A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE ENGLISH CURRICULUM HELD BY SELECTED EDUCATIONAL AND NON-EDUCATIONAL GROUPS DESIGNATED AS LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE

BY
JOHN S. SIMMONS
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
AND
ROBERT E. SHAFER
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF
WILLIAM H. CASTINE
FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY
AND
KAREN POTENZA
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
SPRING CONFERENCE--MARCH 10-12, 1994
PORTLAND, OREGON

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We began this survey of the attitudes of influential educational and non-educational groups about English as a school subject with the knowledge that surveying attitudes about anything is always a tricky and uncertain business. Nevertheless, attitudes reveal values and priorities. As the psychologist Gordon Allport once said, "If you want to know what people think, ask them."

The literature of survey research is replete with articles and books on how to go about such surveys but when "the chips are down." researchers usually seek the most practical means to the end of finding out what they want to know. That is what we did in conducting this survey. We used our combined experience of more than 70+ years of teaching English and preparing and working with English teachers in designing the questionnaire, collecting recommendations about the approximately 30 groups to survey, contacted them, first by mail and if they did not answer after several mailings, we went to see them in person and conducted face-to-face interviews with representatives of their groups. We were surprised by the interest in the subject matter of the survey which manifested itself by respondents who often wrote long and usually insightful comments on our questions and by the personal comments made during interview sessions. Many pleaded ignorance concerning specific issues and others recalled various experiences, both good and bad, which had happened to them in English classes during their own school years. Almost all of the persons interviewed remarked on

the importance of English as a school subject and mentioned the fact that it is required of all pupils throughout the years of schooling. We were assisted in our efforts at various points by two long-time friends and colleagues, Professor William H. Castine of the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University and our Research Associate, Karen Potenza of George Mason University, a former English teacher and now a graduate student. We owe them a vote of thanks for their timely assistance and support but hasten to add that all interpretations of the data and conclusions of the study are our own.

J.S.S.

R.E.S.

Historical Background

Since the beginnings of English as a school subject in the United States of America during the latter part of the last century, (Applebee, 1974) and (Squire, 1991) many points-of-view continue to be expressed both within and outside the English teaching profession on the exact nature of the subject itself. The debates within the profession continue to ebb and flow over the decades, noticeably affected by the social, political and economic context of the times. There is not time nor space in this document to review these debates in detail, as they have developed over the years, however some of the more recent ones will be mentioned here. Increasingly, in recent times critics from outside the English teaching profession have directed their attention to various aspects of English teaching, e.g., the selection and censorship of books, films and other instructional materials, the efficacy of grammar instruction and the uses of writing process research in composition programs. "Outside" in this case means essentially educators who are not themselves English teachers as well as school board members, politicians, parents, members of particular religious communities and members of the general public, who for one reason or another have taken an interest in the schools and specifically in various aspects of the English program. This survey was conducted during the Presidential Election Campaign of 1992. The campaign was bitterly fought and most of the contested issues were domestic ones. The Republican Convention featured a speech by Pat Robertson, a Christian minister representing the "religious right" who threatened a takeover of local school boards by his

followers--a threat which has come to pass in a number of American communities. Presidential candidate Clinton continued his advocacy of the "Goals 2000;" Educate America Act, which he helped to fashion as Governor of Arkansas, and is supporting as part of his legislative program as President. The following issues and events provided context for the study:

1. In the election debate of 1992, the ground had clearly shifted from (Desert Storm) foreign policy issues to domestic ones. Then President Bush's preoccupation with foreign affairs, together with deep concerns about the U.S. economy, as voiced by Messrs. Clinton and Perot, placed the fiscal condition of the country center stage throughout the months leading to the popular decision voiced on November 3, 1992. In the researchers view, then Governor Clinton, an individual whose strength lay in his knowledge of domestic issues, was clearly influenced by the writings of Harvard professor, and fellow road scholar Robert Reich, now Secretary of Labor and author of The Work of Nations whose influence on Clinton may well be as strong as John Kenneth Gailbraith and his The Affluent Society was on Clinton's role model, John F. Kennedy.

2. Some visible developments within the English education establishment: joint ventures by the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association in developing national standards for the

English curriculum, the establishment of a task force on intellectual freedom. The Center For The Study of Literature Teaching and Learning, begun in the late 1980's at the State University of New York at Albany, under the direction of Alan Purves, Arthur Applebee, and Judith Langer was also looking closely at policy issues within the profession on a nationwide scale.

As the campaign continued it became clear that many organizations, both educational and non-educational were becoming increasingly politicized. All had strong interests in the nation's education agenda. An instrument was created to survey the attitudes of major national, educational and non-educational organizations toward the appropriate shape of the English Language Arts curriculum (largely middle-junior-senior high levels) at the very time when the U.S. Presidential campaign was moving into high gear. At least five major issues were identified as being significant to the political opinions and attitudes of the national organizations whose opinions we sought to sample. A major aspect of our study was to discover to what extent conservatism and liberalism on political matters translated into conservatism and liberalism on issues in the English curriculum:

1. Communication skills vs. cultural heritage--as seen in the most recent manifestation: functional vs. cultural literacy. (Reich vs. the E. D. Hirsch, William Bennett, Lynne Cheney coterie).

2. Print vs. media--seen most clearly in the textbook vs. computer literacy debates (from MacLuhan's Understanding Media, 1964, to Neil Postman's Amusing Ourselves To Death, 1986)

3. The pre-eminence of grammar teaching over the writing process and vice-versa, in the teaching of written composition.

4. The importance of formal grammar/usage study vs. the understanding of psycho- and socio-linguistic principles and practices in classroom language activity.

5. The significance of contemporary, multicultural literary experiences in the schooling of young people vs. an emphasis on the Eurocentric, largely Anglo-Saxon literature of the past--and we knew, at the time we had left out a lot and that we would be on dangerous ground in that a number of organizations would not wish themselves to be identified as "conservative" or "liberal" in either their political or educational outlook.

Some Recent Debates Among English Teachers

Although it is clear that social and political debates within the greater society continue to influence the English Language Arts curriculum, there have been and continue to be serious

disagreements over the nature of the subject within the profession itself.

In the days immediately before World War II, a Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English under the chairmanship of Professor Dora V. Smith of the University of Minnesota, was appointed. The Commission's work was interrupted by the war and its first major statement on the post-war English curriculum, The English Language Arts, was not published until 1952. This volume, the first of five major curriculum statements, proposed that the English Language Arts consisted of grammar and linguistics, speech, writing, reading, listening, literature, semantics and the study of the mass media of communication. Further, the Commission based its curriculum proposals in the above areas on the emerging sequences of social, physical and linguistic growth and development and held as its major goal the development of language power in each individual through the uses of language in social situations related "constantly to the problems of living in a democracy today" (NCTE Commission On The Curriculum, The English Language Arts, p. 15).

Reactions to the Commission's work followed swiftly. In 1958, the Ford Foundation sponsored a "Basic Issues Conference," which consisted of representatives of the National Council of Teachers of English, the American Studies Association, The College English Association and the Modern Language Association of America. The Conference, consisting basically of 28 professors of language and literature from colleges and universities, met four times in 1958 and ultimately in 1959 issued a report, The Basic Issues In The

Teaching of English: Being Definitions and Clarifications. The document basically defined English as a "tripod" subject consisting of language, literature, and composition and proposed a "sequential, incremental, cumulative," curriculum (K-12) which was further worked out in an accompanying document written by George Winchester Stone, (1959) and a few other members of the Conference but which failed to be accepted by the whole Conference. These proposals clearly represented a conservative, traditional view of English sketched out in skeletal form--a form which was soon to be "filled out" with government support. Stone was then Executive Director of the Modern Language Association and editor of its prestigious Publications of the Modern Language Association and one of the chief critics of The English Language Arts. By publishing the two documents together in the same issue of PMLA, Stone made it appear that the Basic Issues Conference had endorsed both statements. The early 1960's was a time of furor as the debate continued within the profession over the nature of English, although as one of the researchers in this study pointed out at the end of the decade (Shafer, 1969), the Basic Issues Conference was nothing more than an attempt by a few well placed college professors of English to take over and re-define the teaching of English in the spirit of a "discipline-centered curriculum" endorsed by Jerome Bruner, (1960) in his popular book (at the time) The Process of Education. The members of the Basic Issues Conference could not have supposed in 1958 that the federal government under President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society programs would provide large amounts of support for research and development in the field of

English over the next ten years and that the sequential, articulated, incremental curriculum model would be facilitated by what was then called Project English. In all, 19 curriculum centers, a dozen demonstration centers and hundreds of in-service programs for teachers were planned and developed with federal money using the sequential, incremental model. Only a few models other than the sequential, incremental, tripod model were used in Project English programs. In what well may have been an attempt to bolster support for the sequential, incremental, articulated model of English, the leaders of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Modern Language Association of America sought and received support for an international conference on the teaching of English which was held during late August and early September of 1966, with a group numbering about 50, all concerned in one way or another with the teaching of English. They assembled at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire. 28 were from the United States, 20 from the United Kingdom and one from Canada. In general, the Americans at Dartmouth proposed a structured curriculum based on the recommendations of the Basic Issues Conference. The British thoroughly rejected such a definition of English and looked to the processed of maturation and growth to supply the underlying sequence of an English curriculum. Therefore, they showed themselves to be much closer to the authors of The English Language Arts, than to those who espoused an articulated curriculum. In what were weeks of intense discussions, the British teachers described the "personal experience model" of writing and learning to an astonished group of American English teachers, many of whom had

rejected such views as "life adjustment education" in the 1950's (Shafer, 1986).

