

In this type of question, students are tested to check whether they can make connections between the given idea and the text they have read. They are invited to support their discussions with the literary experience gained from the text. In Table 9, teacher personal preferences for the "Evaluate and Discuss Type" of exam questions are given.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluate and Discuss Type (T6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL teachers (N=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ranking: 1= most likely to ask, 6= least likely to ask.

As shown in the table above, the teachers in both the ELL and ELT departments (53% of ELL teachers vs 61% of ELT teachers) agreed that "Evaluate
and Discuss Type" of questions were slightly more likely to be asked in their classes. However, almost a similar percentage of teachers in each group (47% of ELL teachers vs 39% of ELT teachers) ranked the question-type as less likely to be asked in their literature tests.

In the following table (Table 10), mean ranks for all test question-types are displayed. The results in the table demonstrate ranking comparisons between the types of test questions that literature teachers in English Language and Literature (ELL) Departments and English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments state that they are likely or not likely to ask.

Table 10

**ELL and ELT Teacher Preferences in Literature Test Question-types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question-types</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELL Ts (N=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Question Types:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase and Context Type</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe Type</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Comprehension Type</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-based Question Types:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment and Criticize Type</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Response and Impact Type</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and Discuss Type</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (Rank Means: 1-most likely to ask, 6-least likely to ask) Ts= Teachers; MS= Mean scores.*

As discussed earlier, the criteria used in the rankings indicated that the question-types which were ranked between "1" and "3" were "more likely to be asked" in literature classes. In this study what ELL teachers ranked as "more likely to be
asked" were found to be "General Comprehension Type" (MS= 2.33), "Comment and Criticize Type" (MS= 2.80), and "Evaluate and Discuss Type" (MS= 3.33) of questions (see Table 10). In other words, it can be claimed that ELL teachers preferred asking "language-based" question-types in literature exams because 2 question-types out of 3 were ranked as "more likely to be asked". The results of ELT teacher rankings showed that ELT teachers preferred "conventional" question-types. They ranked "General Comprehension Type" (MS= 2.77), "Evaluate and Discuss Type" (MS= 2.94), and "Describe Type" (MS= 3.50) of questions "more likely to be asked" in their classes. Since 2 of those questions out of 3 were "conventional" questions, it appeared that ELT teachers favored "conventional" question-types more than they did "language-based" question-types. However, the original hypothesis was that ELT literature teachers would prefer "language-based" test question types and ELL literature teachers would prefer "conventional" test question types. As visual inspection of the rank means in Table 10 shows that this hypothesis was not confirmed.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference Rank</th>
<th>ELL Ts (N=15) MS</th>
<th>ELT Ts (N=18) Preference Rank</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Comprehension T.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>General Comprehension T.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment and Criticize T.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Evaluate and Discuss T.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and Discuss T.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Describe T.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe T.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>Paraphrase and Context T.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase and Context T.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Personal Response and Impact T.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Response and Impact T.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>Comment and Criticize T.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (Language-based question-types shown underlined.) (Rank Means: 1-most likely to ask, 6-least likely to ask) Ts = Teachers; MS = Mean Scores; T = Type.
For ELT literature teachers, two out of three of their top half rank preferences were "conventional" question-types, whereas for ELL literature teachers, two out of three of their top half rank preferences were "language-based" question-types. The teachers of both departments (i.e., ELL and ELT) ranked "General Comprehension Type" (conventional) questions as the most likely to be asked. The teachers in ELL departments ranked "Comment and Criticize Type" (language-based) as the second most likely to be asked while the teachers in ELT departments considered "Evaluate and Discuss Type" (language-based) as the second most likely question-type to be asked in literature tests. General rankings of ELL teachers and ELT teachers were somewhat similar. They were positively but not significantly correlated. (Spearman rho = .20; p = N.S.)

