DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 891 CS 201 777

AUTHOR Wenck, Aileen Alana Hendricks
TITLE The Dartmouth Seminar: Analysis of Proceedings and a Bibliography.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 122p.; M.A. Thesis, Texas A & M University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Annotated Bibliographies; Creativity; Drama; *English Instruction; Language; Literature Appreciation; Masters Theses; Mythology; Publications
IDENTIFIERS *Dartmouth Seminar on the Teaching of English

ABSTRACT

This master's thesis focuses on publications resulting from the Dartmouth Seminar, an international conference of English teachers held at Dartmouth College during August and September of 1966 in which the fifty participants advocated changes in the teaching of English to correspond with world-wide technological advances. Following an introductory essay, the second chapter explores eleven points of agreement among participants, based on the two general seminar reports, "The Uses of English" by Herbert J. Muller and "Growth through English" by John Dixon. Chapter three discusses the five specific reports of the seminar: "Language and Language Learning," edited by Albert H. Marchwardt; "Drama in the Classroom," edited by Douglas Barnes; "Response to Literature," edited by James R. Squire; "Creativity in English," edited by Geoffrey Summerfield; and "The Uses of Myth," edited by Paul A. Olson. Chapter four consists of a selective, annotated bibliography of published articles in official journals as well as books published by the National Council of Teachers of English, all pertaining directly to the Dartmouth Seminar. A list of references is included. (JM)

THE DARTMOUTH SEMINAR: ANALYSIS OF PROCEEDINGS AND A BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Thesis

by

AILEEN ALANA HENDRICKS WENCK

Submitted to the Graduate College of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August 1974

Major Subject: English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Dartmouth Seminar, an international conference of English teachers, was held at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire in August and September of 1966. Significantly, the delegates to the conference advocated changes in the approach to the teaching of English. The participants, respected teachers, scholars, and leaders in the field of English, reached conclusions that were important to the entire English teaching profession. With the financial support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the National Association for the Teaching of English in the United Kingdom, the National Council of Teachers of English in the United States, and The Modern Language Association of America cosponsored the Seminar. The participants, fifty in all, advocated changes in the approach to the teaching of English because they recognized the great changes taking place in the world as a result of technological advances in communication and other areas. Therefore, they concluded that the approach to the teaching of English

---

In this thesis, PMLA will be used as a model for format and style.

must likewise progress in order to meet the demands of this changing world.

Two reports, The Uses of English[1] and Growth Through English,[2] contain general accounts of the proceedings at the Seminar, while five specific monographs give more detailed information.[3] Of the two general reports, The Uses of English was written "for the general reader" (Muller, p. vi), while Growth Through English "is addressed to the professional community" (Muller, p. vi). The five monographs were all published for the cosponsoring organizations. They contain papers, summaries of discussion, and related materials from the Seminar. The authors of these specific reports as well as the authors of the general reports participated in the Seminar.

The general reports, although acknowledging disagreement at the conference, claim that certain conclusions were agreed upon by most delegates. Albert H. Marckwardt says in the preface to Growth Through English that "Somehow or other eleven points of agreement were written into the record" (Dixon, p. ix). Dixon himself admits that he has "stressed the consensus that emerged at Dartmouth" (Author's Preface). Muller, though admitting that his "account is highly selective" (p. vi) says that he has "tried to do justice to the

different opinions expressed" (p. vi). A comparison of the specific reports and the general reports reveals the contrast in ideas and emphasis, thereby clarifying the amount of agreement on the eleven points. The eleven points are not clearly presented as such in either of the general reports; therefore, in chapter two of this thesis I have created a list of apparent agreements among participants, based on the similarities in the two general reports. Since the specific reports are specialized and do not apply to all the points listed, each monograph deals with and is compared to only one or two of the eleven points of agreement in this thesis.

The introductory essay in this thesis compares and contrasts these five monographs to the two general reports so that the amount and significance of agreement and disagreement between the participants at the conference can be measured and judged; and therefore, the validity of the conclusions as being representative of the feelings of the delegates to the Seminar can be determined. The rest of this thesis is a selective, enumerative, annotated bibliography of published articles in official journals and books published by NCTE that directly pertain to the Dartmouth Seminar. The MLA publishes an annual bibliography containing a

list of journals which for the purposes of this thesis will be considered official journals, along with The Eric Index which contains some journal articles that are included in this bibliography. In addition, only publications of the years 1966 through 1973 are included in the bibliography. All works are listed alphabetically by author or editor; and all annotations are meant to be descriptive of content rather than a critical analysis of any work. In order to make this bibliography as useful as possible, the emphasis of each listing is noted; that is, if a book or journal article deals with the theory of English instruction rather than the actual classroom practice or exercises, the theory or practice is accordingly noted.

Since this Seminar is important to the English teaching profession and no bibliography listing the works directly related to it has been written, this bibliography should be of value for several reasons. Hopefully it will further explain the Dartmouth Seminar and its effect on the teaching of English in the United States by showing relationships between the general and individual reports; it will be a useful reference guide; and it will help teachers of English implement changes in teaching that enhance learning in the classroom. Finally, if this bibliography helps

English teachers to put into practice the changes advocated at the Seminar, then this work will have served its purpose.

NOTES

[1]Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of English (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967). Hereafter cited in text as Muller.

[2]John Dixon, Growth Through English (Reading, England: NATE, 1967). Hereafter cited in text as Dixon.

[3]All five specific monographs were published by the NCTE (Champaign, Illinois, 1968). They are as follows; Language and Language Learning edited by Albert H. Marckwardt, Drama in the English Classroom edited by Douglas Barnes, Response to Literature edited by James R. Squire, Creativity in English edited by Geoffrey Summerfield, and The Uses of Myth edited by Paul A. Olson. Recently, the NCTE announced that publication of a sixth monograph originally scheduled for the series, Sequence in Continuity edited by Arthur Eastman, has been canceled. Hereafter these monographs cited in text by editor.

CHAPTER II

ELEVEN POINTS OF AGREEMENT

Both John Dixon's Growth Through English and Herbert Muller's The Uses of English are general reports of the proceedings of the Dartmouth Seminar. Because of this, the two reports are quite similar, but, for several reasons, they are also quite different--mainly because of the authors' different nationalities and the different audiences intended for each work. Dixon, because he is addressing the English teaching profession, is more formal than Muller, who is addressing a very general audience that includes the English teaching profession as well as other interested persons or groups. In addition, both men reported that any disagreement at the Seminar was split along national lines; and these authors are of different nationalities--Muller from America, Dixon from the United Kingdom. The explanation for this split was the differences in the educational systems in the two countries. Because of this split and because of the resulting differences, a comparative analysis of these two reports is necessary in order to isolate the eleven points of agreement and to partially measure the amount of disagreement at the Seminar.

Naturally, the length, style, and organization of the books differ. However, more importantly, each author emphasized and interpreted the subjects covered at the Seminar in the way he thought appropriate. In the "Author's Preface" Dixon says, "It has been my aim to draw from the discussions and reports at Dartmouth such ideas as are directly relevant to my own work in class and to that of teachers I know. Inevitably the selection and the interpretation involved make this a partial report--a simpler view from a single vantage point" (p. xi). Likewise, Muller admits that his report is highly selective: "Inasmuch as the discussions ranged all over a large subject and produced dozens of papers on different topics, my account is highly selective. I have skimmed over some problems that interest chiefly specialists" (p. vi). Both authors admit, then, that their reports are partial and selective. It will be shown that Dixon's report is much more "partial and selective" than Muller's report. The subjects or topics covered in the reports and each author's manner of dealing with them must be examined next.

The first topic apparently covered at the Seminar was the nature of English. What should be

included in the definition of English, how it should be taught, and when it should be taught were the questions asked by the delegates. Muller claims that all the questioning at this conference indicates an "intense dissatisfaction in the leaders of the profession" (p. 6). Dixon seems to agree with this, in that he presents two popular images of English in the past as a proficiency in skills model and as a cultural heritage model. He then brings in a third image or model and says that the two past images "exaggerated two areas at the expense of the rest and in so doing have distorted these areas themselves" (p. 3). Because the question What is English? "throws the emphasis on nouns like skills, and proficiencies, set books, and the heritage" (Dixon, p. 7); according to Dixon, "the Seminar moved from an attempt to define 'What English is' . . . to a definition by process, a description of the activities we engage in through language" (p. 7). The activities were organized under subjects or topics that arose in answering these questions. Groups were formed to study language, drama, composition, literature, mass media and myth, teacher training, examinations, and the school syllabus or program. The results of these study groups and the

reaction of the Seminar to those results are covered in these two general reports by Muller and Dixon.

The main difference between the authors in regard to the question, What is English? is in what they emphasized. As Muller reports, "The Americans were upholding the traditional British ideal of intellectual discipline, the British were clamoring for the individual freedom that Americans have always prized in theory" (p. 13). Dixon says, "But the response of the majority of the Seminar was to reject the terms of the question and to ask instead for language knowledge that helps the pupil perceive himself, and for that matter Man, as in some sense the organizer of his experience" (p. 11), placing the emphasis on the individual's self development through language. Muller, on the other hand, says, "I would emphasize the traditional belief, too often disrespected in practice but at least still paid lip service, that young people ought to be trained to think honestly for themselves, and that society needs as many fully developed individuals as possible" (p. 18). Apparnetly Muller and Dixon were divided just as the British and Americans were, between intellectual discipline and individual freedom. However, Muller is more objective, in that he reports this conflict,

while Dixon overlooks it, emphasizing the British point of view.

An important subject covered at the Seminar, according to both general reports, was the study of language because it cannot be separated from the other subjects that were also discussed. Muller goes so far as to say, "To my mind, nothing said at the seminar was more important for the general public to hear about than what the linguists had to say in their final report" (p. 57). The linguists pointed out that a person's dialect is closely related to his status in society and that to attempt to change it by condemning it as incorrect was considered equal to condemning the speaker. Because of this, the British opposed the teaching of standard English, which they termed a bourgeois dialect, and any explicit teaching of language. The Americans disagreed, and Muller speaks for them when he says, "Standard English is not just a bourgoeis dialect, after all, but the most common, widespread form of English, and no education for life in a democracy can be adequate without some knowledge of it" (p. 63). The British apparently "concluded that explicit teaching about language should have a low priority" (p. 70), while the linguists, some of whom were British, and Muller, representing the

American view, thought otherwise. Muller says, "It seemed to me that the British who held out for low priorities overlooked how much a teacher is bound to teach about language, and how much value they themselves saw in the contributions of linguists to a better understanding of it (not to mention the fact that most of their students leave school at the age of fifteen, when they thought it might be safe to teach language explicitly)" (p. 71). Again, Dixon fails to mention the disagreement. Characteristic of the British point of view, Dixon stresses the implicit teaching of language: "The classroom is a place for taking on new roles, facing new situations--coming to terms in different ways with new elements of oneself and new levels of human experience. In the course of doing so with the teacher's encouragement and guidance, language is incidentally adapted to the new role, especially when the teacher can avoid serious discontinuity" (p. 31). Most of what Dixon reports has to do with the development of the child and very little to do with the explicit study of language. Muller is more objective in reporting the discussion of the question of English and the subject of language. He reports the differences, while Dixon stresses what may be the

consensus but definitely is the British view of these subjects.

Equally important as language was the subject of creativity and Drama at the conference, which was strongly emphasized in relation to the study of English. Muller says, "Creativity was a major factor at the seminar because many British schools make much more of it all through their curriculum" (p. 116). He points out that dramatic activities, such as pantomime and improvisation, are continued in the British schools for a longer time than in American schools: "Such activities are carried on in the early grades in both countries, but in America they stop early; the British believe they should be continued throughout the school years" (p. 129). Muller goes on to say that, "No other group reached such complete agreement so soon on their basic recommendations to the seminar--here, that drama in this sense be made an integral part of the English curriculum from beginning to end" (p. 129). Likewise, Dixon confirms this agreement and says essentially the same things as Muller but not with the same objectivity. He quotes Albert Kitzhaber as having said that drama in the United States has received almost no attention so far (p. 36-37). It is obvious, however, that Dixon,

typically British, disapproves of this lack of drama in American schools. He says that in order "To help pupils encounter life as it is, the complexity of relationships in a group and dynamic situation, there is nothing more direct and simple that we can offer than drama" (p. 38). In addition, he claims that "Our everyday experience tells us that talk, gesture and movement work together. In this sense 'all effective teaching in the classroom situation is dramatic by its very nature'" (p. 37). He then explains the benefits gained by the use of drama in the English classroom at different age levels. According to Dixon the student reaches a "developed stage (somewhere between twelve and eighteen)" (p. 42) where the drama work becomes so inclusive that it is central to English work at every level. It

> involves: improvising talk appropriate to a vast range of situation and role; listening and responding in the fullest sense, while taking a role; discussing the approach to a theme, its possibilities, and finally the insights gained; writing scripts for one's own group; reading, learning and probing the meaning of a text--through private study, talk and enacting. (p. 42-43)

He concludes by saying, "When possible it is the truest form of learning, for it puts knowledge and understanding to their test in action" (p. 43). Apparently both Muller and Dixon report agreement on

the use of drama in the classroom as discussed at the Seminar. However, Dixon again expresses the British view in his strong support of drama. Muller reports the agreement at the conference rather than expressing his own view as Dixon does. Once again, Muller is more objective than Dixon in his report.