John Dixon in his book, Growth Through English, the report of the Conference from the British side, described a "skills" model, a "heritage" model and a "personal growth" model of English teaching. It had become clear from the reports of deliberations at the Conference that even some Americans preferred the "personal growth" model of English teaching. This put them very much in line with the 1940's and 50's English Language Arts statement and very much in the Progressive camp. "Personal growth" was based essentially on observing language in operation from day-to-day and appeared to have quite different goals from the "heritage" model which is the model involving the handing down of the cultural heritage as the key concept of school English programs.

Debate over the various models--particularly the "personal growth" model and the "heritage" model receded into the background in the 1970's as "accountability" and "back-to-basics" movements gained ascendancy in the wider political context and began to influence English programs. The leaders of the English teaching profession showed a great deal of indecision during this period over what course to follow as revealed in two key publications of the time. Allan Glatthorn's, (1980) A Guide For Developing An English Curriculum For The Eighties, is devoted to the "mastery curriculum of a skills model." (p. 27). But Chapter 16, "A Personal Epilogue: A Curriculum Of Meaning," seems to renounce the first 15 chapters of the book by pleading that "undue emphasis on competency can trivialize the English curriculum...too many of the competencies

are derived from an analysis of what an adult needs in order to 'survive,' instead of an analysis of what young people need in order to grow." (p. 106). Glatthorn concludes that chapter with a few short paragraphs on "the development of a curriculum of meaning." (p. 107). Proposing that such a curriculum be devoted to "person-centered processes," (p. 107) but his first 15 chapters seem concerned with almost exactly the opposite--that is, a management by behavioral objectives curriculum or as it has become more recently known---"outcomes based education."

In another NCTE curriculum commission document published in 1980, Three Language Arts Curriculum Models: Pre-Kindergarten Through College, editor Barrett Mandel cites an incident at the 1977 NCTE convention in New York City, when the President of the Alabama Teachers of English introduced a "sense of the house resolution" calling for "national guidelines for curricula in English similar to those of the Bullock Report of England." After the motion passed, the charge to implement the motion was given to the NCTE Curriculum Commission. Mandel, chair of that same Commission, notes that the Commission spent three years on the question of competency-based instruction and minimal competencies, but while "the motion gave focus and direction for the Commission's new emphasis...during the early stages of planning, it became clear that the Council did not have the resources nor the desire to follow the lead of a Language For Life. (p. 1-2). Barrett's book consists of essays written about three curriculum models at various levels: 1) Mastery--the competency model; 2) Discovery--the process model; and 3) Surrender--the heritage model. That essays were included on the

process model (personal growth) suggests that there continued to be a number of English teachers interested in that model despite almost two decades of pressures from groups both inside and outside English teaching to abandon it. These groups were interested in using the heritage model to achieve a management by objectives--"mastery learning" and "competency-based education" curriculum in the name of "back-to-basics" and "accountability." Writing in the mid-80's, Ouida Clapp (1986) cited the "mastery," "heritage," and "process" models which had continued to be debated during the 80's and noted the importance of an "eclectic stance" which "serves an English teacher well." (p. 63). But she ultimately returned to the concept of "self-realization" as a "primary goal" for both teachers and students and noted the importance of forging "effective public identities for students" and noted also that "teachers choose those goals, content, and procedures that are most in harmony with the pursuit of personal fulfillment." (p. 64).

Another major debate/discussion of the place, goals and definitions of English as a school subject took place at the English Coalition Conference held at the Wye Plantation in the state of Maryland during the Summer of 1987. The National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association, the College English Association and the College Language Association as well as the Conference on College Composition and Communication of NCTE and the Conference on English Education of NCTE and the Association of Department of English banded together to obtain foundation support for a three week conference. The 60 participants (as Professor Wayne Booth) (1989) has written, were largely chosen by the

Executive Director of NCTE and officers of the other various organizations representing all levels of English teaching.

The Wye Conference was touted as another Dartmouth Conference but only six years after the Conference was held it already seems to have been forgotten by most English teachers. From the two published reports on the Conference, The English Coalition Conference: Democracy Through Language, edited by Richard Lloyd-Jones and Andrea Lunsford (1989) and What Is English? by Peter Elbow (1990), it is clear that the discussions were intense and that the 60 participants felt they had had a valuable and educative experience. Wayne C. Booth (1989), who wrote the Preface to the Lloyd-Jones Lunsford book described the opening of the Conference in part as follows:

> ...a self-styled spokesman for 'the public' who seemed to tout a kind of training we all mistrusted...gave the opening address and charged us to joining a grand national repudiation of the "skills movement," in the name of the new discoveries about the importance of information. Relying on E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs To Know as his scriptural text for the day, the official charged us either to embrace Hirsch's list of nearly 5,000 'cultural literacy' terms or to come up with a list of our own. (p. vii).

Wayne Booth, (1989) proceeds on to indicate that he had never seen "an audience more effectively united by one-hour long speech." (p. viii). Clearly from the two documents, what united the participants and what seemed to preoccupy them throughout the three weeks of their debates were their concerns for a multiplicity of ways in which language can be read and written and the necessity to encourage students to "appreciate different perspectives and to

articulate their own points-of-view," and further, to stimulate the idea of teacher research in classrooms, to make teachers sensitive to the changes in our communities as they become more and more linguistically, culturally, and socially diverse and to stress the need for interactive classrooms necessary for learning how to write and read and develop the various abilities of communication. (p. 85). The speaker referred to by Wayne Booth was Chester E. Finn, Jr. (1991), author of We Must Take Charge: Our Schools And Our Future, then an official in the United States Department of Education and one of the spokespersons for a return to the "heritage" model of English teaching, mentioned earlier by John Dixon in Growth Through English.

Other Voices Outside the English Classroom

Chester E. Finn, Jr. and E. D. Hirsch, (Kenan Professor of English at the University of Virginia) and Lynne V. Cheney, then chair of the National Endowment For The Humanities became part of a campaign attempting to restore the "heritage" model to both English and history classes in the nation's schools. Cheney and her colleagues including Diane Ravitch, Adjunct Professor of History and Education at Teachers College Columbia University, who later became with Finn an official in the United States Department of Education during the Bush administration used their respective positions to launch a campaign against the work of those they called "professional educationists" who, in language reminiscent of the attacks on the Progressives in the late 1950's, asserted that the schools had been subverted and that America's cultural heritage was

being lost. Cheney began with her report American Memory, supposedly pointing out the limitations of the schools in teaching the cultural heritage and sanctioning the work of Hirsch, (1987) who had already written a volume with essentially the same point-of-view and an appendix which contained a list of items that all "literate Americans" should know. As indicated above, the English Coalition Conference roundly rejected Finn's proposal that they come up with a similar list of items that should be taught in English classes in all grades, thoroughly rejecting the notion that this was a part of their role and responsibility as English teachers and that English as a school subject should be cast in such a light. But these were, indeed, influential voices and although they were rejected by the Coalition Conference, they are once again present in the newer proposals for "national standards of achievement," a national curriculum currently being proposed and consequently, an associated national testing program about which the battle is currently being waged. It is clear that in the days ahead there will be many discussions debating the virtues of national standards and a national testing program. These discussions undoubtedly will be influenced both by internal debates within the English teaching professions as well as externally imposed reforms from various outside agencies representing one or another point-of-view within the body politic. The rationale for this study was to determine the attitudes toward English teaching of a number of these key agencies.

