

HALL TICKET NUMBER

Maximum Marks: 70

**ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS – 2019**  
(Ph.D. Admissions - January 2020 Session)

**Ph.D. English**

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Do **not** reveal your identity in any manner on the **OMR** sheet or answer book.
2. Enter your **Hall Ticket Number** on the **Question Paper**, the **OMR** sheet and the **answer book**.
3. This question paper consists of **two** sections:

**Part A** consists of Multiple-Choice Questions in Research Methodology and must be answered in the **OMR** sheet. Each question carries **1 (ONE)** Mark. **0.33** marks will be deducted for every wrong answer. No marks will be deducted for questions not attempted. **Part A** carries **35 (THIRTY FIVE)** marks.

**Part B** must be answered in the answer book provided, and requires you to write an essay **and** a critical analysis of the given passages. The essay carries **15 (FIFTEEN)** marks and the critical analysis carries **20 (TWENTY)** marks. **Part B** carries **35 (THIRTY FIVE)** marks.

This question paper contains **11 (ELEVEN)** printed pages.

4. At the end of the examination return the **OMR** sheet and the **answer book**.

[Turn to Page 2 for PART A]

V-72

**PART A****Research Methodology****(1x35 = 35 marks)**

1. Match the following correctly:

- |                 |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| I. non sequitur | a. and others         |
| II. op.cit.     | b. it does not follow |
| III. et al.     | c. in the same place  |
| IV. ibid.       | d. in the work cited  |

The correctly matched series would be:

- A. I.-b, II.- d, III.- a, IV.- c  
 B. I.-c, II.- d, III.- a, IV.- a  
 C. I.-a, II.- d, III.- b, IV.- c  
 D. I.-b, II.- a, III.- a, IV.- b

2. The main heading of an Index entry in a book is normally -----.

- A. An abstract noun  
 B. A qualifying word  
 C. A noun or a noun phrase  
 D. An obscure reference

3. When you make a substantive claim about a writer's works in your doctoral dissertation, which one of the following would be prudent to assume?

- A. Every claim is always subject to conditions  
 B. Every claim will have its substantive merits  
 C. No claim is absolutely substantive in any case  
 D. Some claims are more substantive than others

4. When you marshal textual evidence in a dissertation, it is expected that you also offer -----.

- I. arguments that might challenge its veracity  
 II. reasons for marshalling such evidence  
 III. evidence marshalled by other scholars  
 IV. the grounds for what counts as evidence

- A. I and II  
 B. II and III  
 C. II and IV  
 D. III and IV

5. As a researcher, what role do you think most appropriate for yourself to assume?
- Of someone who knows what others need to know, and to cast your reader as someone who doesn't know but needs to
  - Of someone who does not know what others need to know, and to cast your reader as someone who knows more than you do
  - Of someone who neither knows what others need to know, nor as one who knows more than what readers need to know
  - Of someone who knows what others need to know, but one who casts your reader as someone who knows just about enough
6. The most helpful bibliographical databases include details of publications such as:
- Indices
  - Reprint rights
  - Author biographies
  - Abstracts
7. Respectable publishers of English books provide bibliographical data for each title:
- on the back of its title page
  - on the dust jacket of books
  - as part of their blurbs
  - as cataloguing information
8. Academic books published in the US will invariably carry the publishing data of -----.
- the Union Catalogue of Books and Periodicals
  - the Modern Library of America
  - the Library of Congress
  - the New York Public Library
9. Good researchers prefer the use of printed and (C) authenticated primary texts to copies posted on the internet because:
- The internet copies are so often inaccurately reproduced.
  - The printed copies have the advantage of primacy and precedence.
  - The print is easier to access than the fly-by-night websites.
  - The internet texts sometimes violate the author's copyright.
- I and II are correct
  - I and IV are correct
  - II and III are correct
  - III and IV are correct
10. In a critical or bibliographical source you consult, if you see some names appearing so often, and repeatedly *passim*, that is a sure sign of -----.
- the outmoded practice of their scholarship
  - those scholars' reputation in the field
  - those scholars' expertise in the field
  - the supersession of their kind of scholarship

