CHAPTER IV

THE MICRO-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF DATA (I):  
THE 'HIDDEN CURRICULUM' OF ER

4.0 Introduction

The analysis of data is undertaken in Chapters IV, V and VI to find the hidden curriculum of the ER Course. This we have said will be revealed through the tension manifested between the 'inner' syllabus (or Theory I) and 'outer' syllabus (or Theory II) (see 1.4). While Chapters II & III described the inner syllabus and outer syllabuses, the contrastive analysis of data will follow in Chapters IV, V & VI. The analysis of data will follow on two levels:

(a) The Micro Analysis - reported in Chapters IV and V, and
(b) The Macro Analysis - described in Chapter VI. (see Fig.3.1)

(a) The Micro Analysis as the term suggests looks at the detail of analysis when curricular forces are described and evaluated.

The description in Chapter IV, responds to the Central Question A of this study which in brief asks "How does ER work in the curriculum?"

The evaluation in Chapter V responds to the Central Question B of this study: What value does ER have especially for the low achiever in English?
(b) The Macro Analysis, on the other hand, will be in the nature of an overview of the case, and a discussion of the larger issues of curriculum and change that the data offers for study. This will be described in Chapter VI.

The two terms 'micro' and 'macro' analysis, refer to the levels of discussion - in classroom and syllabus terms (Chapters IV & V) and in curriculum terms (Chapter VI). This does not mean that the classroom and syllabus will be discussed to the exclusion of curriculum issues and constructs and vice versa. Our position (see 1.2.1), is that ELT issues need to be rooted in curriculum constructs especially when course implementation is the issue under discussion.

All sources (see 3.4.1) have been covered by the sub-headings\(^1\) (Dynamic sub-headings (2) - 3.4.3) 'exhaustively'. Even if only one instance of a category or sub-category occurs, it has been represented. However, all examples of sub-categories have not been mentioned. Chapters IV & V will then proceed under Dynamic Sub-headings (2), the final categories arrived at through analysis. The sub-headings finally arrived at are:

1. The Goals and Objectives of ER and Theory I.
2. Assessment and Pleasure in Reading.
4. Motivation and the Positive value of ER.
5. Streaming and the Low Achiever in English (ER).

6. ER and ER Pedagogy.

Sub-headings 1-3 will be discussed in Chapter IV, whilst IV-VII will be discussed in Chapter V.

As already stated in Chapter I, an ethnomethodological approach was adopted in the gathering and analysis of data. There are, however, some categories for analysis that stem from Theory I which are in a sense \textit{a priori} in nature (e.g., Self-selection and Pleasure in Reading). These categories have been used as a stimulus to generate discussion. They are open-ended in nature, and appropriate for a qualitative analysis, which is the mode of analysis used in the study. Proportionately, however, the more dynamic categories, 'emerged' from the analysis; e.g., ER and ER Pedagogy, Assessment and Pleasure in Reading, Objectives and the Theory of ER.

The data, moreover, yielded the hypotheses of the study - Hypothesis A (Chapter IV) and Hypothesis B (Chapter V) that came out of the discussions of the Central Questions A and B respectively. The hypotheses that a discussion of these questions yielded have been developed and articulated through the field work and through a rough analysis of data; they 'emerge' clearly as it were through the analysis. They will, therefore, be stated at the end of Chapters IV and V.
The 'emerging' hypothesis can be substantiated with several case studies at the same level, in different educational environments. Though we do not prove the hypotheses here, as a study within a scientific paradigm covering a large sample would, the emerging hypotheses is true of this particular case. We have said in Chapter I, that generalisation can occur with the reader's response. This chapter would, it is hoped, be read interactively with existing schemas the reader already has about a known educational environment where ER might (or might not) occur, starting thus the movement towards generalisation. The representative nature of ER, of the larger principles of CLT, also contributes (see 1.2.2) towards generalisability.

Chapter IV then, discusses central **Question A** from which Hypothesis A emerged.

**Question A:** What forces operate crucially in the implementation of ER as a course, to constrain its successful implementation? Or, how does ER 'work' in the curriculum? This question is discussed under the first three sub-headings. They are:

1. **Goals and Objectives of ER and Theory I**

   The question addressed here is: How is ER perceived in the curriculum by different participants (by the college, head, teachers and A, B, C stream students). Do perceptions clash or contradict actual operations? What is the significance of this?
2. **Assessment and Pleasure in Reading**

This section examines assessment procedures which have emerged in the previous section as a major constraint on reading practice. What is the relationship between the two, and where do the teacher and the A, B, C stream student stand in relation to each other?

3. **Self-Selection and Curriculum Constraints**

Assuming that there is a selection device activating a 'schema' and operating within a reader, it would seem that self-selection is linked with reading and the continued practice of the activity. Besides assessment, what other constraints vis-a-vis the teacher and student operate here? In what ways, therefore, would Theory I be limited in application?

This chapter concludes with the statement of Hypothesis A of this study.

4.1 **The Goals and Objectives of ER and the Theory of ER**

We begin the examination of the data, by looking at different perceptions of ER held by the participants of the course. The purpose of such an examination is to see the intentions of the syllabus, of the teachers and of the students, in order to evaluate:

(1) Where ER stands against Theory I.

(2) Operations in the ER Course.
The distinction regarding aims (goals) and objectives is maintained here. Aims are seen as larger goals of the curriculum, while objectives are more immediate and short-term, almost the means (Widdowson, 1983b).

Goals and objectives have an element of rhetoric inherent in their statements, making them unrealistic to an extent, thus giving rise to much of the adverse criticism levelled against them. The significant difference between operations and claims are pointed out. This section examines these differences.

This section therefore concerns a contrast between Theory I and Theory II illuminated by relevant sections from Operations, focusing on the area of goals and objectives, or perceptions of ER. The perceptions are those of:

1. The Administration or syllabus makers
2. The Teacher
3. The student (to an extent)

Sources

1. The Administration or syllabus makers
   Docs
2. The Teacher
   T-Int
3. The student (to an extent)
   St-Qn & St-Int

to predominantly yield the ought factor.

Operations are derived from:

1. Actual classroom operations
   T-St-Int
2. The Hidden Curriculum (Student Operations vs. controls)
   T-S-Int & St-Int

to predominantly yield the Is factor.
This is the break-down of sources used in the argumentation. The discussion however will not follow in the above order, but will be a description of the perceptions of one source followed by a contrastive analysis to another source. That is, we start with document analysis, go on to teacher perceptions (and their contrasts) then on to student perceptions (and their contrasts).

4.1.1 Goals of ER Stated in College Documents

Stated Goals: The goals have been stated at different times and in different documents. These documents are:

Doc A: The 1977 planning document, developed before the implementation of the programme.

Doc B: The document used as a 'syllabus' statement where the objectives and requirements of the course are stated.

The stated aims of the course are:

Document A

i) "The chief aim is to encourage the habit of reading for pleasure and in so doing to develop the student's lexical and structural proficiency as well as their overall grasp of extended texts."

ii) "To encourage the habit of reading for pleasure ... a variety of graded texts (8 per semester)."
Document B

"The chief aim of the course is to encourage the habit of reading (for pleasure) and thereby develop the student's language proficiency as well as their overall grasp of extended texts."

The stated aims of Documents A and B, are similar, except that 'lexical and structural proficiency' in A, becomes 'language proficiency' in B. For analysis therefore, both phrases will be taken together. We can make the following comments and queries about the aims of the syllabus:

A. "To encourage" - The phrase "to encourage" puts the objective firmly within the control of the teacher.

B. "The habit of reading" - Is pleasure included here or not? Especially in the aim which does not state the phrase "for pleasure" how can the habit be encouraged?

C. "for pleasure" - This feature is optionally stated in Document B, in the two places where it is stated.

D. "Language proficiency" - College questionnaires say that this goal has been achieved. (It has alternatively been described as lexical and structural proficiency.)
E. "Overall grasp of extended texts" - A vague term that brings in, however, the concept of
- gist vs. detail
- large amount of texts
- reading with an optimal speed.

Contrasting Documents (Theory II) and Theory I (Docs and Theory I): A comparison between Documents (Theory II) and Theory I, shows that there is a very close link between the goals of the course (syllabus) and the definition of ER that was proposed in Chapter II: that ER is an activity undertaken heuristically and for pleasure by the reader.

4.1.2 Teachers' Perception of the Goals and Objectives of ER (T-Int; T-St-Int)

The teachers' perceptions of the goals of the ER course, is in the nature of retrospectively articulated aims (Breen, 1984; Candlin, 1984). The teachers' perceptions sometimes coincide with that of the documents e.g., "To read on their own and for pleasure" (T.12) but most often they do not.

The teachers' aims are summed up as follows:

The ER course gives opportunities:
- for exposure to books/to read/to read something other than what is prescribed (T.3).
- to read something extra/more students should read something other than subject books (T.7).
- to develop habits of reading
- to develop language proficiency/fluency
- to develop 'culture' in "a pleasurable way" (T.5)
- "to develop imaginative power in readers" (T.5)
- to develop love and taste in reading. [sic]
- to read "on their own and for pleasure" (T.12)

The teachers' perceptions of the ER course indicate that there is a wide variety in teachers' aims. In spite of a syllabus statement, teacher intention is not uniform in the same educational programme. This will be reflected in ways in which teachers focus on the course, and the sort of personal input invested in it. There is therefore a differential teacher input.

Teachers' perceptions of the ER course and its aims, moreover, show that they do not look at A, B and C students in the same way. There is a definite understanding of the different levels of ability of A, B and C stream students. This is not surprising, since their language abilities are different. What is interesting here, however, is the different ways in which the teachers perceive the problem. While A stream teachers are more pessimistic of what is possible for teaching C streamers, C stream teachers (semester I) are more hopeful. The 3rd semester teacher interviewed was quite certain, on the other hand, that C streamers could not have the same goals as A and B stream
students. This information has been developed through the T-Int. Thus the table 4.1 (see page 196) shows that T.No.1 for example, feels that the objective of ER 'reading on one's own and for pleasure', is not really manageable as far as pleasure is concerned for A and C streams, is manageable for A and C when it comes to reading on one's own, but that this also, is working, only with A, and not with C stream students. This grid shows to what extent in teachers' stated aims teachers consider their own objectives to be manageable, and if manageable whether they ought to be operational or are operational (in their perception).

This table demonstrates therefore that in the opinion of teachers, their aims are by and large manageable, though A stream teachers feel that their aims do not work for C stream though they should.

Contrasting Documents and Teachers' Claims (Docs & T-Int)

A comparison of two sets of aims: the publicly stated ones in the College Documents, and the retrospectively articulated manageable aims by teachers yields the information that the element of pleasure is discussed only by three teachers. Of these three, one is the head, who sees pleasure in reading as a goal, one is a teacher who sees pleasure in reading as a means for developing ER skills and culture, whilst the other is a teacher who sees ER as both an end and a means.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Teaching in Stream</th>
<th>Non-manageable</th>
<th>Manageable</th>
<th>If Manageable Is?</th>
<th>Ought?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To read on their own and for pleasure</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A Stream</td>
<td>A Stream</td>
<td>A on their own</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Stream</td>
<td>C Stream</td>
<td>on their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(for pleasure)</td>
<td>(on their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Give a chance for the S to read widely. Habit of reading, read a lot,</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boys are reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Read something extra, other than subject books</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boys are reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exposure to books</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Vocab.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To cultivate the habit of reading and augment vocabulary.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(habit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More exposure, a chance to read at least 4 books on their own, making</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(some)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To make the boys read more books</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Development of culture</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To develop a love and taste of reading. To develop fluency, imaginative</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A,B,C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(some)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 4.1: Teachers' Perceptions of Feasibility of Their Own Stated Objectives of ER |

All three are individuals who are teaching the ER course with considerable thoughtfulness and purpose and who see some importance in ER goals and means (T-Int). The Head was involved moreover with the development of the syllabus itself whilst the other two teachers have had considerable experience in ELT research and training.

The element of pleasure has been totally left out, however, by all the other teachers. Interestingly, some do so although they clearly state their agreement with the aims set forth in the Docs. Either these teachers are, it would seem, not focussing on pleasure in reading as important enough for mention, or they feel that their stated aims and practices do include and imply the element of pleasure, in which case the pleasure element is still not operational.

Further, an analysis of teachers shows that teachers focus differentially on different aspects of the aims in the syllabus, and in addition add their own priorities to the programme. This is illustrated in the table given below.

Syllabus Statement: The chief aim of the course is to encourage \( a \) the habit of reading \( b \) for pleasure \( c \) and thereby \( d \) develop the student's language proficiency as well as their own overall grasp of extended texts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tchr. No.</th>
<th>Stream taught</th>
<th>I: The habit of reading</th>
<th>II: For pleasure</th>
<th>III: Develop the student's language proficiency</th>
<th>IV: Overall grasp of extended texts</th>
<th>V: Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>[C] develop skills of reading a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implied</td>
<td></td>
<td>[B] read widely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>[D] something extra something more than subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (vocab)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E] exposure to books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>implied ✓</td>
<td>✓ implied</td>
<td>✓ implied</td>
<td>✓ implied</td>
<td>[F] make it somewhat pleasurable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (fluency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[G] fluency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Contrast between Syllabus Statements and the Focus of Teachers' Stated Claims
In this table, while columns I-IV show how teachers (1-8) focus on the aims of the syllabus, column V shows additional priorities (A-H) the teachers have added. The variety and kind of priority added by the teacher are: read on their own, read widely, skills of reading a lot, exposure, fluency, development of culture, development of imagination.