Audrey James Schwartz, (1991) has recently probed the consequences of externally developed curriculum reforms as they

impact the schools. Her view reflects the opinion that most of the acknowledged failures in implementing top down curriculum mandates come from underlying notions about education that are "inconsistent with the reality of schooling." (p. 167). Attitudes exist in the minds of state and federal policy makers, Schwartz points out, which have major implications for the quality and feasibility of the educational reforms they propose. This, of course is true for not only policy makers but for parents, citizens and members of organized pressure groups which attempt to influence school policies and classroom practices. In a similar vein, James Moffett has probed the "attitudes which affect curriculum improvement and reform" in the teaching of English:

> If lack of knowledge or evidence is not what blocks curriculum improvement, then what does? It is something that no one rushes pell-mell to examine--a set of attitudes and emotions in both the public and the profession that is mostly unconscious.
>
> Generally, the larger society places certain constraints and demands on schools that conflict with the learning activities advocated by most thoughtful educators. The majority of the public wants schools to control the content of reading and writing. But so long as students do not find and choose the content of reading and writing for themselves, they remain essentially unengaged with schoolwork and never learn to make the decisions that lie at the heart of composing and comprehending. Furthermore, both laity and educators fear the liberation of thought and behavior that students would achieve if talking, reading, and writing were taught most effectively --that is, if these powerful tools were freely given to youngsters for their personal investigation. Parents and teachers are unconsciously hedging and stalling on implementing a successful Language Arts curriculum.
>
> Most parents still want schools to reinforce home training by inculcating their values, heritage, and modes of behavior...This creates a conflict with educators. Whereas, most parents want their children to stay the way they made them, most teachers regard learning and growth as change.

> The public wants schools to prepare youngsters for jobs and roles such as it grew up among. It wants to perpetuate a world it understands, a world limited to a particular era in culture. This is, of course the real meaning of "back-to-basics."
>
> Consequently, when the public asks schools to teach its children to read and write, to think and create, it does not entirely mean it. At least, it does not mean it as educators might, who know that growth entails change and that you cannot both indoctrinate students and teach them to think for themselves. But reading and writing are, in fact very dangerous--at least as likely to transform and to transmit culture. Everyone knows this, however subterraneanly. Literacy bypasses the local oral culture of family and may acquaint youngsters with ideas and ways of life that their parents either ignore or abhor. As a way of carrying one's thought beyond received ideas, writing too may change youngsters. Composing, after all means putting together. Composing is making sense. An authentic author is not a plagiarist or a paraphraser but someone who puts things together for himself or herself. (pp. 200-201).

Moffett goes on to point out what many of the Coalition Conference members also concluded, that "making students active and teachers reactive seems like a gratuitous relinquishing of power. But empowering others is the teachers job." (Lloyd-Jones and Lunsford, p. 202). Fundamentally, this quotation goes back to the answer that the British educators at Dartmouth gave to the question, "What is English?" They changed the question to "What do English teachers do?" This, in essence, became the fundamental question in this study since our questionnaire items all dealt with actions that English teachers take when they seek to empower their students. As mentioned above, new debates are shaping up in the United States over "standards of achievement" translated into "new standards" and translated again perhaps into a national curriculum followed closely by national testing--or is it to be the other way

around? The 32 agencies involved in this study will clearly play an important role in formulating the answers to the above question.

Methodology

With the varied attitudes and assumptions abroad as to the way native speakers should be taught English, we began the work of assembling our study. Our first consideration was the selection of the groups from whom we would solicit responses. We divided these groups into two broad categories: Non-Education and Professional Education. Our criterion for choosing the organizations in the first category was the public participation of these groups in the several contentious political issues of the day. We also labeled each group as "conservative" (C) or "liberal" (L) as to political attitudes as defined by their expressed position of various issues. If we could not identify a position, we labeled the group as "neutral" (N). The list of these organizations is as follows:

1. Planned Parenthood of America (L)
2. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (L)
3. Citizens For Excellence In Education (C)
4. American Civil Liberties Union (L)
5. American Family Association (C)
6. League of Women Voters (L)
7. League of U.S. Latin American Citizens (L)
8. Rotary International (N)
9. Public Citizen (The Nader Consumer Group) (L)

10. National Organization of Women (L)
11. The Eagle Forum (C)
12. Concerned Women For America (C)
13. Educational Research Analysts (C)
14. People For The American Way (L)
15. Southern Christian Leadership Conference (L)
16. The Conservative Alliance (C)
17. Council For Basic Education (L)
18. American Legions (C)
19. National Legal Foundation (C)
20. American Association Of University Women (L)
21. U. S. Chamber of Commerce (C)
22. American Federation of Teachers (L)
23. John Birch Society (C)

Placing certain of the above organizations in the Non-Education category could be deceiving to some readers in terms of their interpretation of organization labels. The Citizens for Excellence in Education group, for example, is an arm of the American Christian Educators' Association, an extremely conservative fundamentalist organization whose avowed goal is to impose Christian philosophies on the curricula of all public schools in the U.S.A. The Educational Research Analysts is the name adopted by a Texas couple, Mel and Norma Gabler, whose goal is to remove all "non-Christian, anti-American" curricular materials from the public schools of their state. The Council for Basic Education consists mostly of a group of intellectuals who, for

almost half a century have sought to expunge all vestiges of the Progressive Education movement of the 1930's and 40's from the schools. The American Federation of Teachers is an arm of the national union, ALF-CIO, whose activities consist of lobbying for higher wages and better working conditions for their classroom teacher members although they have taken positions on curricular issues as well. To all of the above described groups, the curriculum represents a tool for political activism of a broad nature.

The Professional Education list includes organizations which are led and represented via rank and file membership by individuals who are trained, certified, and for the most part, practicing professional educators. The great majority of these members are employed in the public school systems of this country. We did not identify these groups as having political biases although obviously, individual members would have various political opinions both liberal and conservative. The list consists of the following:

1. Pi Lambda Theta
2. Phi Delta Kappa
3. American Association of School Administrators
4. International Reading Association
5. National Education Association
6. American Association of Counseling and Development
7. Modern Language Association of America
8. American Council of Learned Societies
9. American Library Association

10. Association for Supervisors and Curriculum Development
11. National Council of Teachers of English
12. National Congress of Parents and Teachers
13. National Bilingual Association
14. National Council for the Social Studies
15. National Science Teachers Association
16. Association for Teacher Education
17. American Council on Education
18. National Association for Research in Science Teaching
19. National School Board Association
20. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

Once the groups were selected, a four-phase instrument was created.* Part One contains 15 items and reflects concerns with the teaching of the English language. For each item, the respondent was asked to choose one of five opinions: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. This pattern of response was also used in the three sections which followed. The total instrument can be found in Appendix B.

Part Two contained 15 items, all on aspects of the teaching of writing. Part Three included 16 items, all of which related to

* The researchers wish to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. William Castine, Professor Educational Research and Statistics at Florida A. & M. University in the preparation of the instrument.

the teaching of Literature, and Part Four provided 12 items on the English Language Arts curriculum as a whole.

The first mailing of the cover letter and survey instrument to all 43 potential respondents went out in early July, 1992 (Appendices A and B). We were aware of the poor, but necessary, timing of the mailing, given the widespread absence of organizations' staffs for vacations or summer conferences. In each case, it was addressed to the "Executive Director," further reducing the possibility of rapid return. Thus, it was no surprise when only a small number of surveys were returned by early August. The researchers decided to do a follow-up, post-card reminder which went out later that month.

The first follow-up yielded a few responses, and so one of the researchers traveled to Washington, D.C. in November, 1992, where he visited a number of central offices of the organizations polled and interviewed a number of representatives of the various organizations. This effort led to several more returns, and a second follow-up reminder mailing yielded a very few more. No responses arrived after the second week in December, 1992. At that time, the authors decided to proceed with the analyses of those questionnaires which had been returned. The organizations returning completed survey instruments are as follows (their code numbers are those found in the parentheses):

NON-EDUCATION GROUPS (N-)

1. National Organization for Women (N-1)
2. The Eagle Forum (N-2)

3. Concerned Women For America (N-4)
4. The John Birch Society (N-5)
5. Educational Research Analysts (N-6)
6. People For The American Way (N-7)
7. Southern Christian Leadership Conference (N-9)
8. Conservative Alliance (N-11)
9. Council For Basic Education (N-12)
10. The American Legion (N-15)
11. National Legal Foundation (N-16)
12. American Association of University Women (N-19)
13. Chamber of Commerce of the United States (N-20)
14. American Federation of Teachers (N-26)

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS' GROUPS (E-)

1. Pi Lambda Theta (E-1)
2. Phi Delta Kappa (E-2)
3. American Association of School Administrators (E-3)
4. International Reading Association (E-4)
5. National Education Association (E-5)
6. American Association for Counseling and Development (E-6)
7. Modern Language Association of America (E-7)
8. American Council of Learned Societies (E-8)
9. American Library Association (E-9)
10. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (E-10)
11. National Council of Teachers of English (E-11)

12. National Congress of Parents and Teachers (E-12)
13. National Association for Bilingual Education (E-14)
14. National Council for Social Studies (E-15)
15. National Science Teachers Association (E-17)
16. Association for Teacher Education (E-18)
17. American Council on Education (E-19)
18. National Association for Research in Science Teaching (E-20)

The researchers considered that any percentage of return over 50% was "reportable." Thus a 77% overall return was more than respectable. As could have been anticipated, the Non-Education groups provided a lower proportion of returns--61%--than did the Professional Education organizations, which returned 90% of the questionnaires mailed to them.