As a result of the findings in this study, it was found that both ELL and ELT teachers preferred a mix of both conventional and language-based questions in their classes. However, ELL teachers preferred asking more language-based questions while ELT teachers preferred asking more conventional questions.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

This study sought to investigate preferences in literature test question-types among university teachers of literature in Turkey. As part of this investigation I sought to validate the Carter/Long (1990) model of literature test question-types. A particular inquiry was whether there would be differences in the test question-types preferred by literature teachers in Departments of English Language and Literature (ELL) versus those preferred by literature teachers in Departments of English Language Teaching (ELT). Carter and Long (1990) suggested that ELT teachers should have a strong preference for test question-types they defined as language-based since such questions supported language development as well as literary insight. In this study it was hypothesized (per Carter and Long) that ELT literature teachers would have a strong preference for "language-based" literature test question-types, while ELL literature teachers would probably have a strong preference for "conventional" test question-types. The participants in this study were 33 literature teachers at eight major universities located in Istanbul and Ankara in ELL (15 teachers) and ELT (18 teachers) departments. The teachers were asked to rank order six different sets of question types. In each set two representative question samples were given. Three of the question sets represented "conventional" type questions and the other three question sets represented "language-based" question-types. In the study, subject teachers read a target poem and then examined the six question sets based on the poem. The teachers were asked to rank each set of questions between 1 and 6. They ranked as number "1" that set of test-questions they were most likely to ask in their own classes, and number "6" that set of test-questions they were least likely to ask in their classes. The data collected from the teachers were analyzed using various data analysis techniques. In analyzing the data, the percentage of responses
indicating the teachers' preferences for each question-type were calculated. The mean rank scores for all question-types were determined for each group. Tables and figures were designed to display the data from the rankings. Each table included data from both groups so that comparisons of the preferences for literature teachers in ELL and ELT departments were possible.

Discussion of the Results

The teacher rankings were analyzed for an answer to the main question concerning preferences of literature teachers - of both ELL and ELT majors - with respect to literature test question-types. The analysis showed that literature teachers in ELL and ELT departments use both conventional and language-based question-types in their classes. However, for ELL teachers language-based question-types are more likely to be asked, and for ELT teachers conventional-types are more likely to be asked in their literature tests. This finding disconfirmed the original hypothesis which was that ELT teachers are more language-sensitive and that they are more likely to ask language-based questions in their classes.

In carrying out this study, I was impressed with the great variation in styles and predispositions that there are among my colleagues in university literature teaching. If one looks for homogeneity in an academic perspective, one certainly does not look amongst teachers of literature. Just as individual preferences for literary genre - poetry, short story, biography, novel - are widely diverse, so as it seems are preferences for style of teaching and testing literature. One reading of my data reflects the diversity of those individuals who teach and test literature.

In considering the question-breakdowns, some results show a standard bell-shaped distribution with relatively high clustering of responses (see Table 7, T4, ELT data), other results show a flat distribution with no clustering of responses (see Table 5, T2, ELL data), and still other results show a bath-tub distribution with most
responses at one extreme or the other (e.g., Table 9, T6, ELL data). This again assumes that the Carter/Long labelled "language-based test questions" are not seen by ELT teachers as language-based test questions.

The researcher sought an answer to the second research question, which was whether teachers of ELT students make more use of language-based exam questions than do teachers of ELL majors. Although ELT teachers were expected to give more importance to language as they train their students to be future language teachers, the importance given to language-based test questions in ELT classes is, in fact, less than in ELL classes. The findings in this study support the findings of a previously conducted survey in high schools in Turkey by Akyel and Yalcin (1990) regarding the strategies followed by literature teachers in teaching literature. Akyel and Yalcin have demonstrated that there are three groups of teachers with three different aims of literature teaching. One group of teachers advocates the inclusion of a language development (language-based) approach to literature in their programme. Another group in the survey indicates that they focus on a more academic objective, which is to enable students to pass the language proficiency test for university entry (mostly grammar-based). There is one more group of teachers that do not mention the development of language competence as a goal of literature study at all. This group, in fact, comprised the majority of subject teachers (14 teachers out of 22).