11. Faced with an incredibly large amount of disparate resources for the study of a subject, what principles ought to guide your select reading of critical and scholarly sources?
- accessibility and ease
  - reliability and relevance
  - concision and currency
  - scope and adaptability
12. Good researchers will always be circumspect in dealing with multiple sources. It is necessary therefore to guard themselves against the bias of -----.
- Going after easily understood ideas and theories
  - Overlooking texts/ arguments that qualify or contradict one's arguments
  - Overemphasizing their preferred themes and ideas
  - Going after fashionable theories and theorists that find favour with readers
13. Which one of the following methods should you adopt in fairly surveying the scholarship in your research?
- Scrupulously analyse and represent the argument of available scholarship
  - Report details of available scholarship inaccurately, in a biased manner
  - Offer cursory summary and your conclusions of available scholarship
  - Insistently if ignorantly criticize all or some parts of available scholarship
14. While preparing a bibliography of printed books, we list the following: author, title (including the subtitle if any), editor(s), volume, place of publication, publisher, and date of publication.
- What may have been missing on this list?
- (C) page
  - Index
  - Hard/ paper/ soft copy
  - Edition
15. Arguments are sometimes trickier than most other things in a dissertation. For the readers/ evaluators of a dissertation want to ascertain whether:
- the conclusions of the study proceed logically from the candidate's own arguments
  - the conclusions of the study have been drawn from the candidate's sources
  - the sources cited are all authentic or spurious with reference to arguments
  - the conclusions logically precede the arguments in the light of sources cited *passim*
16. Careful scholars acknowledge the limitations of their claims (that not all readers of *Finnegans Wake* respond equally to *all* Joycean effects, for example). How do they indicate the limitations of their substantive claims?
- by citing exceptions to the rule in a foot-/ end-note
  - desisting from making any substantive claims at all
  - by deploying discreet hedges in appropriate places
  - citing convincing authority in support of their claims

17. Identify the statement that shows a correct reading of the following:

*Contradiction is an opposition between "this" and "not-this." Only one of the two can obtain at once; only one half of a contradiction can be true at once. A contrariety, on the other hand, is an opposition between two poles that describe a spectrum or difference of degrees. A single entity—your body, say—can be a little of both at once.*

- A. "Hot"/"cold" represents contradiction in absolute sense
- B. "True"/"false" is an example of a contradiction. "Hot"/"cold" is an example of a contrariety
- C. "True"/"false" represents opposition between two poles
- D. "True"/"false" is an example of a contrariety. "Hot"/"cold" is an example of a contradiction

Questions 18 to 21 are based on the following passage.

The use of a term like *appropriate* is mystificatory because it seems to rest on functional criteria when really the criteria can only be normative. It misleadingly suggests that certain ways of speaking just *are* more appropriate, that they simply 'work better' than the alternatives in a given situation, and this glosses over the crucial question, what *makes* a way of speaking appropriate?

Why, for example, is it appropriate to use standard rather than non-standard English in a job interview? A common answer makes use of ostensibly functional criteria: it is appropriate to use standard English in a job interview because in an interview your goal is to impress, and standard English is more impressive than non-standard English. And why is standard English more impressive than non-standard English? Research on attitudes has shown it is associated with such qualities as competence, intelligence and prestige, which are (understandably) more impressive than their opposites. Furthermore, people generally associate standard English with 'correct' English, and this association in turn derives from the fact that standard English is the dialect of a certain class of people. Thus the judgement of standard English as 'appropriate' turns out to rest on the same linguistically arbitrary basis as the judgement of it as 'correct.' It is, in effect, the exact same judgement dressed up in functional terms which lend it a spurious air of objectivity.