Before proceeding with analyses of data found in the returned questionnaires, a few reactions to the nature of returns seem appropriate at this juncture. Of the nine organizations in the Non-Education group which failed to respond, after two or three reminders, seven were considered "liberal" and; only two were considered "conservative" ones. The spokesperson of Planned Parenthood of America, during a lengthy telephone conversation held in late August, promised faithfully to tender a completed questionnaire. It never arrived. Possibly the most interesting "non-return," however, was written by Ms. Phyllis Franklin, Executive Director of the Modern Language Association of America. After the first reminder had gone out, we received, on the back of

the original cover letter, the following hand-written statement, "I'm sorry to disappoint you by not returning a completed survey form, but I am not a specialist regarding the schools and so am reluctant to respond." This from the director of an organization which had been closely and consistently involved in a dialogue regarding the status of English teaching in "the schools" for a 30-year period, from the Basic Issues Conference (1958) to the Coalition Conference (1988). It was Ms. Franklin, furthermore, who helped to organize the latter meeting and who was heavily involved in selecting participants therein. We can only speculate as to the reason for her very puzzling response.

Results Between The Groups

The first phase of data analysis revealed some significant differences between the Non-Education (NE) and Professional Education (PE) groups toward several aspects of the English Language Arts curriculum. Of the four parts in the survey, the most pronounced differences were found in the area of language study. Using a difference of 1.0 or more as the criterion for significance, we found such disparity of opinions in three of the 15 items. Item Four solicited reaction to the following statement: "The teaching of formal grammar should be the dominant element in English language teaching." On this one, the NE groups favored the notion 3.643. Only 2.233 of the PE groups felt likewise. Similarly, in Item Eight, "Memorizing grammatical rules, definitions, and processes should be emphasized in language study," the NE people responded favorably (3.714) while the PE groups were considerably less enthusiastic:

2.406. And in Item Nine, "The study of parts of speech will help most students write more grammatically correct sentences and thus should be emphasized," the NE group agreed (3.714) which, once again, the PE'ers were less enthusiastic (2.688).

The differences noted above point to what is probably the most distinctive aspect of this study: the disparate views held by various groups on the nature, the purpose, and most of all, the value, of formal grammar study in the English curriculum. This disparity can be further noted in the responses of the two major groups to Item One, Part Two, focusing on the teaching of writing: "The teaching of writing should include a great deal of time devoted to formal elements (grammar, usage, punctuation, spelling, paragraphing, etc.). Those in the NE group supported the statement strongly (4.0) while the PE'ers gave it less support (3.0). The only other item in that section to produce a significant difference in opinion was Item Three: "Teachers, especially English teachers, should correct each piece of student writing meticulously." The NE respondents were once again supportive of that contention (3.714); the PE people less so (2.688).

In the area of literature study (Part Three), only two items produced sharp differences of opinion, the fist of which was found in Item One, "The teaching of the Great Books should be the dominant component of the literature program." The NE organizations were for it (3.571) significantly more than the PE groups (2.201). The only other item of the 16 included in that part to elicit such a difference was Item 15, "Memorizing certain poems/essays (such as "the Gettysburg Address") and speeches from plays (e.g., Mark

Antony's funeral oration from Julius Caesar) effectively promote literary appreciation and should be assigned on a regular basis." To this, the NE'ers expressed considerable support (3.5); the PE'ers considerably less (2.344). The disparity reflects the commitment of many organizations to the value of memorizing in both cognitive (comprehension) and affective (appreciation) aspects of learning, a belief held by former U.S. Education Commissioner William Bennett and most of the Hirsch Cultural Literacy devotees.

The largest number of differences between the two groups surfaced in Part Four, whose focus was on the English curriculum as a whole. They differed on four items of the twelve presented to them, and in two cases, the differences were significant. Item Three, "The development of cultural literacy among young people should be largely Eurocentric in nature," evoked stronger acclamation from the NE groups (2.923) than the PE ones (1.824), and that opinion was corroborated by the responses to Item Four. "The development of cultural literacy among young people should represent a multicultural balance." This one, the NE people supported rather solidly (3.692). The PE people were even stronger in their support (4.706). This rather strong support of multiculturalism on the part of the NE group came as somewhat of a surprise to the researchers in that it was inconsistent with the generally conservative tone of most of the overall responses. As such, it was also inconsistent with responses to Item Eight, "The study of classic literary works, along with Western History and World Geography, should largely replace popular/contemporary

literature and social issues at the center of the middle/secondary school curricula." The NE organizations gave support to this contention (3.308) while the PE groups did not (1.969). Evidence of the recent movement by some Americans to the embracing of a narrower version of Cultural Literacy can be clearly discerned in these responses. Another manifestation of the liberal/ conservative split in philosophies of education was also evident in the responses the two groups made to Item Ten, the "English Only" referenda, passed in recent years in a number of states which some feel represents desirable public policy and should be reflected in English curricula." The NE group, not surprisingly, supported the statement (3.214) while the PE'ers rejected it by and large (1.750).

Results Within The Groups

In order to discover further manifestations of the political aspects of curricular perceptions, we performed another set of analyses, establishing certain dichotomies within both the Non-Education and Professional Education groups. In the former group, we composed "Liberal" and "Conservative" sub-groups on the basis of their own previously stated positions and analyzed the differences in curricular thinking between them. These groupings are presented below:

Liberal

1. National Organization of Women
2. People For The American Way

3. Southern Christian Leadership Conference
4. Council for Basic Education
5. American Association of University Women
6. American Federation of Teachers

Conservative

1. The Eagle Forum
2. Concerned Women for America
3. The John Birch Society
4. Educational Research Analysts
5. Conservative Alliance
6. The American Legion
7. National Legal Foundation

In establishing these two sub-categories, we freely admit that the terms "liberal" and "conservative" are elusive ones, truly incapable of precise and uniformly acceptable definition and we further recognize that the leadership of each group might differ with our characterization. Since the early days of the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War, however, each of the above named groups have emerged with and/or developed distinctive positions on a number of significant social, political, economic, moral, and cultural issues which have been of concern to the American people and, in most cases, have gained worldwide visibility. Among these are the right to own and use arms; women in leadership roles, including church ministries; definition of the family; the place of gays and lesbians in society; the prerogatives

legally held by the executive branch of government; a woman's right to choose to terminate a pregnancy; the size, mission, and relative autonomy of the military and the police; the prerogatives of parents and concerned citizens to redirect school activities; and (closely related) the rights of teachers to choose curricular materials and of students to read them. Thus, despite the disclaimers our lists may elicit, here are some of the noteworthy findings which were made when we compared all responses from those two sub-groups in the NE category: (In these comparisons, to save on verbiage, we will summarize the Item, asking the readers to check the full statements found in Appendix B):

In Item One of the Language Study, relating to students right to use their own language, liberal organizations were considerably more sympathetic (3.71) than their conservative counterparts (1.71). In Item Four, the "grammar dominance" issue already noted, the conservative groups were solidly in favor (4.29), while the liberals were not (2.83). In the next item, related to the appropriate balance to be maintained by oral and written instruction, desire for more written activity seemed more important to the conservatives (3.86) than the liberals (2.5).

As one views the relative merits of memorizing grammatical rules, established as low in long-standing research findings, the reactions of both groups to Item Eight is somewhat surprising. The conservatives went for it in a big way (4.27), but the majority of liberal groups were also in favor (3.17). This positive view of the efficacy of grammar teaching continues to persist among many educators and non-educators and liberals and conservatives alike

despite the findings of most research studies to the contrary. Nevertheless, using our criterion, the difference was significant even in this one. That difference was also significant on Item Eleven, related to the efficacy of spelling drills, which found the conservatives once more solidly supportive (4.29) and the liberals much less so (3.00). There was also a significant difference in attitudes toward the dictionary's role, in Item Twelve. The conservatives saw it as a prescriber, instead of a describer, (3.57), the liberals again much less so (2.50).

The final three linguistic items related to socio-linguistic issues. Item Thirteen, rejected the value of literature as a vehicle for increasing students' understanding about dialects. Liberals rejected the rejection (1.67) while the conservatives were not quite so opposed (2.86). Geographic aspects of U.S. dialects, the focus of Item Fourteen, were considered quite desirable by the liberals (4.33), more so than the conservatives (3.00). The social dialects matter, expressed negatively in Item Fifteen, was supported more by the liberals (1.83) than the conservatives (3.00).