In this study I examined the testing of literature at university level while Akyel and Yalcin investigated literature teaching goals at the high school level. Overall results suggest that a language-based approach to testing (and presumably to teaching) of literature is not a focus in most literature programmes either at the high school level or the university level. In other words, language sensitivity is not widespread among literature teachers either at the high school or university level and that language development is not perceived as a major goal of literature study, even for literature teachers of ELT majors.
Various reasons might be given to explain why the researcher's hypothesis was disconfirmed in this study. A first thought is that the Carter/Long model itself may be the problem. Carter (1996) himself indicated the model is "proposing a new category of language-based questions, hence many teachers would perhaps not recognize them" (R. Carter, personal communication, May 23, 1996). This may very well have been the case in my study. Second, some "technical" reasons might be considered. That is, there might have been an experimental problem in the study. Perhaps other question samples and labelling should have been used in the ranking exercises rather than those chosen for the study. Giving the subjects a ranking task might have caused a problem in the experiment. Some teacher subjects were observed to respond to the ranking exercises thoughtlessly. Others hesitated over their choices. A third reason might be the general variance among literature teachers (as mentioned earlier). The subjects' different personalities and different educational backgrounds, ages, years of experience and so forth might have caused major variance in response to the task.

There is a variety of perspectives in the appreciation and criticism of literature. For example, schools of literary criticism include allegorical interpretation, biographism, formalism, feminist criticism, psychoanalytic criticism, semiotics, structuralism, mythic criticism, reader response, and so forth (Harris, 1993). The teaching of literature is likely to be equally rich in its variety of perspectives and approaches. One system of categorization and labelling of literature test question-types (per Carter and Long) may be interpreted quite differently by different literature teachers. Finally, the primary concern of ELT majors is not English literature study but English language. Teachers of ELT majors might have felt less confident in such a survey which was focused on literary analysis rather than language development.
Limitations of the Study

This study gave me an opportunity to meet with many literature teachers and to inquire whether different approaches to teaching and testing literature are practised in departments of English Language and Literature and English Language Teaching. The study re-enforced my own experience that literature teachers in a department do not operate as a cohesive unit but rather as a collection of unique even idiosyncratic individuals with a common academic address. The study is interesting in that most of the teacher subjects were also teacher trainers. Hence, their personal preferences in literature teaching/testing approaches may have long-term effects on the teachers of new generations.

There were some limitations to this study. First of all, during the visit to the universities, it appeared that giving the teachers the task of rank ordering the question-types looked too much like a test and that, as teachers, they preferred not to be tested. Although the ranking task could be completed very quickly, some teachers raced through the ranking with little attention to the task while others paused hesitantly. I doubt that rankings would have been identical if subjects were given the same ranking task two weeks later. If true, this suggests a low measure of reliability. Given the uncertainty and disagreement among university literature professors with respect to the task (reported in the pilot-testing procedures in Chapter 3) such uncertainty and variability of responses among my subjects seems likely. The teacher subjects were similarly reluctant when the researcher asked them to display their own question samples. Had the researcher been able to collect any actual test question samples from the teachers, more reliable and consistent data could have been obtained as a result of an analysis of the test samples. Reliability and validity of the data analyzed in this study could have been cross-checked with the test samples.

Another constraint encountered during data collection concerned time. Since there were eight universities to be visited according to the procedure, visiting those
universities which are situated in two different cities took longer than I expected. Particularly in Istanbul I had a hard time travelling between the two sides, from the Asian side to the European side, during administration of the ranking task to participating subjects.