It would seem that the teacher makes more realistic goals than the syllabus does. These goals (T-Int) are seen as different for different levels and streams of students. Some differences noted are:

**For A Stream:** the realistic goals are that the students read widely, on their own, read something extra, read books other than fiction (biography, historical novels and classics) which they would not otherwise pick up, expansion of vocabulary and enjoyment of reading.

**For C Stream:** the more realistic goals are: students read more, on their own, learn something new while the means are somewhat pleasurable, develop language skills—vocabulary augmentation, read a complete book, get exposure.

A comparison of these realistic goals shows that what is envisaged for A stream is closer to Theory I or our definition of ER, than what is envisaged for C stream.

It is necessary, however, to see whether these aims and objectives were the most realistically held in practice for teachers. It was felt that since the assessment session was
the only class meeting hour, some information about the
criteria used for evaluation, would yield the actual operational
objectives. This assumption could have been held by the
teachers also; on the other hand it was not necessary that it
should be so. In fact, it was not. Asking the teachers for
their evaluation criteria without informing them of the
intention of the question yielded interesting finding in that
teachers did not consider their assessment criteria as actual
operational objectives. To the question: 'What do you look
for in your evaluation?' all the teachers answered that they
looked at whether the students had read the book (completed
the task) or not. This was a common objective for giving
marks. Even one or two more 'progressive' and enthusiastic
teachers held this objective. In fact these teachers did not
think that reading even half a book was acceptable according
to the evaluation criteria.

These stated criteria for assessment are, we hold, the
operational criteria of the ER course in implementation.
Since the assessment session is the only opportunity for
teacher monitoring of the ER programme, it is argued that
the objectives or criteria for evaluation are what actually
operates. The transactional 'currency' of marks, ensures
that it is the evaluation criteria which finally matter and
which have become the focus of ER. What this entails for
reading is palpable, and will be discussed in detail in the
next section. It will only briefly be noted here that the
stated evaluation objectives of teachers (which we hold are
operational objectives) are very different from the stated claims of the course, and in turn from Theory I or the definition of ER. This difference is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Stated Aims (Individual)</th>
<th>Operational Aims The Hidden Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Give the students a chance to read widely, power of reading, power of vocabulary</td>
<td>read the whole book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Students should read something extra other than their subject books</td>
<td>read the whole book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Exposure to books other than what is prescribed.</td>
<td>read the whole book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>To cultivate the habit of reading and augment vocabulary</td>
<td>remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>More exposure - a chance to read 4 books on their own, making it somewhat pleasurable</td>
<td>read the whole book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>make the boys read</td>
<td>remember details, read the whole book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Development of culture</td>
<td>remember details pertaining to the written summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Contrast between Teachers' Stated Claims and Teachers' Evaluation Criteria

The above table shows how most teachers responded in the T-Int about what they look for in the evaluation sessions. Since these are the only meetings for ER, we hold that these are the actual objectives of the course. That these assessment
objectives are being stated through the T-Int and not actually in operation, however, was noted.

Comparison of T-Ints and T-St-Ints

An analysis of the T-St-Int sessions however, corroborated the stated objectives, or evaluation criteria of teachers.

Our analysis (T-St-Int, St-Int) shows that the main objectives of teachers for evaluation can be split up further into three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>That the student reads the whole book.</td>
<td>the student</td>
<td>remembers the details in the summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remembers details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Actual Evaluation Criteria of Teachers

Though for most teachers/actual objective seems to be to see that the students have read the whole book, there have been two additional objectives - where (1) a recall of detail, and (2) a recall of details of written summary.
are required. The reading is not all that happens, it seems study is required as well: a careful reading of the text, and a memorisation of details. The operating objectives here, therefore are far removed from reading for pleasure; it is reading to recall details in order to demonstrate in measurable terms that the task has been completed. An analysis of these three operational objectives:

1. That the students read the whole book,
2. That they remembered details of the book for assessment, and
3. That they remembered details of the submitted written synopsis for assessment

indicate, further, that while objectives (1) and (2) were initially teacher-oriented, students (Semester III, C Stream, St-Int 14) negotiated strongly for criteria (3). (Discussed further in 4.2)

The student-interview discusses the aspect of recall. To the query: 'have you forgotten anything during your interview sessions with the teachers?' C stream students said they forgot names, though some said they never forgot anything. But the A and B stream students all seem to have had the experience of forgetting what they had read and they blamed this on the time lag between reading and testing (St-Int 2, 19, 15, 17, 18).
That the student has gone through an initial reading of the book with interest, is not therefore the objective—but the point stressed is that this aspect should be measurable. The demand for memorisation of detail, moreover, is more true of C stream than A stream. Again in terms of assessment it is noted that A, B and C streams are differently treated. While A stream is asked to discuss issues/plots/themes etc., C stream is asked for details of stories, to show that the book has been read. It would seem that memorisation of detail is expected more from the C streamer (assessment will be discussed in more detail in 4.2).

A comparison of the stated aims of teachers, and the aims of teachers as seen with the observation of the teacher-student evaluation session, therefore, indicated a further step away from the aims in the Documents. What we have are short-term objectives (distinguished from long-term goals or aims).

We have an interesting development here, therefore. The teachers' aims are seen to be different from those of the documents. In practice, the teachers' aims are even more narrowed down. It is not enough that the students read a book but that they recall details, since this is the only measurable means a teacher has that the activity has even
taken place. A set of objectives, more realistic than goals, have been arrived at, therefore, by the teacher. These have evolved out of classroom practice, and however far from or even contradictory to the 'ought' factor, is the operational or 'is' factor to be examined and understood. That these realistic objectives are still made predominantly by the teacher is emphasised. Our examination of a 3rd semester C stream class shows, however, that operations occur with student agreement. The teacher makes a contract and has to maintain it consistently (see 4.2.4).

Where informed evaluation techniques operate, it is also clear, the objectives are more realistic to the actual situation. This is true in the cases of the three teachers (T-5, T-6, T-12) who do include the element of pleasure in their statement of objectives. For these three teachers, evaluation is a problem but a necessity, and ER pedagogy is seen as challenging and crucial.

In spite of being familiar with syllabus statements, therefore, teachers show creativity and autonomy in describing what are obviously 'operational constructs' that arise out of implementation and in a retrospective way. To give an over-all importance to syllabus statements therefore only ignores the realities of a class situation. It also ignores the fact that syllabus statements are made outside the teacher, even as plan, and contain public statements, rich with the 'ought' factor, that are a sort of 'window dressing'.
The issue here is that this is the nature of the syllabus as a 'centrally developed' document; not only is it outside student participation, it originates outside the teacher as well. Thus it originates outside the hidden curriculum, which is the operationalising factor in course implementation.

4.1.3 Students' Perceptions of the Objectives of ER (St.Int, T-St-Int)

Instructional objectives, by their very nature are teacher/instruction-oriented. Since we are concerned with ER, and learner-centred methodology, however, the active participation of a learner is required and would indicate the need for more student-oriented objectives. If students have perceptions of objectives and if they make decisions of course objectives and if they then operate on them, then students are taking an active part in proceedings. What are student perceptions of ER goals and short-term objectives? And to what extent can the student make a bid in decision-making? This question was not directly asked of the students, since it was not a question students normally ask in a public way. The St-Int, and T-St-Int gave a great deal of information however on this aspect.

Generally the stated and implied goals and objectives of students are:

1. To get exposure to the world of books
2. To get relaxation from "real" subjects
3. To improve language
4. To develop the "conceptual" level (knowledge)
5. To get required credits per semester
6. To complete reading a book
7. To find out teachers' criteria and satisfy them

The above opinions, seem to be in the nature of short-term objectives rather than long-term goals. Objectives (1), (2), (3) and (4) are objectives which are more in keeping with syllabus requirements, and interestingly, held by only a small percentage of students. Most of the students however, hold the more practical objectives (5), (6) and (7).

These objectives (5), (6) and (7) indicate that we are already within the hidden/operational curriculum. Unlike the teachers' objectives, there is no 'window dressing' with the objectives of students. Students do not need to state anything publicly, so the gap between the 'ought' and 'is' factors is almost non-existent.

The objective of students for ER is usually 'to get by'. As already mentioned, the focus of the course has become assessment, and the student, who stands to lose or gain according to grades, gives the assessment apparatus prime importance in the curriculum.
The ER course then, is seen to be a means for achieving grades and completing requirements; as a course to be run. Interest in reading material would certainly help the achievement of goals, and would be welcomed, but pleasure is not an element generally expected. Student objectives are practical, moreover, because they are set within the teacher's framework which is the only norm against which the student can work. There is no room for a student 'rhetoric'.

A comparison of student perceptions reveals an interesting phenomenon, however, concerning A, B and C streams. The St-Int reveals that while A and B streamers are the students who hold objectives that are closer to those of the syllabus, they are also the students who are more overtly critical of the course, whereas the C streamers (1st semester) seem more appreciative. It would seem that the A and B streamer, seems to hold objectives as norms to show failures in implementation. Thus a B stream student says:

... the main objective of that is supposed to be to improve our conceptual level but the books that we - for example I got Gulliver's Travels it's sort of fairy tales, and not very interesting much - so it's not going to improve my conceptual level in any way and I feel - I missed 2 classes so I missed 10 marks, so far as for me I consider the main objective is to keeping discipline ... they are not testing my conceptual level - I'm getting marks only for ... I'm just sitting there, I'm getting 10 marks that's why I feel they are ... discipline ... I consider this a total eye-wash ... so from the work point of view I consider this damn simple and damn easy, but as far as they say they are improving our conceptual in any way, they are giving marks for our attendance and all that stuff so...

(St-Int - 13: B Stream)
An A stream student says:

S: When we don't get interesting novels, we don't feel like reading it
R: Yeah
S: ... boring and ... so when we read it also, we feel like skipping half the stuff.
R: Hah, O.K.
S: So, we don't gain anything from that, at least from the point of language - mainly we read it because we could improve our language - write better English - and if we could read more western books, we know more about western ideas

(St-Int 19)

The A and B streamers quoted (not all A and B streamers say this) say that the course, meant for developing language skills and conceptual skills are failures, and that objectives are not being realised.

The 1st semester C streamer, however is more enthusiastic and less critical:

C stream, 1st Semester students
R: Has it been useful to you?
S: Yeah, useful
R: In what way, can you er explain a bit?
S: Some stories are a little bore - it is useful for me for grammar part
R: Grammar part, acha [I see]  
S: And I can - it gives me a chance how to speak

(St-Int 2: C stream)
and

R: Has it (ER) helped you read more?
S: Yes and to talk also

(S-Int 1: C Stream)

The C streamer third semester student, however, seems more quiet and disillusioned, taking on himself, and not on the course, many of the failures he meets with. E.g.

Semester III, C Stream

R: You know, you read a book and then the teacher asks you questions - I want to know specifically - do you enjoy these sessions with the teachers?
S: It is that when I am not prepared when really the question embarrass me very much
R: Yeah
S: So
R: It becomes hard
S: Yeah
R: Hard
S: That's a part of my weakness
R: Ha
S: But when I reflect about it I realise that it is meant for my growth

(S-Int 14: C Stream, Semester III)

It could be said, that A and B stream students come closer to discussing long-term goals, than C streamers. It is demonstrable,
however, that while the A and B streams, who incidentally have a far richer course than the C streams, are more critical and articulate about the objectives and the course; the C streamer expresses his criticism and views in more covert but equally powerful ways. Our perception is that the C stream students have their own ways of making contracts (e.g., St-14 talks of objective 3, being questioned on the summary) holding objectives and showing criticism. These ways are less articulate perhaps because the reactions of C streamers are a mix of criticism, boredom and incomprehension, all of which are compounded together in teacher reactions to label them as "muffs" or unintelligent. What does the C streamer do?

The St-Int had a question which asked the students in what ways they found the ER course useful. The C streamers' response was, that it helped in:

1. speaking, listening to lectures
2. using words
3. discussions/communicating in English
4. development of grammar

These comments, made by C streamers, indicate that there are perceptions of ER that are objectives in a real sense, which more than teacher objectives, are operational, and a justification for the course. The C stream students see ER
as a means to language proficiency and not as the end-goal. This is significant. The C stream student's perception of ER as a means could be because ER as a goal is not attainable or graspable for the C streamer. In our interpretation, therefore, more achievable, short term goals are recognised and accessed - though still not as 'goals'. If these students had been asked for the purposes of ER and its importance, they might well have given other answers. It is clear then that if students' objectives or perceptions of goals and means were included in syllabus statements, what would emerge would be qualitatively very different from current syllabus specifications, making a very different reading of the syllabus. It is clear that the objectives for students are not the goals stated in the syllabus, just as they are not the same as the goals and objectives held by teachers - even though the professed aim of the college is to consider the student at all times (Docs). It is possible that a more rational description of goals would reduce the cynicism accompanying many English programmes today. This would mean bringing goals closer to operational objectives which would thus give back a credibility and relevance to education in English.

If goals and means are evolved through student and teacher participation then, they would be different from the current syllabus. The question to be asked is what then is the purpose of a syllabus? If left as a 'guiding' document, it would have value - but if used as a means of accountability
as is often the case, the distance between goals and objectives and operational objectives are lost sight of, and unrealistic expectations are built up to affect both implementation and assessment.