As can be seen quite unmistakably from the above summary, there was a greater, more widespread split between liberal and conservative groups over the teaching of the English language than there was between the NE and PE ones. Popular misconceptions about the nature, the place, the efficacy, and the value of a wide range of teaching language initiatives are still alive and well within the U.S. body politic and seem to be inexplicably linked to political beliefs and attitudes.

Those differences in attitude continued to emerge in Part Two. Though fewer in number than in the Language Section, seven as compared to ten, discernible differences in thinking about writing instruction were present nevertheless. The importance-of-grammar issue, found, in Item One, was once again more accepted by the conservatives (4.5) than the liberals (3.50). The latter group wanted journal writing, the topic in Item Two, more than did the conservatives, 4.33 to 3.14. The latter groups were more in favor of meticulous paper correction (Item Three) than were the liberals, 4.33 to 3.17. The liberals were much more supportive of peer evaluation in writing instruction in Item Four (4.00), than were the conservatives (2.57). In Item Six, the former group favored informal writing tasks (3.67) than did their conservative counterparts (2.43) though neither was strongly supportive. An even greater difference was found in the "split grade" matter, Item Ten, where conservatives were in favor (4.00) and the liberals were not (2.67). Finally, the promotion of personal writing, Item Eleven, was seen as more valuable to the liberals (4.17) than the conservatives (3.17) although both groups were more positive in their perceptions of the value of this practice than might have been predicted.

Another mild surprise emerged in the smaller number of items in which the two groups differed in the Literature Section, Part Three. Once again, however, some traditional beliefs were clearly manifested in responses from the conservatives. In Item Three, for example, that group expressed the belief that British and American authors should be featured in the literature program far more

(4.14) than did the liberals (2.33). The difference in responses to Item Four, on the relative merits of Young Adult literature, was almost as wide, the conservatives opposing it (4.00) to the liberals (2.33). There was about the same dichotomy in response to Item Eight, on the value of the literature of popular culture; conservatives feeling it had little curricular worth (3.43) to the liberals (1.67). The question on that item expressed the belief that popular literature had little value; thus the above numbers. The same sentiments could be found in Item Ten which denied the significance of minorities' literature although in a less pronounced vein. Conservatives disagreed with this lack of value (2.43) to the liberals' (1.37). And, in Item Fifteen, the recurring disagreement over memorization as a means of learning re-emerged. Conservative groups favored that approach to literary appreciation (4.00) as did the liberals, but to a lesser degree (3.00).

The two groups differed significantly in attitudes toward half of the twelve items in overall curricula (Part Four) and sometimes widely so. In Item One, which advocated teaching for "functional literacy," liberals were in favor (3.6); conservatives not so much (2.14). The latter group preferred cultural literacy (Item Three) as the dominant feature (3.86); the liberals did not (2.14). The conservatives believed that Latin would help improve the cultural and linguistic awareness of young people, as stated in Item Seven, strongly (4.43); the liberals less so (3.17). That difference in attitude was seen even more distinctly in Item Eight which supported classical studies over

contemporary issues. The conservatives went for that one in a big way (4.57); the liberals, not at all (1.67)--the widest difference in the entire survey. The "English Only" referenda item (Item Ten) also reflected a great difference in thinking: the conservatives embraced it (4.25), the liberals not so (2.33). Finally, in terms of the belief that minimum competencies in reading and writing should be established and tested regarding all students (Item Eleven), the conservatives wanted it (4.14) considerably more than the liberals (2.83). The conservative groups' preferences for an older, more classically oriented English Language Arts curriculum for American youth, offered in a somewhat rigid manner, came through loud and clear in their Part Four responses.

Other contrastive analyses, drawn in both the NE and PE groups, produced few or no significant differences which, in and of itself, is of interest. Among the NE groups, contrasts were analyzed between the "purely women's groups (e.g., N.O.W.) and "mixed gender" groups (e.g., People For The American Way). No differences appear. Also in the NE groups, contrasts were analyzed between those organizations with some element of "education" in their titles (e.g., the Council for Basic Education) with those whose titles had no such inclusion. No differences worth noting appeared in that analysis, either. Some similar groupings were analyzed in the PE component. "Non-content oriented" organizations (e.g., NEA) were contrasted with content specific ones (e.g., NARST, NCSS) which, once again, produced no noteworthy differences. That lack of attitudinal difference could also be seen in the contrastive analysis of "Non Language Arts" content

groups (e.g., NSTA) versus "Language Arts" groups (e.g., NCTE, IRA). In the overall analysis of sub-groups within the two major categories, then, the only real differences emerged in the attitudinal contrasts between liberal and conservative groups. And they were an interesting outcome of the entire study since certain English curricular issues were so clearly linked to conservative and liberal political attitudes. The tabular results of all analyses can be found in Appendices C-F.

Conclusions

Before attempting to express generalizations reached from the data just analyzed, some comment needs to be made about insights we gained during the gathering of those data. First, and most obvious, was the relative willingness of organizations to respond at all. The NE groups proved to be far less interested in doing so than were those in the PE ranks. This was not terribly surprising to us although, as the Presidential campaign began to gain momentum, many of the very organizations proclaiming their positions of needed educational policy did not respond to three requests for their input.

More surprising to us was the fact that the groups we labeled "conservative" were more willing to contribute than those we noted as "liberal"--in the NE category, we waited in vain for responses from the ACLU, the NAACP, and the Public Citizen (Nader) groups, all of whom we inferred to have a stake in such a survey. We felt the same surprise about the non-response of the Modern Language

Association of America, until Phyllis Franklin's stunning disclaimer (previously quoted) arrived, that is.

As for the conclusions which could be reasonably drawn from those data we did collect and analyze, here are the ones we feel to be most important:

1. In our first set of contrasts, NE vs. PE, the disagreements about appropriate goals and procedures in language study were most pronounced. To us, the positions taken by the NE group reinforced our long-standing perception that to many, many Americans, the grammar issue is no longer a curricular one; it has become intertwined with basic values. As such, it stands alongside patriotism, respect for the law, love of football, and concern for maintaining the nuclear family unit in the canon of citizens' fundamental beliefs. In terms of the manner in which even members of the education establishment cling to this belief, Patrick Hartwell once summarized it appropriately in a 1985 College English essay:

> For me, the grammar issue was settled at least twenty years ago with the conclusion offered by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer in 1963.
>
> > In view of the widespread agreement of research studies based upon many types of students and teachers, the conclusion can be stated in strong and unqualified terms: the teaching of formal grammar has a negligible or, because it usually displaces some

> instruction and practice in composition, even a harmful effect on improvement in writing.
>
> Indeed, I would agree with Janet Emig that the grammar issue is a prime example of 'magical thinking': the assumption that students will learn only what we teach and only because we teach.
>
> But the grammar issue, as we will see, is a complicated one. And, perhaps surprisingly, it remains controversial, with the regular appearance of papers defending the teaching of formal grammar or attacking it.

The NE groups strongly supported the teaching of Latinate grammar and the doctrine of correctness in usage despite 90 years of research findings which have consistently proclaimed such beliefs to be without empirical foundation. As Kurt Vonnegut reiterated regularly in Slaughterhouse Five, "So it goes." These same organizations wanted more attention paid to written than oral linguistic instruction and, in all language study, supported the concept that there was a Standard English out there somewhere and that it should be taught. The researchers infer that, in supporting the desire for one set of language choices be taught, the NE groups stand directly in opposition to the "Students Right to Their Own Language" statement passed by the National Council of Teachers of English at their convention in New Orleans in 1974:

> We affirm the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language--the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find

> their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language.

This belief in the fundamental value of traditional grammar study seems to be closely associated with the preferences in curricular initiatives which featured memorization. To the NE groups, memorizing things was believed to be a key factor in language assimilation and literary appreciation--a notion which had receded considerably from post-war curricular thinking but had resurfaced in the 1980's, notably in the writings of William Bennett, E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Lynne Cheney, and Chester Finn.

2. Throughout the analysis, we became aware of the lack of awareness on the part of most PE organizations, and <u>all</u> of the NE groups, of the published research and scholarly literature which has been produced on the teaching of English during this century. As Rice, (1904) pointed out decades ago, research on the negligible effects of grammar/usage teaching on the improvement of young people's writing, reading and speaking has been in print

virtually since the turn of the century, and the findings of that area of educational and linguistic research, as has been stated earlier, have been most consistent. Studies on the reading abilities, interests, tastes, and attitudes of youth have been published in abundance since World War II. So has research on the nature and quality of literature for young adults. Moreover, the last quarter century has witnessed considerable research on the responses children and adolescents make when they read literary works. The same can be said about professional scrutiny, through carefully designed investigations, of students' ability to compose ideas/information in writing. Apparently, this large body of research data has had little impact on the attitudes of many of the leaders of those 32 organizations who submitted responses to our survey.