A third constraint concerned data interpretation. In attempting to assess instructor preference for literature test question-types, one assesses not only differences in question-type preference, but, indeed, differences in how individual literature questions are perceived and categorized. Such differences in preference may be due to differences in personalities and literary biases. Many of these are hidden differences and not differentiable in terms of standard experimental subject characteristics - age, sex, teaching experience, educational background, and so forth. Thus, these results must be seen as preliminary and tentative and not as yet generalizable.

Implications for Further Research

In this research, I examined two approaches to teaching and testing literature: "conventional" approaches and language-based" approaches, in Carter and Long (1990) terms. Here, the main focus was on teachers' personal preferences in their classes at the university level for approaches to testing literature. A more general question relates to how teachers teach literature. I have earlier tried to indicate the relation between teaching and testing, but I have not looked at teaching. A further study might examine the approach of teachers to teaching literature in view of their approach to testing it. In other words, it should be examined whether testing "backwash" has any effect on classroom teaching.

A second type of study might look at student preferences for testing and teaching approaches. In the study it could be seen whether students have a sense of
their own needs and how the teaching and testing of literature might best serve those needs.

Pedagogical Implications

In some literature classes there happens to be mismatches between teaching processes and the kind of product required by the end-of-course examinations. As a result, the tests do not appear as a reasonable outcome of classroom activity. Therefore, this survey leads the researcher to make broad recommendations for the teaching and testing of literature.

As indicated earlier by Akyel and Yalcin (1990), L2 students need to develop their language competence. No matter what the level of students, literature as a content area can be used to enrich students' awareness of the linguistic and rhetorical structure of literary discourse. Students can learn to see the significance of the writers' linguistic and rhetorical choices in classroom discussions of specific linguistic and rhetorical clues in the text and develop their speaking and writing abilities.

Secondly, I suggest that teachers should develop techniques appropriate to their students' literary studies. They should return students to the text and its uses of language as the originating centre of their experiences. That might be achieved through language-based approaches that encourage students to call on their own experience to respond to the text.

The researcher believes that if these recommendations are followed, they would improve both the literary and language competence of students, provided that teaching techniques and approaches are primarily language-based.
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1. Write a short paragraph about the character of the schoolmaster; imagining you are: 
a) a colleague  b) a pupil of his.
2. There are three components in the poem - the schoolmaster/narrator, the pupils, and death. How do the three link together?

PARAPHRASE AND CONTEXT

Type

from which I gaze upon the april faces
That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves,
And yet I feel no pinch or prick of envy
Nor would I have them know their sentenced selves.

Those lines are taken from Vernon Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*. Referring to the whole of the poem, answer the following questions:

1. Who is speaking in the stanza?
2. Who is 'them' in line 4?
3. Do these lines contain a) metaphor  b) simile  c) personification? Give examples.

DESCRIBE AND DISCUSS

Type

- Describe the schoolmaster in Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*, and explain what happens to him.
- In the poem *Ageing Schoolmaster* by Vernon Scannell, what does the schoolmaster find out about himself, and what are his feelings about this?
TEXT FOCUS

1. What phrases are used to refer to the pupils?
2. What is the 'chill autumnal cell', and what other phrases in the poem could be linked to the 'autumnal cell'?
3. The poet says, with some formality, 'I shall never reacquaint myself with joy'. What, in the poem, was his former 'joy'?
4. 'One autumn morning' / 'Now another autumn morning': How is the effect of these two phrases different?

EVALUATE AND CRITICIZE

Discuss how the theme of 'death' is depicted in Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster.*

GENERAL COMPREHENSION

1. What is the mood of the schoolmaster/narrator?
2. He says in line 5 that he is 'not wholly wretched'. Where in the poem does he seem 'wretched', and where does he seem relatively happy?
3. What evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?
4. Is there any evidence in the poem as to the age of schoolmaster (in addition to the title)? To what extent do you think that this is important?
Please, rank the following questions between 1 and 6 according to your personal preference. Write the number in the box next to the question-type. Start from (1) for the question you think you are most likely to ask and end with (6) for the question you think you are least likely to ask in a literature test.

