

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 102

CS 200 285

AUTHOR Stryker, David, Ed.
TITLE Educating the Teacher of English: Selected Addresses
Delivered at the Conference on English Education
(3rd, University of Kentucky, March 18-20, 1965).
INSTITUTION National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign,
Ill.
PUB DATE 65
NOTE 65p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon
Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801 (Stock No. 17804, \$1.65
non-member, \$1.50 member)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Composition (Literary); Culturally Disadvantaged;
*Educational Research; Elementary School Teachers;
*English Instruction; Inservice Teacher Education;
Linguistics; Rhetoric; Secondary School Teachers;
Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Certification; *Teacher
Education; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher
Improvement; *Teacher Programs; Teaching Quality;
Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

The 10 addresses in this volume on teacher education illustrate the conference theme of combining the old with the new. Henry C. Meckel surveys what is good in the current preparation of English teachers, and Carl A. Lefevre and Father Daniel Fogarty discuss, respectively, the contributions of linguistic studies and of current thinking about rhetoric and composition to teacher education programs. The implications of the Conant studies for the teaching of English are presented by Jeremiah S. Finch. William E. Hoth surveys new educational tools relevant to the teaching of English, and William H. Evans outlines the organization, scope, and direction of the Illinois Statewide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET). Needed reforms in the preparation of elementary and secondary school language arts teachers are described by Ruth G. Strickland and Sister M. Phillippa Coogan. Robert E. Lewis presents the problems of teaching English to the culturally disadvantaged, and Don Davies concludes with a discussion of national trends in teacher education. (This document previously announced as d 023 686.) (LH)

ED 070102

EDUCATING THE TEACHER OF ENGLISH

Selected Addresses Delivered at the
THIRD CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

University of Kentucky
March 18-20, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

DAVID STRYKER
University of Florida
Editor

Program Co-Chairmen: J. N. HOOK, University of Illinois
WILLIAM H. EVANS, University of Illinois
Local Co-Chairmen: LIZETTE O. VAN GELDER, University of Kentucky
ALFRED L. CRABB, Jr., University of Kentucky

Standing Committee

Chairman: DWIGHT L. BURTON, Florida State University
Vice Chairman: ALFRED H. GROMMON, Stanford University
G. ROBERT CARLSEN, University of Iowa
MARGARET EARLY, Syracuse University
WILLIAM H. EVANS, University of Illinois
GEORGE H. HENRY, University of Delaware
J. N. HOOK, University of Illinois
ARNO JEWETT, United States Office of Education
STANLEY B. KEGLER, University of Minnesota
RICHARD A. MEADE, University of Virginia
ROBERT C. POOLEY, University of Wisconsin
RUTH G. STRICKLAND, Indiana University

Editor: DAVID STRYKER, University of Florida
Assistant Editor: SHIRLEY CARRIAR, Colorado State College
Secretary-Treasurer: JAMES R. SQUIRE, NCTE and University of Illinois

National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois 61822

CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
DAVID STRYKER	
What's <i>Right</i> in Our Preparation of English Teachers.....	1
HENRY C. MECKEL	
Contributions of Linguistics to Teacher Education Programs.....	10
CARL A. LEFEVRE	
Contributions of Current Thinking about Rhetoric and Composition to Teacher Education Programs.....	17
FATHER DANIEL FOGARTY	
Implications of the Conant Studies for the Teaching of English.....	22
JEREMIAH S. FINCH	
New Educational Tools Relevant to the Teaching of English	29
WILLIAM E. HOTI	
ISCPET: New Dimensions in Research.....	34
WILLIAM H. EVANS	
If I Had My Way: Needed Reforms in Preparation of Elementary School Language Arts Teachers.....	38
RUTH G. STRICKLAND	
If I Had My Way: Needed Reforms in Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers	42
SISTER M. PHILLIPPA COOGAN	
English and the Culturally Disadvantaged.....	48
ROBERT E. LEWIS	
National Trends in Teacher Education	56
DON DAVIES	
Program Planning Committee	62

INTRODUCTION

More than three hundred specialists in English education attended the March, 1965, meeting at the University of Kentucky which formally established the Conference on English Education as a permanent organization within the National Council of Teachers of English. Delegates to the third annual conference, from thirty-four of the United States and two Canadian provinces, heard speakers in five general sessions and at a banquet and a luncheon. The discussions which followed each of the general sessions proved the worth of the topics that the program chairmen had selected.

The usefulness of printing a number of the conference talks may be two-fold: (1) Those who heard the talks can read the text and recall the discussion; those who did not hear the talks can read the text and deliberate thereon. (2) The talks offer seminal ideas needing discussion by English education professors, by their students in English education classes, and by elementary, secondary, and college teachers in faculty meetings, workshops, and conferences.

Language and literature—in the curriculum and in life—are as basic to the communicative process between human beings as they ever were, recent technological advances in communicative media notwithstanding. How to combine the new with the old was the theme of the Lexington conference at which these talks were delivered: *New Lamps with Old*—for the enlightenment of students and teachers.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY

National Council of
Teachers of English

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE
OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION
OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PER-
MISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Copyright 1965
National Council of Teachers of English

Opening Address

WHAT'S RIGHT IN OUR PREPARATION OF ENGLISH TEACHERS

Henry C. Meckel, San Jose State College

You and I are living at a time of great vitality in education. During recent months impressive educational developments have occurred in this nation. In a period of history when the entire country has engaged in a great debate over public education—and will, in fact, continue to do so—we are beginning to see a mobilization of support and effort in behalf of education that holds great promise for the future. Never before in the history of our country have we in English education had so much to look forward to.

During the next century, when the educational history of our own times is written, I believe that this decade will be regarded as a period when the basic democratic values of American education were reaffirmed. I would expect that these years will have their significance in the fact that the great debate over the schools developed in the American people a heightened sense of the importance of public education, that it created an awareness of the relation of education to the economic growth and prosperity of the nation, that it associated educational opportunity with the more basic aspects of the civil rights movement, and that it formed in the minds of lay people a deepened conception of the importance of the teacher. I believe that our decade will be notable, also, as a period when literacy and competencies in English language skills became clearly associated with cultural, economic, and educational opportunity—a time when the importance of English to the interest and welfare of our country became clearly enough understood to receive the legislative attention of the President and the Congress. President Johnson, in his inaugural address, associated the idea of the Great Society with both the quality of education and with educational opportunity. It seems to me that at this conference it is appropriate to recall that the President came not from a prestige campus or from one of the great state universities but from a college dedicated to teacher education.

In considering what is right with the preparation of our teachers, I would like you first to consider certain matters related to recent federal legislation. The total educational environment is of great significance today. I have already referred to the affirmation of basic educational values. During recent years, many of us in English education may have had the uneasy feeling that we were moving toward the abandonment of our traditional commitment to universal education. As the attention of the country turned to the education of university preparatory students, to the development of advanced placement programs, and to programs for gifted young people, it may have sometimes appeared to us that in our deep desire for better education for the college preparatory student we were moving in the direction of a two-class system of education. Three great pieces of federal legislation have reestablished our basic orientations and reassured us concerning the future directions of American education: the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the amendments last year to

the National Defense Education Act. The Vocational Education Act has highlighted the educational problems related to the nonbaccalaureate students. We, by the way, need to give serious consideration to the quality of English instruction they require. The Economic Opportunity Act has focussed interest on the relation of literacy and English language skills to employability. NDEA legislation has turned the attention of the country to the most basic problem of democratic education: the improvement of the classroom experiences in essential academic subjects of those pupils who have been the most difficult to teach. The availability of federal funds for this purpose is therefore the greatest positive factor in teacher education today and the greatest educational achievement in the history of the American people. As long as NDEA provided assistance only to mathematics, science, and foreign languages, it mainly benefited the college preparatory students in our schools. With the addition of English and social studies, assistance became extended to the subjects that are required of all pupils throughout their entire public school experience. Provisions for reading, for the culturally disadvantaged, and for instructional materials make the act a piece of legislation preeminently concerned with teaching and teaching methods. For us, the significance of NDEA lies in the fact that it is legislation concerned with English education.

One result of this federal legislation is that it is apparently going to force us to reconsider the definition of our subject. During the last few years, concurrent with the efforts to improve the high school English curriculum of university preparatory students, attempts have been made to formulate a new definition of public school English instruction. Considerable consensus developed around the definition of English as instruction in language, literature, and composition. This trivium, it has been argued, constitutes what is *essential* in English. Federal legislation appears to be forcing us toward a new orientation. In Washington the trivium seems to have been recognized as not comprehensive enough to serve as a definition for federal legislation that seeks to improve the English instruction not only of the more capable students in our schools, but of those whose culture and environment have not provided educational opportunity, those who lack reading proficiency, those for whom English is a second language, and those for whom the learning of English skills has been and still is a seriously frustrating and unpleasant process. Certainly the trivium tends not to direct our thinking toward the oral aspects of language, which linguists would see as essential in our approach to English usage, in teaching the culturally deprived, in teaching reading, or in instructing those for whom English is a second language. The trivium has encouraged the idea, especially among those who are inclined to be congenial to it, that the teaching of reading—at least at lower levels of skill—is not really English teaching at all. It is, of course, possible to put forward strong arguments for this point of view. If we hold it, however, the consequences for American education are very great. Not only the nature of English is at stake in the issue but the very future of public education.

How we define English has a great deal to do with what we consider to be essential in the preparation of teachers of English. I am encouraged, therefore, by developments that invite us to remember that English as a subject in the public

schools is a more comprehensive area than is English at the division level of the college. It is English at the lower division level which the trivium most aptly describes.

Every development that affects teacher education at the inservice level exerts an indirect influence on the preparation of beginning teachers. The resident classroom teacher has always been influential in determining the effectiveness of teacher education. The opportunity to work under the supervision of a good teacher has always been the one aspect of teacher education that has been strongest. We should, in the future, have supervising teachers who are increasingly competent. I think that we are going to see, in the years directly ahead, a great resurgence of interest among teachers in problems of instruction. We shall find more teachers in our schools who have had advanced coursework in English, more who have acquired additional understanding of the English language, more who have had advanced work in rhetoric and composition. I believe that NDEA will dramatically emphasize to teachers, to administrators, and to the public a new standard of academic preparation, and that never again will we be satisfied with preparation that falls below this standard. I would expect that classroom teachers will learn a great deal that will be new in teaching language skills at the preschool and elementary school levels, that the teaching of English at intermediate grade levels will be very much improved, that we shall have a more adequate curriculum developed at junior high school grades, and that more high school English departments will contain teachers with confidence in their ability to teach reading skills. I believe, too, that colleges and universities will be stimulated to review their programs of teacher education and make improvements responsive to new curricula and instructional changes in the schools.

It is, of course, early to guess at the direct results of the first summer institutes of NDEA and the indirect influences of these institutes on the preparation of English teachers, especially through student teaching experiences. Examining the list released from Washington, I count 105 institutes in English and 44 in reading. One hundred twenty other institutes may have significant relationships to English education. There are 66 dealing with special problems of disadvantaged children and youth; 28 concerned with educational media and teaching materials; 26 for librarians. Generally I am impressed by the scope of the program. The English institutes will be held in 40 states; reading, in 32. More attention in the future should be given to the English program of the elementary school. Fifty-five institutes are designed for teachers from grades 7-12; 32 more for grades 9-12. Five cover the entire curriculum, grades 1-12. Only 5 of the English institutes, however, are specifically related to the elementary school.

The effectiveness of institutes is not to be measured by the number of institutes alone. State departments of education, the federal government, and national and state professional organizations are likely to increase the influence of the program through dissemination of materials and by the use of participants as resource people.

As one looks over the names of institutions which have received grants, one is gratified by the number of state universities which are participating in the pro-

gram. Sixty percent of the institutes in English are being sponsored by departments of English; 32 percent are being sponsored cooperatively by departments of education and departments of English. Actually it matters little which departments administer an institute. What does matter is the extent to which the best resources of an institution are utilized. It is evident, from the figures which I have just quoted, that English departments are feeling a growing commitment to public education and that in the NDEA institute program, they are cooperating with departments of education in a way that scarcely would have been anticipated several years ago.

As a result of NDEA legislation and the projects receiving support from the Cooperative Research Program, we are perceiving a development of interest in learning problems related to English language skills. This has been an interest that has always been dominant among people with responsibilities for English education and a phase of teacher education that has always been *right*. We should be encouraged, I believe, by indications that courses in the psychology of learning may become more specifically related to content areas. Recently at one of our universities I came across the following description of a course in the psychology of learning: "A study of the relationship of basic learning processes to areas of reading, the acquisition of language, the use of creativity in problem solving, and the formation of mathematical and verbal concepts." This would seem to me to be a highly desirable emphasis from the point of view of teacher preparation. Opportunities to incorporate into our programs a more effective approach to learning depend on the extent to which we have chances to develop model curricular structures and to produce learning materials to implement them. We shall now have more opportunities of this kind. As a result, it will be possible to have research in learning that can be more substantial and thorough.

I consider as especially important to teacher education the current interest in sequence in learning; the search for the essential structural principles of a subject; for the instructional patterns that promote cumulative growth in concepts and skills, and that encourage growth and independence in performance. For this reason I regard as of great significance the kind of project represented by the model curriculum in English developed by George Hillocks and his staff at Euclid Junior High School in Cleveland. The following features of this project hold promise: the delineation of a theory of *learning* English, the development of curriculum patterns in accordance with this theory, the writing of sample units, the demonstration of the entire project in a school, the careful analysis and evaluation by the teaching staff of the *processes* of instruction and learning, and the use of the school for demonstration purposes. The very practical form of the units developed, the statements of the theory and principles of instruction, the attempts to formulate a unifying idea for the curriculum—all these phases suggest to us the kinds of materials that would have a high degree of significance for students in our professional courses who are studying processes of learning English.

I should like to mention next the emphasis being given in discussions of learning to learning by discovery. The starting point of all instruction in literature is

the nature of the student's encounter with the literary material, be it short story, novel, play, essay, or poem. What matters most is the *quality* of the experience which this encounter *becomes*. A significant aspect of such an experience educationally is the integrity of the aesthetic and intellectual reactions of the pupil. These are the result of the guidance and personalized teaching of a sensitive instructor and are seldom, if ever at all, imparted directly by lecturing. I mention this aspect of learning not only because it seems to me to be such an important item in good English education, but because developments in our schools require our attention to it. Experimentation with large classes and with lecture techniques used in most team teaching projects too often turns the attention of the teaching team away from the essential processes of learning English and obstructs the achievement of some of the most primary objectives of English instruction: the development of critical reading, good reading habits, desirable patterns of appreciation, and critical judgment. I cannot see how lecturing can develop the skills of interpretation, judgment, and defense of opinions that are required of students by the end-of-year examinations, for example, unless the students have already acquired such skills through living in homes where a literary environment fosters the behaviors required. It is gratifying to see, therefore, evidence of interest in discovery, inquiry, and independence in learning and in theories of learning which recognize the mind of a child or the mind of an adolescent as a dynamic element in a dynamic process and not as a passive kind of receptive intellect that can always be programed and structured, lectured to, or told how to respond to a piece of literature. We have been essentially right in our methods courses, I believe, when we have given emphasis to teaching procedures based on the dynamics of children's or adolescents' responses to literature. We have been on firm ground when we have stressed the importance of starting with a pupil's *honest* responses. Once we accept honesty in response, we have the foundation for developing critical insight in which independent perception and discovery are essential characteristics.

One of the most critical elements in the preparation of teachers is the experiences that give student teachers understandings about the responses and learning problems of pupils. I therefore place high value on activities in English education that require our teacher trainees to work with individual pupils, coaching in reading skills, guiding free reading or discussing books, discussing particular pieces of literature, or talking over papers in which critical opinions are developed and substantiated. I favor practices which require trainees to keep logs or diary records of their sessions with students and to use such records in clinical discussions with other trainees. Such activities seem to contribute to an understanding of patterns of individual learning which seldom result from observation of a teacher, the experience of teaching an entire class, or internships that involve entire days of teaching. The latter experiences should follow individual and small group experiences of the kind I have described.

For this reason I regard, as examples of good practice, programs that encourage tutoring experiences of all kinds. I have heard Professor Durreil of Boston University report that pupils from culturally deprived areas of a community are brought regularly by bus to tutoring in remedial reading by stu-

dents in his reading classes. I understand that at the University of Illinois there is experimentation with tutoring for pupils who need help with writing. I am impressed with the possibilities in volunteer programs where young men and women donate their time to study centers in culturally disadvantaged areas or assist particular schools with tutoring programs before or after school or on Saturdays.

It has been a great step forward to speak of the "continuing education" of teachers; more than a change of terminology is at stake. The specific skills that make up the complex structure called "teaching skill" can not be acquired at once; they require development over a period of time that is longer than we usually recognize and provide for. In this connection I should like to refer to the new program for the secondary credential at Stanford University. The principles underlying this program seem to me to suggest *right* directions.

All phases of a fifth-year professional program at Stanford are extended over four quarters, beginning in the summer and ending in the following spring. Each quarter, in addition to academic work of from three to five units, a student has work in English methods, educational foundations, secondary education, and laboratory experiences in teaching. We may think of the program, therefore, as one in which each component has continuity in time over a year and a sequence that is integrated with all the others.