*Appropriate* is supposed to be less prescriptive as well as more objective than *correct*, but the effect of substituting it, ironically, is less to suggest that 'anything goes' than to reify the norms we currently happen to have, however illogical or unjust they may be. Most linguists believe, for instance, that the characterization of non-standard English as 'incorrect' or 'bad' English is arbitrary and mistaken, and that prescriptions or judgements based on this characterization are therefore illogical and unjust. Yet once we have recast such judgements in the language of the 'appropriateness' they become much more difficult to contest. If it is hard to convince people of the proposition that standard English is not in fact better linguistically than non-standard, it is impossible to convince them of the proposition that it is not more appropriate at a job interview; for the latter proposition is simply untrue.

18. This passage emphasizes that:
- A. The use of *appropriate* in everyday English is nothing but normative
  - B. The use of *appropriate* in everyday English is nothing but functional
  - C. The use of *appropriate* in everyday English is nothing but arbitrary
  - D. The use of *appropriate* in everyday English is nothing but situational
19. Which of the following statements correctly reflects the burden of thought here?
- A. Adjectives such as *appropriate* and *correct* are relative but may still be considered linguistically tenable
  - B. Descriptions such as *appropriate* and *correct* are not quite accurate and therefore linguistically permissive
  - C. Adjectives such as *appropriate* and *correct* are arbitrary and therefore linguistically untenable
  - D. Descriptions such as *appropriate* and *correct* are quite accurate and therefore linguistically admissible
20. Which of the following words shares semantic affinity with *appropriate*?
- A. prior
  - B. approximate
  - C. proper
  - D. apportionable
21. What is "the latter proposition" of the last line of the passage?
- A. Standard English is not better linguistically than non-standard
  - B. The language of the 'appropriateness' is difficult to contest
  - C. Standard English is not more appropriate at a job interview
  - D. Standard English is better linguistically than non-standard
22. If you are interested in Rhetoric, Composition, or general writing practices and exercises for teaching English, which of the following professional networks offers you information regarding such activities and opportunities for scholarly participation?
- A. H-Rhetor
  - B. CCC Network
  - C. Listserv Rhetoric
  - D. C E Network
23. A heuristic method involves-----.
- A. Finding a perfect solution to a problem
  - B. Finding a satisfactory solution to a problem
  - C. Adding a detour to the solution
  - D. Adding an open-ended question to the solution

24. The journal *New Literary History* is brought out by-----.
- Johns Hopkins University Press
  - Ohio University Press
  - Chicago University Press
  - Harvard University Press
25. In Film, Media, Visual Analysis and other related fields, studying the pleasures of looking is an important method of analysis. Which of the following alludes to the pleasures of looking?
- Ocularphilia
  - Augophilia
  - Sensophilia
  - Scopophilia
26. Postmodernism foregrounds -----.
- High culture
  - Heterogeneity
  - Homogenisation
  - Totalism
27. 'Green living experiments' is increasingly becoming a major area of interest in -----.
- Ecosemantics
  - Neo socialism
  - Social ontology
  - Biosocial theory
28. Citation analysis is a sub field of -----.
- Bibliology
  - Bibliometrics
  - Citology
  - Citometrics
29. A subscription journal with select open access articles is called a/an ----- journal
- Hybrid journal
  - Mixed journal
  - Semi-open journal
  - Allied journal
30. Identify the Journal:  
 "-----examines the social, cultural, cognitive, political and technological shifts affecting how, what and why individuals, groups and societies remember, and forget."
- Health Studies*
  - Memory Studies*
  - Holocaust Studies*
  - Slavery Studies*