What is interesting in this analysis, however, is the way both students and teachers cope with the intentions of the syllabus and the course, making sense of classroom activities in individual ways. What are seen as end-goals by teachers are more pedagogically manageable than those in the syllabus. The goals of ER, on the other hand, are seen more practically as means by students. This points to one further interesting question concerning the goals of a syllabus: Are goals realizable? Or something to reach towards and strive for? Can the same question be applied to objectives? It is a strong supposition that it is the regular curriculum at the tertiary level that does not allow objectives to be realised - whereas 'tutorial colleges' and 'tuition' classes seem to be quite successful in 'delivering the goods'. Is the problem the curriculum itself? It would seem that it is the curriculum, which demands a public document like a syllabus which displays 'window-dressing' goals. Goals however are important to indicate a general ethos of the institution and should be taken as such. Tutorial colleges, on the other hand, would emphasise short term objectives.
Concluding Statements

The examination of goals and objectives undertaken in a contrastive way, Docs ←→ T-Int ←→ St-Int ←→ T-St-Int reveals interesting structures in the ER course that serve as an introduction to the rest of the analysis.

We have distinguished between student objectives and teacher objectives, teacher objectives, operational and held, and teacher goals and syllabus goals or aims. Because of constraints in the curriculum, it would seem that what was intended is not happening - even at the intentional level.

The link between evaluation and objectives has been also demonstrated, for where teachers are thoughtful of aims, there the assessment sessions have been closer to the requirements of ER itself, to the goals set forth in the syllabus.

More specifically, the data indicates that the objective of ER in the curriculum seems to be that students read for detail. The perception of reading is not one which would encourage the interactive nature of reading discussed in Chapter II. Certainly, the pleasure element in reading is not a valuable component of the operating ER programme. It cannot be disregarded in statements of aims and objectives, but it is not a 'feasible' component in practical terms.
Students are expected to read a book and demonstrate that it has been read - the question of enjoyment in reading is incidental, and not a factor focussed on for reading and language development in the classroom. This is a practical 'sentiment' shared by teachers and students alike. Student objectives in fact, are far more 'practical' than those of the teacher. The C stream students hold short-term objectives rather than aims. Operationally, moreover, teacher expectations for A, B, C streams are different. However, the requirements for C stream assessment are not necessarily easier than those for the A streamer. The C streamer has to read for detail and the memorisation of it which is difficult, and moreover, far removed from reading for pleasure, which we hold is optimal for the activity of reading. This point is discussed further in 4.2.

4.2 Assessment and Pleasure in Reading

In the last section, it was noted that assessment objectives were the real working objectives of the BR course for most students and teachers.

The relationship between assessment and reading needs to be examined in more detail, since it is crucial in nature, and embodies the larger contradictions within which any instructional programme operates.
What are the larger contradictions? Assessment is a necessary part of any course, it is claimed, because it renders accountability to what is essentially a private transaction in the classroom. The private nature of the ER course in addition requires, it would seem, a monitoring of student activity, if it is to be more than a library reading session.

What do teachers and students have to say about assessment, of ER monitoring? What effects does assessment have on the learner-centredness of ER activity - or what relationship do assessment and pleasure in reading have with each other?

In our examination of these questions, the focus will be on the kind of demands assessment makes on the reader, and on ER, especially the low achiever. For this we will look at the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What teachers say</td>
<td>T-Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What teachers do</td>
<td>T-S-Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What students say publicly</td>
<td>St-Qn; St-Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What students say privately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The contrast here is between what the student says privately and publicly. Generally, what he says privately can be taken to be what he does.)

Before the analysis is undertaken however it is necessary to state that the general focus revealed through the data is that of the teacher-dominated paradigm. The issue of this paradigm in the classroom is briefly introduced in the next section.
4.2.1 The Teacher-Dominated Paradigm: Focus of Interpretation

The focus of interpretation of data under sub-heading "Assessment and Pleasure in Reading" is the teacher-dominated paradigm. This is so for two reasons:

(1) Our concern with ER as a learner-centred activity saw assessment as being in direct opposition to it, assessment being traditionally a teacher-dominated activity. That the assessment sessions in the Case Study are called 'interviews' of students by teachers underlines this focus.

(2) The teacher-dominated paradigm has been established in several research areas as in existence in the traditional classroom. Our data also shows this trend, where the teachers knowledge is paramount. Our discussion is seen in the light of studies in classroom interaction, in curriculum theory and the sociology of knowledge which discusses the disparity between teacher and student power, and factors influencing a teacher-dominated paradigm. This perspective informs the disparity between the materials producer and teacher (Apple, 1985) and between the head and teacher also (Sussman, 1977, quoted in Delamont, 1983).

Our concern here, however, is primarily the relationship between the teacher and student. Bernstein (1974) describes the concept of 'frame' i.e., the boundary between what may
or may not be transmitted, as being outside the scope of the student. Thus there are three 'message systems' in the curriculum - the **curriculum** defines what is counted as valid knowledge - **pedagogy** - defines what are valid transmissions of knowledge - and **evaluation** - defines what are valid realisations of this knowledge where 'the teacher's definition of knowledge is paramount, unexamined and undefended' (Delamont, 1983:51-52). Several studies show that the classroom is essentially **closed** in nature, and accessible only through evaluation, and that the teacher-pupil relationship is 'generally invisible' and therefore basically non-accountable in nature.

Indeed, assessment is one way the teacher can demonstrate that s/he can 'cope'. Indeed, teachers need to cope.

He has to cope, but to be seen to cope in accordance with what is expected from a professional if he is not to damage the teacher image. This disjunction matches exactly the gap between ideals and practice ... (Woods, 1980:19)

This is the hidden curriculum here, "Teachers want to be experts ... but society gives these experts neither the tools for the job, nor the raw material ..." (Woods, 1980:20). The teacher can only turn to the "definition of the situation" (W.I. Thomas quoted in Woods, op.cit.:20) and "whatever the
ideals and impulses, the individual can only become the kind of person the situation demands" (Becker, quoted in Woods, 1977:130).

It would seem, then, that assessment is a life-line to the teacher; a means of establishing credibility. It is a means of making public what is essentially private.

The unfortunate aspect of a teacher-dominated paradigm, in an 'accountable' curriculum, is that, the framework and standards of accountability are set outside the student and outside the teacher. The syllabus decrees what has to go into evaluation. Assessment is moreover seen in behaviourist and product-oriented terms. The teacher, in order to establish a credibility therefore, is forced to ignore the process of the student's development and their abilities. The individual student in other words cannot be considered. What is paramount, is achieving a set, product-oriented goal. The anxiety to complete the 'portion' for the day/term/year, for students to succeed in public examinations, to see that the percentage of failures are less, are classroom priorities for demonstrating to parents and administrators that the teaching is adequate.

This anxiety pressing on the teacher, the demand for a product, defined centrally and outside negotiation in the classroom, results in a teacher-dominated classroom, where teachers decide what, how and when an 'item' is to be taught
and what evaluation criteria to use. This teacher-dominated structure has been captured by classroom interaction studies (Bellack et al, 1966; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Stubbs, 1976; Mehan, 1979; Delmont, 1983; Allwright, 1982b and others) as a basic initiation-response-feedback (IRF) structure, where the teacher initiates discussion, the students respond and the teacher delivers a feedback. This structure demonstrates how teachers control interaction and topics of discourse.

In this section, therefore, we will examine how our data stands in relation to teacher domination. We are not however looking at teacher domination as classroom interaction studies do, but primarily in relation to assessment and pleasure, the sub-heading under purview. It must be emphasised that the purpose of examining the data is to see the relationship that exists between assessment and the pleasure principle inherent in our definition of ER. It will be recalled (2.6) that we identified the pleasure principle as Principle I, with reader choice and the activation of reader schema standing for Principle II and III respectively. This break-up, convenient for analysis, is not however seen to stand in water-tight compartments; in fact, the activation of the schema is subsumed under the pleasure principle and vice versa. In the same way, choice is subsumed under pleasure, and under activation of schema and so on.
As it emerges from the discussion of data, as we will demonstrate, it would seem that a discussion of assessment and pleasure in ER, in keeping with existing trends of research in the classroom, is in fact an examination of a teacher-dominated classroom and its implications for the learner.

Having described the focus of interpretation here, we will now look at the data, looking first at teachers' perceptions, and actions, and then students' perceptions and claims.

4.2.2 Teacher Perceptions of Assessment: What the Teacher Says (T-Int)

What the teacher says. All the teachers interviewed support assessment, with various degrees of approval and enthusiasm. Assessment is supported for the following reasons. Assessment is seen as

1) a necessary component of English reading:
   "it must be there or boys won't read"/ or
   "how do we know boys have read?"

2) as a means of reward or motivation:"boys won't read otherwise" (T-3) "unless students get marks they won't read; only 10 students read voluntarily" (T-4)

3) as a means of teacher control:"how to trap the boys?" (T-2, T-11) teachers are "diffident without assessment" (T-3).
The following figure reflects all the reasons why teachers have supported evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to recall</td>
<td>to check</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>further</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>student teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the st.</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>expect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has read</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or not</td>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1: Causes for Teacher Support of Course Evaluation**

The variety of reasons again reflects a variety in teacher input and motivation showing that a syllabus cannot be more than a general plan. It also reflects why assessment is an important and unavoidable factor in curriculum design. A course must be evaluated, according to the teachers. Assessment, however, is also viewed negatively:

1) **Assessment is seen as a barrier to proper reading.** As one teacher put it,

   Little reading is done without assessment.  
   Proper reading is not done with assessment.  
   Pleasure (in reading) and assessment are mutually exclusive. (T-10)

   Reading for pleasure - that is what we adults do, but we press the boys - that is contrary to ... (T-9)

The sentiment was fairly commonly held by the teachers interviewed.
2) Assessment is also seen as a necessary evil; "a necessary stick" (T-5), "Though bad, it is necessary in the curriculum" (T-6).

These opinions capture the essence of the dilemma of ER in the curriculum, for the teacher especially. However, the problem is not just that assessment is a regrettable fact of institutional learning alone. The point that needs to be emphasised regarding ER, is that ER, as a private activity involving pleasure, would lose this quality of pleasure if assessment is too difficult a factor for the student. The problem is that the student who has difficulty in acquiring grades might not enjoy reading.

Teachers 'cope' with this contradiction in many ways; indeed it is admirable how s/he copes. S/he has strategies that are varied. One way has been noted in the last section, where teachers' objectives, ostentatiously, and organically leave out the element of pleasure in reading, in order to try to resolve the contradiction between course implementation and pleasure in reading. Basically, the stated aims in the syllabus, are idealistic, and more than that too impractical to expect in a curriculum, where assessment must accompany any evaluation of students participating in a course. The teachers, in other words, 'reformulate' objectives, operationalising these reformulations with implementation; i.e., for teachers, the objectives are seen differently and implemented differently.
Teachers cope with the contradictions within the ER course, further, by addressing the problem to the boundaries of the curriculum that the teachers are familiar with and in which they have an expertise. One teacher saw the way out of the contradiction by saying that pleasure in reading for C stream was not an objective in ER, but that an exposure to texts, made somewhat pleasurable by choosing interesting themes, was. This solution puts an emphasis on the means or process of developing ER skills within the constraints of an instructional programme. Clearly pleasure and instruction in reading seem mutually incompatible. What we have here is an operational objective, as against the idealistic one. Another teacher, (T-5) saw the summary or synopsis required by most teachers as a useful way of encouraging student feedback to develop the course. The summary is also described as "a reconstruction of the story, not to be rushed into, and valuable in its own right." Again, this gives some value to the summary, and to the operationalising of objectives.

It is interesting, however, that no teacher discusses the possibility of eliminating evaluation completely, though there have been suggestions for reformation in assessment techniques (e.g., grading of progress - why continuous assessment? - evaluative discussions etc. (T-5).
Assessment according to the teachers, must exist for work to proceed in an orderly way, as the syllabus plans. But if the plan is not what is happening, if what is being assessed is not what was planned, and if assessment still is a necessity, then it would seem that assessment is important to the teachers to maintain in course implementation for reasons other than what they say.

Why do teachers, almost without exception include assessment in the general scheme of things?

4.2.3 Teacher Assessment of ER: What the Teacher Does (T-St-Int)

The assessment of ER in the case is carried out through the teacher-student interview sessions. It is an interview that the teacher has with an individual student to ascertain whether he has read the book. It is the only class meeting the student has with the teacher for ER; indeed, it is the only meeting the individual student has with the teacher in any of the English courses. It is possible, in fact, that it is the only individual interaction the student has with a teacher in the entire curriculum. As such, the T-St-Int sessions have a larger significance than merely implications for the ER course. We will, however begin our analysis by examining the T-St-Int against the ER course.
The T-St-Int Analysis

The T-St-Int, the only classroom interaction for ER carries the weight of being an evaluation session. This factor gives the session a measure of seriousness; it is unlikely that students would deliberately cut this session, for instance, or indulge in any such 'subversive' activity. Assessment makes sure of attendance.

Our examination of the Interview session, will be focussed specifically, therefore, on what effects the session would have on the reading activity of the students. (1) What is the model of reading that emerges as expected and encouraged by ER pedagogy? We will, in other words, look at learner participation in relation to the learners interaction with the text. (2) We will secondly look at the way the evaluation session, as the only meeting session of teachers with students is used as a means of ER instruction and language instruction. What are its potentialities and to what extent are these potentialities being exploited in actual use? We will, in other words, look at learner participation in relation to the learner's interaction with the teacher. The two larger questions are broken down into sub-questions. Thus question I, has further sub-questions like: How teacher-dominated is the classroom? How much of student interpretation is allowed to develop? Is the reading perspective of the students allowed to be expressed? (Qn.I). Question 2 has sub-questions like:
What type and how much of verbal interaction is permitted in the interaction? To what extent is it seen as a means, and not as a goal? How much leeway does the questioning give to students to think out an answer - to think and re-think? To what extent is there scope for peer group discussion?