In the summer quarter, methods are taught in a three-unit course covering the English curriculum: the teaching of language, composition, literature, and reading, and unit construction. In each succeeding quarter, methods receive additional attention in a one-unit course, meeting two hours once a week during the fall and winter quarters and one hour once a week during the spring. Grammar and composition receive further emphasis in the fall; reading and literature in the winter. In the spring there is a return of attention to curriculum problems in English. Psychological foundations of education are stressed in the summer and autumn, sociological foundations in the winter, and historical or philosophical foundations in the spring. This arrangement allows for a designed sequence in learning theory.

All during the year, as I have indicated, students in this program are having experiences teaching, but the progression of these experiences is from simple to complex—through an instructional laboratory in the summer and through a partial internship during the autumn, winter, and spring quarters. During the summer quarter the candidates for credentials plan lessons and teach groups of five students for short periods of time—approximately fifteen times during the summer. This teaching, called "microteaching," is supervised, and kinescopes are made of it for purposes of discussion. Candidates also have tutoring sessions twice a week throughout the summer with a slow-learning pupil. Stanford students in this program have bachelor's degrees; moreover, they are carefully selected and must have a B- average. The tutoring of a pupil who has difficulties in learning is therefore regarded as a very important part of the experiences of the teacher trainee, who is likely to be a person for whom learning has always been relatively easy. English student teachers have an opportunity to become acquainted with the special reading problems at this time.

In planning such a program, a staff must give attention not just to the content of courses but to a total learning process. Instructors must consider how concepts and skills can best be learned in this total experience, which extends over a year. The professional coursework must be examined not only in terms of the relations among the courses, but in terms of *progressive* contributions to the development of a set of concepts that will give the student teacher better understanding of his student teaching experiences.

The Stanford program appears to me to illustrate many principles that are *right* in teacher preparation. It recognizes a time element in the learning of teaching skills; it attempts to make specific provisions for continuity in all phases of the program; it seeks to move the student through a sequence that progresses from simple to complex; it attempts to illuminate this sequence continuously with concepts and principles from campus professional courses; it shows a constant concern for the integration of all phases of the student's experiences.

In addition, the Stanford program is based on the recognition of a fact that deserves a great deal more consideration in teacher education; namely, that an internship involving a full teaching program has undesirable features. Too much teaching cannot be carefully planned and critically examined by the beginning teachers because demands for *good* performance are too heavy. I find this argument convincing. It is my belief that the idea of a limited supervised teaching experience involving one or two classes is an essentially *right* procedure in the education of a beginning teacher. A full internship tends to result in an unenlightened teacher who misses opportunities for careful planning and experimentation.

The Stanford program represents another principle which I believe to be sound in teacher education—the idea that the scope of the program has to be limited and the focus of it sharpened. Stanford attempts, at the secondary level, to provide instructional experience only in the field of the major. Students in English have professional experiences only in English. In this respect the program is in accord with Dr. Conant's recommendations. In California we have a five-year program for the education of both elementary and secondary teachers. In secondary education we are finding at my institution that while we can easily provide for the academic coursework required for the minor, we have difficulties developing professional competencies in two fields. We constantly discover that in attempting to provide for professional competencies in the minor, we are curtailing opportunities for additional coursework in the major. Can we today adequately prepare a beginning secondary teacher to acquire teaching skill in more than one academic field? I hope this problem receives considerable attention throughout this conference.

Traditionally we have made a distinction between professional courses and academic courses, associating courses in education with the former and courses in English with the latter. I like to feel that this method of thinking about teacher education is less common today than formerly. A promising phase of current curricular and learning theory is that subject matter is an essential "professional" item. As I have already suggested, we search for clues for organizing principles of the curriculum within the academic discipline. We are interested in research, not

just about child development in general, but in the *language* development of children. We attach a high degree of significance to the relation between linguistic knowledge and elementary reading instruction. We have high expectations that research in urban dialects will yield information and principles which will help us to teach children in urban centers of deprivation.

The essential relationship between academic background and courses in methods and learning is one that I am sure the people at this conference have always understood. One cannot teach methods or principles of learning as a subject to students who are weak in their understanding of the subject. It is essentially dishonest for us to regard a methods course as a place where we attempt to reinforce subject matter instruction or cover gaps in a student's knowledge. We know better. Too many of us have been dismayed by our failures to teach methods to teacher trainees who have been sent to us with meager backgrounds in the English language or no college work at all in grammar. Many of us are still wrestling with the problems of preparing teachers who have had no composition work beyond freshman English. In my own state a new credential law specifies that every candidate for a teaching credential, regardless of teaching field, must demonstrate ability in composition by taking an examination or by passing a course. Freshman English is still evidence of composition proficiency for this purpose, provided that the candidate has had another year of English in addition. My own department, moreover, still can not bring itself to require an advanced writing course of every English major planning to teach, though we follow the practice of strongly recommending such a course. We now require a course in modern English grammar and to strengthen background in language study, we are now proposing a minor in linguistics, which a student might take *in addition* to the English major for teachers. Let us regard as *right*, therefore, every slow advance to provide instruction in our English departments sufficient to provide the competencies required for teaching language and composition in public school classrooms today.

I would like to close my remarks with some further references to current educational developments. It seems important, as we consider the education of teachers of English, that we give careful attention to directions in which the Cooperative Research Program is moving. Judging by exploratory discussions in my own state and elsewhere, it appears that we may expect the formation of educational centers, cooperatively developed by the federal government as an educational foundation, and state departments of education, school districts, and colleges and universities. These centers would promote the planning of curriculum programs, the development of instructional materials, the demonstration of programs in cooperating schools, the study of learning processes as the programs are put into practice, and the testing and evaluation of results. What is most significant about these probable developments is that they suggest a level of cooperative effort and the utilization of educational resources far beyond what we would have thought possible a few years ago. They suggest that candidates for teaching credentials can look forward to opportunities for continued professional growth far richer and more extensive than those enjoyed by any other generation of student teachers. Every young man and woman who is going into

educational foundation, and state departments of education, school districts, and the teaching of English ought to be inspired by the prospects that lie ahead of him. It should be our mission to develop a sense of dedication in these young people and to give them guidance that will enable them to make the best use of their great opportunities.

It is my belief that our roles in the colleges with respect to teacher education are likely to change very much in the next decade. I expect colleges and universities to be much more involved in the continuing education of teachers than they have in the past. English education at inservice levels is likely to become increasingly advanced. I am expecting also that the position of the high school department chairman is likely to become increasingly important in teacher education at the secondary level. The best high school English departments today appear to be headed by men and women with advanced education in English and much experience in teaching, curriculum planning, and supervision. They are people well versed in the newest developments and practices. In the years ahead, I believe that the probationary period of teachers will be more and more thought of as part of the total process of teacher education. I expect that the English department head in secondary schools will be a key person in the professional growth of these probationary teachers.

I have tried to discuss what I believe to be right in teacher education in a context that includes our new opportunities. I have attempted to show that we cannot profitably talk about what is right in our preparation of teachers without first considering what is generally right in teacher education. A comprehensive glance at current developments gives us cause for great optimism. We are seeing American education as a whole again; our viewpoint is balanced and inclusive. Our commitment to our democratic traditions is restored without any loss of our recent gains in programs for our more privileged boys and girls. We are being forced to reconsider the nature of our subject as it is a subject in the public school curriculum for all kinds of pupils. All of us are being encouraged to work together in teacher education in behalf of the nation's welfare. We are paying greater attention to learning theory and methods of teaching. We are beginning to give more and more attention to learning as it is related to phases of language, more attention to learning sequences, and more attention to learning through discovery. We are viewing professional courses in new ways. We are realizing more and more that teacher education is a continuing process, with the inservice aspects of it more extended and developed. Not only are we making efforts to develop new programs; we see completely new possibilities as we contemplate the future.

Let us, then, be increasingly aware of the possibilities of our times. As we consider further what is right with the preparation of teachers of English, let us avoid, as much as we can, backward glances at the past and commitments to practices merely because they are familiar customs. Let us rather find what is right in the patterns of teacher education that are emerging out of current developments, and seek to identify the most creative and inventive approaches. We have been invited by the Congress and our President to take part in a great national educational endeavor. Let us play our roles with imagination and vision.

Second General Session

CONTRIBUTIONS OF LINGUISTICS TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Carl A. Lefevre, Illinois Teachers College Chicago (North)

English Education and the Renaissance Spirit

The bedrock of English teaching should be language—language as language—because language, rightly understood, can be the broadest and deepest of humanistic disciplines. Language and literature, with all they encompass to a modern mind, constitute an interdisciplinary field in themselves. This is the rich lode that we shall explore for contributions of linguistics to teacher education programs.

To me no subject is more vitally important, more difficult, more complex, more fascinating, than English education. The demands made upon English teachers at all grade levels require the spirit if not the attainments of the Renaissance man—but in an age characterized by a fantastic explosion of knowledge; by strict specializations, many of them unknown a generation ago; by rigorous scientific research; by team approaches to many problems. Can this seeming contradiction of the demand for broad generalism in an age of narrow specialism be resolved? Or is the Renaissance spirit extinct? Can twentieth century man learn all that he must know in his specialties and still remain an avid amateur of life, a generalist invigorated by the spirit of inquiry? Can existential man experience the *sense* of fresh discovery in many areas, if not actual discovery? Or is it all too late?

Modern teaching aims to cultivate in the child the Renaissance spirit of inquiry, aims to lead the child to ever deeper understandings of his world and his life through his own individual discoveries. How can the child learn if the truth is not in the teacher? Despite obstacles, I believe that we must revive the spirit of the Renaissance in a modern approach to English education, for both prospective teachers and those long in service. Let the English teacher stand with one foot in the camp of language and literature, the other in professional teaching. Let him incorporate within himself the elements of a one-man team.

The College and University Teacher of English Education

What kind of teacher is needed to teach the prospective English teacher and the thousands of inservice teachers who seek to inform themselves in linguistics? The person with conventional training in English graduate schools is notoriously malequipped to teach Freshman English, not to mention courses for prospective English teachers in elementary and secondary schools. The person with conventional training in education and English methodology has a practical foundation, but probably needs to do serious homework in linguistics and literature. The technical linguist is not necessarily acquainted with English teaching at all, much less English education; he may astound you with such sayings as this: "I know nothing whatsoever about how to teach reading—all I can tell you is which

words you may use in reading instruction." My conclusion is that the college and university teacher who would develop English education generalists for classroom teaching must be a generalist himself, imbued with the Renaissance spirit, a professionally educated person having more than one string to his bow.

The professional with graduate training in English, or in education, or in linguistics, can qualify as an effective modern teacher of English education if he will modestly but diligently turn his scholarly attention to the fields in which he needs more educating. In linguistics his primary interest will be applied English rather than pure linguistics. Introductory materials, some with bibliographies, are accessible through the National Council of Teachers of English; many are listed under "Language, Grammar, and Usage," in *Resources for the Teaching of English*, 1965-1966. There have also been special issues on linguistics of *Elementary English*, *English Journal*, *College English*, and *College Composition and Communication*. As an introduction it would be hard to improve on the booklet by Charles C. Fries, *Linguistics: The Study of Language*. Harold B. Allen's *Readings in Applied English Linguistics* (Appleton, 1964), a comprehensive collection of articles, in an excellent survey. My own book, *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading* (McGraw-Hill, 1964) deals with basic and primary skills of literacy from the point of view of descriptive and structural grammar; it has proved useful as an introduction to linguistics in summer institutes for teachers and in graduate courses in English or language arts methods in colleges and universities here and abroad. *Writing by Patterns* (Knopf, 1965), a worktext for grades eleven through fourteen containing a capsule structural grammar, by Helen E. Lefevre and Carl A. Lefevre, is also of interest here. Teachers found the 1962 test edition useful in methods courses as well as high school English and college composition classes.

The above comment suggests how college and university teachers can enlarge their effectiveness in English education. While we may not be able to provide large numbers of teachers matching this description, we must do our very best; we should cultivate the inquiring spirit of the Renaissance. Otherwise, our narrownesses, insularities, and biases may defeat our noblest purposes. I would caution particularly against requiring prospective English teachers to take technical courses in linguistics, taught by professors who make no pretense of a claim to any understanding of applied English linguistics in elementary and secondary school classrooms.

Since it is not feasible to develop such a rich topic as mine in detail or depth in a single brief presentation, the remainder of our discussion will be essentially two outlines of pertinent topics, with suggestive annotations. The two titles are: (I) Language courses, degree programs, summer institutes; and (II) What should the classroom English teacher know about linguistics?

I. LANGUAGE COURSES, DEGREE PROGRAMS, SUMMER INSTITUTES

Bachelor's Degree Program

Freshman English. Language should be the central subject of the introductory English course: Wide readings in language topics and local field investigations

can provide subjects for expository writing, simple platform speaking, and structured group discussion. Communication theory is also appropriate both as *subject* for speaking and writing and as *guide to form and sequence*. This course should include a rigorous introduction to applied English linguistics, with attention to the work of Trager-Smith, Fries, Chomsky, and Pike; school grammar can be related to these materials. Broad topics covered would include dialects, speech communities, idiolects; differences and interrelationships between speech and writing; language in terms of ontogeny and phylogeny; form, style, rhetorical devices; dictionaries; logic and persuasion; paralanguage and kinesics.

In a one-year, three-hour course, students can acquire substantial new knowledge and new understandings of themselves, particularly with respect to language; moreover, they can begin to develop humane attitudes toward language learning as a basis for humane teaching when their time comes. They can also develop speaking and writing skills fully equivalent to those developed in traditional speech and composition courses.

Literature. Prospective elementary teachers need a solid course in children's literature, taught not as a library reference course but as literary interpretation of language and form; children's literature is to be appreciated not as some cute little thing, but as part of all literature. Students should write children's literature (poems, stories, plays) and practice oral interpretive reading; they should also read widely in children's literature and write serious literary criticism of selected works and of each other's creative writing.

While children's literature as described above would be a good requirement for all English teachers, it is probably impracticable to require it of all. Both elementary and secondary teachers should study a variety of forms of world literature of many ages, as well as the literatures of America and England. Focusing on literature as language and form can enrich other aspects of literary study; students also need to become familiar with applications of Kenneth Pike's tagmemics to literary analysis.

Speech. It would be an excellent thing if all English teachers took advanced work in speech, acting, and oral interpretation, as deep background for teaching composition and literature. This experience would also develop their skills in classroom teaching as one of the performing arts. Here linguistics can contribute valuable insights into intonation, paralanguage, and kinesics.

English language. Secondary English teachers, at least, should study the history of the English language, including American English, from the descriptive point of view. Advanced English structure should be offered, and secondary teachers advised to take it.

Advanced writing. All English teachers need at least one advanced writing course incorporating linguistic insights, in either expository or creative writing, according to needs and preferences of students, and subject to professional advisement.

Foreign language. Every English teacher would profit greatly from studying a foreign language according to modern linguistic techniques, including use of a language laboratory; as much literature as feasible should be included in this study.

English as a second language. A sequence in English as a second language may be offered for prospective teachers in bilingual communities, or for those desiring to teach English to immigrants in this country, or to other nationals overseas. Still another sequence may be offered dealing with the language problems of "the inner city."

Methods. Elementary and secondary methods courses should draw heavily upon the content of the language and language-centered courses. A course in audiovisual media and methods is urgently needed.

Master's Degree Programs (Later Afternoon, Evening, Saturday, Summer)

Four groups of courses may be offered, with varying proportions assigned to elementary and secondary teachers according to needs and preferences and subject to professional advisement: (1) Introductory and applied linguistics; (2) Intermediate and advanced linguistics, grammar, and structure; (3) Speech—acting and interpretation, persuasion, rhetoric; and (4) Literature: language and form. Individual programs can provide depth in two of these areas, including the writing of major papers.

Summer Institutes in Applied English Linguistics

Inservice teachers profit from short (two-three weeks), intensive, all-day courses in linguistics and applied linguistics; these courses can provide an entry into a graduate program of late afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes. After the first introductory summer course, succeeding institutes can offer courses at several levels of difficulty for elementary and secondary school teachers. The new NDEA provisions will enable many schools to offer such institutes.

II. WHAT SHOULD THE CLASSROOM ENGLISH TEACHER KNOW ABOUT LINGUISTICS?

Linguistics as a cultural-anthropological field. Broadly conceived, and in historical perspective, linguistics alone is an interdisciplinary field. It is rooted in and has grown out of anthropology, specifically the scientific study of language systems of peoples remote from Western culture, whose speech was structurally quite different from Western languages and had never been reduced to writing or print. Insights gained from such studies established the primacy of speech; they have proved invaluable to an understanding of language structure generally and, for us, of the structure of English.

Language is viewed as culturally determined human behavior. It is a system of vocal symbols by which men in a given culture communicate, interact, and cooperate; if a writing system develops, it is a secondary symbol system based upon and derived from the primary symbol system, which is speech. The study of literacy involves understanding the complex ways in which the two symbol systems interact.

Psycholinguistics. Language—a complex system of vocal symbols that is not instinctive but must be learned—is what makes human beings out of babies. Lan-

guage is very close to the individual, closer than his skin of whatever color, closer psychologically to his personality and individuality, closer to his self-image, closer to his sense of merging with his social group. Language is the sociopsychological bond that unites the human being with his speech community. Thus, *to attack his language—or his dialect—is to attack the person*. Making such an attack, or creating the impression that such an attack has been made, is one of the most destructive things, psychically, that one human being can do to another. For English teachers, it is the unpardonable sin, beyond all hope of redemption.

