Ten Geleide

Dit nummer opent met een artikel van Jenny Schuitemaker-King over de resultaten van haar (promotie-)onderzoek naar verschillen in het geven van correctieve feedback tussen tto-docenten en mvt-docenten. In het tweetalige onderwijs ligt een ander accent op het leren van een tweede taal dan in het reguliere modernevreemdetalenonderwijs. In tto-lessen staan taalaanbod en interactie ten dienste van het bereiken van vakinhoudelijke leerdoelen, terwijl in mvt-lessen taalverwerving doel op zichzelf is, vaak met de nadruk op het leren van de regels van de taal. Maar in beide contexten is het leren van een vreemde taal een leerdoel. Eén hulpmiddel om het leren te bevorderen is correctieve feedback aan leerlingen tijdens interactie in de les. Het onderzoek laat zien dat de onderwijscontext (tto of regulier; taal- of vakgericht) een duidelijke rol speelt in het aantal en type feedbackstrategieën.

Theun Meestringa en Clary Ravesloot deden een vragenlijstonderzoek naar de inrichting, weging en vormgeving van het schoolexamen Nederlands in havo en vwo. Dit onderzoek vond plaats op het moment dat scholen en secties Nederlands voor de opgave staan de referentieniveaus taal te verwerken in de opgaven, toetsen en beoordelingsmodellen van het schoolexamen. Het beeld van het schoolexamen dat uit de antwoorden van de respondenten naar voren komt, laat een groot verschil zien tussen docenten ten aanzien van de wegingsfactoren, het aantal meetmomenten en het al dan niet inzetten van handelingsdelen. Meestringa en Ravesloot spreken hun zorg uit over deze variatie binnen het schoolexamen Nederlands, nu Nederlands een van de 'kernvakken' is geworden.

Bij het nieuwe vak Chinese Taal en Cultuur ontbreekt een curriculum voor het domein cultuur, terwijl juist bij dit vak, waar sprake is van een geheel andere cultuur dan de westerse, cultuur een belangrijk element zou moeten zijn bij taalverwerving. Om te komen tot een zinvolle en evenwichtige invulling van dit domein hielden Gwendolyn Tates en Judith Zoetelief interviews met docenten en Chinadeskundigen, die ze analyseerden met behulp van literatuur. Op grond hiervan doen ze een voorstel voor een leidraad voor een curriculum van het domein cultuur, ter versterking van het vak Chinees.

Het beoordelen van schrijfvaardigheid staat centraal in het artikel van Theo Pullens, Hanny den Ouden, Wolfgang Herrlitz en Huub van den Bergh. Om de schrijfontwikkeling van leerlingen te kunnen volgen is er behoefte aan een valide en betrouwbaar instrument. Mogelijk kan de meerkeuzetoets hiervoor ingezet worden, want op het eerste gezicht kan met deze toetsvorm snel en betrouwbaar gemeten worden. In het onderzoek is een meerkeuzetoets schrijfvaardigheid vergeleken met de globale schaalbeoordeling van acht opstellen van dezelfde groep basisschoolleerlingen. De toetsonderdelen inhoud & organisatie, idioom & stijl, grammatica en spelling blijken een redelijk goede interne validiteit te bezitten. Bij de vergelijking van de meerkeuzetoets met de globale oordelen van leerkrachten kan geen positief verband aangetoond worden, behalve bij het onderdeel spelling.

Het nummer sluit af met een signalement van een artikel van Shintani, Li en Ellis, met de titel *Comprehension-based versus production based grammar instruction: A meta-analysis of comparative studies* door Machteld Moonen.

Namens de redactie,
HELGE BONSET

Giving corrective feedback in CLIL and EFL classes

JENNY SCHUITEMAKER-KING

In het tweetalige onderwijs (tto) ligt een ander accent op het leren van een tweede taal dan in het reguliere modernevreemdetalenonderwijs (mvt). In tto-lessen staan taalaanbod en interactie ten dienste van het bereiken van vakinhoudelijke leerdoelen, terwijl in mvt-lessen taalverwerving doel op zichzelf is, vaak met de nadruk op het leren van de regels van de taal. Maar in beide contexten is het leren van een vreemde taal een leerdoel. Eén hulpmiddel om het leren te bevorderen is correctieve feedback aan leerlingen tijdens interactie in de les. Dit artikel beschrijft de resultaten van een onderzoek naar verschillen in het geven van correctieve feedback tussen tto-docenten en mvt-docenten. Het laat zien dat de onderwijscontext (tto of regulier; taal- of vakgericht) een duidelijke rol speelt in het aantal en type feedbackstrategieën.