Drama was not the only creative activity discussed at the Seminar. Composition or Writing, both creative and expository, was the topic of much debate. Dixon, in emphasizing creative writing, expresses the British point of view: "Pupils need the opportunity to choose the form that suits them, and this means that for many a lesson when a class are writing enthusiastically there will be a mixed output of poems, dialogues and pieces of prose" (p. 46). Writing that is not based on "discussion and shared experience," according to Dixon, is "unlikely to elicit much response from many children and young people" (p. 44). He comes the closest to mentioning expository writing when he says, "The deliberate introduction of topic sentence method and stanzas is more likely to prevent their [students'] having something to say than assist it" (p. 46). Often, teachers in the United States who teach expository writing use the introduction of topic sentence method; but Dixon completely ignores

this fact, reporting only the agreement of the Seminar in regard to creative writing. Like Dixon, Muller agrees that discussion was considered important at the conference; but he only says that it "may in turn then enliven the study of literature and composition" (Muller, p. 109). He does not say that writing is unlikely to succeed if it is not based on discussion. Unlike Dixon, Muller also reports both sides of the debate as well as the resulting agreement: "The British inclined to trust to the aid of literature to keep students interested in writing, and in composition to the stimulus of personal, creative writing. . . . The Americans were more concerned about the practical necessity of training in exposition, the kind of writing students have to do in other courses, and later on in professional memoranda and reports" (p. 102). Muller admits that his countrymen's view was modified by the discussions of writing at the Seminar. In regard to creative writing, he says, "American members of the group were at first disposed to be skeptical, pointing out the need of gifted teachers and the practical necessity of teaching functional prose, but eventually they were convinced that creative writing should be made an essential part of the English curriculum. The British admitted that

it was not actually the core of their curriculum, taking up only a period or so a week, and that functional writing of course had to be taught too" (p. 116). Not only does Dixon overlook expository writing as it was discussed at the conference, failing to mention the British admission that functional writing is important, but he gives the reader the impression that most schools (and because he is British, most British schools) teach only creative or imaginative writing:

> . . . there is both room and need for individual work in writing. It is as if the teacher brought a magnifying-glass into the classroom. She might show the children her choice of things; or she might show a few transient things like raindrops, say, and leave the glass lying around; or she might give it to the children, suggesting they look for changes in things when they are magnified, and come and tell her about them. In all three cases children have something to talk and write about, but not all offer the same pressure and opportunity for personal exploration. (p. 45)

In addition to this he gives numerous examples of creative writing, not expository writing. In what he says and the examples he gives, he conveys the impression that he is speaking for the rest of the Seminar delegates rather than expressing his own ideas. However, this conflicts with what Muller reports concerning creative writing and its place in

the British curriculum. Dixon's bias in favor of creative writing is quite evident, which makes it difficult, particularly for an American, to accept what may be some very good ideas about creative writing and its place in the curriculum. A conflict between American practicality and British idealism is evident here.

The reports also relate student composition to literature. Dixon goes so far as to define student's composition as literature when he says, "Thus, when pupil's stories and poems, though necessarily private activities, re-emerge as experience to be shared and talked over with teachers and classmates, they become the literature of the classroom" (p. 55). In reading a literary work a person experiences various aspects of the work and responds to those experiences. For this reason Dixon claims that "literature cannot be taught by a direct approach, and that the teacher who weighs in with talk or lecture is more likely to kill a personal response than to support and develop it" (p. 58). Likewise, he says, "The dryness of schematic analysis of imagery, symbols, myth, structural relations et al. should be avoided passionately at school and often at college. It is literature, not literary criticism which is the

subject" (p. 60). Again, Dixon gives the impression that he is expressing the consensus at the conference. As a result, the reader is led to believe that there was no disagreement in regard to the study of literature, as reported by Dixon, at the Seminar. Yet in reading Muller's report the reader finds that this is a false impression.

Although basically Muller agrees with Dixon, as most of the delegates at the conference did, there are noticeable differences in Muller's report. For instance, Muller agrees that such courses as the history of American literature, English literature, and world literature courses were rejected as being unrelated to the student's experience and therefore, unnecessary in the curriculum. However, Muller also mentions the dissent, which Dixon failed to do in his report. Muller says, "The applause over this demolition of the standard curriculum drowned out the doubts ventured by one or two who wondered (as I did) whether our schools really should stop teaching American literature" (p. 80). Like Dixon, however, Muller reports that the emphasis of the Seminar in the study of literature was on the individual's experience. He says, "A joint Anglo-American paper suggested that the English curriculum might be

designed in terms of experience rather than knowledge . . ." (p. 81). Concerning literature, there seems to have been more agreement as reported by both authors than disagreement. However, Dixon still fails to report the minor disagreement. Muller reports both, saying "The British as usual frowned on the traditional teaching of knowledge about literature, in particular literary history, but on this matter they had most of the Americans with them" (p. 80). This statement would indicate that once again Dixon failed to report the complete American view of literature, emphasizing only the British idea of it, which dominated the conference; and further, he reported only the views of those American delegates who supported the British or his stand.

However, both Dixon and Muller reported that mass media was included in the definition of literature at the Seminar. Dixon says, "Though our central attention was for 'literature' in the ordinary sense we found it impossible to separate this sharply from the other stories, films, or TV plays, or from pupils' own personal writing or spoken narrative" (p. 58). Muller substantiates the inclusion of mass media in the definition of literature when he says, "Several groups reported independently that the curriculum

should include not only English and American literature but the 'resevoir' literature in the background of our culture . . . , some foreign literature in translation, and some attention to other media of expression, such as moving pictures, radio and television--altogether a quite ambitious program" (p. 79). However, Muller does not stop here; he goes on to report in depth the Seminar's discussion of myth along with mass media. He says, "In this discursive chapter I am gathering together suggestions offered in various connections, and some bearings of still other discussions, as of myth, on the uses and abuses of the mass media" (p. 140). Because of the influence of mass media "Today the man on the street, living in a mechanized world, has little sense of these deep connections between the life of man and the natural world, or of elemental rythyms and recurrences" (p. 145). According to Muller, mythology can fill this void by giving "a sense of the past and of our common humanity" (p. 144) to older students because "It is a symbolic expression of elemental and universal realities, the age-old rythyms, the cycle of the seasons, or of life and death and new life out of death, and so the themes of rebirth, resurrection, regeneration" (p. 145).

Apparently, the conference thought it important enough that a special study group was assigned to discuss myth; and Muller claims that myth is very much alive today because "men still have a basic need of giving symbolic form to their deeper hopes, fears, loves, and hates, and in particular to their communal sentiments and beliefs--the social and political myths nations live by" (p. 145). The myth of the happy ending, popularized by the mass media in their entertainment offerings "point to a particular problem of the teacher of literature, that for most Americans literature is another means of escaping life, or getting away from it all, not getting more deeply into it" (p. 146). But the conference agreed that it is not up to the English teacher to demythologize. In spite of this, Muller seems to disagree when he says, "The devotees of myth may also forget how dangerous it can be today, or how compelling the need of 'demythologizing'" (p. 146). While some delegates were concerned with the subordination of the written word to pictures "The Seminar itself demanded more technological aids for English teachers--such facilities as projectors, tape recorders, sound recording booths, and duplicating equipment" (p. 148). Yet the idea of taped lectures and teaching machines did not appeal to many delegates;

One of the most important subjects discussed at the Seminar and reported by Dixon and Muller in their books was teacher training. It naturally arose as a result of the discussions and study of the topics already covered of language, creativity and drama, writing, literature, and mass media and myth. Neither Dixon nor Muller says very much about teacher training; but what they do say is not contradictory. Dixon says, "Clearly students who intend to teach the subject need wide experience and encouragement in imaginative writing; and a confident grounding in the purposive talk that arises from group learning in an English workshop" (p. 107). He further states that linguistic research and experiment as well as continuing education for teachers should be conducted. He urges caution, however, in regard to linguistic theories. Likewise, Muller agrees that the conference recommended a better education for teachers before and during their careers with a sharing of ideas between all members of the profession (p. 166). Contrastingly though, Muller does not warn the reader about the uncertainty of linguistic theories; and he disagrees with Dixon in regard to what should be expected of English teachers. Muller says, "Although I assume that no one really expected teachers to master all these

but the value of modern technology in producing "readily available cultural goods--paperbacks, records, reproductions of paintings, photographs, reputable films and television programs, and so forth" (p. 151) --was acknowledged.

The most conspicuous difference in the treatment of mass media by Dixon is his incomplete reference to its relation to myth, and his neglect of myth in general. All he says is that "work on Synge's Riders to the Sea can lead on to Flaherty's film 'Man of Aran,' to reading about primitive communities of many kinds, discussion of the family, of myth" (p. 113). Nothing else is mentioned about myth in this report. In addition, his mention of mass media itself is brief. He devotes only about two full pages to it, whereas Muller devotes a whole chapter to it. Nevertheless, what he did report agrees with Muller's account that mass media is a reality and can be of help to the English teacher, but must be dealt with. The main difference between Dixon and Muller's reports in regard to mass media and myth is Dixon's neglect of myth and brief coverage of mass media, indicating, perhaps, the value placed on these subjects by each author.

subjects, the good English teacher as defined by the report is a person of quite exceptional capabilities . . ." (p. 166), indicating that such expectations are too great. But Dixon really does seem to expect teachers to master improvised drama, creative writing, and so forth. Once again Muller, the American, stresses practicality and Dixon, the Englishman, stresses creativity since linguistic theory implies explicit study of language, which in turn implies practicality as opposed to creativity.

In addition to the topic of teacher training, the topic of examinations arose. Dixon claims that examinations in both the United States and Great Britain cause the English courses to conform to the specialized uses of language that are tested. Further, "the influence, actual and potential, of examinations and tests upon school curricula is increasing in both Britain and the United States" (p. 94). Because of this, Dixon believes, what needs to be done in all three countries, Britain, the United States, and Canada, is to look critically at examinations. Dixon does not report any conflict at the Seminar concerning examinations, but Muller does report conflict about this subject between American and British delegates. According to Muller, the

British urged the Seminar to make an emphatic statement condemning external examinations. "Hence the two delegations again diverged" (Muller, p. 158) because the Americans felt that the situation in the United States did not call for such a "manifesto." Muller then reports that a compromise emerged urging the review of exams and grading in both countries. Although Dixon does not mention the conflicting views concerning examinations, or that what he is reporting was a compromise, his report of examinations otherwise does agree with Muller's report.

All the discussions and recommendations about literature, composition, language, mass media and myth, drama, teacher training, and examinations had implications for the schools. Therefore, the school syllabus or program was also discussed at the Seminar. Muller says, "At least the seminar agreed unanimously that there should never be a uniform syllabus or fixed program" (p. 53). However, he also reports differences of opinion between American and British delegates, regarding content and emphasis in the English curriculum. While both the British and Americans agreed that the English curriculum must follow some order of development which corresponds to the growth pattern of students, each stressed a

different guiding principle," . . . the British inclining to look for the principle of order in the psychological development of the child, the Americans looking more to subject matter or objective principles of knowledge" (p. 39). Because of this difference Muller reports that George Allen of England "warned chiefly against the danger of oversimplifying the whole problem, regarding Americans as ruthless disciplinarians suppressing the child, the British as eccentric individualists thinking only of the child" (p. 53). Muller stressed the role of the teacher: "While appreciating the concern of the British for the tender minds of youngsters, I felt there was some need of asserting the rights of teachers too, or even their duty to 'intervene' now and then when their mature judgament of a child's needs differed from his" (p. 50), indicating more disagreement than agreement concerning this subject. Apparently, the only agreement was that the syllabus should be flexible. Still, Muller reports both sides of the issue, being careful to let the reader know what is his opinion and what is the dialogue that was carried on at the Seminar.

Dixon does not clearly distinguish between his opinion and the proceedings of the Seminar. He says that because "improvisation can become sloppy,

makeshift and even overwhelming unless it is sustained by a clear sense of broad underlying patterns . . . it was agreed that every teacher is working with a structure" (p. 82-83). This coincides with Muller's report that the Seminar agreed that there is a need for order in the English curriculum. Dixon goes on to say, as if the whole Seminar also agreed on this, that "Thus it seems an elementary mistake to demand a list of skills, proficiencies and knowledge as the basis for an English curriculum" (p. 85). Since this is precisely what is done in American schools and what Muller reports American delegates stressed, Dixon, once again, is showing his partiality by emphasizing the British point of view of this subject. Dixon does mention that there was disagreement about Frank Whitehead's conclusion that the structuring principles currently under consideration are controversial, lead to "retorgressive emphasis on 'knowledge . . . ,' as opposed to 'ability to use'" (p. 84) and "to a demand that the English teacher's field of activity be restricted to that which can be made incremental" (p. 84); but he claims that "a detailed reply did not emerge" (p. 84). Other than this he does not mention any disagreement at Seminar in regard to curriculum. He shows that his is a one-sided report, the British side,

in contrast to Muller's report of the proceedings of the conference, which is objective.

It is obvious in comparing these two reports of the proceedings of the Dartmouth Seminar that a definite contrast emerges in the two authors' treatment of the views expressed by delegates to the conference. Dixon expresses the British view, which dominated the Seminar, while Muller reports both the American and the British views, as well as expressing his own impressions of each. Brian Ash, in a review of The Uses of English, says of the report, "The Americans are shown as being primarily concerned with teaching useful skills; the English, only with the creative individual. It is hard to believe that either camp represents truly a state of English in its own country."[1] Whether or not either camp is representative of the true state of English in either country, the fact remains that at the Seminar, as reported by Muller, there were camps, which Mr. Ash corroborates in this review. Muller, at least, does report two views; Dixon does not. In a review of Dixon's Growth Through English by Margaret Early Dixon's bias is noted. Margaret Early says of Dixon, "he presents a very British point of view, drawing almost exclusively from the contributions of British participants at the Seminar. One wonders if

the Americans contributed anything of value, so rarely are they quoted in these pages."[2] Both these reviewers support the contrast that emerged as a result of the comparison of the treatment of the subjects that were discussed at the Seminar and reported by Dixon and Muller in their books. Dixon reports the British point of view while Muller reports the American point of view along with the British.

In addition to Dixon's bias and Muller's objectivity emerging from this comparison, the obvious differences, areas of disagreement, or omissions are;

a) The British emphasized the teaching of language in operation as opposed to the teaching of language through structural analysis, particularly with reference to grammar. American linguists, especially, were opposed to a complete absence of analytical language study.

b) The British ignored expository writing, preferring to teach creative writing, while Americans stressed the importance, in terms of practicality, of expository writing.

c) In general the British stressed creativity and the Americans practicality.

d) Dixon overlooks myth in his discussion of mass media, while Muller includes it, saying that the seminar agreed that the great and good myths should be taught.

e) The British strongly oppose all external examinations, while Americans think them beneficial if regulated to insure proper aims.

f) The content and emphasis in the English curriculum was controversial, with the British concentrating on the psychological development of the child and the Americans concentrating on subject matter and objective principles of knowledge.

Although Dixon's Growth Through English and Muller's The Uses of English differ in the many ways already mentioned, there is enough similarity of content in these two general reports to formulate eleven mutually acceptable points of agreement that apparently emerged at the Dartmouth Seminar. Both books stated that the Seminar as a whole recommended:

(1) That more informal group discussion be reasserted in the English classroom from primary school to the university (Dixon, p. 34, Muller, p. 111).