These considerations bear importantly on possible outcomes of "bidialectism" as now advocated by some linguists to solve inner city dialect problems that are presumed to be a major cause, if not *the* major cause, of unemployment in our society. Whatever degree of causation we assign to substandard dialects—in contrast, say, to automation—we must be extremely careful to motivate the learning of a second dialect. It cannot be forced. (See the next topic.)

Language learning (including all dialects) as an astonishing intellectual feat. Each individual infant and child goes through a process of creating his own version of the language and the dialect he was born to; he personally shapes it to his own uses in his particular speech community. This is an unparalleled intellectual feat, requiring mastery of a complex and highly abstract system of vocal symbols, an accomplishment of every normal human being. But once the child achieves mastery of the basic system, his native linguistic processes become automatic and sink below the threshold of consciousness. Language is a system of ingrained habits that have become unconscious by the time the child goes to school.

Developing literacy, the prime task of the schools. The child from five to seven years old enters school with the hope of becoming literate and of learning to use language fluently in reading, writing, speaking, listening, *thinking*. If the child is not aware of this hope himself, it is very likely that members of his family and intimate speech community are well aware of it. Either way, a main task of the teacher is to be a model of language skills, showing the way, and not a harsh judge or an avenging fury sent by the speakers of a prestige dialect. A relaxed approach to language, descriptive rather than prescriptive, provides a healthy climate in which children's language can grow. The arts and skills of reading, writing, speaking, listening—*thinking*, above all—can grow only by increments, sequentially, through trial and error, in a spiral ascent into maturing experience; the best classroom teachers will find opportunities at every point along this rising, widening curve to share their love of literature with children and young adults. The ultimate goals of language learning and language skills as means of access to experience and knowledge may be approached in school programs, but they may not be realized until later in the life of the individual, if they are ever realized fully. The ultimate goal is cultivated individual maturity.

Basic knowledge needed by all teachers who have anything to do with English instruction.

Intonation. Intonation is an important part of the English structural system, involving both obligatory and optional (or interpretive) features. The basic sys-

tem as described by Trager-Smith consists of four degrees of loudness (accent, or stress); four levels of pitch; and four terminals, ways of interrupting or stopping the stream of speech. Kenneth Pike has also written extensively on English intonation.

Intonation makes native speech sound like native speech; faulty intonation is an unmistakable mark of foreign speech. Intonation is a specialized study, but the teacher, especially one equipped with a tape recorder, can rely on his intuitive command of it for many practical applications in reading and writing.

The fade-rise and fade-fall terminals are perhaps the two basic intonation features for English teaching, particularly for reading and writing. The fade-fall terminal is the dropping of the voice that marks the end of most sentences, as well as many questions; in sentence-level utterances it signifies finality. The fade-rise terminal is the "rising inflection" that marks the end of certain questions; it often occurs within sentences at points marked by commas in writing, where it signals the end of a syntactical element and promises something more to come.

Optional (or interpretive) intonation is what gives quality and variety to oral reading and interpretation; many linguists call it *paralanguage*. Paralanguage and kinesics—the nonlingual, visible accompaniment of speech, such as bodily movements, nods, shrugs, gestures of all kinds, winks, "mugging," and so forth—underlie the art of acting. Kinesics is the basis of pantomime, and of the dance as a performing art. Both paralanguage and kinesics have a bearing on the study of literature.

Syntax. Despite differences between structuralists and transformationalists, they agree that the English sentence in all its variety is a basic meaning-bearing language pattern; they agree that it can be described. It is also agreed that syntax involves basic sentence patterns, or kernel sentences, capable of infinite variation by means of inversions, expansions of many kinds, substitutions, and transformations. The chief difference between the structuralists and the transformationalists is that structuralists tend to limit themselves as closely as possible to language as meaning-bearing code, but with emphasis on the objective code as code; whereas transformationalists concern themselves largely with the subjective message. Their concern with message rather than code gives them a remarkable resemblance to traditional grammarians. The explicit assumptions of the structuralists are those of science in general, of behavioral science in particular; the assumptions of the transformationalists are not always explicit, and often wear the face of neo-Platonism.

English teachers interested in applied linguistics should know that fewer than ten basic sentence patterns are generally agreed upon by structural linguists. These correspond to the declarative sentences of school grammar, and all have inversions or passive transformations as counterparts. Other major patterns are questions, requests, and commands. All these patterns are capable of virtually infinite variation.

Certain elementary applications of transformational grammar have been put forward as means of writing more sophisticated sentences in contrast to the less mature; so far, these applications do not differ much from what English teachers have always recommended to their students without benefit of lin-

guistics. It seems possible that applications of Pike's tagmemie theory may help provide a breakthrough from the grammar of the sentence, whether structural or transformational, to a "grammar," so to speak, of paragraphs and many other forms of extended writing, including literary forms.

Structure words. English has a subsystem of about three hundred words whose primary function is to serve as joints or glue between syntactical elements; although relatively few, these words occur with very high frequency in speech and writing. The most important are five sets of markers: (1) noun markers (articles and all other words that fill the positions of articles); (2) verb markers (auxiliaries and other words that function in the same positions); (3) phrase markers (prepositions of all kinds); (4) clause markers (two kinds, so-called coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, and all words that fill the same positions); (5) question markers (such words as *who*, *why*, and *how*, when those words initiate question patterns). Structure words are of great importance in both reading and writing; detailed knowledge and experience with them is invaluable to the English teacher.

Word-form changes. Grammatical inflections and affixes are the two kinds of word-form changes. Grammatical inflections include noun singular, plural, and genitive forms; the parts of verbs; and the forms for the comparison of adjectives and adverbs. This residue of an elaborate Old English inflectional system is the basis of many differences between standard English and substandard dialects; so, of course, are the forms of pronouns. Affixes comprise the remarkable system of English derivational prefixes and suffixes; generally, suffixes added to word bases (roots) change the word from one form class (part of speech) to another, and prefixes change the meaning of a word without changing its class; but there are enough exceptions to "prove" this rule many times over: it is not a rule but a statement of common occurrence. Just as with the subsystem of structure words, a detailed knowledge of affixing is invaluable to the English teacher.

Phonemes and graphemes. Phonemes are the basic sounds of language which combine in larger patterns; phonemes do not occur singly, in isolation. Graphemes are the letters and combinations of letters that represent the basic sounds in standard spellings. Study of phonemes and graphemes is of great utility in spelling, and has the same relevance to reading that spelling has. In thinking about phonemes, an English teacher would do well to consider the linguistic phenomenon that Pike calls "sneering" or "slurring." This insight might help avoid the egregious error of asking students to "pronounce all the letters in every word." (See the next topic.)

Phonemes, the basic structural units of language. For clarity in his own mind, and for the sake of good English instruction, the English teacher should take the trouble to understand the difference between phonemics and phonetics. Phonemics deals with the smallest distinctive and significant classes of sounds in the language system. Phonetics is the scientific study of speech sounds of all kinds, with no necessary concern with phonemes at all.

Phonemes are basic *structural* units of a language or dialect; in descriptions of phonemes, phonetics can deal with nondistinctive variants of phonemes, *allophones*; allophones are the members of the significant and distinctive classes

of sounds collectively designated as phonemes. Consider, for example, the four *p* sounds in *pin*, *spot*, *suppose*, and *top*. In *pin*, *spot*, and *suppose*, there is some degree of aspiration, but in *top* there need be no aspiration; other differences are caused by the sounds before or after the *p*.

The native speaker automatically disregards the nondistinctive, nonsignificant variants of phonemes; he has learned to group them all together into classes of sounds which he unconsciously treats as identical. For the communicative purposes of the language system, they *are* identical: that is what the term *phoneme* means.

Clarity on these distinctions is essential to good English teaching.

Humane attitudes. It is just as important that the English teacher develop humane attitudes toward language and language learning as that he acquire knowledge and proficiency in language, linguistics, and language-centered studies. The plain truth is that if a choice had to be made, humane attitudes are far and away the more important, because without them, all else will surely fail.

Have a heart. Let the child grow. *Help* him grow.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF CURRENT THINKING ABOUT RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Father Daniel Fogarty, University of Halifax

English teachers have for years deplored the fact that the usual manuals used as textbooks for composition and communication courses, especially in college, have changed very little since the days of Aristotle and the Academy at Athens. We have had good reason for change too, particularly during the past fifty years or more, when the social sciences began to provide us with a wealth of insights about ourselves and how we think and talk and get along with other people.

There have been attempts at a "new" rhetoric. But they seem to have been limited to a strictly psychological approach to rhetorical persuasion or confined to a kind of negative criticism of our language. Though these attempts have helped us much in other ways, they cannot easily be applied to our classroom need for a rhetoric that will give our students a science and art of expression that fits their uses for it.

Perhaps part of our failure in this regard is due to our looking for improvement from one isolated angle or another rather than starting afresh and attempting to see the whole of rhetoric from all the angles possible to us. It would seem, then, if this be true, that we need a thorough look at the philosophy of our language and of our thinking. We need to examine the fields of logic and epistemology, since these disciplines are central to the way we choose words and build propositions. We need an ethic for the responsible and mature use of lethal weapons like words and ideas. And beyond this we shall have to search the outside fields for whatever contributions they are able to make to a new art of expression. Perhaps the most likely and pertinent of these would be linguistics, psychology, and sociology, along with their histories.

Out of this overall look at the sources—out of the philosophical revolt of Wittgenstein, Russell, Carnap, and Schlick, with their logical analysis—out of the discovery of the unconscious after Freud, Jung, and Adler—out of the thought analyses of James, Kafka, Kohler, and Piaget—out of our newly acquired social consciousness—out of our awareness that technological change has altered the whole texture and content of our communicative lives—out of all this comes a flood of insights, any one or two of which should be enough to make us revise our courses in English composition.

It will suffice here to select just two of these insights, to indicate their source, to describe them, and finally to show how they may be applied to a new rhetoric course for classroom use.

I. SEMANTICAL GEARS

The first of these insights involves what I have called Semantical Gears. It comes out of the British and Austrian language analysis of fifty or fewer years ago. And it comes to us more directly out of the admirable efforts of more recent descriptive and comparative linguists. As you know, the recent more careful examination of all kinds of language units has shown us that there are three different levels of expression—three different levels of meaning. If we imagine these as the three forward speeds of an automobile, we get a more dynamic idea of how they work in communication. While all three gears are communicative, they are vastly different in depth and quality. In low gear, for instance, when two people have just met and are trying to get acquainted, the talk is not really communication of idea or verbal content. Rather, it is almost completely an exchange of signals of good will in which the words used have little or no real dictionary meaning. "Hello," "Lovely day!" "How're ya doin'?" "Pleased to meet you," "Skol!" "Good Morning!" "Take it easy!" "Merry Christmas" are all low gear communications. And there is usually much more meaning communicated by the gesture, facial expression, and posture than by the words themselves. Here the two people are not communicating ideas. They are emotionally circling one another and looking for a suitable way to interlock. Two little ids and two little egos are dancingly aware of one another and are maneuvering like mad to find the right programing for their individual message-sending computers—and this so that the net result of the communicating will forward their inner needs. It is easy to see that in this low gear, what is being communicated is not fact or ideas or even proposals—but rather tentative attitudes and approaches.

When communication gets into second gear, which it often fails to do, there are usually two things that shift it: empathy is one, and understanding is the other. When the two circling egos come to a mutual and unconscious agreement that they can manage to interlock, it is because they find what they need in one another and want to go forward to an interrelationship of give and take. They now have to keep this empathic agreement by intelligent observation and judgment of one another's conversational moves. In the communication of meaning in second gear their linguistic moves sound like meaningful statements, exclamations, questions, and challenges. But, they are often not that deep. They are,

often enough, tentative probings into the other's beliefs and principles, probings into how far their doing goes along with their talk. "There's an exhibition of paintings downtown. I think you'd like it. Want to go tonight?" Often communication in second gear asks for advice, not so much to be advised as to sound out the other person and keep the communication from slipping back into the low-gear circling around. The ego that asks advice often has already programmed itself for automatic selection in several sets of possibilities and is more clearly ready for what it wants than the person himself consciously realizes. But it may lack approval and need it for its structure of sublimation or rationalization. If it gets advisory approval, the communication can hope to go on into high gear. If not, it may slip back into low gear or stop altogether. In this second gear, the person is more often communicating the opinions of his social group than his own opinions, experience, and feelings. It is at this level that people utter all those window-dressing communiques that assure others they are "normal" according to strata and status: "We are saving up to send our son to college." "I like symphony, but opera is just too much long hair for me!"

Now, to get from second gear to high, we need an increased amount of empathy and understanding, but particularly we need the emotional and intellectual common commitment which we sometimes call "rapport." In the state of rapport the listener is anxious to hear and agree with you before you even start. He knows your principles, feelings, and approach, at least on the point in discussion, and he won't leave you or drop back into second or low unless you first slip back yourself and begin to show it. You can go right on into the heart of the matter and display your own reasonings and conclusions, share your inmost delights and fears, give solace and lift to his ego, while you feed your own ego with reasonable and healthy calm. All this is not necessarily deliberate. But it is natural and very necessary. Even when the formal essayist or the editorialist or the television comedian pours out his personal approach to life in his own medium, for everyone to see or read, he is desperately hoping to use his singular gift of rapport to communicate in high gear with an almost impossible number of people.

But the key to the classroom effectiveness of this kind of analysis of communication lies in the importance of looking at the three speeds ahead and particularly in examining the requirements for the shifts in between one gear and the next. For between the shifts, as a way of insuring the forward progress, lies the learning of such things as the theory of definition, the levels of abstraction, the mysteries of word magic, word shift, ambiguity, word slant, and word propaganda. The exact analysis of what is happening in each of these instances is also the preventive for that ever present possibility of slip back into a lower and slower gear. The new rhetoric, then, ought to be teaching young people to communicate, even in writing, according to such psychological, social, and linguistic levels. They might have as much or more chance of someday writing imperishable prose. But they will certainly have the tools for a better and more confident art of relating themselves to others. Such a new rhetoric will produce just as many playwrights and perhaps ten times as many happy young people who will know how to propose marriage or write a good letter of application for a job.

II. INTERDIMENSIONAL TRANSPOSITION

As a second random instance of the many insights available for the building of this same "new" rhetoric, there is the question of added dimensions in communication. Our attention has been drawn to these dimensions by the growth of the film and television media and the development of the camera techniques, lights, set, sound, color, and angle effects used in such productions. We are now aware that young people's reception of communication is somewhere near 80 percent three dimensional. The rest is evenly riddled with still pictures. The rest of us, on the other hand, are old enough to remember being brought up on reading reception or radio reception with a much lower percentage of film intake. And yet, today we largely specialize in teaching these same youngsters to express themselves, at least in composition courses, in the one dimensional paragraph and theme expression. We need to realize that the student has been learning all his life, outside of class, to communicate in three dimensions and not in one alone. He has not read as much or talked as much abstract talk, or even seen in print one half of the words, word formations, or expressions that we have under easy control. We cannot expect him to be as good in this verbal dimension as we are—even though it is by far the most important dimension. So how do we get him up to the standard of verbal efficiency we expect of him? The obvious answer is reading, reading, and more reading. Of course! But still he isn't geared to it, and, above all, he doesn't know that the verbal intricacies of creative writing can and will paint all the pictures, move all the objects, and describe all the feelings that three dimensional expression has. It seems clear, from the psychological and philosophic findings about the nature of our thinking, that the best way to make the student word conscious and word efficient is to start him off with the three dimensions he is most familiar with, and then teach him to transpose backwards and forwards from two to one and back to three dimensions. This will give him a chance to enrich his vocabulary by gradually finding names for those things he knows so well in picture or movement or color. He will also see the dimensions, each by itself and separate from the others. It is difficult in so brief a paper to show how this would work in a classroom. But for a sample experiment, why not show a piece of film and then abruptly stop it anywhere, turn on the lights and ask the students to put into words the feelings of the main person in the film. Or you might describe in full, with words only, a situation involving one person and ask your students to verbally describe the background, color, sound, and movement they would put with it if they were making a film. All the usual miming games that guess the appropriate words for certain actions are likewise excellent practice in interdimensional transposition. Students might take an interest in miming in either one or two dimensions. In this way they can see the verbal content of a communication separate from the other dimensions and can see how important it can be when the verbal portion is strong and creative. One of the television commercials currently uses such a mime very effectively. In it, not a word is spoken. A young couple is in a ladies' hat shop. The husband keeps gesturing disapproval while she tries on hat after hat. Finally one pleases him and he gestures with thumb and forefinger that it suits her exactly—just like, of

course, that wonderful cigaret he now offers her. Fill-in of the verbal counterparts of such a mine would, I believe, stretch the mind of today's youngster—stretch it towards verbal efficiency.

Let's not forget also, that we have an accompanying responsibility—and that is to help our students towards an educated nonverbal art of expression as well as verbal. The exercise of interdimensional transposition by the same token, and for the same reasons, will help us to fulfill that responsibility, too.

But how, you might well say, does all this help towards a new rhetoric or a new classroom rhetoric? It will help, I think, because it is part of a completely revised organization of the material that should go into a new rhetoric course book. Instead of the usual textbook, where the chapters are arranged on the basis of how to write with unity, clarity, coherence, and interest, how to organize speeches and writings for different occasions, with maybe a chapter on semantics—instead of that, it ought to be organized on the basis of how we intercommunicate, the nature of our thinking and feeling as it finds its way outward into language. This will involve logic and epistemology, experimental psychology, and linguistics. It will call for psychiatric, personality, and social psychology. But it will synthesize all the findings and ponder all the angles. It will study our language descriptively because it is the map of all our verbal possibilities of creative expression, and not just a list of rules to fence us in. It will explain figures of speech as the artful side of our naturally and necessarily abstract way of thinking, and not just fancy accessories to verbal costumery. Finally, it will take stock of the usual linguistic abuses, not to condemn them or their users, but to recognize them with a healthy and positive sense of criticism.