Over the past decades, the Netherlands has witnessed a consistent increase in the number of secondary schools opting to include an English bilingual stream in their curriculum. The general model of instruction currently being implemented is the teaching of some curriculum subjects in English and some in Dutch. A basic tenet and rationale for bilingual education is that language learning be combined with the meaningful context of content learning. The CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) guidelines form the underlying principles of bilingual education. When considering the aspect of language learning. it is to be expected that in bilingual contexts the approach to language learning may differ from that in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) class. In a bilingual context the language structures and lexis will be presented as they occur in the content texts and not necessarily be graded according to perceived complexity of syntax or level of vocabulary. An EFL class is generally focused on presenting structures and vocabulary in a more sequenced and restricted fashion, with the main teaching objective being the acquisition of language structures and the use of lexis within a context that may or may not be focused on content acquisition. While it can be assumed that the presentation of language in a bilingual context follows a different path than in the foreign language learning context, the common denominator is the learning of an additional language. Teachers in both instructional contexts are dealing with the

process of language acquisition. And one aspect salient to effective language learning is the teacher's use of corrective feedback procedures and strategies.

This article presents findings into the differences in teacher-talk when giving corrective feedback (CF) and uses data gathered from lesson observations in the two instructional settings of bilingual and non-bilingual schools. In the bilingual setting, data was gathered from two types of lessons. The first was subject-specific teaching, which will hereafter be referred to as CLIL, and the second was the EFL teaching in the bilingual setting. A third set of observations was made using recordings of EFL lessons in non-bilingual schools. The main focus of the study was on the strategies used by CLIL teachers, with the English language teachers' actions in bilingual and non-bilingual settings acting as a comparative measure.

Literature review

One of the major areas in the study on classroom discourse relevant to learners' language development is how teachers give CF to learners' output, and numerous studies have been carried out to establish its efficacy. Some deal with the correlation between feedback and learner uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, Panova & Lyster, 2002, Lightbown & Spada, 1990), while others consider explicit or implicit presentation and explanations of language use (VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996, VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993, Sharwood Smith, 1993, De Graaff, 1997, Day & Shapson, 2001). The findings of these studies appear to result in the identification of several broad types of didactical options of CF which are considered conducive to SLA (Second Language Acquisition): feedback and learner uptake, form-focus and meaning-focus feedback, and teacher

recasts. Lyster and Ranta (1997) expand these categories and assign corrective feedback comments to six categories: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic comment, elicitation and repetition.

An additional aspect to be considered in the analysis of effective corrective feedback is the dichotomy of form-focused (FFI) and meaning-focused instruction (MFI). This is discussed in studies by, amongst others, Netten (1991), Spada (1997) and Williams (2001). Spada (1997) maintains that FFI in a CLIL learning environment is particularly effective (1997:82). A study by Williams (2001) takes the initiator of focus-on-form episodes in classroom discourse as its topic and examines incidental episodes in classroom discourse when learners enquire about correct form. One conclusion is that beginning learners pay little or no attention to correct form, and regard meaning as paramount. The effectiveness of interventions by teachers of form-focused instruction is questioned, although explicit action is not dismissed. The suggestion is that drawing learners' attention to form should be done at a time when the instructional task lends itself to attention to this aspect (Williams 2001:341), which seems to suggest that a CLIL setting with a focus on content would lend itself well to incidental FFI feedback.