(2) That drama and teacher training in it, beginning with the acting out or improvisation of stories and personal experiences then advancing to the writing of scripts, be an integral part of the English curriculum from beginning to end (Dixon, p. 42, Muller, p. 129).

(3) That writing assignments be creative, based on discussion and shared experience so that students get involved or engaged in their writing (Dixon, pp. 44-45, Muller, p. 98). Muller states that the American delegates were more concerned with expository writing, while the British stressed personal creative writing (p. 102). Dixon, however, does not mention this difference in regard to writing and stresses creative writing as previously noted. The Seminar then recommended:

(4) That the school program or syllabus be planned to encourage a flexible teaching strategy based on natural language development in operation, with the processes involved in language learning a main concern (Dixon, pp. 30, 31, 33, 91, 14, Muller, pp. 53, 39).

(5) That the English classroom be equipped with stackable furniture, space for movement, and material appropriate to a workshop or democratic classroom,

where the teacher fosters self-reliance by stimulating and collaborating with groups of students rather than simply instructing, prescribing, or laying down the law (Dixon, p. 42, Muller, p. 36).

(6) That mass media, such as television, be viewed as literature, included in the curriculum, and accepted as part of the responsibility of an English department (Dixon, p. 112, Muller, p. 137). Dixon's very brief mention of myth in relation to the conference is curious since one of the specific reports, The Uses of Myth, is devoted to this topic. In all fairness to Dixon, however, he does state in the "Author's Preface" that his is a "partial report." Muller, as mentioned earlier, includes myth in his discussion of mass media, stating that television fosters popular myth. He says that the Seminar agreed that ". . . the English teacher should teach only the great or good myths . . ." (p. 146). It is not up to the English teacher to "demythologize;" that is better left to the science teacher. Since Dixon left this out of his report, perhaps all the delegates to the Seminar did not agree on this point. However, since one specific report is devoted to it and Muller does report agreement about myth, it is included here

as part of the sixth point of agreement. The Seminar went on to recommend:

(7) That teachers be better trained in improvised drama, creative writing, group learning, and mass media; further that such training be continued throughout an English teacher's career (Dixon, p. 107, Muller, p. 166).

(8) That "streaming" or grouping be stopped (Dixon, p. 27, Muller, p. 24). Apparently, according to both authors, there was strong agreement on this point; therefore, no previous mention was made of it.

(9) That there be a systematic review of examinations in order to determine whether or not their purposes impede the proper teaching of English (Dixon, p. 94, Muller, p. 159).

(10) That literature be studied for itself and the experience it offers the reader, rather than have imposed on it a historical framework that is designed to teach knowledge about it (Dixon, p. 79, Muller, p. 80).

(11) That English teachers be tolerant of dialectal differences in student's language, and only with patient understanding of the processes involved in developing a mastery of language attempt to teach

Standard English to such students (Dixon, pp. 30, 77, Muller, p. 64).

In spite of the previously mentioned differences both authors agreed on these eleven points. However, a closer look at the specific reports of the Seminar in relation to the eleven points of agreement, which is in the following chapters of this thesis, may reveal further disagreement and confirm that already mentioned.

NOTES

[1]Brian Ash, "The Uses of English," English Journal, 57 (Feb. 1968), 258.

[2]Margaret Early, "Growth Through English," English Journal, 57 (Feb. 1968), 259.

CHAPTER III

SPECIFIC REPORTS OF THE SEMINAR

I

The specific report Language and Language Learning edited by Albert H. Marckwardt would be expected, judging from the views expressed in the two general reports in regard to the opinions of the linguists at the conference, to concern only the fourth and eleventh points of agreement that emerged at the Dartmouth Seminar, concerning a flexible school syllabus and tolerance toward students with dialectal differences in their language. This report consists of four papers and a final group report written by three linguists--one American and two English--and one social scientist, who is American. Since two of these authors are American and two are British any disagreement along national lines should be evident. However, the comparison of the general reports indicated that the linguists at the Seminar, both British and American, were in agreement for the most part. Only a close look at this specific report will prove or disprove this.

The first and longest paper, "Language Standards and Attitudes" by Albert H. Marckwardt says that

beginning with the 1900's and continuing up to the present, research in the United States has proven that, in practice, there is no one single standard of "Good English" spoken by a majority of the American people. There is, however, a prestige dialect spoken in the United States.

At first (1900) the problem of superimposing the the prestige dialect of the language, or "Good English," on students was virtually nonexistent because the very small percentage of the population who attended school spoke this dialect already. Because of this the study of grammar, which was a way of teaching remedial English, was relegated to the elementary school. Unfortunately, "The preferred model for the common school grammar was Lindley Murray's Grammar of the English Language Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners. . . . It was written in 1795 and reflected the authoritarian tradition characteristic of the eighteenth century grammarians . . ." (Marckwardt, p. 3). Its author, like most of his competitors for the American elementary school textbook market, had no philological preparation.

As a result, elementary school texts and, particularly, books written for the general public ignored usage and were highly prescriptive rather than

descriptive. The academic community, knowing from diligent study that language changes in use and that prescription of one single standard is a difficult achievement at the very least, was faced with a dilemma. As time went on and more and more of the population with their non-prestige dialects were attending school, the dilemma became a real problem. Because of this, functional grammar, an attempt to correct a dialect by turning it into the standard prestige dialect, was taught. Functional grammar put emphasis on the details of language rather than the system. The schools, however, were unsuccessful in teaching this type of grammar: therefore the emphasis shifted again.

Unfortunately, teachers were not at all prepared to deal with this shift in emphasis to teaching language as a system; the result has been confusion and disagreement. The inability of the schools and scholars in the United States to agree upon linguistic standards and attitudes reflects this confusion, which has continued up to the present time, according to Marckwardt. However, research by linguists has shown that the extremely important process of language learning occurs by the time the normal child reaches school age. If in this process the language patterns

that the child acquires are not those of "Standard English," then a problem arises. The teacher in attempting to correct deviations from the standard dialect must be flexible and must understand the linguistic process. It is, therefore, up to the linguist to make himself understood and up to the English-teaching profession "to understand what he says and what he means when he says it" (p. 21).

Obviously, this paper coincides with both the fourth point of agreement, "That the school program or syllabus be planned to encourage a flexible teaching strategy based on natural language development in operation, with the processes involved in language learning a main concern;" and the eleventh point of agreement stating "That English teachers be tolerant of dialectal differences in student's language, and only with patient understanding of the processes involved in developing a mastery of language attempt to teach 'Standard English' to such students."

The second paper "Language Standards and Attitudes: A Response" by David MacKay, a British linguist, agrees with Marckwardt's paper that grammar books of the past were written by amateurs and stressed details of the language rather than language as a system. MacKay, in emphasizing the social and psychological significance

of a dialect to an individual, and the injury as well as the lack of language proficiency that results when a linguistically ignorant approach to the teaching of language is used in the English classroom, also supports point eleven just as Marckwardt did in the first paper of this monograph. MacKay states that "Any activity that does not enable us to do the latter (produce) encourages misunderstanding about the nature of language, about the use we make of our native tongue, and about our appreciation of it" (p. 30).

The next paper by John M. Sinclair, also a British linguist, deals with the knowledge an English teacher must have in order to use works based on descriptive, rather than prescriptive, linguistic theory, and with the properties of a good descriptive linguistic theory that will be the most valuable to English teachers. "Nothing short of a proper professional training in linguistics will suffice" (p. 36), according to Mr. Sinclair. He also says that linguists have overlooked the actual pragmatic value of an utterance in discourse which must be included in a linguistic theory that best suits the teacher of English. That theory must also make "possible descriptions which are internally divided and isolating and in which close contact is always maintained between

abstract categories and texts," (p. 41) as well as include a strong developmental aspect, knowledge of the internalised theory of native speakers, and comprehensive description and distinctions of the corpus it describes. Agreement with points four and eleven is implicit in this paper.

Mr. Joshua Fishman, the American social scientist, starts his paper "The Breadth and Depth of English in the United States" by noting the variety of different dialects of past and present language communities in the United States. This great variety in cultural backgrounds of two thirds of American students greatly influences English learning in the classroom and has resulted in a peculiarly American feeling about correctness or propriety of usage. "It is, therefore, a particularly American dilemma to have to use this same means, English, to also help these very same millions to recognize, sensitize, clarify, and intensify themselves" (p. 52). Mr. Fishman obviously supports the fourth and eleventh points of agreement of the Dartmouth Seminar that recommended a flexible syllabus and dialectical tolerance in an attempt to improve the teaching of English.

The last part of this specific report of the Seminar is a group report titled "Working Party 5 and

Study Group 8: Final Report," divided into seven sections. The opening statement clearly says that if a teacher of English has no training in linguistics, he or she is "carrying around and relaying old fashioned and discredited notions, derived in bits and pieces, held uncritically and unsystematically, but often expressed without doubt or hesitation" (p. 56). This would seem to conflict with Dixon's warning that "there is every reason for a tentative, exploratory approach" (p. 108) as far as linguistic theory is concerned. The report also says that language is too important for the English teacher to betray it. Then in the second section the "Native Speaker" is defined in seven different ways, all of which are presented as "confusions." Section III defines "Standard English," as the language "used by educated people when carrying on their affairs publicly, in writing and in speech" (p. 59). "Standard English" includes many types of English, is not fixed, and other dialects have a right to exist and revitalize the standard form. The English teacher should not reject a dialect in favor of the standard form but should aim at adding the standard form. Effectiveness of language, not correctness, should be aimed at. Again points four

and eleven, a flexible syllabus and dialectical tolerance, are supported by this specific report.

Section IV, "Standards and Attitudes," relates to another point of agreement at the Seminar. In advocating that teachers encourage speculation about learning, creative use of language, and communication with themselves by students, this section supports the third point of agreement, "That writing assignments be creative, based on discussion and shared experience so that students get involved or engaged in their writing." In order to speculate about learning and communicate with themselves, students must discuss and share their experiences with each other. They must therefore be engaged in the activities of the English classroom, which include writing.

Learning goals must be set by the students and teacher together, and ways of achieving these goals must be devised by the teacher according to Section V, "Explicit Teaching of Language Concepts." A few examples of ways of achieving goals are presented here; and, as a result, this fifth section supports the fifth point of agreement at the Seminar "That the English classroom be equipped with stackable furniture, space for movement, and material appropriate to a workshop or democratic classroom, where the teacher

fosters self-reliance by stimulating and collaborating with groups of students rather than simply instructing, prescribing, or laying down the law" because in order for a teacher to carry out the examples presented, or similar methods, the classroom would have to be equipped in the manner stipulated in the fifth point of agreement.

The next section, VI, of this final report is divided into parts "A. The Teaching of English Language Implicit and Explicit" and "B. The Teaching of English Language Implicit and Explicit." Part A discusses the value of teaching knowledge about language explicitly. This knowledge in the past has referred to the teaching of grammar (morphology and syntax); but children are seldom capable of any systematic study of language before the age of fifteen or sixteen. A study of language by examining "a variety of 'texts' (both spoken and written) in relation to the contexts of situation in which they occur" (p. 69), therefore, is suggested. A compulsory study of language functioning in the human environment for those capable of understanding it is recommended, and tests of this type of study advised in both countries. Part B of this section explains that many teachers in the United States "present explicitly and systematically

appropriate elements of English sentences and longer discourses, usage, and semantics" (p. 71). An example of a Junior High School program is also included in this part of Section VI. Section VII, "Linguistics for the English Teacher," repeats what John M. Sinclair states in his paper, and what was previously quoted in this chapter, that for the teacher of English "Nothing short of a proper professional training in linguistics will suffice" (p. 74). This is a great deal to demand of teachers trained primarily in literature.

This specific report of the Dartmouth Seminar, Language and Language Learning, rather than showing evidence of disagreement at the Seminar supports not just two but four points of agreement, the third, fourth, fifth, and eleventh, that emerged at this conference. The only hint of disagreement came at the very end of this monograph in regard to teacher training in linguistics and the explicit teaching of language. In Muller's general report the value of the explicit teaching of language was not agreed upon, and in Dixon's general report the usefulness of linguistic theory was questioned, yet linguistic training is considered a necessity in this specific report. In addition, section VI of the group report

states that a systematic study of language in detail is unnecessary, and a quote from Frank Whitehead is used to support this idea. However, in part B of that same section it is stated that "In the United States, many linguists and teachers in elementary and secondary schools believe that what pupils learn about the nature and development of the English language, based upon the best available scholarship, has value in and of itself" (p. 71). These ideas do seem to conflict. Apparently, the same conflict in ideas is present in both Great Britain and the United States. In Great Britain it is the linguists, as Muller reported, who support explicit language. This conflict is further supported by Dixon's warning about linguistic theory and Sinclair's demand that English teachers be thoroughly trained in linguistics. In the United States, however, the explicit study of language is advocated by the English teaching profession in general. Therefore, the disagrement on this point is not totally dependent on nationality. According to the preceding quotation, however, the linguists in the United States were more in favor of the explicit teaching of language than the British linguists at the Seminar who coauthored this report. The points of agreement are stated in such a way that this conflict

is not apparent and only in studying the specific proceedings of the Seminar and Muller's book can it be seen. The next monograph to be examined, Drama in the English Classroom edited by Douglas Barnes, may not prove to be in as much agreement with the eleven points as the report just examined.

II

Drama in the English Classroom by Douglas Barnes, an Englishman, presents four papers, all of which were apparently written by Barnes. However, he says in the preface that he has quoted other delegates to the Seminar, but he has put his own interpretation on these quotations. That Barnes is an Englishman, wrote the report himself, interpreting any quotations by other delegates the way he saw fit, and that the report concerns drama, a creative field of endeavor, further supports the contention made by both Dixon and Muller that the British emphasized creativity at the Seminar.