These questions will be asked through the analysis. These questions, further, will be set against the low achiever. Thus there will be a contrastive study of what happens in A, B, C streams, to see

(1) the model of reading expected, and
(2) whether the evaluation sessions as instructional means are different.

The discussion would indicate why teachers really hold assessment as essential.

Studies in classroom interaction (Stubbs, 1976; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Bellack et al, 1966; Mehan, 1979; and others) have described the basic classroom interactional structure as consisting of initiation, response, feedback (IRF) (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) and structuring, soliciting, responding, reacting (Bellack et al, 1966). This teacher-dominated question-answer pattern has been found to be stable over the years (Hoetkar and Ahlbrandt, 1969) and across countries (Bellack, 1973). The T-St-Int, an evaluation session, is characterized by the question-answer pattern. The question is, is it an IRF pattern of classroom interaction?
Our analysis shows that the T-St-Int is entirely teacher-dominated; not even one question was asked that involved the student as initiator unless it was a clarification of what the teacher's expectations of answers might be. There is a definite 'I' and 'R' factor from the IRF structure therefore. Moreover, the 'F' factor, since it is an assessment session does not always occur. (This will be discussed in the section 'feedback'.)

How does the teacher keep the initiative in the T-St-Int?

We have identified three ways in which teacher control is maintained in the T-St-Int:

(1) By interruptions
(2) By the type of questions asked
(3) By the kind of feedback given or withheld

1. **Teacher Interruptions:** The teacher's interruptions kept the interview within the teacher's control so that s/he remained the initiator of the conversation. Such interruptions helped to 'cover' more students in the hour allotted but many times it prevented the student from exploring meaning, or impressions with the limited language at the student's command. Thus, in the example given below, the teacher interrupts the student, and then goes on to two more questions, the second
of which is totally unrelated to the two questions that preceded it. This is a good example of how the teacher initiates the topic.

1. T: Why do you say he was bad?
   S: He was a bad crook-and a ...
   T: Can you give me one example to say when you say that he was a magician
   S: He was spreading disease

5. T: Disease. Correct. Correct. Now can you describe the fight. Who won the battle?
   (Cl.2, C stream)

1 T: Why did he want to marry her? Was it love or -
   S: She - she is a beautiful girl, sir, also his mother, father, wanting him for ...
   T: That is not the reason - the reason was ...
   S: Beautiful girl.

5 T: No it is one of the reasons. Main reason? She was? an ...
   S: Widow
   T: Rich widow
   S: Rich woman wanting to ...
   T: Now whom did Eleanor marry?
   (Cl.2, C stream)

**Types of questions asked**

Our analysis shows us that the following types of questions are asked.
(a) closed factual questions — test and tricky questions
(b) open factual questions (affective also)
(c) evaluative questions
(d) narrative prompts
(e) leading questions
(f) questions requiring elaborations of thought
(g) questions encouraging discussions.

These questions indicate the definitions of what knowledge is relevant in the hidden curriculum, which is established by the teacher. Questions (a), (b) and (c) will be discussed as Part I, and questions (d)-(g) as Part II.

Part I

(a) Closed factual questions: We take this term 'closed questions' from Barnes (1976). Closed questions or pseudo questions\(^{10}\) are questions to which the interlocuter already knows the answer or to which the interlocuter has an expected or preferred answer. These questions are also called test questions or 'convergent' or 'guess what I'm thinking' questions (Postman and Weingartner, 1971).

The teacher dominates the student's responses by having an in-built expectation of possible answers. This comes out clearly in the exchanges between one teacher and two different students, both of whom were asked the same question about the bishop in 'Barchester Towers'. 
1  T: As soon as you think of the bishop, something strikes you - what is it what is the most important uh ...

    S: ... religious

    T: - He is a bishop. So naturally, yes? What else strikes you

    S: Silence ______

    T: His wife! Mrs. Proudy! He was ... hen-pecked husband - allright. Now here we come across ...

    (Cl.2 - C stream)

St. 2

    T: ... Dr. Proudy, now what impression do you get? First idea that strikes you

    S: ... noble man

    T: noble man?

    S: but uh, he's uh somewhat weak

5  T: Weak yes. He was hen-pecked - uh? he was being hen-pecked by his wife ...

    (Cl.2, C stream)

In the second extract, the teacher does not accept the student’s response in line 4, but goes on to bring out the word he has in mind: 'hen-pecked'. Here, two students face a teacher’s schema without success for it is the teacher’s answer which prevails. Much of the student’s success then depends on his ability to understand teacher expectations - even in terms of vocabulary. In the following example, the student shows that he has prepared for the teacher’s expectations, which however, almost misfired. This teacher, dealing with a collection of
short stories, almost always asked the question: "Which story did you like best in this collection?" after which the student was expected to tell the story. However, there was no guarantee for the students that this pattern would be followed:

1 T: Which story did you like best in this collection?
S: The River St _____ the River Stairs.
T: The River?
S: River Share.

5 T: uh
S: The last story, the last story which uh ...
T: The River Stairs - all right then
S: ... and then the return of the child
T: Why do you, why do(you) like that?

10 S: River
T: Return of the child
S: Actually the poem the story was written by
T: Child's Return
S: Child's Return Sir?

15 T: ah.
S: The first one was that ...
Written by Tagore
T: ah
S: he says his own experience about that
T: mm

20 S: one day he was uh actually he used to sit on steps
T: mm ...

(Clr.9, C stream)
Here, the student reverts to the story he wished to discuss. Here we have one of the few instances where a student-initiating move occurs. The teacher allowed this for a while, then, abruptly about five exchanges later the teacher goes back to the story 'The Child's Return':

T: What's the name of this? Where did the child go?
S: The boy mm lived as Raicharan was uh ...

This abrupt change of topic is accepted by the student, who responds without even a momentary hesitation. It seems that students are well used to questions following arbitrarily one after the other.

Knowing what the teacher wants in the evaluation session is paramount.

Closed questions also reflect (as Barnes (1959) also noted) the fact vs. reasoning knowledge required of students. Most of the closed questions require details from the student. This strategy is used more in the C and B streams, than in the A stream. Indeed, the closed question is what predominates in C stream assessment sessions. E.g.

1. T: What's the name of the magician?
   S: ...... (not audible)
   T: Now - what do you know about this magician? Was he a good or a bad magician
S: Bad magician
T: Why do you say he was bad?
S: He was a bad crook - and a ....

(C1-2, C stream)

Sometimes knowledge of the details is not useful information, except in showing the student he has not read properly:

1 S: So Oliver Twist goes and tells the man that he wants more dinner more food and er ...
T: Not dinner, more gruel

(C1-4, B stream)

and

1 S: Oland the serving maid in the house
T: was she a serving maid or something else?
   She was a slave
S: She was a slave
T: A slave. Yes, now what was her work in the house?
S: to clean (in Tamil)
T: No kitchen kitchen work
S: kitchen
T: kitchen work, kitchen work

(C1-2, C stream)
Such details are trifling and not of great importance to the story itself. A knowledge of them would certainly prove that the student has read the book, and not got the story from his friend. In one way, therefore, eliciting details is good for **evaluative purposes**. But on the other hand, that details cannot be recalled neither points to a lack of comprehension at the moment of reading, nor to the fact that the student has not undertaken the reading task. If we accept that perception is selective (Neisser, 1967), then detailed questioning is not acknowledging the skill of ER. We could put this argument more strongly. In ER the teacher should not ask questions that are of such a detailed nature, that they require memorisation as well as very close reading of the text. If the teacher has to maintain his evaluator's role with skill in ER, he has to think of closed questions which would allow for more interpretation than just facts. It is suggested that asking such trifling questions helps maintain the teacher's control.

b) **Open Factual Questions**

We could call such questions the **open**, or divergent questions. However such questions could be **detailed** or more a question on character sketches etc. E.g.
1 T: What's the character of Olivia?
S: Nice girl ...
T: Sophia?
S: Sophia also
5 T: Just as nice uh?

(C1-9, C stream)

Here, the questions though text-specific, are also fairly open, in that the student is free to give his opinions. In fact, stock answers like 'nice' are accepted without comments that are too obviously negative. Another example:

1 T: O.K. How are they released from the place? It is very crucial for the plot O.K.?
S: Yes.
T: How are they released?
S: They are released this way that is Mr. S's ... men - the - his men come to release him actually and so they bombard the whole jail and they - that se-sergeant or whoever he is - Gyan or someone - he is caught ...

(C1-11, A stream)

Here the question starts in an open-ended way, but it is clear from the students' answer, however, that the teacher's question was really a closed one. What emerges here, therefore, is a pseudo open-ended question, still teacher-controlled, though initially it is not so apparent. Further, sometimes, an open question is asked as if it is an 'essay type' question:
This Pride and Prejudice what do you understand by the story, about the character? Elizabeth?

(C1-10, C stream)

Uncle Dynamite, who is this Uncle Dynamite?

He is a role of a ...

Which is the central figure of the novel?

Him

Why do you say so?

(C1-7, A stream)

Such questions sound very much like questions asked in a situation without face-to-face interaction as in a Supplementary Reader - or worse as in a Reader teaching IR. It is not realistic to expect students to respond freely to an 'esssay type question.' which requires time to answer when it is understood that the evaluation session itself is time-bound.

What are the student responses to such questions? To the first one, the dialogue went as follows:

This Pride and Prejudice what do you understand by this story about the character? Elizabeth?

She is more understanding girl than ...

She is not bothered about herself no, but she's much concerned about her elder sister she ...

mm

Therefore when Darcy's takes uh - Bingley so that they may not be acquainted well she feels very much and therefore she hates Darcy and therefore they becomes a conflict between them and they try to misunderstand each other finally all is all cleared up and again she changes her mind and ...
T: What is the character of Elizabeth?
S: 
T: What do you understand by that she changes everything is she - fickle-minded or steady?

Here the teacher's question in line 5, cuts through the students' explanations, so that a closed question is inserted in place of the 'open' one. For evaluation, for any discussion to proceed with this teacher, it is necessary to be definite about responses.

To the second question, the dialogue is as follows:

1 T: Uncle Dynamite who is this Uncle Dynamite?
S: He is a role of a ...
T: Which is the central figure of the novel?
S: Him

5 T: Why do you say so?
S: Because, he because he dominates most of the events.

Here, the 'open' question in line 5, emerges as 'closed' through the student's response, which is a tautological rephrasing of the teacher's question in line 3 "Which is the central figure of the novel?" The arrow indicates the nature of this rephrasing.

There are some clear open questions being asked however—these are affective questions like:
"Which story did you like?" or "Why do you like this book?" or "What are your comments on the book?"

The answers the students give are, moreover, generally accepted, even dubious ones. E.g.

1 T: So why did you like this story best among all the short stories of Tagore which you have read?

S: Because it aroused pity in us.

(Cl-9, C stream)

The above extract is said by a C streamer. The teacher's acceptance of students' answers, whether they be stock phrases, or dubious in nature, characterises the 'open' questions in the analysis.

It would seem that teacher acceptance of such answers, is giving the student a little lee-way in the tense situation he is immersed in - the student is allowed to 'get away with it', generally, and he is not called for justification. Assessment, in other words, is the factor which stands in the way of open questions from genuinely operating. The teacher does not have time for a genuine discussion, and the student, even when given the opportunity feels no need to really stretch himself. He resorts to stock answers, or expects a closed question to quickly follow a seemingly open-ended one. Sometimes, however, students are made to look at questions and answer them to the point (e.g., Cl-10, Cl-6, Cl-2).
Affective questions however, that go, "Why do you like this book/story" are always responded to. They seem to be open in nature, but are in fact closed. The real communicative intent of the question is: 'You should have read the book, you should have enjoyed it, now tell me about it.' Since it is debatable that the students have enjoyed the book, such questions seem rather unfair. E.g. one teacher began most evaluation sessions with: "Which story you liked most in this ..., Which story impressed/interested you the most?" Most students recognised this question as an invitation to talk about one story, whichever one they liked. The question-answer session would then proceed as closed questions. One distinct advantage of such questions, however, seemed to be that the students were most often discussing something they had read. And this was in one way, linked with what they chose to read from a limited choice in a collection of stories.

c) Evaluative Questions: These questions are so-called because they require the students to make an evaluation or judgement of some sort. They are again more 'open' in the sense that students (A, B and C students) are asked to give their opinions. These can be restricted to the texts. E.g.

1  T: What type of a person is Tom?
   S: Tom is very cunning. Fond of uh the ...
   T: mm. Something good no?
   S: not
5 T:  no good mm? what mm?
S:  no good ... bad

(C1-9, C stream)

and

1 T:  What is the mo - moral of the story?
S:  moral
T:  The moral lesson moral lesson - uh -
S:  He must not just like a born ...

5 T:  mm
S:  We must be straightforward
T:  mm

(C1-9, C stream)

Many are more global in the evaluative question asked.

B stream students were asked questions like the following:

1 T:  How did this book strike you?
S:  interesting
T:  interesting
S:  And uh compared to the previous book, Three Musketeers, I find this more interesting.

5 T:  More interesting than that. What is the main theme of the book would you say? What kind of book ...
S:  How Edmund Dante's betrayed by his friends sent to the prison because of jealousy they had about him.
T: What kind of story would you describe this. Is it a love story, adventure, is it revenge, is it a tragedy?

S: _______ towards the end of the book it is more of revenge.