A common strategy in providing CF, and as listed in Lyster and Ranta (1997), is teacher-recasts: an incorrect utterance by the learner is responded to by the teacher with the correct reformulation but not accompanied by any further explanation. Recasts can be related to lexis, morphosyntax or phonology. Research by Lyster and Ranta (1997) has shown that recasts are not always as effective as other forms of corrective feedback, as they do not always lead to uptake by learners. Frequently, the learner is not required to produce an oral response to

recasts, and teachers seem to use them for highlighting errors rather than as opportunities for pushed output. When a response is required and forthcoming, this does not necessarily lead to the learner noticing the error, as the response tends to be a repetition of the teacher's utterance and does not necessarily require the learner to reformulate the utterance by drawing on her own linguistic resources. Classroom research has not yet clarified the effectiveness of recasts, and there is conflicting evidence regarding their efficacy (Ohta, 2000:50). Nicholas et al. (2001:740) term the implicit and indirect use of recasts as 'mitigated feedback' which suggests that learners may not be benefiting as much as they might from teacher feedback. Nicholas et al. also suggest that teachers are at times unwilling to be specific in giving feedback and mask any critical comments in various ways, one of which is the implicit recast: this is not the most effective way of drawing learners' attention to errors.

Categories of corrective feedback

For this study nine categories of corrective feedback were selected and applied to the lesson observations. These categories are based on previous studies and observations, and were considered to cover the corrective feedback strategies occurring during interactional dialogue with learners. The types of corrective feedback strategies observed in this study are listed below with examples of teacher (T) and learner (L) interaction.

a. explicit modelling of the correct answer by the teacher
   L: *The brain helps the muscles.*
   T: *No. Say after me 'The brain is used to control the muscles'.*

b. recasts to learners
   L: *I don't can understand.*
   T: *I don't understand.*

c. metalinguistic comment in L1
   L: *I walk yesterday to school.*
   T: *No. The past tense has ed on the end of the verb.*

d. metalinguistic comment in L2
   L: *Mouses*
   T: *Wij zeggen muis, muizen en dan mouse en mice.*

e. clarification requests and confirmation checks
   T: *What do you know about the White Cliffs?*
   L: *They were used in the Second World War.*
   T: *Used? In what sense?*

f. eliciting answers from the class
   L1: *There was a treaty.*
   T: *Do you know the name of the treaty?*
   L1: *No.*
   T: *Anyone else?*
   L2 (provides the answer).
   T: *That's right (continues questioning L1 on his content knowledge)*

g. summarising the answer
   T: *40 euros. Would anybody agree with that? 35 euros for a shirt?*
   L: *My shirt aren't 40 euros. Too much. My shirt I pay 25 euro and I buy all the time this shirt.*
   T: *So Tom, you think 40 euros is expensive and you always buy shirts for 25 euros.*

h. modifications and additions
   L: *You have to have some money to go to the university.*
   T: *To be admitted, yes.*

i. prompts
   T: *And the eyes are for s.......*
   L: *Looking.*
   T: *To see..... seeing... you can also say sight.*

School	Art	Bio	Drama	Geo	History	IT	Maths	Sports	Physics	RE	EFL
1	3	2	-	4	4	1	4	4	2	-	5
2	2	1	-	2	4	-	2	2	-	-	5
3	1	-	2	2	3	-	-	-	1	1	1
4	1	4	-	3	2	2	2	5	-	3	3
Total	7	7	2	11	13	3	8	11	3	4	14

Geo = Geography, IT = Information Technology. RE = Religious Education, Bio = Biology

Table 1. Number of CLIL and EFL lessons from bilingual contexts

Subjects

The corpus of classroom-based data was collected from lessons given in years 1 and 3 at five secondary schools in the Netherlands. Some of the teachers were native-speakers of English and some were Dutch speakers. Four were schools with a bilingual stream and a non-bilingual stream, and one was a regular non-bilingual secondary school. Lessons recorded and observed were from the CLIL contexts, the EFL lessons in bilingual streams and from EFL classes in the non-bilingual streams and the non-bilingual school. Table 1 refers to the bilingual streams and shows the subjects involved, the number of CLIL lessons recorded and the number of EFL lessons.

The data on EFL teachers was collected from the four non-bilingual streams plus an additional non-bilingual school, with eleven lessons given by nine teachers (Table 2).