Judging from the title of this specific report, five of the points of agreement, one, two, three, five, and seven, are relevant in an analysis of this pamphlet. Points one through three advocate informal group discussion, drama and creative writing assignments in English; while points five and seven advocate

a workshop classroom and teacher training in improvised drama. The first paper, "Democracy and Education," states that because English speaking people live in Democracies their education should include drama. Living in a Democracy demands decision making by the citizens of that system that would be out of the question in a dictatorship. The use of drama in the English classroom develops decision making ability in students, as well as the ability to live with and tolerate many uncertainties and different ideas. One of the most important decisions a student must make is the choice of a job. If the school is to prepare students for occupations, it must be "a major aspect of curriculum planning" (p. 3). Through role playing in drama students not only have the opportunity to try out many different occupations, thereby preparing for their role in life, but students also learn to understand and evaluate what they are doing. This in turn helps "pupils speak, read and write with all the fullness of which they are capable" (p. 4). A democracy needs citizens with the ability to do all of this. Barnes quotes Benjamin DeMott to prove that drama in the classroom produces human beings able to express and communicate their sense of shared humanity, an absolute necessity as far as any social

life or society is concerned. A dramatic approach to education at every level, that deals in complexes of attitudes rather than in simple certainties is, according to Barnes, what is recommended. The definition of drama being used is broad enough to include the diversity in society, the individual, and the activities that can develop the student's ability to make a choice. The author then quotes Arthur Eastman to support the power of drama.

The value of drama in enriching class talk is the next point that is discussed in this first paper. Drama not only demands close group collaboration, expression of meaning, but it also enables children to go through the process of symbolising. Through the acting out of roles, fears, and desires children also become familiar with choice making. Dialogue, necessary to all learning experiences but particularly concerned with speaking and writing activities, is another essential characteristic of drama. Very closely related to dialogue and each other are the development of language, intellect, and personality. Barnes says, "It must be through language that the processes of dialogue are internalised to become the processes of thought dialogue becoming dialectic" (p. 11). The author further supports this by quoting

James Moffett extensively, and ends this paper by quoting Anthony Adams, "There is a sense in which all effective teaching in the classroom situation is dramatic by its very nature" (p. 14). By using drama no right answer is imposed; rather a complex of attitudes and judgements is learned in order to provide "the most effective approach to a democratic education" (p. 15).

The second paper in this report "Drama in English Teaching" discusses the appropriate order of presentation of dramatic activities. Preschool children begin, by themselves, with individual dramatic play, which becomes a group activity at school age level. Teacher guided improvisations based on personal experience with a great deal of discussion to carry out the improvisations and a written assignment to complete the activity are the starting point. Needless to say, the absolute silence of the past in the classroom does not work with a dramatic approach. From improvisation the teacher moves on to script drama at the secondary school level; and finally, when students reach mid-adolescence whole plays from scripts are recreated. However, only plays of the highest quality that embody some of the most important common experiences of the students should be used.

The first point of agreement "That more informal group discussion be reaserted in the English classroom from primary school to the university" obviously coincides with the first two parts of this specific report. Barnes emphasizes discussion before, during, and after dramatic activities. It is a necessary part of improvisation; it is done in a group; and it is informal. As Barnes puts it, "Both dramatic and non-dramatic work will be impoverished if there is not in the classroom an easy and immediate movement to and fro" (p. 18). Likewise, the second point of agreement coincides with these two parts of Barnes' report. He doesn't mention teacher training in drama; however, the purpose of both these papers, and probably the whole report, is to encourage the use of drama in the English classroom which does agree with the second point that says that drama should be an integral part of the school curriculum. The third point of agreement is also related to these papers. Barnes quotes Anthony Adams as having said that writing assignments should follow dramatic improvisations. Descriptions, character sketches, and contrasting points of view that grow out of dramatic activity and become writing assignments are certainly, as the third point of agreement states, "creative, based on discussion and

shared experience so that students get involved or engaged in writing." Although size of the classroom and equipment for it is not specifically mentioned by Barnes, as it is in the fifth point of agreement, an atmosphere of freedom of expression is encouraged which does coincide with the fifth point of agreement. The seventh point of agreement, concerning teacher training and drama, is not touched upon in these two papers.

Barnes begins the third paper, "Initiating the Use of Drama," by stating that he is not a specialist drama teacher and has had no training to speak of. Then he, by relating his own successes and failures with it to the reader, proceeds to tell nonspecialist English teachers how to use drama in the classroom. He does not contradict point seven by saying that teachers should not be trained in drama; he merely says that such training is not absolutely necessary. Again, he does not directly support the fifth point which specifies what kind of physical environment is necessary for the democratic classroom. But he does note that only limited dramatic work can be done when desks are in position. Mainly, Barnes instructs the reader how to use drama in the classroom in this third paper. Additionally, it supports the points

mentioned as well as point ten concerning the study of literature "for itself and the experience it offers the reader." Barnes says, "It is all too easy in the name of the Play As Literature to deny our pupils a literary response by denying them the dramatic experience" (p. 40). The last paper in this report, "A Final Word," agrees with points two and seven regarding teacher training in drama. According to Barnes, "Teachers should have practical experience of dramatic work partly to enable them to teach it but especially to help their own self-development" (p. 49).

At the end of this specific report two syllabii are given, "A Secondary School Drama Syllabus" and "Drama in the Primary School," which are helpful in understanding the value of drama in the schools. This report agrees with some of the eleven points, specifically points one, recommending group discussion; two, drama; three, creative writing assignments; five, open or workshop classroom; seven, teacher training in improvised drama, etc.; and ten, the study of literature for itself; and it does not contradict any of them. Yet it does seem to disagree with one of the monographs when Barnes says, "Teachers must direct attention more and more to the experience, the reality,

the fact, and away from the purely academic study of literature and language" (p. 52). This quotation appears to be in conflict with the specific report Language and Language Learning edited by Albert H. Marckwardt. On the one hand the last report in the phamphlet Language and Language Learning discourages the explicit teaching of language, but on the other hand it says, "In the United States, many linguists and teachers in elementary and secondary schools believe that what pupils learn about the nature and development of the English language, based upon the best available scholarship, has value in and of itself" (p. 71). The difference in emphasis between the British and Americans is again apparent in this difference of opinion regarding the explicit teaching of language. Barnes, an Englishman, thinks that language should not be taught explicitly, while many teachers in the United States think it should be taught explicitly and teach it that way according to Language and Language Learning. The dominant view at the Seminar again, as is seen in these two specific reports, appears to have been the British one that emphasized a creative approach to the teaching of English. Both these reports supported points three and five, recommending creative writing assignments and

an open or workshop classroom. In addition, Language and Language Learning supported points four and eleven, concerning a flexible school syllabus and tolerance toward dialectal differences in student's language, while Drama in the English Classroom supported points one, two, seven, and ten, concerning informal group discussion, drama, teacher training in improvised drama, discussion, etc., and the study of literature for itself. All of these points express the dominant British view without including the dissenting American viewpoint. It is an important viewpoint because, in reality, it influences most of the teaching of English that goes on in schools in the United States. Therefore, in spite of Barnes' nationality and possible bias because of it, this dissenting viewpoint should have been included in this specific report in order for it to be representative of the Seminar proceedings.

III

James R. Squire, an American, edited the specific report Response to Literature and he states, in the "Introduction," that the national differences have been over-emphasized by critics of the Seminar. He says, "Among the personal views are those which stress the national differences of participants. Yet

the differences which seemed to divide participants were far less significant than the degree of unanimity achieved in attacking many common educational problems" (p. 1). This statement further corroborates Dixon and Muller's assertion that there were differences and that they were based on nationality. Furthermore, it indicates that this monograph may emphasize the agreement at the Seminar in an effort to offset the "differences." In addition to the "Introduction" this report contains five papers written by three American teachers of English, including Squire, one British teacher of English, and one British psychologist.

The tenth point of agreement that emerged at the Seminar, "That literature be studied for itself and the experience it offers the reader, rather than have imposed on it a historical framework that is designed to teach knowledge about it," is supported in the first paper, "Response to Literature," of this specific report. The author of it, James Britton, a British teacher of English, suggests "That a student should read more books with satisfaction may be set down as one objective; as a second, he should read books with more satisfaction" (p. 8). The satisfaction in reading any book comes from sharing the

experience "of the form given to events," (p. 3) as well as the feelings derived from the experience itself. As children mature and gain more literary experience they become discriminating, particularly if wide reading along with close reading is fostered. Britton touches upon the first point of agreement here, "That more informal group discussion be re-asserted in the English classroom from primary school to the university." According to Britton, discussion in the classroom should arise from the student's response to, or expression of feelings about, literature; and it should be open enough that students will frequently dispute and sometimes reject critical judgements. This paper ends with the student's writing included in the definition of literature.

The next paper, "Response to Literature: the Report of the Study Group" by D. W. Harding, Chairman, an English psychologist, uses as a framework Britton's paper, and in so doing supports it and points one and ten, concerning more informal group discussion and the study of literature for itself. It begins by saying that whether or not a reader can enter into the feelings comprising the affective organization of the literary work is determined by the background of that reader. The problems involved in a response to

literature for the student at different stages of development are discussed next. The second point of agreement regarding the use of drama is touched upon when creative drama is included as a group experience in literature. "In such group experiences, the child (whether five or fifteen) relates his own response to the response of other children" (p. 17). It is significant that Harding is British and brings in creative drama, pointing up the British emphasis on creativity once again. The tenth point of agreement is again emphasized just as it was in the first paper, when Harding says, "A continuing obligation remains to assist the young reader to find satisfaction in selections he would not select or understand on his own" (p. 19). Again, the study of literature for itself is stressed. Included in the literary experience are films. "The child's individual interests in literary experience may be increasingly satisfied by forms other than the book--by recorded literature, for example, by films, or by theatrical experiences" (p. 19). This is in agreement with the sixth point, not yet mentioned, "That mass media, such as television, be viewed as literature, included in the curriculum, and accepted as part of the responsibility of an English department." The remainder of this paper

further supports the tenth point of agreement. It ends with the author commenting, "It is literature not literary criticism, which is the subject" (p. 26).

"Literature and the Moral Imagination," the next paper, is written by an American professor of English, James E. Miller Jr. Again, the tenth point of agreement, the study of literature for itself, is emphasized in this very brief paper. Miller says that the teacher ". . . should not become didactic and attempt to inculcate beliefs; rather he should question, discuss, and explore with his students" (p. 30) supporting, as the previously mentioned paper did, the first point of agreement that encourages informal group discussion.

Similarly, Benjamin DeMott's paper "Reading, Writing, Reality, Unreality . . ." supports both point one and point ten. DeMott, an American, says very plainly, in regard to the study of literature for itself as opposed to knowledge about literature, "study the thing" (p. 45). He claims that the English teacher has become a slave to trivia. "He busies himself introducing students to arcane literary hierarchies--the mystique of Great Books, etc." (p. 34). Because of this, English has become emasculated. It does not concern particulars of

humanness. "And, to repeat, the goal is not to know dates and authors and how to spell recommend; it is to expand the areas of the human world" (p. 36). He uses a poem that was chosen by a committee at the Seminar to illustrate how the English teacher, by relating the material (in this case the poem) to the student's human experience, can "expand the areas of the human world" (p. 36). In order to relate English to human experience, "The argument holds only that the teacher and student who speak together of the things that books make palpable, who tell each other what they see and why they believe or disbelieve their eyes, can awaken in each other a stronger consciousness of humanness than that issuing either from an absorption in metrics or design or the hierarchy of taste" (p. 48). According to this quote then, the way to study literature for itself (point ten) is through talk between teacher and student (point one). Not only does DeMott support these points of agreement; he further explains them, giving the reader a better understanding of the rationale behind them.

The very last section of this specific report of the Seminar, "Gleanings From The Dartmouth Discussions" contains "statements on general topics" (p. 49) made by delegates in attendance. "The sampling

is offered as an indication of the vitality and range of the Dartmouth discussions" (p. 49); therefore any conflict between delegates concerning literature and the points of agreement ought to be evident here. The first four sections of this specific report not only support but further explain points one, two, six, and ten that were agreed upon at the Dartmouth Seminar. They do not indicate any great disagreement among delegates to the Seminar. But this is not surprising in view of Squire's comment in the "introduction," regarding overemphasis on differences at the Seminar.

The first subdivision of the last section, "On the Focus of Literary Study," however, does indicate disagreement. According to Frank Whitehead "The stage at which critical assessment can enter explicitly into the practice of the classroom will need careful discussion; there is such disagreement here and, perhaps, a certain amount of muddled thinking" (p. 50). Whitehead further states, "We can probably all agree characteristics (e.g., rhythm, imagery, dramatic irony, narrative point-of-view) should play some part in a student's literary education, at any rate at older ages and more advanced levels of study ". . . Many British teachers certainly believe that for younger and for less able pupils conscious

direction toward such issues can be a hindrance and a distraction because it seemingly offers them a relatively painless alternative to the task of reading the novel, poem, or play as such" (p. 51). Apparnetly there was some disagreement concerning the study of formal characteristics of literature; and it was the British who discouraged such an approach to the teaching of literature according to Whitehead in this specific report and according to Muller in his general report as previously cited. However, the rest of the quotations in this subdivision also support Muller's statement that most of the Americans were in agreement with the British on this. Certainly, the first four papers in this specific report support the study of literature for itself.

Like the first four papers, the second subtopic, "On Literature And Human Experience," of the last section of this specific report also supports the study of literature for its capacity to ". . . amplify the student's power to explain his own world, to bridge its inner and outer dimensions" (p. 57). The third subtopic "On Historical Influences In English Teaching" further supports the study of literature for itself, thereby enabling the student to identify, or experience and respond to literature. Likewise, the

fourth subtopic "On the Selection of Literary Works," points to agreement, in addition to referring to mass media as literature, which supports the sixth point of agreement already cited. It adds that "Disagreement arises over how much knowledge he should have of literary forms and initial vocabulary, but at least he should have some experience with the diverse forms and with talk about them" (p. 61).

"On the Sequence of Literary Study," the fifth subtopic, contains a quote by Working Party Number Two that is in direct conflict with Frank Whitehead's statement, already quoted in reference to the first subtopic, concerning British teacher's disdain for the teaching of formal characteristics of literature to younger and less able students. Working Party Number Two says, "Probably all literary devices and stylistic features can be appreciated, in their simpler forms, at the earliest stages of reading or listening to stories. . . ." (p. 61). Obviously, some delegates saw value in teaching the formal characteristics of literature. The rest of the quotations under this subtopic do not, however, evidence this conflict.

Similarly, the last four subtopics of this last section are supportive of the study of literature for itself, rather than for knowledge about it, the

tenth point of agreement. The second point of agreement, encouraging the use of drama, is likewise affirmed by Study Group Number Two, when the group is quoted as having said that "The experience with a variety of 'voices' which work in drama entails can also lead to a more adequate and sensitively aware reading of literature, . . ." (p. 72).