Banquet Address

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONANT STUDIES FOR THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Jeremiah S. Finch, Princeton University

The subject assigned to me indeed affords a wide range. Dr. Conant has studied a good many aspects of education in America. He studied that fascinating complex called Harvard University, as President, for some twenty years, and perhaps still finds it somewhat mystifying. During his presidency the School of Education was reconstituted, and the M.A.T. degree established. Indeed, he admits to having invented the M.A.T.—as a means of bridging the faculties of education and of the arts and sciences. As early as 1944, in an address at Teachers College of Columbia University, he pleaded for a “truce among educators.” Nineteen years later, when we were studying teacher preparation, we found the truce far from achieved. The “gap” was everywhere, and in a talk to the Modern Language Association last December I was bold to say that it “constitutes a massive impediment to the improvement in the study and teaching of English in the United States.” To this I shall return.

Let me mention a few of Dr. Conant's other “studies.” When he returned from his ambassadorship to Germany, he felt that he had talked about American schools a bit, but did not know them sufficiently at first hand. A grant from the Carnegie Corporation enabled him to visit a great many American high schools, and the results are familiar to all of you—his reports on the American high school and the junior high school. Many of you have read the outgrowing document, *Slums and Suburbs*, that addressed itself to the “social dynamite” in our urban schools. There is also his book *On Understanding Science* (1947) and *The Child, the Parent, and the State* (1959). If you have not seen his latest book, *Shaping Educational Policy*, I commend it to you, for it concerns the need for nationwide consultation and determination of policy. Right now this, the largest enterprise in the nation, is fragmented among fifty states, each sovereign in educational matters, and the resulting complications are plain to any experienced eye.

I shall not expatiate on all the aspects of Dr. Conant's studies, but narrow my focus to the one segment with which I am most familiar, dealt with in his book entitled *The Education of American Teachers*. This, it seems to me, is most suited to this conference, for the subtitle of our program reads: “for college specialists interested in preparing secondary and elementary teachers in English.”

Let me for a moment take you behind the scenes of the teacher education study. It was not a survey, not a sampling, not an inspection. It was the asking of many questions of many people, a weighing of the responses to the questions, and the formulation of recommendations for change, based on the information inherent in the answers.

It took two years. The first year, in which I was involved, was devoted to

visiting colleges and universities in the sixteen most populous states. Our visits to campuses varied in length from one day to a week. The institutions varied from Southwest Texas State Teachers College to Harvard, from Boston State to Berkeley. The second year, in which I was not a member of the staff, was given largely to visits to state capitals, departments of education, certification officers, and to the writing of the report. The entire staff reassembled to go over the final draft, word by word. We did not all agree fully with every recommendation in the report, nor indeed with everything said, but there was a remarkable degree of unanimity.

Dr. Conant himself took full responsibility for the writing. It was not a committee job. He was a good listener, and often a good needler. I have vivid recollections of his sitting composedly at the end of a table, the fingertips of each hand touching, asking quietly: "Suppose there *were* no state certification requirements. What would you do on this campus, in preparing teachers, different from what you are doing?" Invariably there would be an awkward pause, and then someone would change the subject. Ironically, as he says in the report, it was hard to get a rational answer to the question.

The "gap"—that is, the distrust that exists to a greater or lesser degree between the academic departments and the schools or departments of education—lies behind much of the fruitless discussion, much of the angry debate, much of the muddle in teacher preparation that prevents us, as a nation, from doing as good a job as we are capable. Of course, the situation varies from campus to campus, and even from department to department. And it is not all bad. I have been in institutions where the degree of cooperation was heartening. I recall sitting in an English departmental office with the chairman of English, the chairman of education, and the very lively and competent young woman who was in charge of methods work and student teaching. "She has her degrees in English," said the English chairman, "and has a splendid reputation as a teacher. As a matter of fact, she was offered jobs simultaneously by both departments and chose education—but we all work together."

I wish I could report that this was a typical situation. It wasn't. One morning I found myself on the campus of a well-known university, in the well-appointed offices of a strong academic department. Two members were complaining that their opposite members in the department of education paid little attention to comments, by the academic department, on the work and potential of students about to be assigned to student teaching. "The trouble is," the academicians said, "those people won't even talk to us." That afternoon, in the even better appointed offices of the department of education, I raised the question of cooperation. "Oh," they said, "the trouble is that those academic people don't understand what we're trying to do. They care only about their beloved subject. The fact is, they won't even talk to us." One is reminded of the little boy who came home bloody nosed to his mother to protest: "It all started 'cause Jimmy hit me back!"

As I indicated to the Modern Language Association audience, the chasm which divides the professors of education from the professors of the arts and sciences, though narrower, perhaps, is still deep. In the first chapter of *The Education of American Teachers*, Dr. Conant tells the background of the quarrel: how the

social changes of this century transformed the high schools so that they now accommodate nearly three fourths of an age group (between 1870 and 1945, 30,000 high schools were built); how the professors of arts and sciences "with few exceptions . . . turned their backs on the problem of mass secondary education" and viewed "with disgust and dismay what was happening in the schools"; how for their part the professors of education became increasingly embittered, especially at the barrage of criticism after Sputnik, feeling that the work of their former students in the schools was being "unfairly appraised." But Dr. Conant reminds us that the issues are not that simple, and that the complexities of the subject of teacher education are rarely acknowledged by those who are prone to talk in slogans, which "invariably represent a point of view so oversimplified as to be fundamentally invalid." Neither side can be criticized to the exclusion of the others. He concludes with a call for reconciliation and action, and his recommendations provide, I believe, ways in which constructive action can be taken.

Let us see what the central Conant recommendations are (for they have been widely misreported). The first recommendation reads as follows:

For certification purposes the state should require only (a) that a candidate hold a baccalaureate degree from a legitimate college or university, (b) that he submit evidence of having successfully performed as a student teacher under the direction of college and public school personnel in whom the state department has confidence, and in a practice teaching situation or which the state department approves, and (c) that he hold a specially endorsed teaching certificate from a college or university which, in issuing the official document, attests that the institution as a whole considers the person adequately prepared to teach in a designated field and grade level.

Every word counts: a bachelor's degree, not from a degree mill; practice teaching under college and school personnel approved by the state department; a specially endorsed certificate from the institution as a *whole*. Put these together, and you have, I submit, a much stouter guarding of the gate than what we now have. But first let me complete the picture. Recommendation No. 5 (placed next to No. 1 in the final summary), spells out the state's responsibility for programs of practice teaching.

The state should approve programs of practice teaching. It should, working cooperatively with the college and public school authorities, regulate the conditions under which practice teaching is done and the nature of the methods instruction that accompanies it. The state should require that the colleges and public school systems involved submit evidence concerning the competence of those appointed as cooperating teachers and clinical professors.

Again, every word counts. The state does not relinquish a bit of *its major* responsibility, but in fact asserts more. (I do not need to remind this audience that the state has sovereignty in educational matters.) Dr. Conant recommends that it *regulate* the conditions of practice teaching—*and* the nature of the methods instruction that *accompanies* it. Beyond this, the state shall *require* the colleges and

the school systems to stand behind the cooperating teachers and clinical professors.

Let me point to a third interlocking recommendation, No. 2, the collegiate responsibility.

Each college or university should be permitted to develop in detail whatever program of teacher education it considers most desirable, subject only to two conditions: first, the president of the institution in behalf of the entire faculty involved—academic as well as professional—certifies that the candidate is adequately prepared to teach on a specific level or in special fields; and, second, the institution establishes in conjunction with a public school system a state approved practice teaching arrangement.

Here are some large and sturdy fences and significant wording. The president must certify on behalf of the entire faculty, and the institution must establish a *state approved* practice teaching arrangement.

To some of you the implications of these recommendations may, at first glance, not seem very pressing. Many a person in teacher education has reacted to the Conant report by saying, "Oh, we're doing most of this already. We have an all-university approach to teacher education, and we give a lot of emphasis to student teaching." I submit that a careful scrutiny of what actually goes on in the diversity of teacher education programs in this country shows that the actualities fall far short of the objectives Dr. Conant sets forth.

Let us take the recommendation that the college or university should be free to develop its own program. I suggest that outside single-purpose institutions—and there are fewer of them every day—one would find relatively few clear-cut examples where the *majority* of professors of English and the professors of English education work together in genuine cooperation. My estimate is that the time has not yet come when many college and university presidents can confidently certify that the program or programs for preparing teachers of English is the fully agreed on product of all parties concerned.

The question inevitably arises: what can be done? To be sure, a good deal has been done already. In his presidential address to the National Council in Cleveland, last November, Professor Albert Kitzhaber expressed his pleasure at the way things are now going, spoke of the reform movement that is beginning to affect English, and hailed the successful outcome of the efforts to have English included in the amended National Defense Education Act. At the same time, he pointed to the dangers of using the forthcoming money for institutes foolishly and irresponsibly, of creating inexperienced staffs, of enrolling teachers improperly oriented to their summer's study. He also underscored the necessity of understanding between college English teachers and their colleagues in the schools, and he welcomed the increasing cooperation between the MLA and NCTE.

In my own exhortation before the MLA audience a month later, I urged that "first departments of English, particularly the senior professors in them, seek actively to overcome attitudes of indifference, condescension, and hostility toward the problems of English in the schools; second, that departments of English give *full recognition* to those responsible for the supervision of student

teaching—and listen to what they have to say; third, that departments of English alert themselves immediately to the opportunities and challenges, existing right now, this year, in Project English, and in the current extensions of the NDEA.”

“If the first of these three suggestions were to be accepted by a substantial number of departments and the senior professors in them,” I said, “the other two would follow. The attitude of the influential members of our profession is all-important.” It was no news to that audience. I reminded them, “that graduate students and instructors are quick to get the score; their antennae are sensitive; jobs are at stake. From a member of the departmental power structure a word or tone of voice is a signal immediately recognized. Without sneering he can teach the rest to sneer.”

“Suppose, for a moment,” I added, “the situation were reversed. Imagine a department in which the senior professors were genuinely interested in the English program in the local schools—and showed it in word and deed. Imagine that those concerned with student teaching held tenure appointments in English and reported at regular intervals on the effectiveness of the preparation of the student teachers. In a department where such an atmosphere prevailed, the effect on the graduate students, the younger faculty members, and, most important, on the undergraduates preparing for teaching careers would be marked.

“Perhaps there are departments like this. Very probably, some departments have some of the attributes I have been describing. But in general, I submit, too few of us in the colleges and universities are adequately informed about or genuinely concerned with the national interest and the teaching of English. And it is time we were.”

Better understanding on all sides is necessary, in the light of the Conant recommendations, for plans are already going forward, in several large states, to put the recommendations to work; cooperating with state officials will be the academic and education departments of the colleges and universities involved. On each campus the institution as a *whole* will assume responsibility for the teacher's preparation.

Now, the implications of this apply not only to the academicians but also to the professors of education and the people in the schools. For the latter, it means that they must be ready to go more than half way towards their colleagues in the college departments, but beyond that to insist, through the chairmen, deans and presidents, if necessary, that it be a *cooperative* venture in planning the right sort of programs for teacher preparation for various levels.

Nor need it be a matter of extraordinary difficulty, if there is good will and understanding on both sides. Only last month, at a meeting of teachers of English in junior colleges at Tempe, Arizona, a small committee, of which I was a member, succeeded in agreeing on a program for preparing junior college teachers of English without bruises or serious casualties. Here is what we proposed:

Concentration in English, Undergraduate and Graduate

Literature: main periods and genres of English, American, and world literature; criticism.

Language: history of the English language; structural grammar; usage.

Composition: advanced expository and argumentative writing; essentials of rhetoric, logic, general semantics, and problems of mass communication.

Speech: public speaking and oral interpretation.

Thesis and/or comprehensive examination for master's degree.

Professional Education

Methods of teaching English, including analysis of problems and materials in language, literature, composition, and *reading*.

Background in the functions and problems of the junior college.

Supervised teaching in the junior college; student teaching or internship, preferably following or linked to the study of methods.

This is not far off from what might be prescribed, substituting "secondary school" for "junior college," for a teacher of the eleventh or twelfth grades. For the lower grades, to be sure, there would have to be modifications, but not, I submit, many basic ones. Notice, however, that there is no "general methods" course, no "foundations" course, and no "secondary school curriculum" prescription. These studies may, in the hands of skillful and competent professors, be valuable, but in visits to some seventy-seven institutions, the Conant staff found such courses to be very frequently of poor quality, taught by persons out of touch with the schools, and resisted by the candidate teachers. Therefore, we concluded, such courses should not be *prescribed*, but should rather be optional offerings for those interested, depending on the wishes and wisdom of the individual institution.

In short, I am suggesting that if the intent and spirit of the Conant proposals are to be carried into the reform of teacher preparation in English, there must be a willingness on both sides to hear what the other has to say. The college departments must recognize the need for the study of language of speech, of composition, of rhetoric, and of reading problems. They must reexamine their programs for English majors in the light of the realities of modern classroom needs. The professors of education must not try to maintain the protective tariff that now exists around certain course offerings which cannot be demonstrated to have specific and definite value for the future teacher.

After all, the two essential questions for any teacher, including teachers of English, are: does he have competence in his subject, and can he teach it? If it cannot be said with certainty that a course in medieval metrical romances, or a course in the foundations of education, will make a better teacher, such courses should not be riveted into a set of requirements—either by a state certification officer or by an institution.

And this leads me to two other basic implications of the Conant studies. One is student teaching, the single area in teacher education about which there is general agreement as to its importance and value, although there is disagreement as to how it should be carried on. It is the crucial element in the professional program, for it can provide answers to the essential questions: does the teacher know his subject, and can he teach it? Accordingly, Dr. Conant proposes, this is

precisely the point at which the state comes in the picture: to be satisfied that the conditions of student teaching, and the people in charge of it, are competent. In many schools, good cooperating or critic teachers are hard to find. In large systems, especially, their quality will vary. And no matter how well planned the program of student teaching may be, much will depend on the kind of induction the candidate receives. English departments, of themselves, cannot oversee a diversity of student teaching situations. Accordingly, there must be another element introduced: what Dr. Conant calls a "clinical professor."

Here is an implication of the Conant report that deserves, probably, the most immediate attention, for it is at the center of the complex problem. The clinical professor is analogous to a professor of clinical surgery, who may not carry on research but is recognized as a skilled practitioner and teacher and enjoys full status on the medical faculty. Just as the training of a surgeon is in such hands, so "the induction of the teacher into a classroom through practice teaching should be under the supervision of an experienced school teacher who holds high rank" as a college or university professor. An equally important responsibility of the clinical professor, Dr. Conant argues, is to keep the department alert as to what the future high school teacher needs to know. To this end, the department "must go more than half way to meet the professor." This does not mean token recognition by ambiguous joint appointment, or a side-track for an aging departmental member. It means identifying the person who has earned recognition as a teacher and as a teacher of teachers, expert in his profession. Professor Meckel stated quite rightly that we shall need supervisory teachers who are increasingly competent. I would add that one way to bring this about is the entrusting of this task to the sort of professional person here described.

I realize fully that there are many competent people, doubtless: some in this room, who fully meet the most rigorous requirements for a clinical professorship of English. But I know also that there are far too many around the country who are out of touch with the schools, or out of touch with their departments of English. And I am reasonably sure that there are relatively few academic departments where the person in charge of student teaching of English enjoys the full status he needs, *and is listened to* by the department. Having spent many years in academia, I am all too keenly aware of the difficulties in bringing about changes, and of the obstacles in the way of creating clinical professorships of the kind needed. We English teachers can feel with Sir Winston Churchill, "I have derived continual benefit from criticism and do not remember any time when I was short of it." Nevertheless, I am bold to say that until a large majority of the departments of English give recognition and support to the persons who are directly involved in the planning and supervision of student teaching, and the special methods work that should be *interlocked* with it, we shall not bridge the gap that separates English and professional education, or the gap that stands between us and better, more enlightened teaching.

And it is, I submit, our duty to try to bring it about. We are not only teachers of English, we are citizens, with a large stake in our schools. Henry Meckel spoke of the heightened sense, on the part of the layman, of the importance of education. Dr. Conant, similarly, stresses over and over again the final responsi-

bility of the lay public in education. This is a basic implication for us. As teachers, we have entrusted to us the custodianship of an important branch of humane letters and of the language we use. We cannot carry out our task unless we are willing to look beyond our immediate jobs and interests to our larger responsibilities. Creating better conditions for the preparation of teachers of English, through cooperative efforts on each campus, and through recognition of the men and women engaged in the oversight of the classroom training of our fledgling teachers, is in large part up to us—as professional people and as citizens.

Third General Session

NEW EDUCATIONAL TOOLS RELEVANT TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

William E. Hoth, Wayne State University

The words *relevant educational tools* are neither stirring nor ringing, yet they are appropriate. For like much of the material in this talk, this language itself is the result of technological revolution. Perhaps what our society needs is a poet who can do for jargon, like *relevant tools*, what Herrick did for *liquefaction*, *brave vibration*, and other mechanistic terms of his time.