☐ Type I

From which I gaze upon the april faces
That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves,
And yet I feel no pinch or prick of envy
Nor would I have them know their sentenced selves.

Those lines are taken from Vernon Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*. Referring to the whole of the poem, answer the following questions;

1. Who is speaking in the stanza?
2. Who is ‘them’ in line 4?
3. Do these lines contain a)metaphor b)simile c)personification? Give examples.

☐ Type II

- Describe the schoolmaster in Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*, and explain what happens to him.

- In the poem *Ageing Schoolmaster* by Vernon Scannell, what does the schoolmaster find out about himself, and what are his feelings about this?
Type III

Discuss the theme of 'death' in Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*.

Type IV

1. What is the mood of the schoolmaster/narrator?
2. He says in line 5 that he is 'not wholly wretched'. Where in the poem does he seem 'wretched', and where does he seem relatively happy?
3. What evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?
4. Is there any evidence in the poem as to the age of schoolmaster (in addition to the title)? To what extent do you think that this is important?

Type V

1. What phrases are used to refer to the pupils?
2. What is the 'chill autumnal cell', and what other phrases in the poem could be linked to the 'autumnal cell'?
3. The poet says, with some formality, 'I shall never reacquaint myself with joy'. What, in the poem, was his former 'joy'?
4. 'One autumn morning' / 'Now another autumn morning': How is the effect of these two phrases different?

Type VI

1. Write a short paragraph about the character of the schoolmaster, imagining you are: a) a colleague  b) a pupil of his.
2. There are three components in the poem - the schoolmaster/narrator, the pupils, and death. How do the three link together?
Appendix C

Question-types Used in Sorting Exercise for Pilot-testing #3

Paraphrase and Context Type

1. From which I gaze upon the april faces
   That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves,
   And yet I feel no pinch or prick of envy
   Nor would I have them know their sentenced solves.

   These lines are taken from Scannell's Ageing Schoolmaster.
   1. Do they contain any examples of the following figures of speech?
      a) Simile  b) Metaphor  c) Personification
   2. Do they contain any examples of the following kinds of sound patterning?
      a) Rhyme  b) Alliteration  c) Assonance

Describe and Discuss Type

1. Describe the schoolmaster's feelings about his students in Scannell's poem Ageing Schoolmaster.
2. Describe the schoolmaster in Scannell's poem Ageing Schoolmaster.

Evaluate and Criticize Type

1. In the first stanza the poet/narrator says that he is 'not wholly wretched'.
   Referring to the whole of the poem, where in the poem does he seem 'wretched',
   and where does he seem relatively happy?
2. Referring to the whole of the poem, what evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?
General Comprehension Type

1. A critic commented that Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster* captured the atmosphere of a classroom truly and honestly. Do you agree/disagree? Why/why not?

2. Consider the two passages "gaze upon the april faces" and "gleam before me like apples ranged on shelves". Has the poet chosen images that complement or contradict each other? Support your position.

Text Focus Type

1. Write a short paragraph about the character of the schoolmaster, imagining you are
   a) a colleague  b) a pupil of his.

2. The schoolmaster speaks of "this chill autumnal cell". What might your own images be if you were an ageing schoolmaster brooding upon death?

Personal Response and Impact Type

1. Samuel Johnson says "Any piece of artwork should invite the reader to relate the text to contexts of real experience". Referring to Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*, discuss this idea and explain.

2. Discuss the theme of "death" in Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*. 
Please rank the following question-types between 1 and 6 according to your personal preference assuming that you are preparing a test for your Poetry class. In the test the students are assumed to be given a poem (i.e.: Ageing Schoolmaster) which they have never seen before. Start from (1) for the type you think you are most likely to ask and end with (6) for the type you think you are least likely to ask in the test. Write the number in the box next to the question-type.