3. A desire to stick with traditionally maintained policies and practices in English pedagogy became evident in the aggregate responses of the NE groups and, to a lesser degree, with the PE groups as well. Attitudes toward language instruction have already been covered in this summary. Formal, rather restrictive writing tasks still were preferred by the NE groups as well as the "red pencil" approaches to the evaluation of writing. The literature curriculum favored by the same organization was largely Eurocentric, specifically Anglo-Saxon in

nature. Those same groups saw little value in the use of young adult literature, multi-cultural, contemporary, or popular literature as objects of serious classroom study. In terms of the English curriculum as a whole, NE preferences were for one which was dominated by the past. The Cultural Literacy movement of the 1980's, especially as described in E. D. Hirsch's 1987 text, seems to be what is wanted by these groups.

Differences of opinion on what should be in middle/high school English instruction were even greater, as witnessed by the responses of the "liberal" and "conservative" groups among the NE organization. These responses closely paralleled the popularly perceived political positions of those groups.

The conservatives were even stronger in their commitment to traditional language teaching practices than were the NE organizations as a whole. This strict adherence to the grammar approach, as compared with the liberal position, provided the most sharply drawn distinctions we found.

4. The conservatives also demonstrated support for older, more established practices in the teaching of written composition than did either their liberal counterparts of the NE group as a whole. More evidence of the firm

commitment to grammar study as central to the curriculum could be found in these expressed attitudes toward writing. The recent intensive national concern for the lack of writing abilities among the youth of the country (as chronicled in the well known Newsweek article, "Why Can't Johnny Write," of December, 1975), coupled with the concurrent move to innovative instructional practices in the teaching of writing and the development of the National Writing Project seems wholly lost on them.

5. In their stated preferences for various teaching approaches to literature, the conservatives ran true to form. They steadfastly linked memorization with literary appreciation. Their frequently touted xenophobic perspective on American culture was further reflected in their clear preference for Anglo-Saxon literature over any multi-cultural emphases. They eschewed contemporary literature and expressed the strong desire for emphasis on literature written long ago. They resisted the idea that study of social themes in literature had great value. They showed little interest in reader response teaching approaches.

6. As they viewed the curriculum as a whole, the conservative groups once again expressed support for cultural rather than functional literacy initiatives.

Their aversion to multi-cultural curricular trends was nowhere more evident than in their enthusiastic embracing of the English Only referenda, which have now become law in 14 states and which continue to cause intense and often acrimonious debate in educational and other circles. The conservatives also seem quite content with testing practices of the past, with emphases on quantitative, multiple-choice, isolated skills instruments. On the whole, then, the conservative groups seemed satisfied with an English curriculum that could be seen shortly after the turn of the century--the 20th century, that is.

Appendix A - Introductory Letter

Dear ___

As our American society approaches the 21st century, several aspects of public education continue to be sources of both concern and debate. How English, the most widely offered subject in the curriculum, should be taught remains one of those unresolved issues. Various observers feel strongly about what skills, knowledge, and values should be central in the English curriculum--and there is considerable disagreement about the relative emphasis which should be placed on each of these aspects.

The two researchers who solicit your input relative to these important questions have maintained a keen interest in the teaching of English, largely in middle and secondary schools, for more than 35 years. Our concern for the future shape and direction of our subject matter has led us to create the survey instrument enclosed and to request that you complete and return it as soon as your schedule allows. We hope to present the results of this important survey to the Fifth International Convention on Language in Education at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, England, on March 22-26, 1993. It is imperative that a broad-based United States perspective be presented there.

Because this issue is a such a serious one, we expect also to publish our report and distribute it to those local, state, regional and national agencies to whom the teaching and learning of English continues to be an issue of great significance. A copy of this publication will be sent to all who contribute data to its development. That document will be available to those recipients by early summer, 1993.

Your response, as a leader in helping to shape and express American public opinion, is critical in order to present an accurate description of current thoughts and feelings on the teaching of English. A stamped, addressed return envelope is included for your convenience in returning the questionnaire. Please give this matter your earliest attention.

Respectfully yours,

John S. Simmons, Professor
English Education and Reading
The Florida State University

Robert E. Shafer
Professor and Head of English
Education (retired)
Arizona State University

Appendix B - Survey Form

Directions: Please read each statement carefully, then mark the appropriate box to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, using the following code:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
N = Neutral or No opinion
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

Part One	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. In the written and spoken language students use in school, they should be encouraged to communicate in the manner they find most comfortable.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. Students should be taught a uniform and formal standard of English usage.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. Teachers should include semantic devices (glittering generalities, card stacking, testimonials, etc.) in their language units.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. The teaching of formal grammar should be the dominant element in English language teaching.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. In teachers' linguistic planning, considerably more emphasis should be placed on written instruction than on oral instruction.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. English language instruction should include considerable emphasis on critical thinking skills.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. All English teachers should receive extensive training in English as a Second Language in both pre-service and in-service education.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. Memorizing grammatical rules, definitions, and processes should be emphasized in language study.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9. The study of parts of speech will help most students write more grammatically correct sentences and thus should be emphasized.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. Because sentence diagramming helps students to visualize well-constructed sentences, it should be taught frequently to all students.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11. Drills on spelling lists of frequently used words should be a staple of all middle/secondary English curricula.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12. The dictionary should be regarded as a prescriber and not a describer of current English usage.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13. Cultural aspects of language as found, for example, in Mark Twain's use of Southern regional dialect in the novel, *Huckleberry Finn*, should receive little attention in the classroom.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14. Differences in word choice, pronunciation, and syntax in the language of persons from different geographic regions of the United States should be considered in the classroom study of English.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
15. Differences of word choice, pronunciation, and syntax as used by persons from different social classes should not be considered in the classroom study of English.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
	SA	A	N	D	SD

Part Two

		SA	A	N	D	SD
1.	The teaching of writing should include a great deal of time devoted to formal elements (grammar, usage, punctuation, spelling, paragraphing, etc.).	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2.	Journal writing, conducted on a daily basis, should be seen as an integral part of composition teaching.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3.	Teachers, especially English teachers, should correct each piece of student writing meticulously.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4.	Students should be involved in systematically reacting to each other's writing as a regular part of the composition program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5.	The teaching of ways in which competent writers compose should be a regular component of the writing program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6.	Informal compositions should be emphasized considerably more than formal writing assignments.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7.	Teachers should "write along with" their students on a regular basis during assigned in-class writing tasks.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8.	Clear and uniform standards for evaluating student writing should be established at the district and/or state level.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9.	The idea that students write for a variety of audiences should play an important part in composition teaching.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10.	Students should frequently receive two grades, one for content, the other for form, in their written products.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11.	Students should be encouraged to write about personal experiences.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12.	Student writing of imaginative pieces--fiction, poetry, and drama--should be a regular feature of the composition program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13.	The teaching of the formal, extended research paper should be included as a requirement in the writing program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14.	Student writing of expository pieces (essays, critiques, reviews, etc.) shoud be a regular feature of the composition program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
15.	The forms and genres of writing commonly used in academic subjects other than English should be taught in the composition program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
		SA	A	N	D	SD

Part Three

		SA	A	N	D	SD
1.	The teaching of the Great Books should be the dominant component of the literature program.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2.	The works of the traditional (British and American) authors should be those most frequently taught to all students.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3.	Young adult fiction (books written for adolescents) is too shallow and immature to be studied as serious literature by middle/ secondary students.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4.	More emphasis should be placed on the study of contemporary literature in middle/secondary school curricula.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5.	The major literary genres (fiction, drama, poetry) should comprise a major component of literature study.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6.	The writing tasks assigned to students as responses to the works they study should focus to a considerable degree on critical appraisal rather than personal responses.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7.	The great themes or conflicts (person vs. nature, person vs. fate, etc.) should occupy a prominent position in the literature curriculum.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8.	The literature of popular culture should be given little or no attention in the teaching of literature to young people.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9.	The tastes of the local community should be the ultimate factor in choosing or rejecting texts for study in today's schools.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10.	The literature of American minorities should not be featured prominently in middle/secondary school literature curricula.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11.	The reading abilities of students should be a major factor in teachers' choices of texts for study in the classroom.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12.	There are some literary works which should be read and studied by all students before they graduate from high school.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13.	Students should have a great deal to say about those literary works selected for all-class study.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14.	Book reports are an important means of promoting literary interest and appreciation and thus should be assigned to all students on a regular basis.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
15.	Memorizing certain poems, essays (such as "The Gettysburg Address") and speeches from plays (e. g., Marc Antony's funeral oration from *Julius Caesar*) effectively promote literary appreciation and should be assigned on a regular basis.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
16.	Librarians in middle and secondary schools should be encouraged to order and make available to all students those literary works which reflect the world milieu, past and present.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
		SA	A	N	D	SD