Having shared that anxiety about the somewhat nonscholarly title of this address, let me share also a more serious problem. How can we justify an interest in equipment, the hardware of teaching, at a time when all of us who prepare English teachers should be deeply concerned with the many serious reforms needed, including vast improvement in the teaching of composition, a reversal of the apparent failure of the schools to interest the public genuinely in continued reading of good literature, and acceptance of the awesome responsibility of bringing our best teaching to children in culturally disadvantaged neighborhoods of our great cities, and the necessity of impressing the nation with the most productive use of the monies authorized for the improvement of the teaching of English under various federal programs? With such challenges to our ingenuity, how can we concern ourselves with audiovisual aids and other instructional materials?

First, with Title III of the National Defense Education Act now including the teaching of English at all grade levels, it is very likely that we shall see an intensification of what is already a very strong selling program designed to push the use of many of the new materials and machines in the classroom. Second, we are approaching that point where it is possible to make an extremely effective presentation of information without the continuous presence of a teacher. In last year's address by Dwight Burton, reference was made to the necessity of determining how we can best teach cognitive objectives of recognition and recall on the one hand, and affective objectives of interest, attitude, and value on the

other.¹ For obtaining cognitive objectives, those theorists who contend that we could do away with schools and exploit the mass media may be right in a limited way, but to obtain affective objectives, teachers must be very much present. Still the potential of the mass media poses a real threat and heightens our challenge. We must be fully informed of the vast potential presenting information in the new educational tools; we need to examine seriously all the roles of teachers besides presenting information; and we have to assume leadership in identifying the best use of the technological equipment, so as to lead, rather than follow industry in the best application.

When we talk about using new tools, we are being somewhat theoretical, of course. What is possible through new electronic processes is one thing. What a school system can afford or put to use well and relatively quickly is another. It is possible, I am told, to reduce all the print on all of the pages in all of the books now in the Library of Congress onto plates, which will occupy about as much space as six volumes of a standard encyclopedia, and then to expand any portion of that material back into size suitable for human reading. This electronic possibility has not seriously affected thousands of man hours planning additions to public and school libraries throughout the United States. Clearly our technology is outstripping our application or even our sense of potential application. The language laboratory, to take one example, is an established feature of most modern high schools. But foreign language teachers are still learning that the operation of a laboratory to exploit its instructional potential requires a complete reorientation in philosophy and method and considerable training in simple technological operations. For example, a persistent problem is the availability of sound instructional tapes.

For English, the adaptation of competent instructional material for the automatic devices lags as well. In the world of commercial entertainment, television makes fantastic demands on its writers. In our professional world we are only slowly becoming aware of the need for new materials. Closed-circuit television, for example, has not been exploited, largely because of the lack of competent instruction on videotapes.

Yet, despite some lag, there are some new educational tools which are very relevant to our common purposes in teaching English. Among the best known, and yet apparently new in some sections of the United States, is the paperbound book. In this development of mass distribution there is little sense to any objection made about the quantity of quality instruction. In most American cities, it is just as easy to order a given literary title in paperback as it is to have a pizza delivered. Distributors and publishers are providing consultation, storage racks, sales campaigns, and other services related to increasing reading in the school through the use of the paperback book. Other available tools, relevant to the teaching of literature, include all kinds of rear-screen projectors, some now incorporating an eight millimeter cartridge film with accompanying sound, sometimes on the film track and sometimes in a coordinated phonograph record. All

¹See Nathan Blount, "Fructify the Folding Doors: Team Teaching Re-Examined," *English Journal*, LIII (March, 1964), 117-30.

of these devices make possible a visual and aural presentation of scenes and settings in literature which provide historical and regional background information as well as presenting various filmed plays and shorter dramatic vignettes. Of course, the film has long been available, and most of us are acquainted with the generally excellent color series on the humanities with competent actors in various classical plays. No doubt the most recent improvement in presenting moving image and sound is television and its record-keeping devices, videotape and the kinescope. All of these, of course, expand upon the actualization aspect of film.

Perhaps somewhat more conventional because they depend largely on print, an older medium, are many of the new anthologies, some of them made up of adjusted literary selections of high interest and low reading ability for mature but disadvantaged students, and some of them directed to upgrade the maturity of selection, particularly for the college preparatory classroom.

Turning from literature to composition, there are comparable exciting developments. Use of the opaque projector is not new, at least to college teachers, and the use of the dictaphone or tape recorder to assist in theme correction has received national attention in the *English Journal*. Perhaps some of you are aware of the overlay materials developed for the overhead projector at the University of Pittsburgh, which are now available commercially. Somewhat comparable materials, at least in the technological dimension, have been developed at the Newton School, and some of you may have seen these demonstrated, particularly at eastern conferences. For the teaching of capitalization, spelling, vocabulary, and mechanics in general, there are an extremely large number of programmed materials, many of them following the Skinnerean format, and there have been available for some years numerous programs on slides or filmstrips.

In the world of print, there are still other developments. A number of large publishers are now developing overlays to supplement their basic series textbooks. There is programmed material for the teaching of composition in the junior high developed at Yale University. There is a set of three-track lessons in selected ingredients of sound writing produced largely for high school students by teachers in the San Francisco Bay area. Developed in Michigan and Kansas and published in Chicago, is an individualized basic composition series, in a multileveled laboratory format for grades 5 and 6 and for 7 and 8. In paperbacks again, there are four or five composition texts, including one based largely on the stimulation of excellent photographs.

To move to language is to move to still more specific tools. There are, of course, various programmed materials for the teaching of grammar—generative, structural, or prescriptive, including an individualized program developed by the cochairmen of this conference. There are materials developed for use in tape recorders. Materials, for example, for culturally disadvantaged students, developed by Ruth Golden in Detroit are one example, and numerous publishers are ready to distribute lessons and tapes for language labs based on concepts found successful in teaching English as a second language and in teaching foreign language in general. Just as there are coordinated materials involving film, usually in cartridge, and phonograph record to present picture and sound together for the development of lexical concepts and pattern drills in foreign language learning,

so, too, comparable materials can be developed for teaching social usage and providing practice in the acquisition of standard language habits for native spoken English. There continue to be workbooks and textbooks, some of them adapting techniques from programming, but all of them designed primarily to teach prescriptive grammar, despite the findings of discipline, study, and research.

For those of us who subscribe to the notion that English is *only* literature, composition, and language, we have surveyed some of the new tools. For others, and perhaps most clearly those who work in inner cities and pockets of poverty in rural areas as well, English often has to include reading, at least. In this area we have television teaching materials, a vast array of accelerators, tachistoscopes, phonographs and films, and various programmed materials. There are programmed materials for introducing nursery school children to read. There is a controlled computerized typewriter program used experimentally by O. K. Moore at Yale. There are all of the multileveled laboratories identified most particularly with Science Research Associates, but now being developed by some other publishers as well. There are various formats of combining related and yet differentiated paperbound materials designed for literature instruction, but taking into account widely known differences in the potential reading ability of any "average" group.

In teacher preparation, which is perhaps our dominant interest, there is an extremely rich potential research tool, the portable videotape recorder, receiver, and camera. Universities throughout the land are now accumulating teaching vignettes. In some centers there is important research into teaching style leading to the development of exciting materials for the education of future teachers. In this area as well, there are all kinds of two-way vision rooms to facilitate observation, which seems in general to be related to the general topic of new arrangement of space in buildings, furniture, folding doors, movable bleacher seats, cafeteriums, and multipurpose rooms.

To round out this survey, I should like to mention a coordinated machinery exhibition I have viewed, which has potential for instruction, for interview, and for diagnosis, but which also has potential for the giving of tests and perhaps might even be a beginning answer to the honor system. The system, produced by the EDEX Corporation of California, coordinates at the control console of the classroom manager or teacher the instantaneous use of a tape recorder, a film projector, and a slide projector, and provides for each student a four-button or fourpost response set, with an individual meter to record each student's individual response at the moment he makes it, and a kind of cumulative box score dial which keeps a running percentage summary on the total group as the test is being given. Not quite approximating the thrill of some of the World's Fair wonders, this system, nonetheless, does have a kind of three-ring quality to it as the presented material shifts from a voice to a moving image, to a fixed picture, back to a voice, back to a picture, back to a voice. And its serious use in the training of employees in such large industries as Bell Telephone, for example, gives some evidence of its potential.

In conclusion, I must apologize for only mentioning the new materials available from the English Institute Materials Center in mimeograph form, the product of Project English Programs, and excellent materials prepared by An-

thony Tovatt of Ball State University, designed to help teachers assess desirable practices in the teaching of English in the light of research, brought to my attention as this speech was prepared. I have also said little about the computer or about the automated retrieving library system, which eliminates the steps to the stack. In fact, I suspect that for a thorough examination of the potentialities of the computer and a quick trip through *Brave New World*, you will have to call on some younger member of our group who does not remember the running board, who does not know from firsthand experience the contribution of Al Jolson to the development of film and who does not remember, throughout his whole life the delirious cheers for one young man who successfully flew the Atlantic alone. For after all, the word "new" means within the last half-an-hour in New York City, but here in Kentucky, in the land of gracious hospitality, I hope I may be tolerated a broader definition of *new*.

For bringing me up to even that deadline, I am indebted to colleagues at Wayne State University working with television in an experimental program in teacher preparation, to educational psychologists experimenting and conducting conferences on programing and new media, and to co-workers in educational technology, all who share nearby offices in a College of Education, and to Louis Forsdale at Columbia University, and various publishers' representatives.

For those of you who would like detailed information about many of the audio-visual instruments mentioned, may I suggest an examination of publications of the Department of Audio Visual Education of the NDEA, or get yourself on the mailing list of a magazine called *Training in Business and Industry*.

Finally, to cast this all in a Detroit metaphor, if you are working on a new curriculum in English, perhaps you are interested in retooling.

Fourth General Session

ISCPET: NEW DIMENSIONS IN RESEARCH

William H. Evans, University of Illinois

The Illinois Statewide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers holds one distinction which should be apparent from what I have just said. In length, the title of this project compares favorably with the titles of eighteenth century religious tracts and twentieth century doctoral dissertations. It should cause no wonder, then, when I say that one of our first accomplishments was to compose an acronym, using the letters I S C P E T. Please don't allow the pronunciation to become a problem. We have already recognized two pronunciations: (is k-pet) and (is pet). Since I find the acronym much easier to pronounce if I ignore the *c*, I shall refer to our project only as ISCPET (is pet).

How does one define anything called ISCPET? The following definition is too brief and it lacks color, but it could be called a start:

With the support of a USOE contract of almost \$700,000, twenty colleges and universities in Illinois are cooperating on a five-year research program for the improvement of their curricula for students who are planning to become secondary school English teachers. Institutional contributions raise the total financial support to well over \$1,000,000.

I shall try to add some color by explaining in what ways ISCPET has in Illinois opened new dimensions in research. I shall not go so far as to say that you should detect in my talk the distant rumblings of a Great Society of researchers on the teaching of English. But perhaps there *are* new sounds to be heard and new signs to be seen in the organization, scope, and direction of this project. At least *we* think so.

First let us look at organization and scope. Although the University of Illinois, as the contracting institution, is housing the Project headquarters and is making available to us dozens of financial magicians, whose job it is to convince us that the mind is quicker than the hand, ISCPET does not really belong to the University of Illinois. In fact, ISCPET does not belong to—and is not even run by—its Director, its Associate Director, and its Research Associate. The Project is really run by approximately thirty-eight professors of English, education, or English education at twenty cooperating institutions.¹ To make this shift of con-

¹Cooperating institutions include:

Aurora College	Knox College	Roosevelt University
Bradley University	Loyola University	St. Xavier College
DePaul University	Monmouth College	Southern Illinois University
Greenville College	Mundelein College	University of Chicago
Illinois State University at Normal	North Central College	University of Illinois
Illinois Wesleyan University	Northwestern University	Western Illinois University
	Olivet Nazarene College	
	Rockford College	

trol a fact, these institutional representatives have elected three of their members to the five-member ISCPET Executive Committee, thus enabling the institutions to outvote the Director and the Associate Director on major questions. Does this organizational structure seem to create an impossible climate for experimentation? Perhaps so. During a light moment, one member of our Project staff referred to the plan as Brook Farm, dispersed and modernized.

Here are some facts that might truly cause Thoreau and Emerson some anxiety today. ISCPET consists of colleges and universities of many kinds and many sizes. There are small private and church-related liberal arts colleges, each graduating from 6 to 15 English teachers annually; there are fairly large private and church-related colleges and universities, each graduating from 25 to 50 English teachers; and there are large private and state-supported universities, each graduating from one hundred to 145. Together these institutions account for approximately 6 percent of the English teachers prepared nationally.

There is also much diversity of background among the institutional representatives. For example, on most campuses ISCPET is represented by one staff member from English and one from education or English education. Some of these persons have never worked together on curriculum planning and research. Aided by local *ad hoc* committees, which represent several departments on some campuses, institutional representatives have been designing experiments that will purportedly improve, to a significant degree, the local preparation of secondary school English teachers. The representatives have also assumed responsibility for experiments that will make significant contributions to state and national efforts to prepare English teachers. Since some institutions will conduct more than one experiment, it is conceivable that before July 31, 1969, the concluding date for the Project, as many as thirty to forty experiments of different kinds, of different durations, and with both local and national implications, will be completed.

Each research study to be done by a cooperating institution must be approved by our Executive Committee before the University of Illinois in acting for ISCPET will release funds under a subcontract. Institutional representatives must report the progress of their research in the same way that ISCPET must report its progress to the United States Office of Education.

In spite of the obvious complexity and scope of ISCPET, several very promising directions have been established. We believe that these also deserve to be called new-dimensional. For one thing, we have cooperatively defined our criteria and our goals. One might not expect forty professors with different backgrounds to agree upon goals—but our professors have agreed, and they have put their common goals into writing. Influenced somewhat by lists of "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," published by the Modern Language Association, the goals for ISCPET have taken shape as lists of competencies which all institutional representatives expect their future English teachers to meet. Now printed and distributed as "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English," these lists were based upon the recommendations of an advisory committee composed of twelve nationally known persons in English, speech, and education; upon additional recommendations from authorities on certification, school administrators, secondary school English supervisors, Eng-

lish department heads, and English teachers; and upon the cooperative efforts of *all* institutional representatives, for all had a part in drafting the lists.

Imagine if you will forty educators of English teachers as one large group and as several small groups reaching agreements on such topics as Knowledge of Language, Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition, Knowledge and Skill in Literature, Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication, and Knowledge and Skill in the Teaching of English—and then committing these agreements to writing. There were debates, philosophical excursions, speeches—even an impromptu inservice workshop conducted by one member who felt compelled to initiate us to his school of thought on teaching linguistics. But our job was done.

Since these lists will serve as guidelines in designing many experiments and in constructing instruments to evaluate the results of these experiments, ISCPET has in these few months made very significant progress.

Also promising is the fact that seven institutions are making a start on approved projects. Five of these projects are experimental and will test the following assumptions:

1. A prospective teacher of secondary school English preparing in a small, four-year college can be helped by a period of internship under the direction of an experienced college teacher.

Prior to student teaching, each intern will at the college freshman level spend two semesters choosing topics for theme assignments, evaluating compositions, and teaching a sequence of several class periods.

2. It is possible to develop content for a special course in English composition of such a nature that beginning teachers who have successfully taken the course will have greater knowledge of English composition and will teach it more effectively than beginning teachers who have not had the course.

Control groups in this experiment will come not only from the institution doing the research but from a neighboring institution having a matched program except for the experimental course in composition.

3. It is possible to determine whether college literature courses organized by genres or those organized by surveys provide a more valuable preparation for the secondary school English teacher.

There is some likelihood that this experiment will be expanded to include literature programs that are organized in at least two other ways, and that the expansion will involve cooperative research among four institutions that offer similar preparation except for their differing ways of organizing the literature program.

4. For practicing English teachers, additional training in linguistics and composition, and additional knowledge about various approaches to different ability levels, particularly the slow learner, lead to more effective teaching.

An extension course stressing these things will be offered to teachers in three Illinois communities by a teaching team of three instructors.

5. It is possible to design and teach an English methods course which will train prospective English teachers in the skills of critical thinking. It is hoped that, having been alerted to the possibility of using critical thinking as an integrating principle of instruction, these future teachers may develop some of the varied but identifiable skills needed for critical thinking.

Two studies not of an experimental nature are also underway:

1. A statewide survey is now being planned for the purpose of discovering just what English in grades 7, 8, and 9 consists of in Illinois, with reference to such matters as courses emphases and preparation of teachers. A possible second phase of this study will be the development of a program at the investigating institution which will prepare English teachers specifically for grades 7, 8, and 9.
2. A two-year project is underway involving the development, statewide administration, and analysis of an extensive examination based on the competencies included in the ISCPET lists of "Qualifications."

The seven special studies mentioned above constitute only a beginning. In April the Executive Committee will consider other proposals. But even at this stage we have some assurance that some things are not as impossible as they appeared to be at first. For example:

Our professional persons from English, education, and English education have agreed upon aims and goals, even though these persons are from virtually every kind of college and university in our state.

By focusing on the task of identifying common problems and by designing cooperative research, persons with different talents and interests have been stimulated and brought together on college campuses.

Involvement in a statewide project concerned with common professional interests has created an awareness of common problems and the desire to work together in solving them. Interinstitutional and coinstitutional research will broaden and strengthen several special studies.

The complete lack of instruments to measure most of the changes that are anticipated in experiments is causing the creation of these instruments. On several campuses, investigators are already at work creating the kinds of tests of knowledge, tests of performance, scales, and inventories which these investigators feel must be created.