In general then, this specific report Response to Literature edited by James R. Squire coincides with Muller's report of agreement and slight disagreement at the Seminar in regard to the study of literature. It also agrees with Drama in the English Classroom in supporting points one, two, and ten; informal discussion, the use of drama in the English classroom, and the study of literature for itself. However, points three and five referring to creative writing assignments and open or workshop classrooms, which are both mentioned in Drama in the English Classroom and Language and Language Learning are ignored in this specific report; just as points four and eleven, regarding a flexible school syllabus and tolerance of dialectical differences, that were also mentioned in Language and Language Learning are ignored in Response to Literature. Likewise, point seven, advocating teacher training in impovised drama,

group discussion, etc., that was cited in relation to Drama in the English Classroom is not included, as previously stated, in Response to Literature.

So far, in analyzing these three specific reports the only points of agreement which have not been touched upon are points eight and nine which recommend an end to streaming and a review of examinations. Also the areas of disagreement uncovered so far in these three reports coincide with Muller's report of disagreement at the Seminar. Beginning with Language and Language Learning, the conflict over the explicit teaching of language is evident, and going on to Drama in the English Classroom this conflict becomes more evident as well as the strong British domination at the Seminar becoming visible. It is the study of formal characteristics of literature that is controversial in Response to Literature, in addition to knowledge of the diverse forms of literature and at what age such knowledge should be taught. Once again the British dominance can be seen, in that it is their disdain for the study of forms and characteristics of literature, beginning at an early age, that is embodied in the points of agreement supported by Response to Literature. Of the authors represented in these three reports five are British

and five are American, which indicates one, a fairly balanced account of the proceedings of the conference; and two, that perhaps, the Americans were more willing than the British to compromise. The last two specific reports The Uses of Myth and Creativity in English may reveal further British influence, support for points eight and nine, or further agreement or disagreement about the points already covered. The only way to find out is to study these last two specific reports.

IV

Creativity in English, edited by Goeffrey Summerfield, exhibits in its list of authors a strong British influence. Two thirds of this phamphlet was written by the editor Goeffrey Summerfield, a British delegate to the Seminar who openly admits his lack of objectivity in this report. He says, "my own paper and my examples of 'creative' work draw on many of the issues that arose in our discussion, but should be read as a personal statement, which makes no claims to represent the views of the group" (p. vii). The other two contributors to this specific report include the Englishman, David Holbrook and Reed Whitmore, an American teacher of English. Mr. Whitmore, however, contributed only two and one fourth pages to this

sixty-eight page report, while Mr. Holbrook authored twenty pages and Mr. Summerfield the remainder, plus the introductory notes.

The report begins with David Holbrook's paper "Creativity in The English Programme." Based on the belief that in man, in order to develop individual identity "there is a primary need to symbolise" (p. 2) and "not merely the symbolism of outward cummunication" (p. 3) but "all forms of symbolisation from dreams to high art" (p. 5) Mr. Holbrook concludes that creative work is "by no means a minor topic--it is the topic of English" (p. 7). Since creativity is the topic of English, English teachers must be trained in creative work. This statement is in agreement with point seven, which says the same thing in relation to improvised drama, creative writing, group learning, and mass media. The second and third points, concerning the use of improvised drama, and creative writing assignments are also supported by Holbrook. He includes in "'limbering up' exercises" (p. 17); "2. Writing down responses to pieces of music, pictures, sounds," and "5. Miming a poem, piece of music, or a story" (p. 18). In addition, he agrees with points four, a flexible school syllabus, and five, an open classroom with

suitable equipment and room, when he says, "Creative work requires much more freedom of timetable and room arrangement than formal work" (p. 17). Similarly, point ten, the study of literature for itself and the experience it offers the reader, is touched upon when Holbrook says, "These things can best be learnt by responding to literature, by experiencing creativity, and by discussing children's work and literature with others" (p. 15). Point one, more informal group discussion, is hinted at when one of the requirements of the English classroom is set down as "2. an informal setting in the classroom" (p. 15). Although points six, mass media be viewed as literature, eight, abolishment of "streaming," nine, review of examinations, and point eleven, tolerance toward dialectical differences in student's language, are not specifically supported in this paper they are not contradicted by it either. If anything, there is implied support for these points since the individual and his experiences, inner and outer, are emphasized; and mass media is an experience of a person's outer world, "streaming" and examinations deemphasize the individual, and finally, intolerance toward dialectical differences in student's language stifles creative self-expression. This paper definitely

agrees with the British point of view, with its emphasis on the creative individual, and overlooks the American emphasis on teaching practical skills.

Teaching of practical skills in English is not ignored in Geoffrey Summerfield's paper "A Short Dialogue On Some Aspects Of That Which We Call Creative English." Rather, Summerfield criticizes this approach to teaching English: "the schools have succeeded in producing remarkably conformist young people, and there seems to be a subtle and complex, but nonetheless marked, connection between acceptable performance of clerical bookkeeping skills on the one hand and social conformity on the other" (p. 25). In his paper Summerfield mainly defends and explains creative English as "trying to foster the growth of more articulate, more effectively human people" (p. 40). He admits that the word creative has some bad connotations, but prefers it "because I want to keep its force" (p. 21-22). Creative English is replacing textbook English whose "exercises tend to be disconnected, fragmentary, arbitrary, and abstract" (p. 26). Because "'Conversation' <u>is</u> important, both in itself and as an image of human society" (p. 27) it is an important component of creative English. The inclusion of conversation in

creative English here supports the first point of agreement, more informal group discussion. The role of teacher is no longer that of instructor; rather the teacher conceives ways to initiate collaborative creative effort and guides students in such enterprises. Here again, Summerfield touches upon point one informal group discussion. Similarly, in defining creative English he supports points six and three, defining mass media as literature and advocating creative writing assignments: "To take up my second point, about possible modes: unless the school is equipped with closed circuit television, there seems little to be gained from writing scripts for television plays or documentaries" (p. 41). Obviously, he feels that the school should have such equipment. Since "creative English" promotes more adequate self-knowledge, "This will involve us in talk about our selves, our language, our behaviour, our attitudes and beliefs, and, when appropriate, in recording such things in writing" (p. 44). This statement directly supports point three, concerning creative writing assignments.

Although only points one, three, and six are obviously referred to in Summerfield's paper, like Holbrook's paper the implied assent to all the eleven

points of agreement is there. Once again, the strong British domination of the Seminar is evident in this Englishman's emphasis on a creative imaginative approach to the teaching of English and his open dislike of a pragmatic skills approach, which is a predominant way of teaching English in the United States.

Reed Whitmore, a teacher of English in the United States, is the author of the third and final paper in this specific report "A Caveat On Creativity." Whitmore points out the problem of creativity without agreeing or disagreeing with the eleven points of agreement: "The real problem with creativity is one that our Study Group couldn't begin to cope with in its few meetings, the problem of understanding the creative process itself and its relationship to other processes for which we also have names and little understanding, the critical process, the imitative process, and so on" (p. 47). He offers as a solution to this problem cooperation between those in favor of creativity and the enemies of it, in an effort to understand the processes involved.

The remainder of this monograph is devoted to "A Few Examples of Creative English" by Geoffrey Summerfield and a brief "Editor's Afterword" by the

same man. He merely apologizes in this final note for "having left a great deal unsaid," (p. 67) and re-emphasizes the importance of creativity, particularly in relation to the English classroom.

Obviously, this report strongly coincides with all eleven points of agreement that emerged at the Dartmouth Seminar. It just as obviously disregards the American view of the teaching of English. Reed Whitmore is the only author in this report who comes close to mentioning the dissenting American view expressed at the Seminar. Even at that, all he says is, "Perhaps given a little time, the linguists, and others who have long been regarded as political enemies of the Creative, will be able to help the conventional Creative Writing teacher as they cannot now" (p. 47). In contrast to this silence about disagreement, the strong support for points one, informal discussion; two, inclusion of drama in English; three, creative writing assignments; five, open classroom; six, mass media be considered literature; seven, teacher training in drama, etc.; and ten, the study of literature for itself, is quite evident as well as the implied support for those points of agreement not specifically mentioned.

The most striking feature of this report is its similarity to the general report Growth Through English, by John Dixon. Both authors are British and in admittedly emphasizing the positive aspects of their point of view, a creative approach to the teaching of English, are biased in reporting the discussions at the Dartmouth Seminar. This narrowness in reporting was previously mentioned in the comparison of the two general reports of the Seminar and is even more noticeable in regard to the sixth point of agreement concerning Myth. Dixon in his general report Growth Through English almost completely ignored myth, while Muller in his general report The Uses of English, included myth in the discussion of mass media and as a point of agreement at the Seminar. Since one specific report The Uses of Myth is devoted to this subject it was included in the fifth point of agreement, even though Dixon did not include it as a point of agreement in his general report. The fact that this specific report The Uses of Myth was edited by Paul A. Olson, an American, and disregarded by Dixon in favor of his own view, the British one, points out once again the narrowness of his general report.

V

This very last specific report, The Uses of Myth, perhaps the most difficult but the most interesting to deal with, is also the shortest of the five specific reports of the discussions at the Dartmouth Seminar. Five authors are represented, three of whom are British, two of whom are American, and all of whom are teachers. Naturally, the report concerns myth and the Study Group discussions about it at the Seminar. The only point of agreement which deals with myth is point six, as reported by Muller, stating that the English teacher should teach only the great and good myths and that it is not up to the English teacher to demythologize. Since only Muller mentioned myth and only the sixth point of agreement also mentions it, it is unlikely that many of the other points are specifically supported by this report.

Paul Olson, an American and editor of the report, begins with an "Introduction on Myth and Education." Apparently the group was given the topic "Myth and translation" to discuss. They used translation in the sense of translating myth by relating it to the understanding of life and the role myth plays in understanding literature. Myth was used in six

different ways by the discussion participants. It was defined as "a story about the gods in their relationship to men," as "the theory and history of the gods in any culture," as "a group religious narrative," the way some people view life and art, as "a narrative which functions for a group in modern society," similar to a group religious narrative, as "any phantasmagoric story rehearsed in a dream sequence," and as "any narrative which explains or 'renders' in fictive or anthropomorphic terms perceptions of physical nature or social life" (pp. 3-4). No matter what definition was being used the participants agreed about the value of teaching myth.

An area of conflict in relation to myth arose regarding the therapeutic value of it in handling peculiar sexual and emotional problems that psychoanalysts have encountered in children's stories and compared to ancient stories in an effort to explain the inexplicable. Olson says that "Robson's paper in this booklet I take to be a frontal attack on Messrs. Holbrook and Lewis insofar as it suggests that the meanings found in myth by modern psychoanalytic critics rest on no very solid basis" (p. 7). It was also pointed out that understanding myths is an act of historical and cultural imagination. Cultural

symbols are embodied in social myths which in turn are embodied in literature. Little attention is given to the social myths that students bring to school. An omission which creates a void in both education and literary culture.

"The Position Paper: Some Meanings And Uses of Myth," by Albert L. Lavin another American, becomes the basis for the responses which take up the remainder of this specific report. Lavin defines the place of myth in the curriculum by saying, "We need, then, to teach myth from within, inductively, leading students to a sense of power of myth to make and continue to make art from the time of Homer to that of Flannery O'Connor, from Oedipus to A Separate Peace" (p. 18). Furthermore, "Myth, conceived of as symbolic form, underpins all human expression; as a way of organizing the human response to reality, it holds a central place in literature" (p. 19). Without a doubt, point six emphasizing the study of myth in the English classroom is overwhelmingly supported by Lavin. In addition, point ten, the study of literature for itself, is hinted at when Lavin includes myth in the study of literature and advocates the study of it from within inductively.

Having established support for and a definition of the place of myth in the curriculum, he devotes the remainder of this paper to "three representative modern approaches to the study of myth which will serve as an illustration of current possible relevance of the study of myth to the teaching of English" (p. 20). The first approach, "Myth and Language," is based on Cassirer's theory that myth by acting as a symbol that embodies a concept, be it a sound, mark, object, or event whose meaning is or was not consciously understood by a person, preceded language, which is also a symbol that embodies a concept, but one consciously understood by a person; and myth, therefore, is related in a very basic way to language. If myth is the symbolic ancestor of language in man's intellectual expression of self, then it certainly is relevant to the study of the English language as Lavin claims here. The second approach to the study of myth is "Myth and Literature." It is based on Northrop Frye's conception of myth as a form of verbal art which should be included in a liberal education because, "The imaginative element in works of art, again, lifts them clear of the bondage of history" (p. 23) with its record of social corruption. Myth, therefore, liberates by preserving "The corruption out of which human art has

been constructed" (p. 23), and at the same time, rising above that corruption "to make one capable of conceiving society as free, classless and urbane" (p. 23). If this is the purpose of a liberal education and myth is a for of verbal art, then it certainly is literature and relevant to the teaching of English, as Lavin again claims here. The third approach to the study of myth "Myth and Society" is much broader in its application to the activities of mankind and may be more relevant to the teaching of English just by virtue of this fact. In this approach,

> Myth is not content. . . . Like literature and its other self, composition, myth is primarily an act of knowing and making; like these other activities, it comes out as language. This suggests that we should study myth and language as basic modes of symbolic transformation, that, since language has both imaginative and scientific uses when cultures attain to written language, we should make contrastive studies of the differences, as to cognitive basis, between oral and written uses of language. (p. 24)

This approach demands that the teacher be a philosopher using myth and literature to reveal their "power to form and interpret patterns of existence" (p. 26) and allowing the students to make use of myth in their own writing. If this approach is interdisciplinary as a basic human symbol system and will help identify contemporary myths in the language of literature or

make one capable of conceiving society as free, classless and urbane" (p. 23). If this is the purpose of a liberal education and myth is a form of verbal art, then it certainly is literature and relevant to the teaching of English, as Lavin again claims here. The third approach to the study of myth "Myth and Society" is much broader in its application to the activities of mankind and may be more relevant to the teaching of English just by virtue of this fact. In this approach,

> Myth is not content. . . . Like literature and its other self, composition, myth is primarily an act of knowing and making; like these other activities, it comes out as language. This suggests that we should study myth and language as basic modes of symbolic transformation, that, since language has both imaginative and scientific uses when cultures attain to written language, we should make contrastive studies of the differences, as to cognitive basis, between oral and written uses of language. (p. 24)

This approach demands that the teacher be a philospher . . using myth and literature to reveal their "power to form and interpret patterns of existence" (p. 26) and allowing the students to make use of myth in their own writting. If this approach is interdisciplinary as a basic human symbol system and will help identify contemporary myths in the language of literature or

society, then it is certainly relevant to the teaching of English.