10 T: revenge ---- yes then?

S: _______

This extract points to the discussion possible with evaluative type questions (L 1, 7). However even here, when the student initiates a meaningful comparison between two books (1.4), this comparison is not picked up by the teacher (1.5). However, the teacher brings in a question comparative in nature (1.7) with choices, but a closed question to which the student responds appropriately by picking one of the choices. The student's own comparison in 1.4 would have been more rich, drawing on the student's own impressions, probably easily offered, since it was initiated by the student in the first place. In any case, evaluative questions do give scope for changing a teacher-dominated structure, to an extent. It also increases the learner's use of language. Such questions are more open in nature, than the open questions. To the comparative question, the student is able to respond,

"This one is better."

Such answers should it would seem serve to obtain diagnostic information for preparing reading lists for students, and are ready-made mines of information for the teacher as researcher.
Of the 3 streams, it was noted that 'A' stream students are constantly asked to evaluate. E.g.

1  T: How would you classify this novel - under what category?

S: Should I call it an adventure? ... not exactly ... but uh its a sort of a thriller but ...

(C1-11, A stream)

and

1  T: What role does Lord Ickenham play in this novel?

S: 

T: Ickenham

S: Yes Sir, what do you mean?

5  T: What role?

S: He is a sort of mediator Sir?

(C1-7, A stream)

and

1  T: Still no one has (given) me why the novel is called Stranger in the Mirror. Can you please explain that?

S: I think that the main character of the novel ... Toby Temple is uh - I mean he lives with his mother ... whom he loves very much ... and he wants to become an actor ... and he sees himself constantly he has to rehearse in front of the mirror and once he starts imagining he begins as a just as a just his facial expression expressions ...

then later on I mean he ... invokes the character himself when he goes in front of the mirror he to be uh to be different character - I mean not himself he becomes very realistic.

(C1-7, A stream - Teacher's comments deleted)
Though all streams are answering evaluative questions, the teachers are asking evaluative questions, more global in nature to the A stream students, and more textual in nature to the C streamers. It could be that the repertoire of C streamers are being limited by the questions themselves. We have one example of a C stream teacher attempting an open evaluative question, but not getting (by possibly not waiting) for a response, which is supplied by the teacher himself.

T: Then? What type of story is it?

Imagination.

(Cl-9, C stream)

Open evaluative questions would be more appropriate to an ER pedagogy. Looking at the questions asked, the number of evaluative questions asked of the higher levels of students are more than in the lower streams. This indicates that the lower stream students are getting more of an Intensive Reading Experience than an Extensive Reading one.

Part II

The following questions, or categories we have identified viz.:

(d) narrative prompts
(e) leading questions
(f) questions requiring elaborations of thought
(g) questions encouraging discussions
are different from the first three question types: (a) closed, (b) open, and (c) evaluative, which are, in our opinion, more a means of testing. The last four (d), (e), (f) and (g) are however, to be categorised as predominantly teaching questions or categories, which, together with the evaluative promote an ER pedagogy. Perhaps we ought to refer to Widdowson's theory of language use and exploration and Prabhu's concept of deploying language to develop language skills. If the intent of the teacher is to develop thinking and language skills, more open questions of the open, evaluative kind, requiring student active participation need to be developed.

The four categories to be discussed imply a teaching methodology to be used. Thus narrative prompts (d) or the encouraging of students to tell a story, is a means of reconstruction that gives the student aesthetic pleasure (T-5), and helps to make the story the student's own.

(d) Narrative Prompts

The narrative prompt taps the students' schema more successfully than even the evaluative type question, since it deals with details the student knows. The examples given below are extracts from C stream classes. It is still, however, teacher-dominated, and can be described as an 'extended sequence' of the IRF structure (Mehan, 1979).
1  T:  Then? Whom does she marry?
    S:  

    (Cl-9, C stream)

and

1  S:  Yeah, he discovered a murder
    T:  You liked that. Is that what you liked?
    S:  

    T:  Didn't you like any of the earlier things
        that he did?

5  S:  He's very ....
    T:  Do you like him as a boy?
    S:  

    T:  What kind of a - a - boy is he?

    (Cl-6, C stream)

The teacher here rephrases questions to reach the
student's memory. Here the teacher is trying to get the
student to elaborate his assertions that he liked Tom Sawyer
for discovering a murder.

1  T:  And then they have a son?
    S:  Yeah

    T:  Then how does the son come into the story?
    S:  mm 

5  T:  Are they going to have a fight, a duel?
S: Yeah he he ...
T: at some stage
S: No he gets caught by the dacoit, I mean ....

(CL-5, B stream)

Here, the teacher supplies the information till the student's memory is prodded to give more information.

The teacher also reformulates language.

1 T: Wants? Want to .....?
S: gold gold ring and my cut
T: Property - he wants to take all the property.
S: all - all property, he want. He want to kill Oliver

5 T: In order to get all the property.

(CL-6, C stream)

Sometimes, the teacher makes questions which are half-statement, and half-questions:

T: When he returns, when he leaves the Time Machine, he sees the housekeeper walking isn't it? When he returns what happens?

(CL-5, B stream)

and

T: Now, the last scene. One of the last chapters - a boat. There is a woman, there is a villain - there is a hero ... who is the woman? Who is the villain? Who hero? Quick, quick ...

(CL-2, C stream)
and

1  T: Do you remember - regarding this story, no?
   S: mm
   T: how these people get bigger and and Mr. Nelson's
   and Mrs. Nelson are caught in the island, no?
   S: Yes they are caught in ...
   5  T: Suddenly they are over-taken by the -
   S: by the - this fellow's Stans, Stans ...
   T: O.K. How are they released from the place?
   It is very crucial for the plot, O.K.?
   (Cl-11, A stream)

Prompting, jogging the 'memory' of students seems a fair
way of tapping comprehension retrospectively, and after the
activity of reading. The teachers who do this were using
a valuable means of engendering discussion and achieving
evaluation at the same time. Using prompts suggests a more
positive approach to evaluation; rather than 'tricking' the
student, the teacher is encouraging student talk. For the
student, especially the C streamer this could be a 'bonus' in
the tense T-S-Int situation.

(e) **Leading Questions**

These questions are also prompts, but are put in a
separate category, because: (1) they presuppose a strong teacher-
dominated framework or schema vis-a-vis answers and (2) they
can be used to get the students to start a discussion;
(3) they can be used as testing questions.
The leading questions use prompts that are often blatantly false leads.

1  T: Now Grand Babylon Hotel, where was this hotel?
   S: ______
   T: In New York, or Delhi, where?

   (C1-2, C Stream)

But if a student has read the book, the teacher could get a real discussion going.

1  T: So you think this novel is a little bit prejudiced hiding Americans and ... ______
   S: You can't say like that.
      ........
   T: Uh do you mean to tell that the KGB was uh so weak in its organization ....
   S: No it was not like that because, since his wife did not like ...

   (C1-7, A stream)

Here the student seems fairly well launched into what he thinks is happening in the book. Such questions are used in all streams and could be used to develop a student point of view, developed through 'interactive' reading described in Chapter II. But if it is used to trick the student "to trap" him (T-11) the teacher can use the leading question as a powerful means of retaining control. E.g. there is one instance when the teacher asks the student whether the people
on Kontiki Island were completely separated from the world or not. The answer is that they were not because some of them had a wireless. The student knew this, but forgot this detail, so his entire interview session (Cl-10, C stream) was spent with the teacher pointing out the communicating link of the wireless.

(f) Questions Developing Thought

While such questions are best for student growth, and language development since they link thought and language (Vygotsky) a fixed a priori teacher schema could be debilitating.

Questions do help reading, e.g. asking about characters.

T: Yes so, she's an ambitious person mm?
Whereas Vicar? What is the character of Vicar?

(Cl-9, C stream)

Here characters are contrasted. Story type identification (Cl-9), story type interest (Cl-5) the meaning of hero (Cl-6) etc., are questions which are being asked but which need not necessarily require an answer. Interestingly, such questions were asked in C stream interactions. If the student has not focussed on something, or thought about something crucial in the book, such questions can help towards reformulations, so that the reading acquires a remedial character.
This remedial character, could also be introducing students to multiple perspectives of the book - needless to say, this was not happening. Discussions, without the evaluation bias, the learning component of such questions, reflect the value of ER. ER could be used as a means for language use in discussions where language is negotiated for meaning-making. But again, it is the evaluation component that would devalue the whole process. In addition questions which are thought-provoking, and engage the learner, are of immeasurable educational value, making ER extensive in the true sense, i.e., beyond the actual reading of the text. It is such questioning that good SR readers attempt to do; but it is posited that questions arising out of face-to-face interaction and discussion would be more conducive to learner engagement, than questions arising from a textbook writer's skill in identifying student problems.

(g) We now come to our last category, questions developing discussion. The category (f) just discussed, leads on to this area. What we have to present are several examples where the usual IRF structure was broken up in discussions:

1  T: Do you like this novel?       -  I
   S: not much - very boring       -  R
   T: uh?                          -  prompt qn.
   S: Feel very boring             -  R
5 T: Very bored - why? - Tchr-R-I
S: because that kind - R
    mm
S: not clear - St. refuses to respond

T: Not clear. All right. How many children does the Vicar of Wakefield have?
    - Tchr goes back to format

(C1-9, C stream)

What we have here is a slightly startled teacher, asking a genuine question (1.5) not a pseudo question which however soon fizzes out, when the student refuses to give reasons for the opinions offered. Here the teacher has no place for feedback, and the student could have grasped the initiative if he had been so allowed, but there does not seem to be room for discussion either. Another example we have:

1 T: It seems you are not satisfied in the novel? - I
S: No. - R
T: Why - Genuine Qn.
S: I don't know. Somehow it just doesn't appeal to me - R

S: I don't like the story - R
T: No, no. You can't make a general statement like that ... - Prompt - and why ...
    Genuine Qn.
S: I don't like the story because ...

T: Why its not realistic? - T. impatient and interrupts

10 S: not only that - its not like my kind of book.

T: Oh I see

S: with suspense and very ... - St. willing to go on

T: Suspense uh? - Closure

The Teacher accepts this and calls the next boy.

(Cl-7, A stream)

In the above example, again we see how the student could have broken out of the tightly controlled teacher-dominated structure - but in fact cannot, because the teacher has no time to go into a real discussion with the student. Doubtless, such interludes (where purely affective answers, dealing with what the student has read, and the consequent emotional reactions to the students' own individual perceptions) are not held as important as the pseudo question-answer session, where the students have to give expected answers - factual or related to the book. But surely individual perceptions/what reading is all about. An interaction between equals, as Barnes (1969) and ethnomethodological studies posit, would break down these structures and free ER, and the pleasure of it from the imposition of tough bonds. Such interaction shows a different exchange structure posited by Sinclair and
Coulthard, Mehan etc. This is the interaction initially described by Barnes, where students explore and use language more effectively without the inhibitions of the presence of the teacher. Barnes and Todd (1977), Wight (1975) and Labov (1969) have shown that students, though passive in class are more receptive when they are together, that teacher absence can lead to productive and complex discussion among peers. This could, it is suggested be evaluative in nature also.

It is possible therefore that a change in the interaction structure, or in other words, a giving up/teacher control in the evaluation sessions, would enhance language learning, for then we have a relationship as more between social equals, in which students also initiate as well as respond. Real communicative tasks make language more complex (Wight 1975; see Note 12) and would mean different inter-actional structures.

3) **Teacher Feedback**

Teacher feedback is the third aspect or way in which teachers maintain control. In the analysis it is in this section that it was found that the IRF structure described in classroom analysis does not adequately describe the evaluation session, where often the 'F' or feedback factor is missing. E.g.
T: Yes - he gets back the milk?

S: No

T: You're not sure. O.K. doesn't matter.

(Cl-5, B stream)

Four types of feedback were identified: marks, task, content and form, which will be described below. These types of feedback were used by teachers in different ways to maintain control of the classroom.

How does this happen? We could generalize and say that form and task contribute to teacher control when supplied to the student, e.g., form (grammar mistakes) and task ('you haven't read this book, have you?'). On the other hand, withholding the marks ('you want to know your marks? you'll know it, don't worry') and content feedback. ('you don't know what happened? Doesn't matter') increases student anxiety and teacher control.

Marks Feedback

Marks, the product of 'assessment' is what finally is the main concern of teachers and students. This is one aspect which causes anxiety in students. Marks have a value, making the teacher, the dispenser of marks, vulnerable. This situation causes teachers to protect themselves:

1) by not revealing marks at all. Many teachers do not tell the students their marks.
(2) by being open about marks, giving criteria, (zero or full/a point for each answer), so that mark-giving is as objective or as one teacher put it, as 'scientific' as possible.

In our observation, it is clear that marks are often, rather subjectively and arbitrarily decided upon (Why is one student given 10 marks and another 12?). Where the teacher is 'scientific' it was observed that the closed question is the fulcrum on which the assessment rests. These closed questions are supplied to the student before the evaluation session so that the students could prepare answers. The 'reading' process here becomes very mark-oriented.

Which approach is preferable, (1) not disclosing marks (hiding marks from the students sitting in front of the teacher), or (2) giving marks for each point made? It would seem that both are ways of teachers coping with assessment, but that (2) or the second, open way where the criteria is clear, gives cognisance to student anxiety and motivation and encourages students to continue working at least. It acknowledges the contradictions and tries to cope with student anxieties. It was observed that teachers who showed marks seemed to have an easier relationship with the students, than those who hid them. Those who did not reveal marks, seemed more autocratic and distanced from the students. The effect on students, as the students see it, will be discussed in 'student perceptions.'
It has been noted that teachers often accept stock answers like 'nice', 'suspense' etc. Such answers do not discriminate on the reading undertaken; the student could be bluffing. It is convenient for the teacher, however, not to probe too deeply; not only is it less work, it also might mean a less painful exposure of the student. The 'F' component of the IRF structure described in classroom interaction, is very often the marks therefore; 'F' is often only marks for the student. Examples of the other three types of feedback are:

(a) **Task Feedback**

T: Whom does he find on the island

S: ______ (silence)

T: There is a man, no? What is his name?