Such things as I have outlined above constitute, we believe, new dimensions in research on the teaching of English in Illinois. At present we are too busy to make guesses about the impact that our Project might have on future research in our profession. It is possible that not only our research results but our way of working will have national implications. We sincerely hope so.

IF I HAD MY WAY: NEEDED REFORMS IN PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS

Ruth G. Strickland, Indiana University

My "blue sky" flight takes off from muddy terrain, not from a ribbon-smooth runway, and is as soggy and bumpy as the condition of the terrain. In fact, I found it very difficult to get off the ground at all because I have been earthbound too long—earthbound fully as much by the conditions which exist in English departments as by those which exist in departments of education.

Studies by members of this audience have revealed the sadly meager preparation of many elementary teachers for the teaching of English. Students in elementary education have had too few courses in English and too little attention to what English is or should be in the elementary school. The trend toward requiring two majors of all students, one in an academic field as well as one in education, is a wholesome trend and one which will result in considerably more English for those students who choose English for their academic concentration. But all elementary teachers need more and better work in English no matter what their choice of academic major. What they need and how to provide it is the problem. We tend to be very little clearer in our concept of what the teacher needs for himself as an educated man or woman than we are about what he needs for his work with children. Part of the problem lies in the inability of both education and English departments to balance vocational motivation with their interest in English as a humanity.

My background is that of an elementary teacher. Consequently, I shall point my wishful thinking toward what I want for children, then turn my attention to what the teacher needs in order to provide children with the experience I covet for them.

I want children to begin in the primary school to acquire some basic concepts about language itself. They can learn very early that a language is a system of sounds, and that the sounds convey meaning only when they are put together in patterns of words and sentences. They can learn the arbitrary nature of their language in its sound system and its system of arrangement as well as in the relationship of sounds to the things they represent. They can be made aware of the designs that are characteristic of their language and how flexibly those designs can be manipulated, all of this without formal teaching. They can become aware of the changing nature of the language as they listen to and contrast Mother Goose and modern realistic stories. As they grow older, they can be made increasingly aware of the fact that language differences are related to time, to geographic space, and to cultural and life experience. To take the matter higher into the grades, I want every child to recognize, understand, and respect differences in dialects of his own language as well as languages that are foreign to him. I want no child to be taken through the chronology of American history without seeing its relationship to the evolution of American English, from the Elizabethan English of Captain John Smith and Miles Standish to the English they hear in television newscasts.

I want children to master basic patterns of symbol-sound relationship as they learn to crack the code of English script as they learn to read, but beyond that to consider the process of reading to be one of thinking and of relating vicariously to real life experience. I want them to see system and relationship in spelling, as far as that is possible, and to learn the sources and the reasons for some of the irregularities they encounter. I want them to understand how English sentences are put together and the relationship of the structure of the sentences and the way in which they are rendered to the meaning they convey. I covet for all children wide and rich experience with the best literature available for them in the English language to stretch their imaginations and deepen their understanding of man and his relationship to the world of ideas and of material resources. I want this literature so presented that it forms a basis for the children's experience in learning to turn the products of their own thinking into records on paper.

This is enough to make clear what I want elementary teachers to do for children. Now the question is equally clear, "What must the program of preparation do for the prospective teacher to make it possible for him to do this for children?"

The skills the teacher develops in children will be no better than his own. His courses in English and also the courses in education related to teaching English must develop the student's own skills far beyond those he brings to college as a freshman. The two departments, working cooperatively in whatever way seems necessary for an individual, must make sure that he can interpret literary forms through his oral reading, that he recognizes good writing and can produce some of it, and that his handling of oral English can serve as a model for children. They must insistently encourage breadth and depth of experience in reading literature and current material of a variety of types to the end that he expands his vocabulary (usually far too meager in most students) and comes to enjoy and appreciate reading as a means of self-enrichment and self-fulfillment.

Much of the work with refining skills must be done in the Department of English, since, in most colleges, it encounters the student a year or more before he comes to the Department of Education. If this means, and I think it does, far more concern for individuals and their needs than is true in most English classes, then that is a problem to which English departments must turn their attention. Many of them need more of the conviction expressed by a scientist from M.I.T. who remarked vehemently, "Everyone knows that writing must be taught individually!" Certainly, until we can develop a better product in elementary and secondary schools, the English departments of colleges must help with the interim work.

Unless the school requires a speech test of every incoming student (and I wish that all of them did), I should like to see the teachers of freshman English courses require any student who shows any evidence of a speech problem to go at once to a speech specialist for diagnosis so that he could begin, under expert guidance, to remedy the problem. Of course, this would require more opportunity for freshmen to talk in English classes than is often afforded. Speech is increasingly important in all human relations and should be the concern of all teachers.

But even after the English teachers have done their best to help the prospective teacher refine and further develop his skills, the teacher of English methods must carefully diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of each student as to speech, oral presentation of ideas, vocabulary, writing skills including spelling, use of punctuation, and all elements of writing form, silent reading proficiency, and skill in oral interpretation of prose and poetry.

The basic work of the English department in a program of teacher preparation, in addition to sharpening and refining the students' skills in handling their language (and I insist that some of this is their responsibility), is to introduce students to much of the world's great literature. How this can best be done, I am not sure. No department in a university has a greater offering of fragments in separate courses than does a department of English. Vocationalization has so taken over these departments that each man, if he is to survive, let alone progress, must preempt a small area of literary soil and dig interminably for pay dirt, no matter how many others have dug the same soil or how little that is new or valuable they have turned up. Do fragments dealing with various genres, authors, or historic periods add up to the total that is needed? As more and more elementary teachers take a major in English, we shall have to evaluate both the composite of their experience and its effect on their work with children.

The serious shortage of scholars interested in language and linguistics shows up starkly as the new NDEA institutes work to set up their programs. This is a shortage all of us must seek to remedy. People who know elementary education and the problems of the schools must even now interpret and adapt the help of the linguists for the elementary level. Perhaps more of us can study the field intensively and help to fill this gap through our methods courses.

At no level in the school can an elementary teacher plan a course in English and follow it through precisely; he cannot work from a prescribed syllabus. The material he must deal with is the language children bring to school and all of the attitudes and values that come along with it. The methods course must concern itself with goals and standards, but not rigidly set for each grade level. Students should be led, through observation of children and study of the results of research, to understand the sequence of developmental steps through which children grow in mastery of their language. They should learn to ascertain the level on which an individual child can operate, recognize his strengths and weaknesses, and diagnose his difficulties. Then they should learn what steps to take next to help the child to move forward.

In order to meet this requirement, the prospective elementary teacher needs to study the psychology of learning and as much as possible about child development. He needs work in sociology which will enable him to understand and appreciate the varying cultural backgrounds from which children come and the level of aspiration which each has engendered.

The entire field of the social studies is important to the elementary teacher, since he is being called upon to teach more history, more geography and civics, and, in addition, to add anthropology and economics. The English methods course should help the students see how the teaching of these subject matters and the development of language skills can go hand in hand and be used to rein-

force one another. The kind of thinking and drawing of relationships necessary in teaching the social studies is akin to that required in the study of literature. Modern mathematics is a language calling for precise statements of relationship and so is much of elementary science. The elementary teacher cannot and need not work on language skills in isolation. The curriculum of the elementary school is too crowded for that. The methods course can help young people see how language can be the warp into which the woof of any needed content can be drawn.

But while the methods course is concerned with the "how" aspect of elementary teaching, it must not neglect the "what." Children need to learn about language itself, and about their own English language—its origins, the forces that have molded it, its structure, and its methods of operation. And certainly they need its literature in quantity, to be enjoyed at surface level as emotional experience and to be studied in increasing depth. They need to see it in relationship to time and to its related cultural manifestations in art and music.

I see the language arts methods course as an opportunity to pull out, from all that students have learned with relation to language, what they can use in teaching children, put it into perspective, see its interrelationships, and focus it all on the needs of children in a complex society. This is not a course in which to teach devices and gimmicks but a course for understanding values and relationships. The person who teaches it must be experienced in working with children, must keep abreast of social developments and cultural requirements, and must know his field of English well enough to recognize values both for the prospective teacher and for the children he is to teach.

Student teaching is the culmination of all that has been done before. Out of the "blue sky" with which I started, I should like to pluck an artist teacher of children and English for each beginner who could serve as a model and an inspiration to the novice teacher. We all know how infrequently one finds these in the schools and how valuable their products are for the whole field of education. Perhaps an ideal program in our colleges and universities will, in time, provide more of these.

IF I HAD MY WAY: NEEDED REFORMS IN PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Sister M. Philippa Coogan, Holy Angels Academy, Milwaukee

In considering with you today, changes that should take place in our preparation of teachers of English, I shall not stress curriculum enrichment, important as this aspect of the total program must be. All of us who read the signs of the times understand the urgency of providing our prospective teachers with further work in oral and written composition, in criticism, in linguistics, and in speech, and are endeavoring, to the best of our powers and authority, to add these skills and knowledges to our programs. I want to discuss with you instead an even more fundamental way of producing an improved crop of teachers.

I need not remind you that these are whirling times. Many of us who can remember beginning a Sunday afternoon with a quiet ride in the family surrey—out three miles to the old mill and back again—have since been jet-propelled from one end of the continent to the other with daylight all the way, and have watched John Glenn circle the globe in less time than it took us to pack our bags to come here to Lexington. If we consider this increased speed of transportation as a metaphor of the lightning changes that are presently transforming our whole way of life, we will come to realize that the very best preparation we can give our students in college for their careers in the classroom lies in developing their resourcefulness, not in providing ready-made answers to present-day difficulties.

I am not at all sure, though, that the atmosphere in our colleges and universities is notably favorable to the development of the creativity, the intellectual curiosity, the independence of mind which foster resource. For a long time now, our colleges and universities have been in a sellers' market. We can pick and choose our customers—they have to compete with one another for our wares. All this may cause them to place too high a value on our commodity and lead us to the vain complacency that is death to enterprise. The students we get from the strenuous screening process we all engage in are highly motivated toward achievement. They are paying a great deal for the privilege of sitting at our feet—but their very desire to maintain themselves in college may cause them, at times, to lend a pragmatic sanction to teaching that is less than mediocre.

In all too many of our universities, undergraduates receive most of their early instruction in English from graduate assistants. Most of these student teachers are inexperienced, all are using their teaching as a means to an end, and few are likely to stay on the job in a particular university long enough to give stability to the program. Seasoned faculty members, placed in charge of these young teachers, tend to devise rather rigid courses of study, with the laudable purpose of improving the performance of the less talented teachers, but with the deplorable effect, also, of lowering the level of achievement of the more gifted. One hears a good deal these days about breaking the lockstep in grade and high school teaching. I might observe at this point that Frank Browne of Melbourne gives as one of his reasons for encouraging advanced placement courses in his

high school his conviction that his students will be better taught there than in college.

One reads, occasionally, of questionnaires wherein students in college are asked to assess their high school preparation—and sometimes even top high schools deservedly come under severe condemnation. However, often enough a closer look at students' objections leads the veteran teacher to search elsewhere for the fault: bright but inexperienced instructors of college and university freshmen often give unrealistic, poorly prepared, poorly motivated assignments. For instance, can the high school really be blamed if it does not prepare its seniors to meet the following situation? "My first day of class, I was told to hand in a 15-page analysis of two books at the end of the week. I got F, of course; the professor said that the writing was adequate and the content all right, but the form was all wrong. I didn't know what he was talking about until a friend told me how to do footnotes and bibliographies. A lot of other kids got F's for the same reason."

Surely it is legitimate to ask why the teacher gave such a long, apparently unfocused assignment for the very first writing task of his freshmen; and why, further, he did not mention that he wanted the paper documented. After all, the assignment did not of its nature demand documentation. True, the complaining student added that she had had no experience in high school in writing a research paper. This state of affairs must certainly be rare, however, if one is to judge from the attitudes of the professors themselves. "When you get to college," says another student, "the professors take for granted that you know how to prepare research papers. I have yet to hear of a professor asking his class if everyone knows how to write a paper, and I think I'd faint if someone told me that the professor had actually explained how to do it." Certainly some bit of review or reinforcement or directive toward a research manual might well be provided for these aspiring freshmen, to prevent waste of time, discouragement, and needless failure.

Depreciation of methods classes has become a cliché in educational circles, and many of our bright young men and women deliberately bypass the opportunity to prepare for high school teaching so as to avoid them. They elect college teaching instead—methods classes are *not needed* there—and spend their first unfledged efforts trying to get unfledged freshmen off the ground. It is no wonder that despairing veteran teachers, in charge of such programs, devise ironclad syllabi that would make a Rockette chorus line seem individualistic. Anyone who has had job conferences with young Ph.D.'s just off the assembly line will have experienced the reluctance of many of them to take freshman classes. Is it because they see in such assignments the stigma of their bond-service as graduate assistants?

Granted that native gifts and knowledge are necessary for competence in teaching, so also are efficient methods and experience in using them. It is well for us to remind ourselves at this point that the major breakthrough in the teaching of science and mathematics in our time lies in the development of new, psychologically based methods—and this from kindergarten through high school—even, in fact, into college.

When we assess our own college and university preparation, most of us, I think, will be able to say that in those years we experienced the best teaching of our academic careers—and the worst. Truly great teaching, of course, is as rare as top-level performance in any other field of endeavor. The student who is the beneficiary of it should be—and usually is—grateful for the experience all his life long. Granted, then, that it is beyond the power of every aspiring teacher to achieve greatness. It is clearly possible, nevertheless, for him to become highly competent if, added to native talent, he has reasonably good preparation and genuine involvement. Yet it is no slander to say that too many college and university teachers simply lack competence. Many reasons can be ascribed for this. I shall limit myself to a few.

The first, of course, is the emphasis in many universities on pure research, with the chief emoluments going to those who publish most extensively. Research nourishes learning, assuredly, and as such it is always to be highly esteemed. Yet if the researcher is of such a cast of mind as to make genuine contact with students an impossibility to him, why would it not be better to let him stay in his ivory tower and do all his more serious communicating through the printing press? In my experience, the pure researcher sees men as if they were trees walking. Undergraduates exist for him as means to ends. Periodical appearances before them are necessary to ensure livelihood—and opportunity for further research. One elderly philology professor I had was a specialist in Algonquin. He read his lectures from an ancient daybook, whose pages were so fragile that he had to turn them with both hands, lest they evanesce entirely. "These languages," he intoned, "are spoken in regions contiguous with St. Petersburg." Then, quite without dismay or self-consciousness, he added, "Oh, I think that town has changed its name a couple of times since I made up these notes." Obviously, though he was a kindly soul, we existed for him merely to provide him with index cards and wigwams—or whatever it was he needed for his work among the Algonquin. Such scholars bring to mind Kipling's artists-gone-to-heaven: "Each in his separate star, painting things as he sees them," and ignoring things as they are.

Other researchers involve their students in their own investigations—a laudable pursuit, if the problems are such that the students can benefit from their labors. Too often, piecework jobs are parceled out to untrained, unenlightened students, and the results of their endeavors, though conceivably useful to the researcher, who is working in a larger context, are no more liberalizing to the students than threading screws in a factory.

Dr. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, comments that too many professors' students are just "impediments in the headlong search for more and better grants, fatter fees, higher salaries, higher rank," and concludes that this situation will not improve unless professors and college officials "behave as though undergraduate teaching is important." He urges administrators to follow the lead of UCLA and a few other worried universities and offer salary incentives and status benefits, not only to the researchers, but also to faculty members notably engrossed with teaching undergraduates. The need for such a change in policy is underlined by a comment of

one recent university graduate: "In my undergraduate years I had only six outstanding professors, and since my graduation two of these have been let go for not publishing enough."

A second source of incompetence lies in authoritarianism. College teachers often blame their high school confrères for making students over docile by too dogmatic presentations—but there's only a thin line between teaching with authority and teaching with authoritarianism—and all too many college teachers cross that line. The tendency to pontificate grows as one grows older—perhaps chairmen of departments and major professors are most susceptible. I was ashamed to find myself, recently, instructing a former student in the primitive law of survival in graduate school: keeping your major professor happy! Yet I didn't take back my advice. There was no point in my being Joan of Arc, I reasoned. She was the one who would be burned at the stake.

Dogmatism is no doubt a built-in hazard of the teaching profession, but it should be strenuously resisted, as no attitude is more quenching to an eager-minded student than this one. It ought to be possible to teach as one having power, and still not as the Scribes and the Pharisees. Truly great college teachers achieve this goal. Genuinely interested in scholarly investigation, they are also free from pedantry. Their exploration of the field of knowledge with their students has genuine mutuality—they are not merely presiding in a bored way over routine discoveries of the obvious by the uninformed.

A third weakness of college and university teaching, in terms of our problem, lies in its isolationism—the tendency of each professor to an overspecialised approach to his particular discipline. In this area, I think perhaps some linguists are the greatest offenders. I do not object to the fact that there is a great deal of confusion, a good deal of argumentation going on in this field of study. Confusion, after all, is the halfway house between ignorance and knowledge, and it is to be expected if there is to be an advancement of learning. I do object, though, to their regarding the study of linguistics in college as a completely separate discipline, unrelated to literature and composition. I object to the insistence of many of them that it is to be taught for its own sake, merely—for its humanistic value, as they say. The humanistic value of linguistics doesn't loom very large in the horizons of most undergraduates. In fact, they will have to acquire a good deal more knowledge about language and experience in it before this aspect of the matter becomes truly meaningful.