31. In \_\_\_\_\_, the choice of “research approach is too often seen as a choice of methodology rather than method.”
- Oral Narratives
  - Quantitative analysis
  - Qualitative analysis
  - None of the above
32. The journals indexed in which source list/publication hasn't been recognised by UGC-CARE as of date?
- Web of Science
  - Scopus
  - Google Scholar
  - All of the above
33. Research gap is—
- Research question or problem which has not been answered appropriately
  - Research question or problem which existed earlier but no longer exists
  - Research question or problem which is not of much importance
  - Research question or problem that literature review contains
34. Standards of reliability and relevance are very hard to determine in the matter of secondary sources for your study. Nevertheless, currency of a source is a safe guide its standard. How do we check the currency of sources in our special area of research?
- By looking at the dates of published sources listed in the Works Cited
  - By seeking the opinion of your Supervisor
  - By looking up the latest journals in the field
  - By asking subject experts for help in selection of latest articles
35. Identify from the following, the most trustworthy conclusions a reader might draw from this passage:
- However, like other critics of Fish's position (Lyon 1992; Nowachek 2009), we do not see outsidersness as essential for critical engagement; moreover, we see distinctions between disciplines as fluid, permeable, and shifting horizons rather than redrawn, even blurred, demarcations.
- Fish's position, while respectable, has its critics. The author counts herself to be one among them.
  - The “we” of this passage is an inclusive *we*, among whom we might find some readers as well.
  - It is pretty clear from this passage where Fish stands in the matter of “critical engagement” and why.
  - The passage invites readers to endorse the author's view about the permeability of disciplines.
- Only a
  - a b d
  - b c d
  - Only c

## Part B

### Essay (15 marks)

Write an essay on any **ONE** of the following topics. Your essay will be evaluated on the basis of your cohesive argument and the range of texts and illustrative material you draw upon.

1. Dalit Diaspora
2. Kitchen-sink Realism
3. Creating Transnational Identities in Literature
4. End of Democracy: Silencing dissent in academia
5. New Technologies and Reading Practices
6. Celebrity Culture/Studies
7. Canon of the Popular Culture
8. The Literary Market
9. Literature and Religion
10. British vs. European Literatures

### Passage for Analysis (20 marks)

Apart from the fact that Political Correctness (PC) is an invention of opponents who have irreconcilable differences about the social life of language, what other significant aspects of the phenomenon do the two following passages address? Do you think they also raise other questions? If so, what are they? How do they read PC differently? Elaborate.

#### PASSAGE 1

Did you know *nitty-gritty* was a racially charged word? Apparently it has unpleasant origins in a slave ship. To many people, political correctness seems like a tripwire laid across language, you never know what innocent word will get you into trouble. You called a female friend *hysterical*? Didn't you know that means a disease of the womb and has been used to deny and silence women?

Political correctness is a familiar punching bag. To people who haven't experienced any systematic exclusion, it can seem that others are quibbling over words and exaggerating their injuries. Some have a more fundamental opposition. They reject the very effort to include everyone and make sure nobody feels small. All group-based labels aren't equally bad— if there is no real difference in their social power, a Punjabi family's mean jokes about 'Madrasis' are not damaging. You can joke with and about your friend. The sting of a word lies in its context and social effects. Would you want to be contemptuously called 'Pāki' in a white majority nation, or would your sensitivity be justified? For some people, group identity imposes a tax, it limits their lives— think of casteist slurs, or Islamophobic stereotypes, or stubborn associations around women. Subordinated groups are intimately aware of the power of words. They know

how language shapes thought. Think of the word *bahujan* and its force, or *ādivāsi* which carries a moral legitimacy that a word like *vanavāsi* doesn't.

Why should anyone mind if others describe why they feel alienated by certain words? That's all there is to political correctness— making room for others, shedding the default norms of privilege. Those who say free speech allows one to be offensive so grow a thicker skin, etc. are missing the point. Free speech also allows someone who's routinely humiliated to say, *Stop it!* Or someone else to say *Shut it down!* That is not a suffocating closure of debate. It makes for a discourse where everyone can participate. In fact, many who claim to feel policed by political correctness, who are upset because they can't use the old familiar slurs, are the very people who try to silence everyone with their spurious nationalism, who yell theatrically about imagined insults to their leaders.