Part Four

		SA	A	N	D	SD
1.	The teaching of "functional literacy" (reading warranty statements, writing letters of application, etc.) should occupy a position of dominant importance in the English curriculum.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2.	There are certain elements of the cultural heritage (e. g., Shakespeare's plays, the Battle of Gettysburg) which should be taught to all young people before they leave school.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3.	The development of cultural literacy among young people should be largely Eurocentric in nature.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4.	The development of cultural literacy among young people should represent a multicultural balance.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5.	If students have not learned the basic elements of their culture (e. g., leaders of the American Revolution, folk and legendary heroes) by the time they enter middle school (6th or 7th grade), there is little hope that they will learn them in later grades.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6.	All young people should study at least one foreign language before they leave high school.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7.	The teaching of Latin increases students' cultural and linguistic awareness and should be offered in all secondary schools.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8.	The study of classic literary works, along with Western History and World Geography, should largely replace popular/contemporary literature and social issues at the center of all middle/secondary school curricula.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9.	The development of "literacy" among young people should feature a balance between reading and writing ability enhancement.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10.	The "English only" referenda passed in recent years in a number of states represents desirable public policy and should be reflected in English curricula.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11.	Minimum competencies in the reading and writing of all young people should be established, and students should be tested on the basis of them.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12.	Basic understanding of their cultural heritage should be required of all students, and assessment instruments should be developed to measure these understandings.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
		SA	A	N	D	SD

Please return this form in the enclosed envelope to:

Dr. John Simmons
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
The Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306

Part One	Item No.	N1	N2	N4	N5	N6	N7	N9	N11	N12	N15	N16	N19	N20	N26	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E8	E9
Language	1	5	1	1	2	1	3	1	2	4	4	1	4	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	4
	2	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	5	4	2
	3	4	1	3	2	1	4	2	3		3	3	3	5	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	2	2
	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	2	1	4	4	2	4	2	2	2	4	3	1.5	2	2	
	5	1	4	5	5	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	1.5	2	3	3
	6	4	1	5	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	4	4.5	2	4	4
	7	3	3	3	5	2	3	5	3	5	4	3	5	5	4	2	2	5	3	4.5	4	2	3
	8	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	1	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	4	2	1.5	3	2	4
	9	4	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	1	4	4	4	3	4	1	2	3	2	1.5	4	4	4
	10	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	1	2	4	5	3	2	2	2	4	3	1.5	4	2	4
	11	3	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	1	2	4	4	3	3	1	2	4	2	2	2	4	5
	12	4	5	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	2	4	3	2		3	3	4	2	3	2	2	2
	13	1	5	2	3	4	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
	14	4	1	5	4	2	4	4	3	5	2	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	3.5	5	4	4
	15	2	1	3	2	4	2	2	3	1	4	4	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1.5	2	2	2

Part Two	Item No.	N1	N2	N4	N5	N6	N7	N9	N11	N12	N15	N16	N19	N20	N26	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E8	E9
Composition	1	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	1	4	4	4	3	4	1	2	5	3	2	3	4	5
	2	5	1	5	5	1	3	4	3	5	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4.5	2	3	4
	3	3	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	2	1	4	2	2	5	4	2
	4	4	1	3	4	1	3	4	3	5	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	4
	5	4	3	5	5	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
	6	2	2	3	4	1	3	5	3	5	2	2	4	5	3	2	3	5	3	4	2	2	2
	7	4	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	5	3	5	4	2	4	4.5	1	3	3
	8	4	5	1	3	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	2
	9	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	4.5	4	4	5
	10	4	5	4	4	4		2	4	1	3	4	5	5	4	4	3	2	3	3.5	4	4	4
	11	5	1	2	4	3	3	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4.5	4	4	5
	12	5	3	3	4	3	4	5	4	2	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	4.5	5	4	4
	13	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	5
	14	5	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	3	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4.5	4	4	4
	15	5	1	3	4	4	3	2	3	5	2	4	4	4	3	2	5	2	4	4.5	5	2	4

E10	E11	E12	E14	E15	E17	E18	E19	E20	Overall	Non-Educ.	Educators	Diff N-E	Part One	Item No.
	1		3	4	4	3	2	4	2.552	2.429	2.667	-0.238	Language	1
4	1	4	4	4	4	5	5	2	4.129	4.571	3.765	0.807		2
	4	3		3	4	5	5	4	3.179	2.923	3.400	-0.477		3
	2	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	2.914	3.643	2.233	1.410		4
	3	2	2	4	5	2	1	1	2.783	3.143	2.469	0.674		5
5	4	4	1	4	4	5	5	5	4.048	4.143	3.971	0.172		6
5	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	5	3.823	3.786	3.853	-0.067		7
	2	2	2	4	1	3	2	2	3.017	3.714	2.406	1.308		8
	3	4	2	4	1	3		2	3.259	3.857	2.700	1.157		9
	3	4	2	2	1	3	2		3.086	3.571	2.633	0.938		10
	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	4	3.033	3.643	2.500	1.143		11
4	1	4	2	2	3	2	3	1	2.833	3.231	2.529	0.701		12
2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1.903	2.214	1.647	0.567		13
4	4	4	5	2	5	4	5	5	3.952	3.643	4.206	-0.563		14
2	2	4	1	4	1	1	4	1	2.210	2.357	2.088	0.269		15

E10	E11	E12	E14	E15	E17	E18	E19	E20	Overall	Non-Educ.	Educators		Part Two	Item No.
	3		3	4	1	3	4	2	3.483	4.000	3.000	1.000	Composition	1
4	4	4	4	4	5	5	2	5	3.855	3.786	3.912	-0.126		2
	1	3	4	4	4	2	2	1	3.167	3.714	2.688	1.027		3
5	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	3.871	3.357	4.294	-0.937		4
5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	4	4.097	3.857	4.294	-0.437		5
	3	2	3	4	4	5	2	4	3.133	3.143	3.125	0.018		6
5	4	3	3	2	4	5	3	5	3.468	3.357	3.559	-0.202		7
5	4		4	2	4	4		2	3.586	3.929	3.267	0.662		8
5	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	5	4.274	3.929	4.559	-0.630		9
4	3	5	5	3	4	5	1	1	3.583	3.769	3.441	0.328		10
	4	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	4.117	3.714	4.469	-0.754		11
5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4.177	3.929	4.382	-0.454		12
5	4	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	3.935	3.786	4.059	-0.273		13
5	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	4.274	4.214	4.324	-0.109		14
5	4	3	4	2	5	4	3	5	3.565	3.357	3.735	-0.378		15

Part Three	Item No.	N1	N2	N4	N5	N6	N7	N9	N11	N12	N15	N16	N19	N20	N26	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E8	E9
Literature	1	4	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	3	2	4	2	2	4	2	4	5	2	2	1	1	2
	2	1	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	2	5	2	4	4	2	3	4	3	1.5	2	4	3
	3	2	5	4	5	5	2	2	4	1	2	3	3	2	4	4	2	2	2	1.5	2	4	2
	4	5	1	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
	5	4	2	4	4	4	3	3	4	1	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
	6	2	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	1	2	3	4	3	4	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	4	4
	7	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	1	3	4
	8	1	5	2	4	4	2	2	3	1	2	4	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1.5	1	2	1
	9	3	2	5	4	1	2	2	2	1	2	4	3	1	2	1	3	2	2	1.5	1	2	2
	10	1	3	2	2	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1.5	1	2	1
	11	2	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	1	2	2	4	3	2	5	4	4	3	3	4	2	4
	12	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	3	3	2	2	3
	13	4	3	1	2	1	3	2	4	1	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	2
	14	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	3	2	3	4	2	2
	15	4	5	5	4	4	3	2	4	2	2	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	4	3	1
	16	5	5	4	4	3	4	2	3	5	5	2	4	4	4	5	4	2	4	4.5	4	4	5