Furthermore, the same linguists who take this denatured approach to their specialty are apt to be the ones who condemn the traditional grammarians for pedantry and lack of realism. True enough, modern research has pretty well proved that the teaching of traditional grammar as a separate discipline, unrelated to composition or literature, has been a barren pursuit. Students so trained just drop the whole cargo as superfluous; each year the same dogged reteaching goes on, with the same Dead Sea fruit at the end of the course. It shouldn't be necessary for us, then, to have to wait a generation for proof that the same psychological factors operate in the teaching of linguistics: no retention, no carryover unless the transfer is made in the teaching process.

It would be gratifying to nonspecialists who are endeavoring to introduce

the new linguistics into grade and high school programs if they could enlist more help from the specialists along the way. Not long ago I had the privilege of learning about a successful experiment in developing more mature sentence patterns in second grade compositions. Basic to the method is the kernel sentence of generative grammar—just as it is to the method Francis Christensen is developing on the college level. If we could only find a way to bridge the gap between such experiments in the teaching of second grade composition and programs comparable to Christensen's on the college level, we might for the first time develop a really scientific, psychologically sound theory of composition that would revolutionize our teaching. But we need the help of the specialists to prevent slow-downs and fumbles. Wouldn't it be possible for the linguists now on our university faculties to cross the campus to their laboratory schools, find out what is happening there, and make suggestions? They might even discover hints for their own research in language if they were to case themselves to the floor beside their small grandchildren and observe these bright young people building up their personal language patterns through tireless experimentation, selection, and rejection. Jespersen, after all, didn't do too badly when he employed this method of language study.

I have mentioned weaknesses in the instructional pattern in many of our colleges and universities. There are further hindrances to the development of the spirit of resourcefulness and free inquiry among their students. Boys and girls coming from small classes in our high schools are daunted, often, by the mere pressure of numbers in the colleges—and by the anonymity into which they slip after cutting quite a wide swath in their senior years. One principal mentioned to me that she must account to the university in her town for every class whose membership rises even one above thirty. It is a bit dismaying to her to learn, then, that graduates of her high school may enter university classes that number 400. The elixir that college teachers dispense can't be *that* much more potent than the high school variety. It's too bad when a bright and eager freshman finds that the only way he can express his individuality is by biting off the corner of his IBM card. I do not think it is fantastic to see in the disorders on the Berkeley campus last fall evidence of a creeping malaise among American undergraduates, especially in our larger universities: 6,000, 60,000, 600,000 students in search of identity? An appalling concept in a nation whose basic philosophic commitment is belief in the dignity of the individual human being.

Professors themselves, oppressed by the size of their classes, often engage in a pretty ruthless program of decimation—though they eliminate far more than 10 percent! Some, who like to boast of high standards, warn their students not to expect more than 50 percent survival. It is easy to see how students who have brought to the university with them excellent records of ability and performance and who have never before received a low grade will be undone by such a policy. And those who do manage to survive must make a psychological about-face if they are to deal realistically with the teaching problems they will be sure to meet in high school classrooms. Not only the gifted but the culturally deprived, the intellectually disadvantaged, the potential dropouts, the reluctant readers—all must receive the benefit of their knowledge, their training, their dedication. Too few

of their experiences in college and university prepare them for this new and challenging role.

I do not believe that I have told you anything new or anything that you have not yourselves observed. You may well think that nothing can be done about most of these problems, but I am of another mind. We who waited a dozen centuries or so to get an English Mass don't readily abandon hope. If the spirit of the *aggiornamento* can work so manifestly and so swiftly in a council of bishops, may we not expect that a splendid group of dedicated persons like yourselves can spread just such a spirit on your respective campuses? The dough of academic inertia is heaving already—your very presence here proves this. All you may need to do now, perhaps, is to apply heat to hasten the fermentation.

Specifically, I urge reform in two areas. First, in the position of the undergraduate on our university campuses, I recommend simply that he be considered as an individual in his own right, not merely as a reluctant underwriter of the graduate program.

Second, in the position of teaching, if good teaching were to be held in proper esteem, then many other disorders would be speedily corrected. Authoritarianism would be lessened, for professorial defensiveness would diminish. Isolationism would be reduced, for researchers, especially in the field of linguistics, would see the practical value of giving wider dissemination to the fruits of their studies. Increase in the prestige of the teacher would raise the status of method—and might even induce chairmen of English departments to widen the base of Master's investigations to include more studies in the field of English education, with appropriate diminution in the number of dimly lighted literary autopsies on decently interred minor poets.

No doubt all of you will remember the series on college pressures that appeared in *Life* last January. Anyone who takes these samplings as representative, as they certainly were intended to be, will grant the urgent need of change in the academic atmosphere, if only to prevent innumerable psychic disasters among students, professors, and administrators themselves.

Fifth General Session

ENGLISH AND THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED

Robert E. Lewis, Wendell Phillips High School, Chicago

The term "culturally disadvantaged" is used in this paper as it applies to those groups (foreign speaking whites, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Appalachian whites, and Negroes) who have migrated to the urban industrial areas in an effort to improve their living conditions and whose backgrounds have not been conducive to ready assimilation by the communities in which they settle. In this paper I shall be concerned primarily in discussing the Negro group because students of this group make up the total enrollment of the school of which I am principal. Although not all within the groups mentioned are newcomers, many of these have been born in and have never been out of their home city; but they are equally deprived because their home and local community reflect in large measure the culture of their disadvantaged parents. Many terms have been used to describe these youngsters—"culturally different," "culturally and/or linguistically deprived," "disadvantaged Americans," "children of slum schools," and others—yet all refer to a significant segment of our population which is receiving increased attention from our schools and more recently from the federal government as it plans its antipoverty program. I think that most are in agreement that the problems of the group described are overlapping, involving housing, employment, and education; and, as such, must be approached from all three directions.

As educators, we must determine our role in breaking the vicious cycle which generally binds the culturally disadvantaged—inadequate education because of the impact of a substandard culture, poorly paying jobs or no jobs at all because of inadequate education, and inadequate housing because of inadequate education and inadequate income.

Among the "culturally disadvantaged" entering and attending our schools, many enter the elementary level with such a limited background of experiences that they lack the readiness to progress normally through the instructional program and thus fall behind two to six years by the time they graduate from elementary school. As a result, far too few attain scholastic excellence and far too small a percentage of those entering high school are graduated.

The large number of school dropouts during the past few years occurring simultaneously with a shrinking market of unskilled jobs has created a situation which has commanded the attention of educators and governmental agencies. Formerly, dropouts did not pose as serious a challenge for several reasons. In the first place, there were fewer students in school; hence, numerically the dropouts were fewer. In the absence of compulsory education laws and child labor laws in many states, those youngsters who left before high school graduation were absorbed into the jobs available on the farm and into the unskilled jobs then available in the cities. But today the picture has changed. Our tremendous population growth, accompanied by the steady shift from rural to urban industrial areas, rapid advances in technology and automation, what is frequently termed "the

explosion of knowledge," and a job market incapable of absorbing a sufficiently large number of those needing employment—describe the conditions which the dropouts now find. This situation creates a grave social problem, and the rapid increase in the number of jobless youth, largely from the underprivileged group, has been aptly referred to as "social dynamite."

As the number of culturally disadvantaged children increased in elementary and high schools, the teachers of these pupils faced problems for which many were unprepared. For too long a period, teacher training was designed to prepare teachers for a curriculum geared to the needs of children of middle class families. The result was often frustration for both pupil and teacher. The teacher frequently felt "these children can't learn" and the children, in turn, felt that "teacher doesn't like me." In the field of English, the specific area with which we are primarily concerned, the colleges are only recently awakening to the challenge which this situation presents to the teacher and to the teacher training institution.

At the elementary level, the culturally disadvantaged child comes to school woefully inadequate in vocabulary, in the ability to express himself in complete sentences, in the ability to discern differences between shapes and colors, in the curiosity exhibited through asking questions, in the ability to use crayons and similar materials, in the use of acceptable speech patterns—in fact, he is inadequate in his total background of experience. These illustrate some of the differences between pupils from the middle class home and those from the culturally disadvantaged home. In addition, children from middle class homes take it for granted that reading is important, and they go about it as an expected thing. On the contrary, those who are culturally deprived see little value in reading, for they know few who read "just for the fun of it" and have not been stimulated or motivated to learn to read.

Children of the latter group must receive much additional help at school to counteract their shortcomings. Already in a number of localities, projects are being planned and operated for the preschool aged child of the culturally disadvantaged to provide experiences necessary for successful adjustment to the beginning program in school. For those already in school, programs and administrative provisions are being made by many school systems to compensate for deficiencies of the culturally disadvantaged student. Among these are inservice education of teachers; smaller class size; supplementary professional services; special summer school programs, both remedial and enrichment; after-school libraries, reading clinics, study centers, and speech clinics; and after-school classes in remedial arithmetic and remedial reading.

The teacher must be willing to expand the experiential background of all the students whose lives need enrichment, but this is vitally important in the education of the culturally disadvantaged child. In many Chicago schools, groups are organized to visit places of civic, cultural, and historical interest and to attend cultural events such as the theatre, concerts, exhibits and the like, and are given the opportunity to participate in assembly programs, clubs, drama, the choir, and other activities designed to expose them to broader and richer cultural experiences. On the part of the teacher, this requires insight, concern, cultural interests of his own, and a considerable expenditure of extra time and effort to

plan, motivate, and sponsor these activities. Teachers who work with the culturally disadvantaged and put forth this extra time and effort find the experience genuinely rewarding.

On the secondary level, critical deficiencies in oral and written communication among the culturally disadvantaged are evident. And now, apparent to a marked degree, is the attitude on the part of these students of the futility of striving to overcome the readily recognized retardation, due to the low achievement level in English. To help these students recognize the need and acquire the skills and tools necessary to communicate effectively and with ease poses one of the most critical problems of the teacher of English at all levels. To quote Ruth Golden, "Determining what are good standards in our language and then kindling a love and respect for them are joys that should be shared by all teachers and even all English-speaking adults. But this task is the special trust of the English teacher."¹

The school of which I am principal is the general public high school, grades 9 through 12, serving the near south side, one of the older sections of Chicago. The school district includes a large industrial area bordering the central business district of the city and a residential area with some industry interspersed. The housing is largely public housing, with two private housing developments near the lake; however, only a few students from the latter attend the public high school. The balance of the housing ranges from middle class homes to substandard houses and apartments, with the latter type predominant. Those involved in the teaching of English or those representing teacher training institutions may find that our experiences at this school indicate what has been happening generally in large cities, and methods of approaching some of the resultant problems may be suggested.

At present, this school has an enrollment of about 3,000, with approximately one third of this number in the first year. To facilitate instruction, students are grouped in reasonably homogeneous English classes. Basic English is a double period class carrying double credit, providing a one year program for students reading below the sixth grade level; Essential English is designed to meet the needs of those who enter with reading scores between the sixth and eighth grade levels; and Regular English and Honors English are for those reading above the eighth and ninth grade levels respectively.

It is of interest to note that of 428 entering the ninth grade in September, 1962, 187 (44%) were in Basic English; of 836 entering the ninth grade in September, 1963, 293 (35%) were placed in Basic; and of 846 in September, 1964, 138 (16%). Although pupils in the district had made marked improvement by 1964, there were still 16 percent of the entering pupils with reading grades below sixth grade level.

Perhaps the problem for the teacher of English will be more apparent when we observe the number of classes in which entering students were reading below the eighth grade level: in 1962, 22 of 29 classes were in this category; in

¹Ruth I. Golden, *Improving Patterns of Language Usage* (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1960), p. 7.

1963, 29 of 40 classes; and in 1964, 31 of 36 classes were so classified. The remaining classes each year consisted of regular and honors classes.

Teaching English to the students in a school such as I have described requires broader training than that which is now generally provided for prospective teachers. The teachers are obviously faced with the necessity of remedial instruction in many of their classes. This presents a more complex problem than teaching the reading skills for the first time. Diagnostic techniques must be acquired and corrective techniques developed. The Chicago teaching guides for Basic and Essential English present approaches, objectives, and activities which offer help. But in order for guides to be of greatest benefit, teachers need training in methods of diagnosing reading problems. Learning the techniques of informal diagnosis is an important aspect of this preparation. The teacher must also have a knowledge of remedial techniques in order to help students overcome their reading difficulties, once these have been identified. It would be of great benefit if this knowledge could be acquired while the college has the teacher in training.

Inability to read, combined with a lack of interest in engaging in a laborious task, results in deficiencies affecting all areas of the educational program. The failure to obtain the information handed down to us through literature, the inability to have his spirits soar as the result of reading and sensing the beauty of a literary selection, the limited knowledge with which he approaches the study of all other subject areas—all point to the need for corrective measures to be taken with the culturally deprived.

Dr. Conant, in his report on the junior high school, recommends that all English teachers should be prepared to teach reading skills; I subscribe to this recommendation, but I am of the opinion that the teacher of English in a secondary school serving the culturally disadvantaged must have more than a knowledge of how to teach or reteach reading skills. As indicated, many pupils from culturally deprived homes enter high school seriously retarded in reading, and, as a result, they do not like to read. A first challenge to the teacher, then, is that of motivation. The alert and creative teacher will find among the wealth of books published for children many which can be used to help those from deprived areas "raise their sights" and stimulate them to read more widely. Colleges must offer training and opportunities for the prospective teacher to become well acquainted with these books and collections.

In addition to a deficiency in reading, students from culturally deprived homes usually bear the handicap of poor speech habits. Common errors include improper vowel sounds; errors in usage involving tense, number, or agreement; complete omission of a verb; and failure to sound the beginnings and endings of words. Despite these nonstandard patterns of speech, the student has been able to communicate with others in his home and among his acquaintances. The conflict occurs when he attempts to communicate with those who represent a different cultural level. He therefore comes into conflict with the teacher and the school curriculum. However, "It must be acknowledged," says Ruth Golden, "that standard language is a key that will open many doors, and conversely, many doors may be closed to those with nonstandard language."² The student, there-

² Ibid., p. 5

fore, must learn that social and economic mobility are generally related to the ability to learn and use effectively standard patterns of speech. His willingness to participate in a speech improvement program is usually facilitated when the social and vocational values of standard speech are understood and accepted.

Because the student has not developed the habit of listening carefully, he has difficulty in reproducing standard English. His problem is increased because normally he hears the word, phrase, or expression correctly spoken only in school. The teacher who expresses shock, dismay, or disgust at his effort to express himself, however poorly, can only serve to cause the student to withdraw into his shell to avoid the embarrassment of what he may construe as ridicule. The important thing is the manner in which he is corrected; therefore, a climate of mutual understanding must be created by the teacher—one in which the teacher understands the influence of the student's cultural background and one in which the student understands the value of mastering standard speech patterns. Only in such a climate can improvement in both listening and speaking best be effected.

To be of help to speech-crippled students, the teacher must have preparation in speech. His own speech must set an excellent example; he must develop an ear trained to discern errors in speech and convey this skill to the students; and, finally, the teacher must be trained and prepared to teach phonetic skills and standard language patterns.

English, to the foreigner, is a foreign language. In essence, the standard language patterns of English as taught in our schools are a "foreign language" to some of the students from culturally and thus linguistically disadvantaged homes. Techniques, equipment, and materials now being used in teaching modern foreign languages suggest methods of teaching English as a second language to such students. The language laboratory has been tried in some schools and the results have been encouraging. For retraining the students in certain skills at the secondary level, programmed learning may bear investigation.

Inasmuch as many of the students from disadvantaged homes are lacking in the use of standard language patterns and have not developed adequate listening skills, it follows that these students are generally unable to spell correctly and to put their thoughts in correct written form. Written communication in the culturally deprived home is usually limited. The teacher, then, must be ingenious enough to create a need for writing. Written composition should be started early in the primary grades; however, if high school students require instruction in elementary composition, it must be given. The teacher of English on the secondary level in a school serving the culturally disadvantaged, then, should be able and willing to teach composition at any level and must develop proficiency in recognizing the levels of achievement for evaluation. The teacher must likewise be sensitive and alert to the emergence of creativity and artistic literary talent on the part of these pupils, and recognize the danger of overlooking these abilities because nonstandard English may be the student's vehicle for expression.

In this connection, it is important that we point out a very real danger in drawing conclusions from test data and from the language deficiencies of the culturally deprived. A teacher may conclude that these children cannot learn.

But they *do* learn, though some may learn more slowly than others. In my school, for example, as in other schools, some of the students are achieving remarkably well in the regular English classes, some are making superior progress in the Honors classes, and still others are successfully pursuing courses in college before graduation from high school—all this despite the fact that these, too, are “culturally disadvantaged.” (Perhaps these students are not aware that they are “culturally disadvantaged.”) Fortunate is the child whose teacher is guided by the thought expressed by Thomas Gray in his *Elegy*:

Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear:
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

In addition to the special teaching skills and subject knowledge required, the prospective teacher should have some knowledge of the culturally deprived child and his community. Although understanding, empathy, respect, and a constant awareness of circumstances affecting the students are important in all educational programs, these are essential for the teacher working with the culturally disadvantaged. As one psychologist explained in discussing the needs and desires of the culturally disadvantaged, “They don’t want just ‘love’—but they do need and respond favorably to understanding and respect.” The teacher’s respect is the secret. In the booklet, *Education and the Disadvantaged American*, it says,

To provide the basis of that respect and awareness must be a major purpose of teacher education. Observation in disadvantaged areas is an important element in teacher preparation. But observation is not enough, for superficial experience may confirm stereotypes rather than produce understanding or respect. Teacher education should provide the insights of psychology, sociology, and anthropology and of the science of human development regarding the influence of environment. It should help teachers understand the impact of their own background on their personality and behavior. It should help them to examine the relationships among their values, attitudes, and actions. It should cause them to examine their attitudes toward culturally different children. Above all, it should develop in them a dedication to teaching for the unique opportunity it offers to give children hope.³

To aid the prospective teacher of English in developing the desired understandings, some experiences which may have value would include:

1. A course in contemporary American culture. Included would be field trips, guest speakers, audiovisual materials, etc. Here the case study, if carefully developed, could be a most effective instructional technique.
2. Experience after school, on Saturdays or during the summer in camps, churches, schools, community centers, and other agencies serving groups classified as culturally disadvantaged. Some volunteers even work in the homes, thus acquiring a deeper understanding of their culture.