SCHOOL	LESSONS
1	4
2	2
3	2
4	1
5	2
Total	11

Table 2. Number of EFL lessons from non-bilingual contexts

Results

A comparison of the number of each type of strategy occurring in the three types of lesson was made and the findings show that the preferred choices for feedback vary according to instructional context. Table 3 shows the total number (n) of instances of CF occurring in each of the nine different types of feedback and gives the percentage of lessons in each instructional context where this type of feedback is observed.

CLIL lessons

It can be seen that in seven of the categories the percentage of CLIL lessons where the CF options occurs is lower than in the EFL contexts. In summarizing a learner's answer and giving prompts the CLIL lessons show a higher percentage than the EFL in non-bilingual lessons but not as high as in the EFL lessons in the bilingual streams. In the CLIL context modification and elaboration of learners' output occurs the most frequently with a slightly higher percentage of CLIL lessons with this strategy than in the EFL lessons in the non-bilingual context. CLIL teachers seem to use this feedback option as opportunities to add lexis and to give more input on the content concepts. Seldom were the pupils required to incorporate this additional language in any form of pushed output, as they were rarely required to expand their answers. The following example is from a first-year Biology lesson on muscles and the skeleton, where the teacher provides more subject appropriate lexical items to the learner's comment, but does not require the learner to adopt or use the new lexis in subsequent utterances.

T: What is the brain for?
L: Thinking.
T: Thinking. I hope so. And controlling the body.

This type of feedback acts as a source of elaborated input without the provision of productive opportunities. This suggests a primary concern on the part of the CLIL teachers for pupils' comprehension of content material and not an overt focus on providing opportunities for learners to improve their productive linguistic output.

The corrective feedback technique least used by the CLIL teachers is predictably that of giving metalinguistic comment in L1,

FEEDBACK TYPE	N	% OF CLIL LESSONS	% OF EFL LESSONS IN BILINGUAL SCHOOLS	% OF EFL LESSONS IN NON-BILINGUAL SCHOOLS
Modelling	24	10	29	36
Recasts	114	40	43	64
Metalinguistic comment in L1	93	1	7	91
Metalinguistic comment in L2	149	15	71	73
Clarification requests and comprehension checks	74	31	50	45
Eliciting from others	37	19	43	36
Summary of the learner's answer	27	18	21	0
Modification of and addition to an answer	158	52	79	45
Prompts	71	33	43	18

Table 3. Corrective strategies used by teachers in the three contexts (n) and the percentage of lessons with occurrences of the strategies

although giving metalinguistic comment in L2 is used by 10 of the sample teachers with a total of 15 occurrences recorded. The clarification requests observed in the data do not always explicitly indicate which aspect of the learner's answer is being questioned. This aspect could be incorrect lexis or grammar use or, more often as in the CLIL lessons, it could be incorrect content. Some clarification requests function as a signal to the learner that there is a mismatch between their answer and the response that would contain correct content and language. At other times it can act as an authentic request for clarification of an ambiguous and unclear answer that the teacher has genuinely misunderstood.

The generally low amount of metalinguistic comment by CLIL teachers is consistent with the teachers' answers on a questionnaire given to all the teachers participating in the study and which reveal a general belief among the CLIL teachers in the study that their main priority and objectives are concerned with teaching the content concepts and not with focusing on language form or accuracy. The view expressed is that the responsibility for dealing with overt language meaning and rules of use lies with the EFL teachers and not with the subject teachers.

The rather sparse use of some CF options and the limited opportunities for learners to self-repair is a common feature of much classroom discourse observed in the CLIL classes in this study. This is in line with other studies, for example those of Swain (1993) and Musumeci (1996), the latter positing that pushed output is a neglected area in teachers' discourse and one that is underused and not exploited to its full potential. It seems that the data from this study tends to support this position.

EFL in the bilingual streams

The feedback option used the most by teachers in these EFL classes is a modification on the pupil's answer. This strategy, while providing an adjustment or addition to the answer and supplying more input, does not always automatically lead to the pupil reiterating and incorporating the modification into a new utterance. In the example below the teacher introduces the more appropriate verb 'to deliver' but the learner is not required to incorporate this in a further utterance.