It is evident that this position paper supports the sixth point of agreement at the Seminar in regard to the study of myth. However, it goes beyond this point and includes point four, which states, "That the school syllabus be planned to encourage a flexible teaching strategy based on natural language development in operation, with the processes involved in language learning a main concern." The study of myth when it is viewed as a symbol system that predates language expressing man's concepts is based on natural language development in operation, with the processes involved in language learning a main concern. Therefore, point four is indirectly acknowledged here. The third point of agreement, regarding creative writing assignments based on discussion and shared experience etc., is also supported, in that the use of myth in writing, particularly contemporary social myths, is creative; more importantly, however, it is writing based on shared experience because to recognize a contemporary social myth and use it in writing a student must, as part of that society, share in it in one way or another. Therefore, just as point three advocates, his writing is based on shared experience. Similarly,

point ten, the study of literature for itself and the experience it offers the reader, is reenforced, as previously noted, when Lavin advocates studying it from within, inductively. Whether or not the responses to this paper also support these points remains to be seen.

Since, according to Olson, the whole concern of this study group on myth "was 'translation' in the widest sense: from language to language, past to present, belief to belief, man to man" (p. 30), the rest of this specific report is devoted to seven "wooden" questions posed by Olson and answers given by him and the rest of the group. The first of these questions is answered by William Wallace Robson, a British delegate to the Seminar. The question asks how myth and myth criticism can be used in constructing school programs. As mentioned in reference to Olson's introduction, Robson is critical of Northrop Frye's theory of myth as well as being critical of Freud and Jung. What Robson favors is "The raw material (the myths themselves) . . . I am in favor of any amount of immersion in them (though I would advocate a 'mixed diet' in children's reading at all stages)" (p. 35). Robson seems to be supporting point ten here, the study of literature (and myth is literature) for itself.

George Cameron Allen, another British delegate, answers the second question concerning the pitfalls for teaching style presented by the study of myth. The first pitfall is lack of time necessary to study in depth the complexities of myth that give it meaning and make it unique; and the second pitfall is overlooking those complexities. Allen, like Robson, agrees with point ten: "And we should never forget that ultimate objective in literature is a better understanding of the individual work of art, beginning and also ending with its uniqueness" (p. 36). The third question asking, "To what extent should explicit training in the techniques of contemporary myth criticism and searching for archetypes be part of the school program" (p. 38), is answered by another British delegate, Barbara Hardy. Like other British delegates she emphasizes the study of literature for itself, supporting point ten. She advises the study of myth at all ages, but the explicit study only at the graduate level to safeguard against the analytical technique becoming more important than the literature itself.

George Cameron Allen discusses the fourth question, explaining the place of translated materials in the schools and the loss of mythos in the translation

of a work from another time or another culture. Because "the underlying message of our civilisation and culture . . . has been transmitted" (p. 44) and is transmitted through myth, even a poor translation, according to Allen, "is a gift to the hungry. And there is deep down, a hunger of the spirit for what some of the translated work can tell us" (p. 44). Obviously, Allen agrees strongly with point six in regard to the study of myth. In answering question five, Albert L. Lavin discusses modern psychoanalytic approaches to myth and their contribution to an understanding of literature and of the creative work of students, which Robson condemned in relation to the question concerning myth criticism. Lavin, however, disagrees with Robson when he says that patterns of human behavior "do reappear in the mythologies of cultures widely separate in space and time" (p. 45). It follows that myth as literature is one of the best ways of coping with the tensions of identity. Consequently, the psychoanalytic approach must be taken into consideration by the teacher of English. Moreover, "The teacher, then, should be aware of the sequence of tensions in the child's life. Beyond that, he should anticipate them, preparing a structure of stories and writing assignments which

will account for those successive tension" (p. 46). Not only does Lavin support the sixth point of agreement, but he brings in another point not previously mentioned in this specific report. In advocating "a structure of stories and writing assignments which will account for those successive tensions," Lavin is adhereing to natural language development in operation and a flexible teaching strategy just as point four supports these approaches to the teaching of English. It could also be argued that the third point of agreement, regarding creative writing assignments, is touched upon here.

Paul A. Olson answers question six which asks about the problems presented by "modern" readings of myth "and what may be gained from efforts to make historical reconstructions of their resonances" (p. 47). In various ages different readings of myths have occurred, causing the content of a passage to shift. The same passage in different ages has been read "as barbarism, volcanic energy, pride, presumption, lawlessness, etc.," (p. 50). Likewise, "the tone of a passage may shift," (p. 51) just as "the sense of the artfulness or economy of a passage may change" (p. 51). In addition, "to know where the equivalences assigned to myth are unchanging or

changing is to give the student a beginning grip on Western literature as a stable or changing--as a related--order of visions" (p. 52). In short, Olson says, the problems for education are "implicit in any discussion of the transformations of myth and the development of the historical imagination" (p. 52). What we must do is understand the myths as they were understood by the people of the age and place in which they were written. How this can be done Olson doesn't know, only that it should be done. Olson goes on to discuss question seven, "Can education take account of modern operative social myths and mythoi, and how shall it do so?" (p. 54). In answering this question Olson directly supports point six, as reported by Muller in his general report, when he says "Empirical study may cure superstition, but belief, however destructive, is psychologically at least more than superstition, and the business of the English teacher is not, primarily, to 'demythologize'--whatever the mythology" (p. 55). However, according to Olson, "Operative myths and mythoi are a business of education" (p. 55). Therefore, "the English teacher must know the operative myths of his students and their neighbors" (p. 56). Moreover, the student should be allowed at some level of indirect representation "his

or his group's idiosyncratic vision of what makes the world tick" (p. 56). Anything that "attempts to say 'the world is put together so and means this to me' can become, and be used as, the basis for the search for confirmative evidence" (p. 56). Furthermore, it is a matter for research to discover how best a student may be brought to an understanding of literature. Finally, Olson concludes this specific report by saying that "education should recognize its obligations to foster "the total literary process--including the oral storytelling process" (p. 57).

This specific report agrees with points four, a flexible school syllabus based on natural language development; six, as reported by Muller, encouraging the teaching of the great and good myths; and ten, the study of literature for itself and the experience it offers the reader. The other eight points of agreement that emerged at the Dartmouth Seminar are neither directly supported nor condemned. The only disagreement was apparently within this study group itself, in regard to critical analystical techniques. Robson says "Very often a 'theory' or 'science' of myths turns out to be an imaginative and ingenious suggestion or picture, a creative prompting; sometimes, as in Jung or Northrop Frye, it almost seems like a myth itself"

(p. 33). In criticizing Frye and Jung, Robson is in direct conflict with one of the approaches to the study of myth discussed by Lavin in his position paper because Lavin bases the approach "Myth and Society" in part on Northrop Frye's The Educated Imagination and Anatomy of Criticism. The main significance of this conflict is that it points out, once again, that differences at the Seminar were largely along national lines since Robson, a British delegate, in criticizing Frye, an American scholar, disagrees with Lavin another American. In his remarks Robson also reflects "the british clamoring for the individual freedom that Americans have always prized in theory"[1] since he feels that approaches such as Frye's are too schematic and offer premature solutions as finalities. The future teacher, according to Robson, should have the individual freedom of choice between the hypothesis of various authorities. This last specific report, then, coincides with Muller's report of disagreement at this Seminar.

VI

In review, the only points of agreement not supported by these five specific reports are points eight and nine which recommend an end to streaming and a review of examinations. Point one, informal

discussion in the English classroom, is supported in Response to Literature, Drama in the English Classroom, and Creativity in English. Point two, the use of drama in the English classroom, is likewise supported by Response to Literature, Drama in the English Classroom, and Creativity in English. Point three, creative writing assignments, is supported in Language and Language Learning, Drama in the English Classroom, and Creativity in English. Point four, a flexible school syllabus, is supported in Language and Language Learning, Creativity in English, and The Uses of Myth. Point five, the English classroom be equipped as a workshop or democratic classroom, is supported in Language and Language Learning, Drama in the English Classroom, and Creativity in English. Point six, mass media and myth included in the study of literature, is supported in Response to Literature, Creativity in English, and The Uses of Myth. Point seven, training of teachers in improvised drama, creative writing, group learning, etc., is supported in Drama in the English Classroom and Creativity in English. Point ten, the study of literature for itself, is supported in Response to Literature, Creativity in English, and The Uses of Myth. Point

eleven, tolerance toward dialectical differences, is supported in Language and Language Learning.

The areas of disagreement coincide with Muller's report of conflict. The explicit teaching of language and the study of formal characteristics of literature are found to be controversial issues in Language and Language Learning, Drama in the English Classroom, and Response to Literature. It is the British dominance, particularly in the area of creativity, that is most evident in these monographs. A though the number of British and American delegates represented is numerically even in these reports, the space devoted to the British delegates' ideas is much greater, indicating their dominance at the Seminar. One of the five reports, Drama in the English Classroom, was entirely written by a British delegate, while the report Creativity in English was written by two British delegates. Both of these monographs concern creativity, showing that it was mainly the British who favored a creative imaginative approach to the teaching of English; and in addition, showing that it is mainly their ideas that are embodied in the points of agreement that emerged at the Seminar.

In looking at all five specific reports and the two general reports Muller's objectivity, despite his

personal interest in the proceedings of the Seminar, is confirmed. Dixon's neglect of myth, since the last monograph discussed is devoted to it, makes his report not only biased but narrow in scope as well. Muller reported both the British and the American views expressed at the Seminar and in these specific reports; while, for the most part, Dixon reported the British views. That Dixon intended his report to be only "partial" means little because it has been accepted by the professional community, Dixon's intended audience, as a general report of the proceedings of the Seminar. However, Dixon did report, like Muller, that there was disagreement at the Seminar between British and American delegates. He merely made it seem unimportant, which it quite probably was to him. After all, some Englishmen do not consider the language spoken by Americans even remotely related to their own, and, in some cases, they are right. In light of such attitudes, Dixon may have thought that any agreement outweighed any disagreement. In any case, these monographs bear out the American-British controversy at the Dartmouth Seminar over the teaching of English. Not only do they bear it out, but they show its strength and significance. It is unfortunate that the monograph Sequence in Continuity edited by Arthur

Eastman was canceled, since it would presumably deal with discussions of curriculum at the Seminar, which Muller reported was a controversial subject and points eight and nine might have been covered in depth. Since Muller's report of disagreement is borne out by the five monographs that were published, in the absence of Sequence in Continuity, his judgement of the controversy concerning curriculum must be considered accurate.

As already noted in the "Introduction" to Response to Literature James R. Squire considers the differences insignificant in comparison to the "degree of unanimity achieved in attacking many common educational problems" (p. 1). However, the strength and significance of the disagreement at the Seminar are not evident only in Muller's general report as well as the five published monographs and, possibly, in the canceled monograph; but, more importantly, they are also evident in the lack of any revolutionary change in approach to the teaching of English in the American public school system comparable to the "new math," for instance; and they are evident in the lack of experimental schools in the United States recommended by the Seminar since it was held in 1966. A practical skills appraoch is still the main method of

teaching English in the United States and tests which reinforce this approach, such as the SAT and CEEB, are still required of college bound students. Judging from these facts, the disagreement was very strong and very significant, in that it may have discouraged the practical implementation of the creative imaginative approach to the teaching of English that was advocated at the Seminar in American schools.

NOTES

[1]F. G. Jennings, "How Plain Is English," Saturday Review, 50 (Dec. 1967), 73.

CHAPTER IV

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In compiling any bibliography it is necessary to know the best sources of information on one's subject. Following this logic, I first consulted general indexes and bibliographies of English teaching that covered the years 1966 through 1973 included in this bibliography. Since the Modern Language Association of America was one of the sponsors of the Dartmouth Seminar, I looked at the MLA International Bibliography of English Language and Articles on the Modern Languages and Literatures, 1966 through 1971 (the only volumes available to me), as well as the PMLA journal, 1972 through 1973. It was a surprisingly poor source, containing very little material on the teaching of English to native speakers. The National Council of Teachers of English publications, another sponsor of the conference, proved more useful and many of the entries in this bibliography were found in them. The English Journal, 1966 through 1973, and Elementary English, 1966 through 1973, along with the Research in Education index, 1968 through 1973, which lists joint NCTE/ERIC publications, were very valuable sources of information. Although not all of them directly deal

with the Dartmouth Seminar, and consequently are not included in this bibliography, the NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English publications since 1966 reflect the impact of the conference on the English teaching profession in the United States in their attempt through research to answer the many questions raised at this Seminar. In addition, the Current Index to Journals in Education, 1968 through 1973, also published by the Educational Resources Information Center, contained many journal articles directly dealing with the Seminar, just as did Education Index. Unfortunately, British Education Index, Social Sciences and Humanities Index, and the subject guide to the National Union Catalog were of no use to me in this bibliography.

Since both the general reports of the Seminar were reviewed, I looked next in book review indexes and journals for reviews of Dixon's Growth Through English and Muller's The Uses of English and for papers directly pertaining to the Seminar. Book Review Digest, Index to Book Reviews in the Humanities, Childhood Education, College English, Education (British), Educational Review, The Review of English Studies, English Education, and English Language

Teaching were among the many sources that I consulted. Needless to say, many other English teaching and Education bibliographies that are not listed but that I did look at yielded nothing. In the English Journal, however, I did ind a very brief bibliography of publications perta ıing to Dartmouth that is included in this bibliography. Furthermore, several of the papers and books on the conference referred me to other articles that also deal with it.

In this research I have tried to be as comprehensive as possible so that teachers of English can learn more about this importaht Seminar and its recommendations. All works are listed alphabetically by author or editor; and all annotations are meant to be descriptive of content rather than a critical analysis of any work. Although, in order to make this bibliography as useful as possible, the emphasis of each entry is noted directly following it, most of the works deal with the theory of English instruction rather than the actual classroom practice or exercises. Parentheses indicate number of entry.