S: ______

T: He discovers somebody there Mm?

S: ______

T: What's his name?

S: ______

T: Friday, no? Friday — you didn't read uh?

(C1-9, C stream)

Another example: The student greets four questions from the teacher with silence. Then:
T: Do you remember he goes to jail?
S: 
T: You read the story or not!
S: Yes, ... I read it.

(Cl-6, C stream)

In these interactions, the teacher has found out after questioning, that the student has not read the book. It reflects an attitude some teachers have sometimes viz., that of tricking the students, 'you haven't read, I know but I'll catch you.' Another attitude is to ask outright whether the student has read and then to find out what he knows as e.g.,

T: First story? O.K.
Did you read all the stories?
How many have you read?
S3: Except one "The Castaway"
T: Only one you have read?
S3: No - except one - all I have read
T: You have read all except one, what about you Sharma?

(Cl-6, C stream)

2. Content Feedback: This most often, occurs with the teacher agreeing with what the student says, or by repeating his answers before a further question is asked. E.g.

1 T: ... why why are they captured?
S6: To take revenge on the head of the Mohicans
T: To take revenge
S7: To take revenge

(C1-6, C stream)

Sometimes questions are asked, based on what the students have said; this is also a form of content feedback: e.g.

T: You mentioned Mr. Fagin, who is Fagin?

(C1-6, C stream)

and

1 T: ... what kind of boy is Oliver?
S5: He's a kind man, polite to others and honest
T: Honest
S4: Most honest. ...

5 T: How does - how is his honesty shown in the story?

(C1-6, C stream)

Here the student is asked for details and examples, of something he himself has brought up. Content feedback is a good teaching device (Shinnerer-Erben, 1981) that could be exploited effectively by the teacher.

3. Form Feedback: This occurs as grammar correction, and for vocabulary choice: e.g.

1 S4: He went to Sykes for a house for rob
T: for?
S4: For one house to take silvers
T: to rob
5 S5: rob
T: to rob, rob the house

(Cl-6, C stream)

1 T: saw whom?
S: that uh he ... milkmaid
T: uh mermaid ah
S: mermaid - he wanted to marry her marry
5 T: mermaid. mm

(Cl-9, C stream)

If the feedback is communicated to students through discussion groups, there would be possibly a greater stress on content feedback than on task and form feedback. Such feedback if not of the right-wrong variety, would help in reconstruction of what has been read, and help towards a global understanding of the book.

Conclusion

We have demonstrated that assessment is a necessary component of the course for teachers, who are responsible for its accountability. This responsibility results in a teacher-dominated assessment session that concedes very little to the student. The teacher keeps control, through the fact of assessment primarily, and secondly, through the procedures used by the teacher to enact the assessment.
The analysis of the questions used show that though a variety of possibilities for student-centred participation and discussion exists in the questions, the teacher-dominated structure imposes itself very firmly on the interaction. The model of reading involved, further, is one where one reading perspective is encouraged - that of the teacher's. Even this 'one-reading perspective' is not one experienced by the lower streams, however, where the student is looking, not for the teacher's reading of a text, but the teacher's use of words (gruel, 'hen-pecked') which the teacher has focussed on as effective.

Further, the questioning activities are those which do not encourage language exploration by the students. Because of the lack of time, that comes from the need to assess all the students in class, teachers are impatient to 'get on' with it.

We can say, therefore, that since the single reader's (the teacher's) schema dominates in the reading of extended texts, the student's schema is not activated. There is little reading involved, therefore, so the question of pleasure and enjoyment in reading does not even seem to be a moot point. This is one way in which assessment infringes on the enjoyment component in reading (if reading is undertaken at all). The contention is therefore, that the model of reading is not the transactional one discussed in Chapter II, which activates the reader's schema.
Further, a question-answer session for assessment purposes alone, where the teacher knows the answers discourages the exploring of different perspectives in reading and peer-type discussion, important for encouraging language use and hence language acquisition (Barnes and Todd, 1977; Barnes, 1976; Allwright, 1984). Such discussion means student participation and involvement, and necessarily means experiencing enjoyment of what has been read, a recreating of what has been experienced, and also a creation of new understandings and feelings that would promote further reading and student motivation. Because of assessment the advantages of ER as a means for language proficiency is lost. Therefore, what could be an excellent opportunity for language development and student development is lost sight of, because of assessment and all that is involved therein.

4.2.4 Student Perceptions of Assessment (St-Qn; St-Int)

Having examined teacher perceptions, and teacher activity and orientations in assessment, it is necessary to contrast the findings with student perceptions.

Surprisingly, considering the analysis which saw the ER course teacher-dominating because of assessment, the student-questionnaires show that more than 88% of students want assessment, whereas only 22% do not like assessment.
This opinion was cross-checked by student interviews (St-Int) where the general feeling among students is that without assessment they would not be likely to read, given the load of work (St-Int-2, 11, 12, 17). This is an opinion shared by the teacher. Teacher perception, therefore, is not wrong concerning students and assessment. Another reason why students want assessment, is as already indicated in 4.2.3, the security it offers to the weaker student, because of its sense of predictability. In fact, our perception is that many students seem to want strong frames. Why is this so?

Perhaps a definite demand by the teacher, makes production simpler. Since the evaluation is what counts, any 'open' discussion would be a risky factor for the student, risky in the sense that (a) the student might find it more difficult to show the teacher that the book has been read, and (b) the student will have to undergo a 'continuous' sort of activity or process, trying to find out the teacher's criteria. Thus St-Int 13:

Its better we do it on the conceptual level but from time point of view I don't want to say anything about it ...

and

R: You prefer this kind of thing - you feel its conceptually challenging, it will take up more of your time

S: More of my time and er - I don't intend to waste my time on this - I don't want to say anything about - that's why I just kept quiet ... I said fine fine
Uncertainty of teacher criteria is resented; the student feels then, that the course is getting too much for him. Those teachers who ask questions on the synopsis (which is the student's summary of the book read) are appreciated. This was observed in a semester III, C stream class.

In St-Int-14: C stream, Semester III, for example, the student says how he had a change of teacher with different criteria. Whereas the first teacher asked questions about the book, the second asked questions only on the synopsis - this was felt to be more manageable because it produced less anxiety:

S: according to that synopsis professor goes on asking questions. So I don't have any difficulty in answering that - whereas previously synopsis was kept apart ... from the book itself ... so now I get quite different in attitude towards the ER.

(St-Int-14, C stream)

In the last section, we talked of the power of marks, that not yielding marks was a way of asserting teacher authority. What do the students think of this? Many - the practically-oriented-would like to know their marks:

We'd like to know but he doesn't show us" (St.10)
"Yes, but we are not told" (St.11)
"To get feedback is to get marks" (St.19)
Students try to circumvent teacher refusal of showing marks, by looking out for glimpses of each others' marks in the teacher's registers. Many students affect disinterest (St.1, 2, 8, 10, 12), and to the question, "would you read better without assessment?" Some say that it makes no difference to them personally, though it affects classmates adversely (St-14, 16). But some say it is important:

St.9 - I want very good marks. I got a first class, that's why I'm studying.

Students 2 and 11 say that they will not read without assessment.

However, the general professed lack of interest in marks is somewhat surprising - perhaps there is a uniformity in the marks received regardless of work done or this could be a reaction to the anxiety assessment causes. If marks are given, and a student has no hopes of reading a dull book, and remembering all the details, in the midst of his work-load, he will only take to other measures, which neutralise the teacher's control wielded by his mark-giving powers which are recognised as subjective and arbitrary. Besides affecting indifference, what measures do the students resort to?

Some students do not do the task. They do not read, but ask others for the summary. The interview with T-10, and the T-St-Int of Cl-10 showed that there was no interest no motivation, no understanding or basic knowledge of books
supposed to have been read. T-10 in fact gave the reason for these, that the students told each other the plot. The student interviews therefore, carried an important question: "Can you answer questions on the book without reading it?" Most gave a resounding 'No' initially, but with some prompting, said either that they could try this (St.9), or that they tried and couldn't (St.11) or were dubious about it. "I don't know" (St.14) "haven't tried" (St.12), "its a possibility" (St.18). But many were forthright: "Sometimes I only will do" (St.8) and "O.K. then I can ask" (St.9), "My friend tried it" (St.13), "can bluff" (St.19), "Yes, get the summary" (St.16). One boy (St.7) says, "some boys are doing that everyday, because they are intelligent students."

Since the evaluation session is so limited, it is predictable, and therefore ensures that books are not read. It would seem that objective 2: to read the whole book does not happen, and objective 3 - to read for recall of details, happens, not vis-a-vis the book, but an oral summary, given in a garbled way, by a classmate.

The students are only too aware, it seems, of two games to be played in the ER course: (1) That of finding the teacher's criteria for marks (the hidden motive), and (2) That of reading and enjoying books (stated claims).
It seems that it is (1) that is the predominant motive for students, and of great concern for teachers also, whereas (2) is secondary for students, and perhaps for teachers too but to a lesser degree. It is not surprising that getting marks and credits should be now more important than reading, for it is so for the teachers. One student however (St-16) admitted that he did not try very hard at ER, even for marks, because it was irrelevant to him, and he had decided to concentrate on his subjects - this student did not dislike English either - he just decided he could not put out the time, and that the amount of credits he would get, was not really worth the effort.

The effort of making outstanding marks is considerable; the student has to stretch himself to obtain it. To get average marks on the other hand, is easier, and requires less effort (Zipf's 'principle of least effort'). This is convenient even for teachers. So neither side really gets into discussion, that is open-ended in nature. Even when given the chance, students do not respond:

1  T: It seems you are not satisfied the novel?
   S: No.
   T: Why?
   S: I don't know. Somehow it just doesn't appeal to me.
5  T: Why?
S: I don't like the story
T: No no. You can't make a general statement like that ... why?...
S: I don't like the story because ...
T: Why its not realistic?
10  S: Not only that - its not like my kind of book
T: Oh I see
S: With suspense and very ...
T: Suspense uh?

(C1-7, A stream)

The student here refuses to discuss, 'bite the bait' as it were. The student himself does not accept any digressing from the business of the day - 'have I read the book or not?' and permits the teacher little lee-way in white-washing the situation.

There is one other point that needs to be made about students and assessment. At least one student says quite categorically of himself and his friends, that he took care to get into B stream by putting "and instead of 'on' I put 'in' and all that ..." (St-13), and that he took care not to progress enough to be sent up to A stream. Why was this so? This student's reasons is that while A stream gets only 4 credits per semester, B gets 6 and C gets 8. To get into C
is considered low status, to get into A means making up credits with optional courses held at odd hours, so B seemed a happy medium to attain. This is not of course true of the majority of students. Also, it is doubtful if such a perception of students is shared by the teachers; for them streaming seems to be a good thing, students seem happy with it, and students in C stream seem happy also. However, the reasons are not delved into. It is just seen as 'a good thing'. In the example just quoted –of St-13 – we see the hidden curriculum of the student will in operation, subversively, and as resistance. The student is seen here as a decision-maker in organisational terms.

There are, it seems then, several games that students play during evaluation sessions, which even if accessed by the teacher, leaves the teacher in actual fact not really a decisive factor.

Conclusion

Student perceptions and opinions only corroborate the conclusions we drew at the end of the section on teachers' perceptions. It is clear that ER is not taking place. The hidden curriculum of the course is: getting marks, by understanding teachers' criteria. These criteria are accepted by students, but occasionally negotiated when students have difficulty in coping (e.g., asking questions on the summary).
The Model of Reading is one where there is a correct version, where the schema of the text is the teacher's. As McHoul (1978) says,

There is an orientation on the part of teachers and students that the decidability of the sufficiency of answers is a matter for teachers and teachers only. 13

However, any teacher deviation from an 'accepted' set pattern is resisted by the students, who refuse to discuss their views even when invited. In that respect, both teachers and students have been determined by a pedagogic situation that demands assessment, and each have to find ways of 'coping'. There is however, a serious effect of this (one reading = meaning) attitude being encouraged by classroom practice. Students lose the motivation of reading. Thus, the A and B stream boys do not see anything beyond the surface reading of text - and that too, the accepted story-line version. And if this is not interesting, they are bored. Thus Gulliver's Travels is described as a "fairy tale", with no other possibilities to it (St-13).

Another student-response to the researcher's query, that ER might bring up issues for discussion is:

S: no no because as far as the content is concerned, we grasp the whole thing ...

(St-Int 15, A stream)
This is a serious consequence of careless ER pedagogy, where assessment rules over reading itself. When so much of learning and self-growth depends on ER, a plurality of interpretation needs encouragement.

The second major conclusion arrived at, at the end of the Teacher's section, that the T-St-Int session does not use the evaluation session for discussion, for student exploration of ideas with language adequately, is corroborated through student perceptions. Considering the content that an Extensive Reader provides, this could be a rich resource for such activity. ER as a means has not been sufficiently and consciously realised by most teachers, though it has been by some students. Thus the enjoyment derived from exploring ideas through peer-group interaction is lost, again through assessment. Indeed, the richness of this interview session has not been exploited, because it is a means for assessment alone.