T: *When do chew gum?*
L: *When I'm doing the newspapers.*
T: *OK. When you're delivering you mean.*
L: *Yes.*

So while the teacher's new input is provided, it is not possible to measure whether it acts as intake for the learners. The option least used by these EFL teachers is metalinguistic comment in L1, which is not a surprising result as they are operating in a monolingual context in which the L2 is used exclusively. When this option is discounted, the option used the least by these EFL teachers is a summary of the pupil's answer. The EFL lessons in the bilingual setting classes show the highest percentage of occurrences of five of the nine CF strategies: clarification requests, eliciting from others, summarizing a learner's answer, modifying and elaborating on an answer and giving prompts to assist learners in providing an answer. These EFL teachers seem to have a broader range of corrective feedback options.

EFL in non-bilingual streams

In these EFL classes the most frequently occurring option when giving corrective feedback is a metalinguistic comment, in both L1 and L2, mostly on morphosyntactical aspects of language. This result seems to fit with the didactics and possibly the teaching objectives of foreign language teachers in general. The main objective in these classes may be to teach language rules and use, and with this

the explanations and comments on how language rules operate.

These EFL lessons reveal a higher use of the recast strategy than the lessons in the bilingual streams. Investigation of the linguistic context of these recasts showed that learners in this group are more frequently required to self-repair in the specific case of morphosyntactical recasts than learners in the other two contexts.

L: *Fourth of December go swimming. The five *te December*
T: *Fifth of December*
L: *Fifth of December eleven o'clock*

This could reflect the pedagogical objectives of mainstream language teaching, with teachers more concerned with overt demonstration of the use of discrete language items. This may be attributed to the associated focus on accuracy, causing teachers in the language classes to be more alert to morphosyntactical errors and more pro-active in correcting and assisting accurate production. In this respect the disparity is noticeable between the EFL teachers in non-bilingual schools and those operating in a bilingual setting.

None of the EFL teachers in the non-bilingual streams revealed the use of the feedback strategy of summarising a learner's answer. This may suggest that the learners' output in this type of lesson falls into a restricted and limited range with little additional language provided by the teacher and few opportunities for learners to expand utterances.

Discussion

It has to be remembered that corrective feedback is not only related to second language acquisition, but is an aspect of all educational contexts and can be applied to any interactional dialogic instances of instruction. This

article sets out to present the results of the analysis of instances of corrective feedback related to language aspects, but inevitably in the CLIL classes there will be an overlap in the overt feedback on language aspects and feedback on incorrect answers on content facts. The need for an overt repair of a linguistic error in an answer indicating knowledge of content facts can be considered inappropriate from a non-linguistic point of view and not in keeping with the didactics of teaching subject matter. This fundamental difference in the didactical approaches will provide us with one explanation for the fact that instances of corrective feedback leading to linguistic repair are fewer in CLIL classes than in EFL classes in both bilingual and non-bilingual contexts.

The lack of a high number of occurrences of some types of corrective feedback techniques found in the data on the CLIL classes could be due to several factors. It may be that some teachers are not consciously aware or knowledgeable of effective scaffolding techniques. In addition, the lack may also be attributable to the teachers' beliefs in their role in the classroom as primarily teachers of content not language. Additional factors influencing occurrences of corrective feedback could be the language proficiency level of teachers, the individual teaching styles of the teachers and the socio-cultural relationship between learners and teacher.

The data for this article comes from a research project into bilingual education in the Netherlands and analyses the strategies employed by CLIL and EFL teachers during their classroom discourse. The results and conclusions presented are relevant to the training of CLIL teachers, both pre-service and in-service, particularly in the didactics of the teaching of content through language and the learning of language through content. Current thinking on CLIL methodology emphasizes the dual role of the

didactics of language and content, and if this methodology is to be comprehensively applied to the bilingual context and is to reach its potential as a different type of didactical approach in the combination of language and content, then corrective feedback options which can assist and scaffold language acquisition should become part of the teacher's repertoire of classroom didactical strategies.

REFERENCES

Day, E., & Shapson, S. (2001). Integrating Formal and Functional Approaches to Language Teaching in French Immersion: An Experimental Study. In R. Ellis (Ed.). *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Learning*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

De Graaff, R. (1997). The eXperanto Experiment: Effects of Explicit Instruction on Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 249–276.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 429–448.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake; negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 37–66.