ASH, BRIAN. "The Uses of English." English Journal, 57, (Feb. 1968), 258-59. (1)

"Muller describes the conference with verve and charm for the general reader" (p. 258). The whole range of English teaching, from the teaching of composition to the relevance of myth to students in a modern world, was questioned and the resulting points raised challenged. Muller seems to worry too much about what society wants. And the Americans are characterized as being skills oriented, the British only interested in the creative individual. But this very readable book is important because these conflicts that will always arise at such conferences can lead to new excellencies in the teaching of English.
EMPHASIS: Theory

BALDWIN, J. A. M. "Growth Through English." Use of English, 25, (Autumn 1973), 27-32. (2)

Growth Through English has influenced current thinking on the teaching of English. In particular, two points in the book may be noted by future historians, the importance of the pupil-centered approach in primary and secondary school and the inclusion of observation of language in operation in a model of English teaching. But, Mr. Dixon fails to apply his theory of language in operation to literature, relegating literature to a minor position in the model.
EMPHASIS: Theory

BARNES, DOUGLAS. Drama in the English Classroom. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968. 65 pp. (3)

In this specific monograph of the Seminar discussions about drama "Democracy and Education," "Drama in English Teaching," and "Initiating the Use of Drama" are among the subjects debated. Two syllabii are also included, one for primary and one for secondary school, at the end of this book. The use of drama as a way of experiencing language, rather than learning about it, is the main emphasis of this report.
EMPHASIS: Theory and some Practice.

BAYLISS, J. F. "On Dartmouth; Comparative English Education." Elementary English, 47 (Apr. 1970), 476-81. (4)

Dartmouth served to begin International Studies in English Education, or Comparative English Education, but the debate remains remote to most British and American teachers. In order to improve our systems Comparative English Education is vital. EMPHASIS: Theory

CARRITHERS, LURA M. "A Review of Herbert J. Muller's The Uses of English," Elementary English, 45 (May 1968), 656-57. (5)

This book inspires readers to think through the issues of the Seminar for themselves, asking questions about the teaching of English. EMPHASIS: Theory

COOPER, CHARLES R. "The New Climate for Personal Responses to Literature in the Class." English Journal, 60 (Nov. 1971), 1063-71. (6)

Several important modern critics and literary theorists are credited with having said that there are many useful approaches in literary study; and dogmatic adherence to a single critical approach is wrong-headed. A new development in the teaching of English, the Dartmouth Seminar has angered, confused, and delighted the English teaching profession. Three factors are creating a favorable atmosphere for students; personal responses to literature in the classroom; interest in student involvement in literature; a more eclectic approach to literary criticism; and the Dartmouth Seminar. Once students are allowed personal responses to literature they will enjoy and anticipate literature. A list of eleven points of agreement from the Seminar then follows. EMPHASIS: Theory

DELVES, TONY. "Vaguely Mid-Atlantic," in Issues in Teaching English, Tony Delves. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1972, pp. 9-17 (7)

Although this chapter does not specifically discuss Dartmouth, both Dixon and Muller's general reports are quoted extensively. The contrast in British and American theoretical and practical approaches to English teaching is emphasized. While Americans emphasize a skills approach to English teaching, the British and Australians emphasize shared experience or personal growth. EMPHASIS: Theory

DENBY, ROBERT V. "Dartmouth Seminar Recommendations," in "A Reference Shelf on Curriculum Planning for the Language Arts K-8." Elementary English, 47 (Mar. 1970), 445-46. (8)

In summarizing Dixon's Growth Through English and Muller's The Uses of English, Denby considers both books partial but largely complementary reports of the Dartmouth proceedings. EMPHASIS: Theory

DIXON, JOHN. Growth Through English. Reading, England: NATE, 1967. 121 pp. (9)

Dixcussion and experienced-based work are necessary in the teaching of English because of the great improvements in communications. This book is a report on the Dartmouth Seminar. The need for a student-oriented rather than subject-oriented curriculum was stressed and considered to be the direction English must take in the future. There were twenty-eight delegates from the United States, twenty from the United Kingdom, and one from Canada at this conference, which gained the financial support of the Carnegie Corporation. The emphasis at the Seminar was on personal growth through language and language as inseparable from culture. This book gives the general conclusions of the Seminar, mentions disagreements between English and American delegates, but does not elaborate on them. EMPHASIS: Theory

DIXON, JOHN, and WAYNE O'NEIL. "Conference Report: the Dartmouth Seminar." Harvard Educational Review, 30 (Spring 1969), 357-72. (10)

At the request of the editors of the Harvard Educational Review, Wayne O'Neil, an American, and John Dixon, an Englishman, have assessed the value of the Dartmouth Seminar in regard to curriculum change in the two countries. Mr. O'Neil elaborates on what he considers was nothing less than total confusion at the Seminar and advises that "It's 'findings' should be ignored" (p. 365). Mr. Dixon, on the other hand, explains the causes of the differences as well as the differences themselves between American and British delegates at the Seminar in regard to curriculum. In conclusion, he hopes that the two theories of a subject definition curriculum versus a language in operation curriculum, which represented the differences at the Seminar, in his time will be developed into an overarching theory. EMPHASIS: Theory

DIXON, JOHN. "Processes in Language Learning," in Challenge and Change in the Teaching of English, edited by Arthur Daigon and Ronald L. La Conte. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971, pp. 291-308. (11)

This paper taken from Dixon's book Growth Through English begins by mentioning the need for more and better research into the processes of language learning. Because children learn through necessity the basic structure of language along with the dialect of their environment before they enter school, it is important for the school to build on that learning process, gradually refining and adding to what has been learned. Depending upon the understanding with which it is done, the child will either succeed or fail at various points in the process. EMPHASIS: Theory.

DONLAN, DAN. "Backward Glance at Dartmouth." English Education, 5 (Feb./Mar. 1974), 189-94. (12)

Because Dartmouth's participants disagree on its lasting value, there is no hope of a single, coherent assessment of the effect of the Seminar upon English education. This conclusion is based on ten participants' recollections and reflections. The value of the Seminar is in its inspiration to continual thought and investigation. EMPHASIS: Theory

EARLY, MARGARET. "Growth Through English." English Journal, 57 (Feb. 1968), 259-60. (13)

Although John Dixon "presents a very British point of view" (p. 259) in Growth Through English, this book, along with The Uses of English by Herbert Muller, presents "the most significant statement on the teaching of English in this decade" (p. 259). Unanimity was achieved in regard to method and organization of school and classroom at the Seminar, but there was disagreement on questions of content and objectives. The admirable conciseness and Dixon's stress on concensus does not mask the dissent between the lines, obvious to any English teacher. American ideas have come back, "echoes of the thirties" (p. 261), freshened, modified, and strengthened by the British. EMPHASIS: Theory

EVERTTS, ELDONNA. Study Guide for Dartmouth Publications. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE/ERIC, 1969. 48 pp. (14)

This series of study guides, with quotations and questions for discussion and independent study, is made up of four study guides prepared for Dixon's Growth Through English and five study guides prepared for the specific monographs, one guide for each monograph. EMPHASIS: Theory

FILLMER, H. T. "Review of Uses of English." Childhood Education, 44 (Mar. 1968), 459. (15)

Considers the book an accurate report as well as an entertaining one of the Seminar proceedings and a valuable reference book for teachers of English. EMPHASIS: Theory

GARDNER, J. "Review of Uses of English." New York Times Book Review, 73 (Oct. 6, 1968), 18. (16)

Muller covered the proceedings very thoroughly. The delegates agreed that too often children's natural interest is thwarted in school; therefore, an approach that encouraged freedom of expression was recommended along with tolerance toward different dialects and the use of classroom drama. EMPHASIS: Theory

GROMMON, ALFRED H. "Which Ways Now in the 70's." Elementary English, 47 (May 1970), 607-11. (17)

Characterizes the Seminar as a late in the decade influential trend in the teaching of English. In addition, Growth Through English and The Uses of English are very briefly summarized, and both reports are related to experience based learning, the trend in the teaching of English. EMPHASIS: Theory

HOETKER, JAMES. Dramatics and the Teaching of Literature. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE/ERIC, 1969. 79 pp. (18)

This book is based on the general arguments for the teaching of English that are developed in Dixon and Muller's general reports of the Seminar. Further, it is assumed that the reader is familiar with these arguments and the Seminar. It contains six chapters which are devoted to Dartmouth, drama, and oral language; American reaction to British practices in language and literature; survey of drama in British schools; research, uses, and backgrounds of various types of drama in American education; James Moffett's theory of drama as a central activity of the classroom;

and finally, the value of dramatic approaches in contributing to the students' comprehension of many aspects of literature. EMPHASIS: Theory and Practice

HUGHES, NINA E. "Review of Uses of English." Top of the News, 24 (June 1968), 452-3. (19)

This review briefly summarizes the proceedings of the Seminar as reported in The Uses of English. Ms. Hughes comments, "One conclusion was clear: fundamental changes in the way English is taught in Britain and America are needed" (p. 452). EMPHASIS: Theory

JENKINSON, EDWARD B. "On Teaching English" in Books for Teachers of English. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1968, pp. 139-46. (20)

Lists Dixon and Muller's books, describing their respective content and value to the teacher of English. EMPHASIS: Theory

JENNINGS, FRANK G. "How Plain Is English." Saturday Review, (Dec. 16, 1967), 73. (21)

The Seminar was a disaster with the Americans upholding intellectual discipline and the British emphasizing individual freedom. Because he uses the language so well, Muller was able to take "this sow's ear of a conference and" produce "a brilliant description and celebration of the nobility of the English teacher's role." EMPHASIS: Theory

KIRKTON, CAROLE MASLEY. "Dartmouth Publications." English Journal, 60 (May 1971), 676-7. (22)

A brief description of Dartmouth and its importance to the English teaching profession. A bibliography follows, which is divided into three sections: "Monographs," "Related Articles," and "Related Books." EMPHASIS: Theory

KITZHABER, ALBERT R. "A Rage for Disorder." English Journal, 61 (Nov. 1472), 1199-1219. (23)

Sequential curriculums are out of fashion for several reasons. A major reason is the popularity of informal education, an attempt to imbue a love of learning as well as to teach skills and knowledge, which is incompatible with sequential curriculums. The American awareness of this trend in education began with the Dartmouth Seminar and the British delegates' emphasis on it. But Americans rightly felt the need for some order and discipline in the curriculum. What is needed is a modification of both the informal education philosophy and the strict subject centered philosophy, since human beings need both order and individual freedom to grow. EMPHASIS: Theory

KLEIN, THOMAS D. "Personal Growth in the Classroom: Dartmouth, Dixon, and Humanistic Psychology." English Journal, 59 (Feb. 1970), 235-43. (24)

The importance of the teacher-student relationship which Dixon emphasized in Growth Through English is the focus of this paper. Sensitivity training is advocated for teachers who do not have the intuitive interpersonal skills Dixon may have. The relationship of sensitivity training and Dixon's personal growth model is explained through a comparison of the traditional classroom to the sensitivity group, concluding that the whole school system must change. Brief examples of the student centered, personal, and affective learning technique end this paper. EMPHASIS: Theory and very little Practice.

LEWIS, E. G. "Postscript to Dartmouth, or Poles Apart." College English, 29 (Mar. 1968), 426-34 (25)

As the title indicates, this article deals with the differences between American and British delegates at the Seminar and explores the reasons for those differences. The body of this article focuses on two fundamental differences, the role of the English teacher and the social responsibility of the teacher

of English, giving both the American and British points of view about each question. EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. "Dartmouth and After: Issues in English Language Teaching" in New English New Imperatives edited by Henry B. Maloney. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1969, pp. 1-21. (26)

The author begins by explaining the events and conferences that led to the Dartmouth Seminar. He then briefly discusses the agreement and disagreement at the Seminar, concluding with an evaluation of the Seminar's impact on the teaching of English. EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. "The Dartmouth Conference in Retrospect." English Quarterly, 3 (Spring 1970) 7-19. (27)

This paper begins by tracing the events that led to the Seminar. It then notes the agreement, disagreement, and the important concept of experience and involvement in English that emerged at the Seminar. By no means is it Dewey's educational philosophy, but rather a sharing of experience, or man to man communication. The difficulty lies in setting up situations where this occurrs. An International Steering Committee has been set up to implement the decisions of Dartmouth. A discussion of the influence of Dartmouth then concludes this article. EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. "Dartmouth Seminar: Anglo-American Conference on the Teaching of English." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 51 (Apr. 1967), 101-6. (28)

That the Dartmouth Conference was held is significant in itself because such international collaboration is rare. But, at the same time, Dartmouth was a

continuation of earlier attempts to solve problems posed in the teaching of English. The organization of the Seminar is described and the eleven points of agreement, written in the record of the proceedings, are listed. Finally, the language experiences of the child are of more importance to "new English" than new content. EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H., ed. Language and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English. 1968. 74 pp. (29)

One in a series of six monographs presenting material concerned with the Dartmouth Seminar. Five reports are contained in this book written by four authors. The papers concern standards and attitudes toward language, the relationship between linguistics and the teaching of English, and the linguistic component of the preparation of the English teacher. EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. "From the Basic Issues Conference to the Dartmouth Seminar: Perspectives on the Teaching of English." Publications of The Modern Language Association of America, 82 (Sept. 1967), 8-13. (30)

A comparison of the Basic Issues Conference and the Dartmouth Seminar helps put into perspective influential trends in English teaching. Although very similar to each other, Dartmouth was an improvement over the Basic Issues Conference in organization and diversity of delegates. But, more importantly, a change of focus in three areas, literature, developing classroom approaches, speaking and listening, and reading and writing, occurred. The Dartmouth Seminar, unlike the Basic Issues Conference, firmly rejected the imposition of an external, static, sequential curriculum on the schools solely in the interest of continuity. Nevertheless, Mr. Marckwardt found the Seminar "salutary and refreshing as much as it was disturbing" (p. 13). EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. "The Other Side of the Coin." College English, 28 (Feb. 1967), 383-8. (31)

School programs received more attention than those of the college and university. Although the delegates were for the most part united, there was a great deal of confusion because of culture shock, resulting from differences about means of reaching ends, rather than ends themselves. Mr. Marckwardt goes on to point out and discuss the striking differences between the American and British delegates. He concludes by noting that because it is the contrasts in ideas that attract our attention and further stimulate reexamination and reform, such differences are productive of growth. EMPHASIS: Theory

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. "What Does the English Teacher Do?" California Teachers Association Journal, 63 (Mar. 1967), 27-28. (32)

This is a continuation of the preceding entry (31) "The Other Side of the Coin." The British changed the emphasis of the Seminar by asking what the English teacher does, rather than what the subject English is. In addition, sequential curriculums, taken for granted by American delegates, were scorned by British delegates at the conference. Likewise, they rejected the American concept of transmission of cultural heritage through English instruction, particularly in regard to literature, just as they rejected the concept of teaching standard English. Nevertheless there was much unity and agreement on many other issues. EMPHASIS: Theory

MILLER, JAMES E. JR. "What Happened at Dartmouth?" in "To the Editor." Harvard Educational Review, 40 (Nov. 1970), 642-50. (33)

This is a slightly shortened version of the next entry (34) with the same author and title. There is still much confusion over the meaning and impact of the Seminar. Americans at the Seminar tended to concentrate on the subject of English, while the British emphasized the nature of the individual pupil.