The conclusions one can draw from the above discussion is that assessment is an important part of the 'game' both students and teachers play. In the process, ER itself and certainly the component of reading for enjoyment seem to be secondary. This need not however, be detrimental - if students are reading anyway. Given a curriculum, it seems expedient however to have grades - as one teacher put it: "I would like to see it (ER) not attached to the curriculum in the sense of having to put ... put down marks ..." (T-6). It would seem then, that
assessment is a major constraint in the optimal practice of 
ER, which in our definition is that it is an activity undertaken 
heuristically and for pleasure.

4.3 Curricular Constraints to the Self-Selection of Texts

The last section identified assessment as a major constraint 
in the practice of reading (identified as 'optimal' in Chapter II) 
in the curriculum. In this section we continue using Theory I 
as a norm, to examine further curricular constraints in the 
implementation of Theory I. Whereas in the last section we 
specifically examined Principle I (Pleasure in Reading) that 
got to make up the definition of ER (that reading is an 
activity undertaken heuristically and for pleasure by the 
reader), this section discusses Principle II, or the 
heuristic element or choice element, which we describe as the 
'self-selection' or student selection of texts.

The importance of the 'heuristic' aspect of the definition 
is that it stresses the individual reading schemas operating 
in interactive reading. It is tied up closely with the 
motivation of the reader, with reading what is comprehensible, 
and therefore with what would ultimately be enjoyable. The 
notion of choice in other words is closely tied up with 
Principle I (pleasure) and Principle III (schema). The
reader, it was hypothesised in Chapter II (2.6) has the
in-built or inherent ability to discard or choose what to read.

The question is, however, how this ability is allowed to
function within a curriculum. What constraints within the
curriculum discourage and even prevent the exercising of a
student option in reading, and to what extent does the student
emerge as a decisive factor in shaping his or her own reading
experience?

The current system of selection of reading texts in the ER
programme in the college studied, is one where book-lists are
prescribed selections for reading, where students are given a
limited choice (two out of four or five out of ten have to be
read eventually). This system, however, is still better than
the 'standard' ER programme in the country, where there is a
minimal number of books (a 'couple' of books) prescribed with no
in-built choice (aside from choice in answering questions at
examinations).

The ER programme being studied here, claims that it is
learner-centred; that it takes into account the selections and
reading preferences of students. The extent to which this can
be done in a common reading programme, is however the moot
question; teachers have to decide on book-lists and to that
extent, we have a teacher-dominated programme. Is such a
programme therefore truly learner-centred?
A common instructional programme cannot incorporate, it would seem, the personal choices of the individual student. The interactive reading described in Chapter II cannot therefore be properly implemented. We could say that a self-selection of texts, where the reader decides what should be read has no real climate for operation at the tertiary level. Why is this so? Why can't the learner emerge as central in the ER programme? What forces within the curriculum act as constraints to this? A major implication of a programme where the learner is central as a decision-maker, is that a change in the teacher-student relationship is necessary. How acceptable would such a situation be to teachers, and what are the constraints to its acceptability?

Since the supposition that self-selection of texts was not operating became more and more certain, (with informal discussion, earlier knowledge of the case, and ER procedures and previous T-Int) the question of self-selection therefore was posed as a question initially, and reformulated later as a hypothetical case to the teachers. The question generally had the following intent: 'If you had 200 titles for the students to choose from, do you think this would be a good idea for the ER programme?' The same question was differently posed to the students, but no less directly since the examination of self-selection is mainly an examination of a hypothetical case. Our analysis has already seen (in the last two sections) that the classroom
and programme being examined is a teacher-dominated one, the examination of the question of self-selection of texts, will identify factors that will act as constraints, to the idealistic concept of self-selection (Theory I).

The analysis will discuss teacher perceptions, student perceptions and then a comparison between the two. These three aspects are discussed first in terms of present practices and then in terms of the hypothetical situations (the 'ought' factor).

4.3.1 Teacher Perceptions: The Selection of Texts

Present Practices - The 'is' Factor: Separate booklists are given for A, B, C streams. While A stream selections are made up of 'authentic texts', complete, unadapted stories like best sellers, B stream have a smaller range of books, which however are not as narrow as the books on the C stream list, which is made up of simplified tales and adapted stories.

The booklists are not fixed. Teachers claim that they can add to the list if necessary; at least one teacher was observed to do so. It is our observation, that, while the booklist for the A stream contain more than 90 titles, the lists for B and C streams are far fewer in number. The problem obviously is that of availability of books.
The main concern of the teacher is adding to the list, bringing in new titles, and having a more 'mobile' list, where the same book does not feature as long as six years for example. T-10 complains that a book called The Card has been on the C stream list for six years. Since there is not enough of a changeover, this teacher feels that motivation is affected. (It would seem that motivation here however refers more to that of the teacher than of the student.)

How are the reading lists prepared? Generally, the opinions of students are sought, and a list of titles are prepared. The claim is that the list of books are based on student interests. Indeed, after gaining feedback from students more Indian titles have been included in the lists. Individually, though, many teachers contradict this assertion: some teachers say that favourites do not feature on the lists (T-3 and T-7) and some say that it does only partly (T-9 only romance; T-6).

Why is there a difference of opinion here? One reason could be that, though feedback from students is involved in text selection, it is generally a select few who actually give suggestions for titles. Operationally, there seems to be a 'filter grid' applied by teachers to the suggestions from students. The control and responsibility remains with the teacher — parents demand this. This demand refers especially to the A stream students for whom best sellers are allowed,
recommendations coming from the students and teachers (T-7, T-11). The C stream selections are generally more restricted because of the availability of reading materials appropriate to the level and cultural interests of the group (T-6, T-3, T-9, T-10, T-2). The restriction is also in terms of funds allocation (T-3). More time, effort and energy are spent on A stream reading selections than on C stream selections.

T-St-Ints tell us however that the factor of teacher control operates again in text selection in the following way: teachers shortlist the books so that what is actually offered as a selection is much smaller than the choices offered in the larger list. Thus, even though 90 titles are included in the A stream list, operationally only about 10-12 are given to the students as viable choices for A stream (T-7, T-11, St-17). Why is there a shortlist of longer lists? It would seem that finally, the selection of texts depends on book availability, the personal discrimination and selection of the teacher, notions on what students ought to read depending mostly on what the teacher, parents and the 'ethos of the institution' (T-7) permit. Also the shortlist reflects teacher willingness to read themselves. Teachers, it seems, have to read in order to evaluate. These factors seem to finally decide choices of texts. What is available therefore is basically a selection that is not a student selection, but is more teacher-oriented.
The control and power balance in the selection of texts is clearly with the teacher, though all agree that student votes ought to be considered. (In T-Int only T-10 says it ought not to be for C stream.) This is corroborated by the student responses to the parallel question (St-Qn 10): If you have suggested books, has the teacher used the book in class? Two out of five boys in A stream say that the teacher has not used the suggestions.

Indeed the preoccupation of the teacher seems to be with what titles should be recommended, rather than who selects.

Differences in Selecting Texts for A and C Streams

In our analysis of teacher perceptions on text selections it was noted that:

1. books for A stream are 'chosen' by students with direct control by the teacher;

2. C stream selections have very little student choice, because of the paucity of 'adequate' texts;

3. A stream selections get more attention because of book availability. This is not so for C streams, where there is a lack of adult, simple, culturally relevant and interesting books available for use. There is therefore less scope for changing book-lists.

4. More funds are spent on A stream than on C stream books.
What are student preferences according to the teacher? The perception of reading preferences of students according to teachers, varies from teacher to teacher. We have in Table 4.5 (see page 279) clubbed all the A, B and C stream teachers' perceptions together. A more detailed table appears in 4.3.3 to show how teacher's perceptions stand against the students' voiced preferences.

It is interesting that the teacher is not just concerned with what the student likes, but also in what he ought to like. This attitude would tend to ignore student preferences being taken too seriously.

Besides genre, there are other reading preferences of students perceived by teachers.

Though the reading list of A stream is considered 'adequate' (T-11, T-7) there is still a dislike of text selections reported in the A stream (T-7), and a "craze for some titles" - like detective stories, for example.

An A stream teacher's perceptions of C stream selections is that it is adequate, whereas it is the A stream selections that are not as good (T-11). One A stream teacher says his students "love classics" another says they "hate classics".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streams</th>
<th>Detective</th>
<th>Romance</th>
<th>Science Fiction</th>
<th>Best Sellers</th>
<th>Newspaper Reports</th>
<th>Magazine Articles</th>
<th>Comics</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Any Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social themes controversial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Controversial</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more non-fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Teacher Perception of Student Reading Preferences
The B stream selections are not considered good by the teachers. It is the B stream teacher who speaks against the abridged/simplified/adapted texts as being unpopular with the students (T-4, T-5).

None of the C stream teachers, however, react badly to the simplified text. One teacher says that books need to be simple (T-3, T-6, T-9, T-2) and culturally relevant (T-9, T-2, T-7). One teacher (T-6) does not want authentic means for authentic ends - the two are felt to be different. What is necessary are adult reading material - less of animal stories for example. However, III semester C stream teachers feel that C stream selections, as simple as they are, are still above the reading ability of the students (T-10, T-2). C stream teachers say that students look for size of print (T-6), colour of the cover (T-3), number of pages (T-3), thickness of volumes (T-3, T-6) in deciding what to read.

It is clear that there is a large variety of perceptions, preferences and opinions. The variety of student preferences and satisfying them, seems to be a problem teachers are aware of. But to cope with this problem is another matter. For most teachers the resistances, some outside themselves, and some within, seem almost insurmountable, making the notion of self-selection impractical for implementation, within the curriculum.
Teacher Opinions on 'Self-Selection': The 'ought' Factor

The question on self-selection was presented to the teacher as a hypothetical question, in order to identify why self-selection does not work in the curriculum, to identify what constraints are understood as operating in implementation. The hypothetical question: "Suppose you had a large amount of books, say about 200, could this be offered as a choice to students?" was posed to the teachers.

Most teachers (eight out of ten) say that they would let the students select their own reading matter, but that students do not have the capability to choose. It is added by some teachers (T-10, T-3) that C stream definitely do not have the ability to choose - but could perhaps recommend the kinds of reading they would like. Only a few teachers see self-selection as feasible for C stream. Of these, one is very positive, saying it is already happening in C stream, and that more option should be given for C and not A stream.

About half of the teachers are strongly of the opinion that self-selection of texts is not a good idea for C stream:

T-2: "The boys already have a library they don't use."

T-10: "If 200 books are given a genuine selection of texts will take place only the first time - from the second time onwards, the students don't read, but get the synopsis from each other."
More practical opinions are:

T-12: To go from guided to self-selection is the purpose of the course.

T-5: It is not quantity but quality that is important, "a judicious selection of texts".

T-6: Choice should be made optional.

The last two opinions are made by teachers who are speculating with constraints of the curriculum in mind, so their responses can be termed as more operational. The reasons for these opinions offered by the teachers are:

1. Organisational problems
2. Teacher-control problems
3. Student inability to choose (because he cannot read)
4. Student refusal to choose

Of these, points (1) and (2) emerge as the crucial ones which directly influence students' reactions (3) and (4) in the hidden curriculum. Teachers feel that the assessment of 200 books is impossible - because how can the teacher read 200 books? No teacher except one, could conceive of the idea of evaluation without reading. As long as there is evaluation, the teacher's role is limited - here again we come across the limiting quality of assessment - but since it has been seen to be an essential part of the curriculum, assessment can be taken to be a constraint upon the free-choice and self-selection of texts by students.
Why should teachers read all the books? Several answers have come up:

(1) Some teachers leave it simply as - "We can't be fools", "boys will laugh at us" (T-3)

(2) Others say - "then how do we ask questions?" (T-2)

(3) "If we don't read, it takes longer to trap"(them)(T-11)

(4) Others say - "you need to read for proper discussion" (T-5)

(5) "Need to read to prod the memory" (T-6)

"If the teacher doesn't read, he might as well be a librarian - the position of the teacher becomes redundant" (T-2). Interestingly, only four teachers see the teacher's role as being different from the current one of evaluator. One teacher (T-2) puts it succinctly: "evaluator or librarian". One reason therefore is, read more, ask more searching questions to help students to read. Another is - for teacher control. One teacher reacted to self-selection by saying that this would make the teacher's 'trapping' more 'foolproof'; another said, "if they select the books themselves then I have better control "(T-7).

4.3.2 Student Perceptions: The Selection of Texts (St-Qn: St-Int)

Several questions were devised to get information on the selection of texts (St-Qn Nos. 8, 14, 16). The data obtained from these questions was in addition, corroborated and supplemented by information from the St-Int, where the question was asked "Do you enjoy the ER course?"
The Selection of Texts - The 'Is' Factor

The claim is that student feedback is involved in text selection. What do the students feel about the ER texts? Qn.8 (St.Qn) asks the students whether they liked "all, none or some" of the ER texts. The response:

While an equal number of C stream students claim to like all and some of the texts, all the B stream students and practically all the A stream students like only some. Very few students claim to like none. This information can be qualified, however, with (Qn.14) which asks, "how often do you actually read an ER book - never, rarely, sometimes, often, always?" The information obtained is: Most C streamers say that they read the ER text only 'sometimes', half of the B stream boys read ER texts 'sometimes', and half 'always' and half the A stream boys read ER texts 'often' and half read 'sometimes' and 'always'. To put this briefly, only about 20% of the students read ER texts 'always'. It is clear that the student answer on whether they liked all the books, and their equivocal response is not reliable. The St-Ints give a clearer picture, compared to the St-Qn. When asked whether the students liked ER, the response was:

"Bore madam" (St-Int 2: C stream)

"When we don't get interesting novels, we don't feel like reading it ... too boring and ..."

(St-Int 19, A stream)
St.17 does not like the choice - the selections offered; this is the student who pointed out that only 10 selections were offered to the A stream.