Netten, J. (1991). Towards a more language oriented second language classroom. In L. Malavé and G. Duquette (Eds.). *Language, culture and cognition*. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as Feedback to Language Learners. *Language Learning, 51*(4), 719–758.

Ohta, A.S. (2000). Rethinking Recasts: A Learner-Centred Examination of Corrective Feedback in the Japanese Language Classroom. In J.K. Hall & L. Stoops Verplaetse (Eds.). *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Panova, L., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*, 573–595.

Schuitemaker-King, J. (2012) *Teachers' Strategies in Providing Opportunities for Second Language Development*. http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/faculties/arts/2012/j.schuitemaker-king/

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 165–179.

Spada, N. (1997). Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Acquisition: A Review of Classroom and Laboratory Research. *Language Teaching, 30*, 73–87.

VanPatten, B., & Oikkenon, S. (1996). Explanation versus structured input in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 495–510.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *Modern Language Journal, 7*, 45–47.

Williams, J. (2001). Learner-Generated Attention to Form. In R. Ellis (Ed.) *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

JENNY SCHUITEMAKER-KING gained her teaching diploma from the Institute of Education, University of London. She went on to study the teaching of English as a Second Language and received the TESOL diploma from the Royal Society of Arts. She gained her Masters in Applied Linguistics from the University of Surrey. Her interest in bilingual education and CLIL led to the successful completion of a PhD from the University of Groningen. Jenny has taught at schools in London, England and at international schools in Germany and the Netherlands. She is involved in teacher-training at Fontys Hogeschool in the Netherlands and is currently working at the University of Maastricht. E-mail: <jennyschuite-c@telfort.nl>

Het schoolexamen Nederlands havo/vwo in kaart

THEUN MEESTRINGA & CLARY RAVESLOOT

Docenten en secties Nederlands in het voortgezet onderwijs voelen steeds vaker de noodzaak om de kwaliteit van schoolexamens onder de loep te nemen, niet alleen als gevolg van het verscherpte inspectietoezicht, maar ook naar aanleiding van de nieuwe slaag-zakregeling (effectief in 2012), de kernvakkenregeling (in 2013) en straks in 2014 de koppeling van het examenprogramma Nederlands aan het referentiekader taal. Secties Nederlands staan nu voor de opgave de referentieniveaus (3F voor havo en 4F voor vwo) te verwerken in de opgaven, toetsen en beoordelingsmodellen van het schoolexamen; ze hebben daarom bijzondere interesse in de vraag hoe andere scholen het schoolexamen Nederlands inkleuren. De vraag 'Hoe ziet het schoolexamen Nederlands op havo en vwo er uit?' staat centraal in dit artikel.

Om een antwoord te krijgen op de vraag 'Hoe ziet het schoolexamen Nederlands op havo en vwo er uit?', heeft SLO een digitale enquête uitgezet, onder meer via de vakcommunity Nederlands van kennisnet.nl. De enquête is tussen oktober 2011 en januari 2012 door in totaal 254 respondenten ingevuld: 70 res- pondenten voor havo (28%), 68 voor vwo (27%), 116 voor havo en vwo (45%). Als elke respondent voor een afzonderlijke school zou staan, zou bijna de helft van de scholen in dit onderzoek zijn vertegenwoordigd. Maar dit is niet zeker. Niet uit te sluiten is dat meerdere docenten van één school de vragenlijst hebben beantwoord. Over schoolgrootte, denominatie of demografie van de respondenten zijn geen gegevens verzameld. Over de representativiteit van de gegevens uit deze enquête voor alle Nederlandse scholen valt dus slechts te speculeren. De uitslag van de enquête geeft echter wel een indicatie van de wijze waarop veel secties met verschillende aspecten van het schoolexamenprogramma lijken om te gaan.

Eerder onderzoek

Voor zover wij weten is dit de eerste keer sinds het themanummer van MOER uit 1987 over schoolonderzoeken (Buys e.a., 1987) dat er een poging is gedaan de praktijk van het schoolexamen Nederlands in havo en vwo in kaart te brengen. Dat themanummer ging vooraf aan de instelling