The creativity of the British and the discipline of the Americans must be combined if the ideal conception of English teaching is ever to be achieved. EMPHASIS: Theory

MILLER, JAMES E. JR. "What Happened at Dartmouth?" Use of English, 23 (Winter 1971), 99-109. (34)

Inability to answer the questions posed at the Seminar, a deep division by a common language between British and American delegates, and a shattering into many pieces of the conference by a common subject and discipline frustrated the Seminar participants. Therefore, "'What Happened at Dartmouth'" was a very individual experience. First, a national division occurred. The British appeared "to be the progressivists, while the Americans talked like classicists" (p. 101). Each had expected the opposite of each other. As a result, all participants suffered from cultural shock. EMPHASIS: Theory

MULLER, HERBERT JOSEPH. The Uses of English. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967. 195 pp. (35)

There are ten chapters in this book which give the author's interpretations of the issues discussed at the Dartmouth Seminar. The chapters cover "What is English," "Democracy in the Classroom," "The Development of the Child," "Good English," "The Uses of Literature," "Writing and Talking," "Creativity and Drama," "The Mass Media and Myth," "Examinations and Teachers," and "The Issues of Responsibility." Differences which arose in discussions between delegates are brought out; and the agreement that teachers of English must be prepared to face the many challenges and changes in the future is emphasized. EMPHASIS: Theory

NEVI, CHARLES N. "Growth Through English: Another Appraisal." English Journal, 58 (Sept. 1969), 912-19. (36)

Nevi limits his evaluation of Growth Through English to the uses or purposes of language as they relate to student writing and speaking because he feels Dixon's views as expressed in this report are quite likely to influence the teaching of English in America. He first focuses on a major defect in Dixon's thinking--a failure to place enough emphasis on communication. Nevi concludes by presenting a positive appraisal of Dixon's ideas, saying that Dixon is concerned with student abilities and work to encourage them to develop competence in using their language. EMPHASIS: Theory

NYSTRAND, MARTIN; and SUE ZEISER. "Dewey, Dixon, and the Future of Creativity." English Journal, 59 (Nov. 1970), 1138-40. (37)

Equates Dewey's Progressive education movement to Dixon's personal growth movement in English, criticizing the vagueness of the goals and purposes of the movement. Four behavioral manifestations of growing creativity are identified as: "'independence of approach,' 'urge for expression,' 'increased interest in detail,' and 'departure from stereotype,'" which conflict with the majority of educational institutions in the United States today. Therefore, a total reassessment of the place of creativity in our schools is our most urgent need. EMPHASIS: Theory

OLSON, PAUL A. ed. The Uses of Myth. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966, 61 pp. (38)

A book in a series of six concerning the Dartmouth Seminar published for the Modern Language Association, National Association of Teachers of English (Great Britain) and the National Council of Teachers of English. It contains an Introduction and two papers by five authors. Myth is defined in several ways and its relationship to education is discussed an analyzed.

It is interesting and informative in exploring a little thought of area in the twentieth century space age and relating myth to the culture of man and his development through all ages. EMPHASIS: Theory

O'NEIL, WAYNE. "When Sensitive Souls Met the Heavies; Dartmouth Seminar." Times Educational Supplement, (Nov. 7, 1969), 2842-4. (39)

The British were the sensitive souls at the Seminar, those in favor of individual freedom, the Americans the heavies, those in favor of intellectual discipline; and a number of delegates of both nationalities were very confused people. The Seminar retreated from issues, leaving the non-questions raised unanswered. Mr. O'Neil concludes from all this that there must be a combination of individual freedom, intellectual, achievement, and, most importantly, knowledge in the schools. EMPHASIS: Theory

OSTEN, GWEN. "Structure in Creativity." Elementary English, 46 (Apr. 1960), 438-43. (40)

John Dixon in Growth Through English apparently assumes that structure is incompatible with creativity. Ms. Osten disagrees and she relates her own classroom experience to the reader, concluding from her experience that "Structure liberates" (p. 443). EMPHASIS: Practice

PICHE, GENE L. "Romanticism, Kitsch, and 'New Era' English Curriculums." English Journal, 61 (Nov. 1972), 1220-24. (41)

Mr. Piche uses Thomas D. Klein's article "Personal Growth in the Classroom: Dartmouth, Dixon and Humanistic Psychology," listed in this bibliography by author, as an example of a popular orthodoxy corrupted by a less than great teacher. Because Klein and other proponents of "new" curriculums reject any form of intervention, they are rejecting any concept of "structure," a necessary concept having to do with fundamental human processes for ordering qualitative

and relational phenomena. New curriculums are needed, but the difficulty of the task must be realized and dealt with; it is not a simple issue of more or less freedom. EMPHASIS: Theory

POOLEY, ROBERT C. "The Dartmouth Seminar and the Supervision of English," in English and Reading in a Changing World. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972, pp. 3-12 (42)

This paper concerns "the impact of the Seminar on the teaching of English and the special implications of the reports of the Seminar upon the state-wide responsibility in the supervision of and curriculum building in the language arts" (p. 3). EMPHASIS: Theory

SCHWARTZ, SHIELA. "Creativity in English," in "Books for Teachers." Elementary English, 47 (May 1970), 694-95. (43)

Although an interesting introduction to the area of creativity, Ms. Schwartz feels that this specific report of the Seminar by Geoffery Summerfield because of its length is prevented from including any material with depth. Therefore, another book is suggested as a follow-up to it: Readings on Creativity and Imagination in Literature and Language edited by Leonard V. Kosinski. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English,(1968). EMPHASIS: Theory

SCHWARTZ, SHELIA. "Review of Growth Through English and Uses of English." Teachers College Record, 70 (Nov. 1970), 172-4. (44)

These two reports should have a great impact on the field of English. Although the British were reacting to too much discipline in English teaching and the Americans to too little discipline, resulting in clashes, important issues were agreed upon. Ms. Schwartz considers the concept of learning by doing

the most important agreement reached at the Seminar. Both reports are concise and well-written presentations of the events of the Seminar. EMPHASIS: Theory

SHUGRUE, MICHAEL F. "The Lessons of Dartmouth," in English in a Decade of Change, by Shugrue. New York: Pegasus, 1968, pp. 73-8. (45)

In this short but well written summary the author comments on the disturbing effect of the Seminar on the English teaching community and lists the eleven points of agreement reached at the Seminar. He ends this summary of the proceedings of Dartmouth by commenting that "Seen in retrospect, the Dartmouth Conference stimulated new thinking about the English curriculum" (p. 78). EMPHASIS: Theory

SHUGRUE, MICHAEL F. "Information Retrieval and the Changing Curriculum," in English in a Decade of Change, by Shugrue. New York: Pegasus, 1968, pp. 154-63 (46)

Criticizes the lack of knowledge teachers have concerning the Dartmouth Seminar and suggests ways to make information, such as that about the Seminar, more useful to each school. EMPHASIS: Theory

SHUGRUE, MICHAEL F. "Resolutions of the Anglo-American Conference on the Teaching and Learning of English," in a special issue within an issue, "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English," compiled by Michael F. Shugrue and Eldonna L. Everttts. English Journal, 57 (April 1968), 549-50. (47)

This very short article lists the eleven points of agreement of the Seminar. EMPHASIS: Theory

SMITH, EUGENE H. "Teaching Composition," in Teacher Preparation in Composition, by Smith. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE/ERIC Studies in the Teaching of English, 1969, pp. 28-45. (48)

Discusses Dixon's emphasis on the process of learning and shows how this view is compatible with an experience based curriculum in English. He further shows that the Seminar's recommendations concerning teacher training are consistent with statements made in the early 1900's by prominent members of the English teaching profession. EMPHASIS: Theory

SMITH, RODNEY P. Creativity in the English Program. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE/ERIC, 1970. 101 pp. (49)

Creativity and its relation to writing, literature and language, semantics, drama, and the language arts is explored in this book. Dartmouth and its participants' ideas and works are discussed throughout this book. It helps answer many questions left unanswered at Dartmouth, regarding English and creativity as well as including a bibliography on both subjects. EMPHASIS: Theory and Practice

SQUIRE, JAMES R. "International Perspective on the Teaching of English." College English, 29 (Mar. 1968), 419-25. (50)

This general address prepared for the opening general session of the International Conference on the Teaching of English, Vancouver, British Columbia, August 21, 1967 recalls past International conferences and evaluates their usefulness. The Dartmouth Seminar, despite differences between delegates, is remarkable for the consensus achieved between the conferees on a number of crucial issues. A comparison of British schools to American schools follows, with the author noting differences between the two. In conclusion Squire comments that his visit to British schools as well as the international conferences have taught him a great deal about his own system of education. EMPHASIS: Theory

SQUIRE, JAMES R. ed. Response to Literature. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968. 80 pp. (51)

This specific report of the Seminar proceedings contains an "Introduction" and five papers on literature. The main emphasis of the report is on the study of literature for itself and the experience it offers the reader, rather than for knowledge about it. In addition, the use of drama in the classroom and informal discussion are encouraged. However, there is some disagreement in regard to the study of formal characteristics of literature. EMPHASIS: Theory and some Practice

SQUIRE, JAMES R. "Running Water and the Standing Stone." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 83 (June 1968), 523-9. (52)

Dartmouth occurred at a time when the profession had tired of one type of reform and awaited the birth of another type. Since the profession is at the crossroads of reform Mr. Squire has six urgent concerns: 1) quality instruction, 2) education of scholars and leaders, 3) advanced preparation for leaders in the teaching of English, 4) continuing education of school administrators, 5) relationship and communication between colleges and schools, and 6) lack of strong state associations to promote intelligent use of taxpayer funds. In order to avoid discontent these concerns must be dealt with. EMPHASIS: Theory

SQUIRE, JAMES E. "Six Major Influences on the Secondary English Curriculum." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 51 (Apr. 1967), 3-6. (53)

The long-range implications of the recommendations resulting from the Dartmouth Seminar are cited as being one of the six major influences that are causing the teaching of English to change today. EMPHASIS: Theory

SQUIRE, JAMES R. and ROGER K. APPLEBEE. Teaching English in the United Kingdom. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1969. 290 pp. (54)

The apparent differences that emerged at the Dartmouth Seminar prompted this comparative study of British and American English programs in schools. It explicitly answers the question, asked by many American educators, is the creative approach to the teaching of English advocated by British delegates to Dartmouth actually practiced in the United Kingdom? Although the Seminar itself is only specifically mentioned on pages 4, 8, 167, and 1[illegible]5n, this book shows to what extent the creative approach to the teaching of English advocated by British delegates to the Seminar is actually practiced in the United Kingdom. EMPHASIS: Theory and Practice

SQUIRE, JAMES R. "Toward a Response Oriented Curriculum in Literature," in New English New Imperatives, edited by Henry B. Maloney. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971, pp. 89-99. (55)

This author focuses on the Seminar's treatment of literature as it affected him through the acquirement of insights into the teaching of literature. EMPHASIS: Theory

SUBLETTLE, J. R. "Dartmouth Conference: Its Reports and Results." College English, 35 (Dec. 1973), 348-57. (56)

In answering the questions for whom is Muller's book intended? and what, if any, has the effect of the Seminar had on the profession and the actual teaching of English? the author comments on three of the most significant topics of the Seminar: 1) a definition of English as a classroom subject, 2) the place of literature in the curriculum, and 3) the training of English teachers. EMPHASIS: Theory

SUMMERFIELD, GEOFFERY, ed. Creativity in English. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968. 68 pp. (57)

A book in the series of six put out by the NCTE, MLA, and NATE in connection with the Dartmouth Seminar, it contains four papers by members of the Conference. This series of papers encourages, discusses, explores, and gives examples of creativity in English that can be very helpful to the teacher of English. It further points out the need for a change in the approach to the teaching of English and views English as creative symbolism. EMPHASIS: Theory and some Practice

SUMMERFIELD, GEOFFREY. "Responsibilities and Structures," in New English New Imperatives, edited by Henry B. Maloney. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971, pp. 99-107. (58)

Speaking as an elementary school teacher, the author criticizes rigidly structured curriculums in schools in the aftermath of the Dartmouth Seminar. But, he also shows that the situation is improving. Nevertheless, his conclusion in regard to the beneficial effects of Dartmouth are very cynical. EMPHASIS: Theory

ANON. "The Uses of English: Guidelines for the Teaching of English from the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College." Booklist, 64 (Mar. 1968), 810-12. (59)

This brief review, in summarizing the contents of Herbert Muller's The Uses of English, describes it as a supplement to the more formal official report of Seminar, presumably Dixon's Growth Through English, intended for the general reader. EMPHASIS: Theory

WHITEHEAD, FRANK. "Continuity in English Teaching." Use of English, 22 (Autumn 19 0), 3-13. (60)

This condensed version of his Dartmouth paper "'What is "continuity" in English Teaching?'" which was supposed to be part of a Dartmouth monograph on "'Continuity'" (more than likely the sixth monograph in the NCTE series to be edited by Arthur Eastman that was canceled). There is a need for an ordered sequence in teaching, but to derive it from the internal structure of the subject at its highest level is objectionable. Therefore, a sequence based on the developmental pattern of language aquisition by the individual is the author's suggestion. Several dimensions of growth, upon which an ordered sequence in English teaching can be based are discussed briefly. EMPHASIS: Theory

REFERENCES CITED

Ash, Brian. "The Uses of English." English Journal, 57 (Feb. 1968), 258.

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: NATE, 1967.

Early, Margaret. "Growth Through English." English Journal, 57 (Feb. 1968), 259.

Jennings, F. G. "How Plain Is English." Saturday Review, 50 (Dec. 1967), 73.

Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

National Council of Teachers of English. Language and Language Learning. Ed. Albert Marckwardt. Drama in the English Classroom. Ed. Douglas Barnes. Response to Literature. James R. Squire. Creativity in English. Ed. Geoffrey Summerfield. The Uses of Myth. Ed. Paul A. Olson. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1968.