There were, however, positive reactions also. In C stream many students found the texts interesting (St-Int: 1, 7, 9 - C stream). It is significant that A stream students who are reading best sellers etc., are less satisfied. Student responses to question 16 which asks "do you find difficulty in language or ideas?" has a mixed reaction. While C stream boys have difficulty in both, many A stream boys claim to have difficulties in ideas in the books. It would seem that A stream also finds difficulty in the ER course.

Further, while A stream students express more dissatisfaction in questionnaires, C stream students do not do so. However, in Interviews (St-Int) both A and C stream students are equally critical. B stream students are especially critical of the dull nature of the books read, and the simplified texts they have to read (St.13).

Conclusion

There is, on the whole a dissatisfaction with ER texts, pointing to the fact that the course is not learner-centred, and not activating the reader's schema. The students are not reading books they enjoy, nor are they reading books of their choice.
Student Reading Preferences (St-Qn:9)

Students therefore would like to have more choice, more interesting novels/books to read. The variety of their interests are reflected through their responses (Qn.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>A Stream /6</th>
<th>B Stream /5</th>
<th>C Stream /24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Sellers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Reports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine Articles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Student Reading Preferences

Other A stream boys feel that reading books like Sidney Sheldon are not 'useful', A stream should be asked to read texts they would not normally pick up, e.g., classics (St-Int 19, St-Int 18). This is an opinion shared by T-6 also, that A stream should be given something from where they would learn something new. Here the 'pleasure' element of
reading is completely dispensed with by students and teacher.

St.15: ER helps if there were some really good novels - classics - which we don't usually read provided to us and then we are asked to, and then we are even guided how to read the novel - I mean so it is not just left to us you know ... even the teacher guide us how to read the novel and then after reading the novel - after he ... may this is not the way you should have looked at it - maybe instead of just leaving the novel to ourselves ...

(St-Int 15: A stream)

St.18: ... we get all this type of Sidney Sheldon and other things - I don't think they are very useful. They can even increase the classics - abridged form of classics and other things - that will be more useful actually.

(St-Int 18: A stream)

Here, you could say student wants are needs (Allwright, 1982a); ER could be a chance to develop what is not given opportunities in other situations. In the student interviews apart from the more common requests for stories (St.11, 19) - more adventure stories (St.11) stories with less descriptions (St.19) and for less fiction (St.16, St.5) there is a different definition of interest that comes from the A streamers, for whom needs (what the students feel they ought to read) and wants (what students would like to read when at leisure) seem to correlate. B stream students, further, demand authentic texts (St.13).
Conclusion

There are it is clear, a wide-range of student preferences, too wide to be satisfactorily covered by a short list of pre-selected books. Indeed it is possible that the range of books in the table could have been more exhaustive, if the students responding to the questionnaire had responded to the 'any other' books category in Question 9. As it is, Question 9, acted as an exhaustive list for the students, limiting responses perhaps which was why the St-Ints question on ER texts was felt to be necessary.

There is, it is clear, a range of preferences in ER, that includes what ought to be read on the part of the student, as there is with the teacher. Again, the problem is, what these 'oughts' are and whether all students want them and feel happy with them. The range of preferences here are again open-ended in nature.

Self-Selection of Texts - The 'Ought' Factor

The question of self-selection of texts was asked in the St-Qn (Qn.13a, 13b and Qn.17). Information was volunteered by students, further, in the St-Int. What do students think on the subject of choosing their own texts?

To the question "Would you like to select your own books to read?" (St.Qn - 13a) there was an overwhelming response in favour of this (about 74%).
To the question (Qn.13b) "What sort of books would you like to read: (what is interesting, easy, and easily summarisable)?" the students responded mainly for *interesting* books and books easy to read.

Interest is again the factor for selection - the criteria for students when they talk of what sort of books they would recommend for reading. About half the students choose interest as the criteria. Further information comes from Qn-17. An overwhelming response for independent work is asked for. Most students (94%) opt for this as opposed to more help from teacher, classmates or any other sort of change.

Theoretically therefore, the students would like to

1. choose their own books
2. choose interesting and easy books
3. have more independence in reading

Students 13, 19 and 17 (St-Int) further voice the need for self-selection more graphically.

R: Do you enjoy the choice given to you
S: No not very much

... ...

R: You don't like them - and you have a lot of that sort.

S: No - only the book - not much choice - you have to take - out of 10 titles - choose one

(St-Int 17; A stream)
S: ... I mean they could give us books which we feel like - I mean some people like adventurous and some people like love stories and some people ... I mean we should have more choice, so that it could bring some interest to us - now I like adventurous ones and if I'm given love story or some other type of story, perhaps I won't be interested but would just like to slip over the pages and time-pass - But if I'm given a book which I like, I'll take more pains in reading it and understanding it.

(St-Int 19, A stream)

S: ... if we weren't given marks for this and instead they give a couple of books so we can read it alone within - in leisure and at the end of the month - maybe they can give a test on conceptual level - we will have all the time in the world to do it.

(St-Int 13, A stream)

The St-Int give further information: The students are it seems asking for self-selection of texts. Many students are asking for greater autonomy. Students want more choice and to not be 'forced' (St-Int 13, 19, 15). Of the 15 students interviewed, however, no C stream student asked for more independence in the course as did the A and B stream students. What the C stream student did comment on, was the boring quality of books etc., generally they were diffident about voicing (and maybe even holding) opinions on what they read as being unsatisfactory or boring and so on. It would seem then, that C stream students, for whatever reasons, require stronger 'frames' for the ER class. What would be the reasons for this? We will discuss this further in Chapter V, under 'Streaming' (5.2).
There seems to be therefore a general desire for autonomy, and for self-selection among all the students. This is a feeling, however, held more 'theoretically' with C stream, than with A and B stream students.

4.3.3 A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions on Text Selection

We are now in a position to make a comparison of what teachers and students say, primarily focussing on aspects which appear crucially different. This is done in order to gauge why a 'self-selection' principle of text-selection does not operate within the curriculum. What are the forces in the curriculum which act as constraints?

Again, as in 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, we will use the subheadings of: Text Selection, Reading Preferences and 'Self-Selection' of Texts. The teacher's perceptions of student criteria of a good book are markedly different from those of the students. Whereas students emphasised interest as an important factor, teachers say of A stream, that they want informative books, and of C stream that they look for thickness of volumes, number of pages, size of the print and so on. They want cultural familiarity and books easy to read. However teachers were responding to an open question, the students were responding to a
closed one. It could be that the students were using the possible responses provided, whereas the teachers were responding to the real situation giving the hidden curriculum operating here, quite easily because it involves the students alone and does not infringe on the teachers' interest.

**Student Reading Preferences**

What do students like to read? This was asked of both students and teachers to compare and match perception. The responses are given in the Table below. The Table indicates the responses of students, and teachers of each stream. The numbers indicate the number of people who responded under each sub-heading or 'type' of book. MT = mother tongue; and E = English. Student reading preferences in mother tongue and English have been noted (St-Qn: 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>A Stream</th>
<th>B Stream</th>
<th>C Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Sellers</td>
<td>5 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>4 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>4 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comics</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>4 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>2 E</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Matching Student and Teacher Perceptions on Student Reading Preferences
1. The Table indicates that the variety of student reading interests is not a perception shared by teachers. Even if it is, this variety is obviously not being tapped by the ER book-list.

2. Reading Interests in leisure, in mother tongue and English is an activity that students do undertake. Resistances to the ER course, treating the reading of one/two books per semester as a chore suggests that good readers do find ER not pleasurable.

3. This Table shows clearly that teacher perception of what the students like, even in terms of such rough categorisation, is not quite accurate. All three streams seem to respond to science fiction for example more than teachers expect. Comics seem popular with C stream, and even religious books seem interesting. This information need not, of course, be very reliable - but the overwhelming response of the students being so markedly different from that of teachers is interesting. Though they do all demand more adult, culturally appropriate material, it could be said that teachers either do not have a clear perception of student preferences in reading, or that they do not focus on them because it would prove too demanding a task. Perhaps this is not considered as crucial in learning, and teachers feel that what students ought to read should receive prominence in instructional programmes. This position however, is questionable, given that the teachers
(of the C stream classes at least) have already admitted to a lack of availability of adequate texts. It would seem, then, that student preferences are not sufficiently represented by the teachers for reasons of serendipity, rather than for pedagogic reasons.

What exactly are teachers' reasons for not considering the learners' preferences? This question was answered when we look at teachers' responses to the hypothetical question of self-selection of texts by students. Basically, the problems are (a) housekeeping problems for the teacher. This is directly linked with (b) problems of teacher control. These factors might directly influence student ability and compliance in exerting a choice.

Many C stream students commented on the dull nature of books. Many, further, did not like the idea of retold versions and simplified texts, which are the prescribed ER reading for C streamers. 14

Many teachers on the other hand, see that Simplified Readers have to be used, because only these have simplified English, that is comprehensible to the C stream students. It is clear that many teachers have still got only a linguistic concept of comprehensibility and that the interactive idea of reading ensuring a different kind of comprehension (reader's
schema and cognitive structures) is totally new. There are a few teachers, however, who point to the inadequacy of texts being simplified on linguistic principles alone — what is missing is the imaginative, discursive and humourous aspects of the language (T-5).

Support from the literature (Widdowson, 1976; Honeyfield, 1977; Davies, 1984; Krashen, 1981) have been cited in Chapter III, to show that linguistic simplification is not necessarily on aid to comprehension. It would seem that these assertions and claims in research have some validity when we see the negative responses C streamers have for simplified texts and retold tales.

Conclusion

Whereas most students tend towards more independence in reading, and a desire to choose books that are interesting, the attitude of teachers towards self-selection is different.

While many teachers say that books are not available for choice many talk of student inability to choose. This is true especially for C stream, according to many teachers.

Others, however, advocate giving a select choice for students. Since ER as a course is different from library work, then there should be some sort of teacher intervention. Most teachers however talk of difficulties of teachers reading more
than 200 books. Though one teacher commented on this response, saying that English teachers should read, it is clear that the teachers who voice these fears see assessment as a problem, and related to this, their own 'image' as a teacher in the classroom. The problems of assessment is, further, linked with IR pedagogy. This response is not one that should be pushed aside. As we said in 4.2, when assessment was discussed, assessment is a means of teacher control; but a teacher control where a power struggle has been imposed from outside the teacher and the student. The struggle that ensues is very real and without a change of the system, i.e., assessment patterns, and student-teacher power relationships, it is clear that even student selection of books would not be permissible.

Self-selection therefore emerges as difficult to implement in a curriculum, because of forces within it that directly affect it.

Conclusion: Chapter IV

The curriculum constraints, against self-selection or the heuristic component of our definition of ER therefore, is that of assessment, teacher interests, teacher control, student unreliability to complete work in the face of a large workload, and administrative problems. Such factors stand against the student selecting books he would enjoy, and selecting books that would agree with his schema of reading.
There is a distinction to be made, however, between A stream and C stream students. Though theoretically C stream students would like independence in choice etc., St-Ints show that this is not a priority for them, as it is with the A streamer. The implications of this will be picked up in 5.2.

4.4 Hypothesis A

We are in a position now, to describe the first hypothesis of the study, which has emerged through the analysis in this chapter, undertaken in response to the first question of the study: What 'curricular forces' operate crucially in the 'optimal' implementation of ER? How do these forces interact with ER i.e., how does ER 'work' and emerge in practice?

The preceding three sections demonstrated the following that supports the emergence of Hypothesis A:

1. That objectives are in practice more assessment-oriented than stated in claims. This means that reading for pleasure is an aspect dispensed with in practice (4.1).

2. That assessment stands as a constraint to pleasure in reading. Assessment, moreover, being essentially teacher-dominated, does not consider the learner's schema in reading - again cutting into the pleasure component as well as the heuristic component of our definition of ER (4.2).
3. That student-selection of texts is not possible given the requirements of the curriculum (assessment and ER pedagogy), teacher (vested) interests, book availability and student motivation. This affects the heuristic aspect of our definition of ER (4.3).

A comparative study between Theory I, Theory II and Operations has yielded the first hypothesis, Hypothesis A, of this study which is stated in the following way:

The requirements of ER (Theory I) are in contradiction with the demands of the curriculum (Theory II and Operations). The value of ER has been decreased or changed because of forces and constraints within the curriculum. ER (as defined in Chapter II), therefore, does not operate in the curriculum.

In the next chapter, we will examine the second Central Question of the study.

...
NOTES

1. We call these "sub-headings" because the Central Questions are the main sub-headings for analysis.

2. It is necessary to note that extra-lingual and non-verbal data: pauses (...) silences (-) intonation etc., are not ignored, but included in data interpretation.

3. The syllabus is a document, and therefore part of Theory II. The discussion of the syllabus is undertaken in this chapter because of the contrasts made to Operations where much information on objectives exist.

4. T = Teacher; S = Student; Cl = Class; R = Researcher.


6. We do not asterisk incorrect grammar in our data extracts. To do so would only dot the pages too thickly.

7. Delamont (1983) cites studies which examine the relationship between open doors of classrooms and the establishing of a good teacher's credentials (e.g. Macpherson, 1972) and the relationship between noise in a classroom and lack of teacher control (Denscombe, 1980).


9. We do not feel it necessary to define 'questions' as in linguistic studies on questions (cf. Barnes and Todd, 1977), since we are examining a blatant question-answer situation.
10. Closed and pseudo-questions are not interchangeable in all cases, but in a classroom testing situation it almost always is.

11. The term "move" is taken from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) who divide an exchange (IRF Structure) into moves and then into acts.


***