³National Education Association, *Education and the Disadvantaged American*, A Report Prepared by the Educational Policies Commission (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962), p. 20.

3. Means should be provided to bring to the college actual reports of classroom activities involving pupils of culturally disadvantaged areas. Videotaping of actual practice teaching in schools serving the inner city has been tried with some degree of success.
4. It would be valuable experience for all prospective teachers to visit schools in a variety of socioeconomic areas.
5. Projects could be conducted at the colleges during the summer, bringing in students from underprivileged areas. Student teachers and graduate students working under supervision could have the opportunity of first-hand contact with the group to study techniques for meeting their needs.
6. Training should be received, not only in diagnosing reading problems, but in what to do for remediation after problems are identified.
7. Practice teaching under supervision involving a member of the English Department would make available to the prospective teacher expert help in the subject area on the job. Firsthand knowledge and direct contact with the teaching situation should make the supervision more meaningful. The college staff should be sufficiently knowledgeable about the impact of cultural deprivation so as to be able to help prospective teachers become aware of the students' needs.
8. The prospective teacher should be trained in the selection of reading materials to meet the individual needs of culturally disadvantaged children. Courses for this purpose should be offered by the colleges. Opportunity should be provided for careful examination of curriculum guides and other curriculum material and equipment. Maintenance of an instructional materials center would be of value to both graduate and undergraduate students.
9. Colleges, in cooperation with schools, could conduct research in the use and evaluation of instructional materials and techniques to be used with the culturally disadvantaged.
10. Seminars and workshops should be organized which would involve teachers who are successfully working with disadvantaged students together with the college staff and the teachers-in-training.
11. Practice teaching should include working with students from various socioeconomic backgrounds.

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, in cooperation with the University of Chicago and the Chicago Board of Education, have followed such a plan for the past two years. Student teachers from these twelve colleges spent eight weeks as practice teachers in schools serving privileged neighborhoods and then spent another eight weeks in schools in less privileged areas. The consensus was that though this experience provided them with their first contact with students from culturally deprived neighborhoods, it was their "most rewarding teaching experience." Many of the student teachers indicated that observation in a variety of schools during their third year would have been a valuable addition to their education and would have bolstered their self-confidence.

It is recognized that there will be many problems in schools serving culturally disadvantaged children which cannot be solved by the teacher without help from others on the staff. Solving these problems may require the assistance of the administrative staff and also require special services, such as those provided by the teacher-nurse, psychologist, counselor, and fellow teachers who may, by sharing experiences, increase the effectiveness of their work with disadvantaged students and their parents.

If the situation that I have described appears to be discouraging, then I have failed to achieve the purpose of this paper. On the other hand, our consideration of this problem will not have been wasted effort if I have succeeded in suggesting

- that the problem is complex, but not insoluble;
- that there is more hope than ever before in the united attack being made to identify and resolve some of the problems facing the culturally disadvantaged;
- that we, as educators, must assume the key role in approaching the basic problem; and, finally,
- that despite the overwhelming numbers of these young people in our classrooms today, they can through our efforts be stimulated, encouraged, and led to put forth the effort necessary to more nearly achieve their potential and increase their value to themselves and to society.

Luncheon Address

NATIONAL TRENDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Don Davies, National Education Association

In the 1950's the great conflict in teacher education was between the educationists and the academicians over the nature, quantity, and quality of subject matter preparation and professional study.

In the first half of the 1960's, the great conflict has been over the control of teacher education—certification, accreditation, and the regulation of standards. Conant, Koerner, "The Establishment," NCATE, and the Wisconsin case have been in the headlines.

In the second half of this decade, what will be the focus of conflict? My prediction is that the next conflict may well be between the colleges which prepare teachers and their clients—the teachers who have been prepared and who are going back for further instruction in the form of continuing education. The point at issue will be the nature and quality of preservice and inservice teacher education, both subject matter and professional study; and the end product will not likely prove helpful to the cause of genuine progress for the teaching profession.

You may think that I am being melodramatic. Perhaps I am. But I honestly believe that, *unless the pace of reform in teacher education is quickened, unless significant improvements are made at both the preservice and inservice level, we are in for trouble.*

Let me sketch in some background for this melodrama:

1. It is now clear to nearly everyone that the elementary and the secondary school teacher in America have changed, both in spirit and in competence. Over 90 percent of all elementary and secondary school teachers have a bachelor's degree (twenty years ago only about 40 percent had finished four years of college); 25 percent of all teachers have a master's degree; the number of states requiring a year beyond the bachelor's degree has reached twelve, and it is increasing each year. Also, in the last few years we have begun to attract a larger number of academically talented, intellectually oriented young people to teaching.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that a spirit of aggressiveness, militancy, dissatisfaction, and self-confidence has swept through the profession. Teachers are increasingly demanding to live and teach in the manner to which they have been educated. They are increasingly dissatisfied with being patronized by college professors, school administrators, or association leaders; the "Papa knows best" attitude is being sharply challenged. The aggressiveness and rising demands of teachers today are by no means limited to the area of salary and traditional welfare. If you tune into what is being said, you know that one of the chief cries of teachers is, "We want to have a more important part in managing our own affairs, in making decisions about what shall be taught, how, when, by whom, and under what conditions."

This new spirit can lead to conflict as well as to constructive change.

2. Teachers' organizations are changing, and their expectations for their organizations have increased. The old-time, tea-party kind of teachers' association is out of date and functionless. The NEA is working hard to help build or rebuild professional associations with broad-gauged, significant, and effective programs. Such professional associations can provide a collective voice of considerable influence for teachers in matters such as professional standards.

3. At least twelve states are mandating a fifth year of college work for secondary school teachers, and a few of these have the same requirement for elementary teachers. The twelve will become twenty-four, or more within five years. The number of teacher clients for postbaccalaureate and advanced degree programs will increase sharply. If these courses and programs are poor in quality, or insignificant, or inadequately related to the teacher's job in the classroom, the teacher's dissatisfaction can lead to conflict.

4. Colleges and universities face severe financial problems. Enrollments will jump in a staggering way in the next four years and there are simply not enough well-qualified college teachers available to meet the demand. There is a shortage of college classroom space, of library facilities, of staff, time, and money for supervision of student teachers; lack of staff and money for adequate guidance and counseling for the college students.

5. A good many colleges and universities are still not adequately committed to the importance of teacher education and have still not completely accepted the education of teachers as a legitimate and front-rank responsibility of higher education. In some of the large public and private universities which have been substantial producers of new teachers for many years, there are also problems. Increased stress on research and specialized graduate programs and greatly increased outside money from the federal government and private foundations often result in an orphan status for what some researchers and scholars see as the "grubby business of preparing teachers." And, of course, financial pressures will make it difficult even for the best and most positively committed institutions to provide the kinds of preservice and inservice programs to which they aspire.

6. The size and impersonality of many colleges and universities lead to a kind of student alienation and lack of identification with the institution and its purposes. This is a general problem, but it is also a problem for teacher educators and prospective teachers. The dissatisfied "angry young man" in the 400-student lecture class on "Introduction to Education" or "Principles of Teaching" may stay dissatisfied and angry when he begins to teach and even when he enrolls in graduate courses.

7. With a few exceptions, we still are bound to the sink-or-swim method of inducting beginning teachers. Too often the colleges give the prospective teacher a diploma; the school district gives him a job; the principal gives him a schedule; the teachers' organization gives him a coffee hour; and then we proceed to forget about him. The old notion that a teacher should be fully prepared to teach on his first day in the classroom still lingers. The prescription we offer to the fatigued, pressured, beginning teacher who seeks help is still all too often, "Take a course from 7:30 to 9:30 p.m. on Thursday evening."

8. Things are also stirring in state capitals across the country. Legislators and

lay state school board members are becoming increasingly concerned about such matters as teacher education and certification. Dr. Conant and those who support his views say that they are going directly to the people—bypassing the educational establishment—to attempt to bring about reform in teacher education and professional standards. They are going to the power structure in the state to seek action, but the resulting action can be something none of us, including Dr. Conant, wants. Instead of legislation to simplify and improve certification, we may get legislation that says anybody can teach as long as he has some kind of a bachelor's degree and can get a job. Or, we will see state legislatures writing college curricula and putting the details of teacher education requirements into law.

9. In the next few years, billions of dollars of federally collected money will be pumped into American education, not just into schools and colleges but also into a vast yet undefined network of formal and informal educational programs. Education will no longer be defined as schooling. Education and educators will be involved in preschool programs, new educational centers for special services to young people, the Community Youth Corps, the Job Corps, the Peace Corps, VISTA, and new forms of vocational and adult education.

The new money will bring schools and communities into the kind of close working relationship that the education textbooks of the 1930's and 1940's urged. The impact of all this will change school functions and school programs, and the job of the teacher.

Clearly, large numbers of people will need either to be prepared initially or retained for new kinds of jobs and responsibilities in education. Unless the colleges of education provide effective training and retraining programs, unless we can gear ourselves quickly for a new kind of educational world, this need will be bypassed.

Other items could be added to this list. But these nine are sufficient to make my point that there is a convergence of forces and conditions which could lead to a serious and destructive conflict between the colleges and their clients. On the other hand, these same converging forces could lead to a great period of reform, innovation, and educational progress. I could call these items trends, but that might be less than honest; they represent what I *hope* are and will continue to be trends.

I want to take this opportunity to suggest action that I hope will be taken to prevent a needless and time-consuming conflict—action which will lead to improved teacher education and a strengthened teaching profession rather than to a divisive power struggle in which no one will gain anything of substance:

1. Every college and university in this country which presently prepares teachers but which is unwilling to make a full and adequate institutional commitment to the job of teacher education should voluntarily abandon its program. If it is unwilling to do so voluntarily, the state education agency, the professional associations of teachers and administrators, and the regional and national accrediting agencies should apply appropriate and effective pressures.

2. The national accrediting agency—the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)—should be maintained and strengthened. Its job

should be to apply minimum standards. If NCATE is to continue to be a significant force, it should continue as an agency free from control by any single organization or pressure groups, including the NEA. Teachers, administrators, state departments of education, and the public should continue to have an important voice in the accrediting program, along with the colleges and universities. Representatives of subject matter groups and learned societies should play a more significant role in the accrediting program.

3. Before this decade has run its course, every state should have installed a workable, approved-program approach to certification, abandoning the outworn practice of writing specific courses, credits, and requirements into legislation or state regulations.

4. By 1970 there should be complete national reciprocity in certification (based on NCATE accreditation).

5. In every state two new professional agencies should be established for the regulation of professional standards: (1) a professional practices commission to protect the ethical and competent teacher and administrator from unfair treatment and to discipline or remove the incompetent or unethical; (2) a professional standards board to give practicing teachers and administrators a significant voice in establishing and enforcing policies and procedures of certification, accreditation and proper assignment.

6. Each college faculty that hasn't already done so should undertake a complete reexamination of its preservice teacher education program to find ways to prune out the deadwood, eliminate overlapping and duplication, and reduce education course requirements if these are excessive. I believe that anything in excess of 25 percent of the total baccalaureate program devoted to education courses is excessive.

7. Teacher education institutions should move quickly to establish an effective means whereby teachers and administrators in the field can participate with college faculties in studying and recommending college curriculum revisions and improvements. A scheme for systematic feedback and follow-up of graduates should be developed immediately. A systematic and workable plan should be established on every college campus for the participation of professors in subject matter fields in determining the policies and procedures of teacher education.

8. All teachers, both elementary and secondary, should be required to study in depth one subject matter field (other than education) in addition to general education.

9. Schools and colleges should move now to plan and establish internships for all new teachers after they have finished their initial period of preservice preparation and before they are recognized as fully qualified. Such internships should include a reduced teaching load and substantial supervision. Helping to get new teachers properly started in their careers should be seen as a responsibility of schools, colleges, state departments of education, and professional associations.

We should see teacher education as seven or eight years of systematically planned preparation and induction, beginning with the first year of college and ending after the first three years of responsible paid teaching.

10. Sabbatical leaves with pay should be available to a substantial number of teachers in every school district in the country. Such a plan would permit full-time study on a college campus for a semester or a full year.

11. The NDEA Institute program should be expanded with more attention to elementary school teachers. Teachers should be permitted and encouraged to do fifth-year, master's degree, and other advanced degree work in a subject field. What a teacher is to take in the way of postgraduate program should be determined on an individual basis; prescription and proscription should not be written law. For example, taking further professional education courses should be neither prohibited nor mandated. Both degree and inservice credit should be offered when the teacher needs an undergraduate course in a subject field more than a graduate course in education.

12. A large-scale and hardboiled examination of inservice education is badly needed. Dr. Conant was dead right when he criticized the colleges and universities for offering cash register courses for teachers in service; and he was also right when he accused teachers of being under a kind of opium-eater spell in continuing to participate without a whimper in inadequate, insignificant, inservice education activities, whether they are under the auspices of the school district or college.

I propose, therefore, that the leaders of the profession in every state move immediately to bring about constructive study and action to improve the inservice education of teachers. The first step in such an endeavor should be to find out what teachers really want and need.

13. A final suggestion, which is both the most important and the most difficult: We need to move as rapidly as possible to develop the body of knowledge about teaching which can be used with confidence as a basis for planning programs of preparation.

The most valid criticism that can be made of most education courses today is *not* that they are "Mickey Mouse," not that they are too easy, but that they are not always relevant to the problems faced by the teacher in the classroom. There is too often a lack of adequate relationship between the actual performance by teachers on the job and the content of training programs, an overreliance on other disciplines and fields for developing educational theory, and a lack of clarity about the body of knowledge and skill that comprises the basis for expert educational practices.

We need greater clarity and understanding in regard to the nature of teaching; we need to identify more clearly the body of knowledge, concepts, attitudes, and skills which provide the most valid bases for preparation and practice.

Every profession has basic problems relating to its practice. As it has faced such basic problems, the teaching profession has typically sought help from other disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, and philosophy, which have contributed and will continue to contribute valuable concepts for use by teachers as they continue to deal with the unique problems relating to their professional service.

However, it is not enough to rely on other disciplines for data needed to deal effectively with questions and problems in teaching. The generalizations derived from the other disciplines are obviously not always directly applicable to teaching.

How many significant questions about teaching can be answered satisfactorily by data provided by a single discipline? Probably not very many. Generalizations from other disciplines have often been applied superficially or out of context, or with inadequate application to problems in teaching. We have given the misleading label of "educational theory" to concepts from other disciplines (most typically psychology) and have presented this material to prospective teachers in education courses with the implication that they should apply this theory in practice.

Everyone involved is usually disappointed with the results. The so-called education theory borrowed from another discipline doesn't seem to be translated well by the neophyte teacher in student teaching or in his first years on the job; he has the same difficulty any of us would have making a meaningful application in the classroom of concepts that were developed in the laboratory. As a result, we sometimes get a kind of pseudoscholarship, characterized by a lack of congruence between what the teacher verbalizes and what he does in the classroom. Other times we get a sharp rejection on the part of the neophyte teacher of "educational theory" and a lasting and damaging hostility toward the education courses in which the material was covered. We find ourselves in the position of the rich American who sends a beautiful new color television set to his son in the Peace Corps, stationed in a remote Ethiopian village where there is no electricity and no television station. Such a situation cannot be helped by improving the television set, wishing for a more grateful son, criticizing the motives of the father, or berating the Ethiopians for their lack of technical progress.

I propose that we stop agonizing about the gap between theory and practice and look at the inadequacy of what we call educational theory as one important cause of the gap. We can then work on developing the ideas, tools, and theory which will, in fact, have clear and meaningful connections with practice. This is just what many of the researchers are doing—people such as Bellack, Smith, Hughes, Oliver, Flanders, and Medley. Efforts to learn more about the process of teaching and the consequent building of programs of preparation around reorganized, revitalized, and new content should be given very high priority indeed.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my central point. Unless the pace of reform in teacher education is quickened, unless significant improvements are made at both the preservice and inservice level—and made quickly—the cause of teacher education and professional standards will be in jeopardy. It is time for those of us who are educators to stop behaving as if we were an embattled army defending the castle of professional education against assorted enemies. It is time instead to renovate the castle.

CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

University of Kentucky, March 18-20, 1965

Program Planning Committee:

SISTER M. PHILIPPA COOGAN, Holy Angels Academy,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

WILLIAM DALLAM, Pennsylvania State Department of Public
Instruction

STEPHAN DUNNING, University of Michigan

MORRIS FINDER, Western Washington State College

GENEVA HANNA, University of Texas

JEAN C. SISK, Baltimore County Schools, Maryland

DAVID STRYKER, University of Florida

MARY TINGLE, University of Georgia