Any movement towards the recognition of equality is rocky, any challenge to dominant order is registered as an affront. A man, bossed around by other men, feels his only power threatened by his wife's lack of submission. This impulse to lash out isn't alien to most of us; as a child, I remember feeling violent rage at my little sister's 'insolence.' The first unpleasant shock may be understandable, but the second reaction, as adults, is to hear others, try to see where they are coming from. Then you either carry on with the name calling, or you choose better words.

When well-meaning people complain about political correctness, it could be because those calling them out make no distinction between ignorance and deliberate bigotry. For instance, a friend used to say 'Oriental' to describe others from the north-east— all it took was someone pointing out that it was a racial and ridiculous term for someone from Uttar Pradesh to use. We did not all grow up knowing about *cis-het* and ableist assumptions— explaining these things simply is important. There are many things that people with social advantages are screened from knowing and educating them is not anyone else's duty. For some utter radicals, though, there is only conflict; there is no possibility of mutual understanding. That doesn't help.

It boils down to this. If we care about civic respect, we can't help but notice troubling words and assumptions. It is not about trendy terminology or virtue signalling, but the need to include. If you think everyone is of equal worth, then it is not a big deal or great effort to adjust your vocabulary accordingly.

## PASSAGE 2

Those of us familiar with the debate on 'political correctness' will often find themselves in the position of the bewildered Alice trying to pin down Humpty Dumpty's philosophy of language in *Through the Looking Glass*. Humpty Dumpty first tells Alice that when he uses a word, it means whatever he chooses it to mean. This reflects a common-sense assumption about the primacy of speaker intentions, but Humpty Dumpty's illustration of it (an absurd claim that *glory* means 'a nice knock-down argument') draws attention to the inherent problem. Accordingly, Alice questions whether meaning can be determined by individual volition; how would we communicate if everyone acted like Humpty Dumpty? There surely must be limits on what words can be made to mean. Humpty Dumpty moves in for the kill. The crucial question,

he says, is one of power: 'Who's to be master?' This remark is usually read as meaning or implying 'Who's to be master, the people or the words? Do we control language or does it control us?' But Alice might also read Humpty Dumpty's words to mean, 'Who's to be master, me or you?'

Both these versions of the question— and a certain real or strategic confusion between them— recur in discussions of 'politically correct' language. Sometimes the contestants behave like Humpty Dumpty talking to Alice: radicals charge that a certain word is, say, 'racist;' their critics indignantly deny this on the grounds that when they use the word they do not intend to be racist, and accuse the radicals of 'reading things in.' At other times, the critics stress that words *do* have meanings independent of speakers' intentions in using them, and that 'political correctness' precisely perverts those time-honoured meanings. It is therefore an attack on the language, and on the possibility of communication. The radicals respond like Humpty Dumpty at the end of the exchange, by posing the question of power: 'And who has traditionally "owned" this precious language? In whose image have its meanings been made?'

The struggle over 'politically correct' language can certainly be apprehended partly as a straightforward contest about 'who's to be master' in the second, 'you or me?' sense: the issue is to decide which set of values will be affirmed symbolically in the language of public discourse. The proponents of non-sexist and non-racist language are insisting that certain values (feminist and multiculturalist) should prevail; their opponents represent this as an attack on freedom of expression (and sometimes even freedom of thought). Such resistance is in part a sign of adherence to a different set of values. Opposition to politically motivated language change is not fuelled by hostility to feminism or multiculturalism or whatever, but in many cases reflects a second and deeper level of disturbance to people's common-sense notions of language.

The new politically motivated verbal hygiene practices assume that language is not just a medium for ideas but a shaper of ideas; that it is always and inevitably political; and that the 'truth' someone speaks may be relative to the power they hold. This set of assumptions, rather than the mere intention to substitute one set of terms for another, is what makes the question of 'politically correct' language so explosive. The crisis precipitated by recent verbal hygiene developments is not only what it might appear to be, or what it is usually represented as: a crisis of cultural values. It is also a crisis for the common-sense theories of meaning to which most language-users (including some of the reformers) subscribe.

\*\*\*\*\*