☐ Paraphrase and Context Type

1. From which I gaze upon the april faces
   That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves,
   And yet I feel no pinch or prick of envy
   Nor would I have them know their sentenced selves.
   These lines are taken from Scannell's Ageing Schoolmaster.
   What does the poet mean by "not wholly wretched"?

☐ Describe and Discuss Type

1. Describe the schoolmaster's feelings about his students in Scannell's poem Ageing Schoolmaster.
2. Describe the schoolmaster in Scannell's poem Ageing Schoolmaster.

☐ General Comprehension Type

1. In the first stanza the poet/narrator says that he is 'not wholly wretched'. Referring to the whole of the poem, where in the poem does he seem 'wretched', and where does he seem relatively happy?
2. Referring to the whole of the poem, what evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?
Evaluate and Criticize type

1. A critic commented that Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster* captured the atmosphere of a classroom truly and honestly. Do you agree/disagree? Why/why not?

2. Consider the two passages "gaze upon the april faces" and "gleam before me like apples ranged on shelves". Has the poet chosen images that complement or contradict each other? Support your position.

Text Focus Type

1. Write a short paragraph about the character of the schoolmaster, imagining you are a) a colleague b) a pupil of his.

2. The schoolmaster speaks of "this chill autumnal cell". What might your own images be if you were an ageing schoolmaster brooding upon death?

Personal Response and Impact Type

1. Samuel Johnson says "Any piece of artwork should invite the reader to relate the text to contexts of real experience". Referring to Scannell's poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*, discuss this idea and explain.

2. Discuss the theme of "death" in Scannell's *Ageing Schoolmaster*.
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Please rank the following question-types between 1 and 6 according to your personal preference assuming that you are preparing a test for your Poetry class. In the test the students are assumed to be given a poem (i.e.: _Ageing Schoolmaster_) which they have never seen before. Start from (1) for the type you think you are most likely to ask and end with (6) for the type you think you are least likely to ask in the test. Write the number in the box next to the question-type.

☐ Type 1

1. From which I gaze upon the april faces
   That gleam before me, like apples ranged on shelves,
   And yet I feel no pinch or prick of envy
   Nor would I have them know their sentenced selves.

   These lines are taken from Scannell's _Ageing Schoolmaster_.

   1. Do they contain any examples of the following figures of speech?
      a) Simile   b) Metaphor   c) Personification
   2. Do they contain any examples of the following kinds of sound patterning?
      a) Rhyme   b) Alliteration   c) Assonance

☐ Type 2

1. Describe the schoolmaster's feelings about his students in Scannell's poem _Ageing Schoolmaster_.
2. Describe the schoolmaster in Scannell's poem _Ageing Schoolmaster_.

☐ Type 3

1. In the first stanza the poet/narrator says that he is 'not wholly wretched'. Referring to the whole of the poem, where in the poem does he seem 'wretched', and where does he seem relatively happy?
2. Referring to the whole of the poem, what evidence is there that the poet/narrator does not enjoy being a schoolmaster?
Type 4

1. A critic commented that Scannell’s poem *Ageing Schoolmaster* captured the atmosphere of a classroom truly and honestly. Do you agree/disagree? Why/why not?
2. Consider the two passages “gaze upon the April faces” and “gleam before me like apples ranged on shelves”. Has the poet chosen images that complement or contradict each other? Support your position.

Type 5

1. Write a short paragraph about the character of the schoolmaster, imagining you are a) a colleague b) a pupil of his.
2. The schoolmaster speaks of “this chill autumnal cell”. What might your own images be if you were an ageing schoolmaster brooding upon death?

Type 6

1. Samuel Johnson says “Any piece of artwork should invite the reader to relate the text to contexts of real experience”. Referring to Scannell’s poem *Ageing Schoolmaster*, discuss this idea and explain.
2. Discuss the theme of “death” in Scannell’s *Ageing Schoolmaster*.
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