Part Four	Item No.	N1	N2	N4	N5	N6	N7	N9	N11	N12	N15	N16	N19	N20	N26	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E8	E9
Curriculum	1	5	1	3	2	2	3	4	2	4	2	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	2	4.5	4	2	3
	2	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	4
	3	1	5	4	4	5	3	2	4	1	1	4	2	2		2	2	2	2	1.5	1	1	3
	4	5	1	4	3	2	3	5	3	5	5	2	5	5		4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
	5	5	4	1	1	4	3	1	2	1	1	4	3	1	2	4	1	1	2	1.5	4	5	2
	6	4	1	5	4	2	3	2	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	2	5	4	5	5	4
	7	3	5	3	5	5	3	4	4	1	5	4	5	5	3	2	3	4	3	2	1	4	3
	8	2	5	5	5	5	3	2	5	1	2	5	2	1		4	3	2	3	1.5	1	2	2
	9	3	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4.5	4	4	5
	10	2	5	5	5	4	2	4	5	1	1	5	3	1	2	2	3	4	2	1	1	1	2
	11	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	1	1	5	5	5		2	4	4	3	3	4	3	4
	12	5	5	1	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5		4	3	4	3	4.5	4	2	4

E10	E11	E12	E14	E15	E17	E18	E19	E20	Overall	Non-Educ.	Educators		Part Three	Item No.
	2	2	3	2	1	2		2	2.862	3.571	2.200	1.371	Literature	1
	3	2	2	2	2	4		2	3.086	3.571	2.633	0.938		2
	2	2	3	2	4	2	1	2	2.717	3.143	2.344	0.799		3
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3.500	3.000	3.938	0.938		4
5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	3.903	3.571	4.176	-0.605		5
4	3	4	3	2	4	3	4	1	2.887	2.929	2.853	0.076		6
4	3		4	3	4	4	3	2	3.533	3.643	3.438	0.205		7
1	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	1	2.177	2.571	1.853	0.718		8
1	3		1	2	1	1	1	1	1.983	2.429	1.594	0.835		9
1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.532	1.857	1.265	0.592		10
	4	2	4	2	1	3	5	4	3.167	2.929	3.375	-0.446		11
5	3	5	4	4	4	4	3	1	3.839	4.286	3.471	0.815		12
5	3	2	2	2	5	4	2	5	2.710	2.500	2.882	-0.382		13
	4	3	3	4	1	2	4	2	3.100	3.571	2.688	0.884		14
	3	2	3	2	1	3	4	1	2.883	3.500	2.344	1.156		15
5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4.113	3.857	4.324	-0.466		16

E10	E11	E12	E14	E15	E17	E18	E19	E20	Overall	Non-Educ.	Educators		Part Four	Item No.
	2		4	2	2	4	2	2	2.948	2.929	2.967	-0.038	Curriculum	1
5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.903	4.071	3.765	0.307		2
2	1.5	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	2.300	2.923	1.824	1.100		3
5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.267	3.692	4.706	-1.014		4
1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2.145	2.357	1.971	0.387		5
	2	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	3.967	3.714	4.188	-0.473		6
	3	3	1	5	4	5	3	1	3.400	3.929	2.938	0.991		7
	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2.569	3.308	1.969	1.339		8
5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4.500	4.357	4.618	-0.261		9
	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	2.433	3.214	1.750	1.464		10
	3	3	3	1	4	5	4	1	3.517	3.923	3.188	0.736		11
	3	4	3	4	5	5		2	3.875	4.154	3.633	0.521		12

Part One	Item No.	Non-Educ. Liberal	Non-Educ. Conservative	Mixed Gender	Women's Groups	Educ. Label	No Educ. Label	Non-Content Related	Content Related	English-Related	Non-Eng. Related
Language	1	3.17	1.71	2.18	3.33	2.75	2.30	1.70	3.29	2.75	4.00
	2	4.33	4.71	4.45	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.20	3.14	3.00	3.33
	3	2.83	2.29	2.55	3.33	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.67
	4	2.83	4.29	3.55	4.00	2.50	4.10	2.05	1.86	1.75	2.00
	5	2.50	3.86	3.27	2.67	2.50	3.40	1.95	2.86	2.50	3.33
	6	4.50	3.71	4.09	4.33	4.50	4.00	4.15	3.71	3.25	4.33
	7	4.17	3.29	3.82	3.67	4.00	3.70	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.33
	8	3.17	4.29	3.55	4.33	3.00	4.00	2.15	2.43	2.50	2.33
	9	3.17	4.57	3.73	4.33	3.50	4.00	2.25	2.57	2.75	2.33
	10	3.17	4.00	3.27	4.67	3.00	3.80	2.45	2.14	3.00	1.00
	11	3.00	4.29	3.55	4.00	3.25	3.80	2.20	2.57	2.75	2.33
	12	2.50	3.57	2.91	3.33	2.00	3.40	3.00	1.86	1.75	2.00
	13	1.67	2.86	2.36	1.67	2.25	2.20	1.70	1.57	1.50	1.67
	14	4.33	3.00	3.36	4.67	4.00	3.50	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.00
	15	1.83	3.00	2.36	2.33	2.25	2.40	2.25	1.86	1.75	2.00
Part Two	Item No.										
Composition	1	3.50	4.57	3.91	4.33	3.50	4.20	2.40	3.00	3.50	2.33
	2	4.33	3.14	3.45	5.00	3.75	3.80	3.65	4.29	4.00	4.67
	3	3.17	4.43	3.64	4.00	3.25	3.90	2.50	2.57	2.25	3.00
	4	4.00	2.57	3.27	3.67	3.50	3.30	4.30	4.29	4.50	4.00
	5	3.67	3.86	3.73	4.33	3.75	3.90	4.30	4.29	4.50	4.00
	6	3.67	2.43	3.18	3.00	3.25	3.10	2.70	3.29	2.75	4.00
	7	3.17	3.29	3.36	3.33	3.00	3.50	3.55	3.57	3.50	3.67
	8	4.17	3.71	4.18	3.00	4.50	3.70	2.80	3.00	3.25	2.67
	9	4.17	3.57	4.00	3.67	4.25	3.80	4.45	4.71	5.00	4.33
	10	2.67	4.00	3.27	4.33	3.50	3.50	3.55	3.29	3.75	2.67
	11	4.17	3.14	3.64	4.00	3.75	3.70	3.95	4.57	4.50	4.67
	12	4.17	3.57	3.82	4.33	3.50	4.10	4.65	4.00	3.75	4.33
	13	3.33	4.14	3.73	4.00	3.50	3.90	4.00	4.14	4.25	4.00
	14	4.17	4.14	4.18	4.33	4.25	4.20	4.55	4.00	4.00	4.00
	15	3.67	3.00	3.13	4.00	4.00	3.10	3.55	4.00	4.00	4.00

Part Three	Item No.	Non-Educ. Liberal	Non-Educ. Conservative	Mixed Gender	Women's Groups	Educ. Label	No Educ. Label	Non-Content Related	Content Related	English-Related	Non-Eng. Related
Literature	1	3.50	3.86	3.64	3.33	3.25	3.70	1.90	2.00	2.25	1.67
	2	2.83	4.14	3.91	2.33	3.50	3.60	2.25	2.43	2.75	2.00
	3	2.33	4.00	3.18	3.00	3.25	3.10	2.05	2.43	2.25	2.67
	4	3.83	2.14	2.73	4.00	3.25	2.90	[illegible].40	4.14	4.00	4.33
	5	3.17	3.71	3.45	4.00	3.25	3.70	4.20	4.14	4.00	4.33
	6	2.67	3.14	2.91	3.00	3.25	2.80	2.85	2.86	3.25	2.33
	7	3.50	3.71	3.64	3.67	3.50	3.70	3.10	3.43	3.75	3.00
	8	1.67	3.43	2.82	1.67	2.25	2.70	1.95	1.71	1.75	1.67
	9	2.17	2.86	2.09	3.67	1.75	2.70	1.35	1.71	2.00	1.33
	10	1.33	2.43	2.00	1.33	2.00	1.80	1.35	1.14	1.25	1.00
	11	2.67	3.14	2.82	3.33	2.75	3.00	3.20	3.14	3.75	2.33
	12	4.33	4.29	4.09	5.00	4.50	4.20	3.70	3.14	3.25	3.00
	13	2.67	2.14	2.55	2.33	2.00	2.70	2.70	3.14	2.50	4.00
	14	3.17	4.14	3.45	4.00	3.25	3.70	2.50	2.57	2.75	2.33
	15	3.00	4.00	3.27	4.33	3.25	3.60	2.35	2.00	2.50	1.33
	16	4.00	3.71	3.73	4.33	4.00	3.80	4.15	4.57	4.50	4.67
Part Four	Item No										
Curriculum	1	3.67	2.14	2.64	4.00	3.00	2.90	2.75	2.43	2.75	2.00
	2	3.83	4.29	4.09	4.00	4.00	4.10	3.60	4.00	4.00	4.00
	3	1.50	3.86	2.82	2.33	2.00	3.00	1.95	1.64	1.88	1.33
	4	3.83	2.86	3.09	4.67	3.00	3.60	4.70	4.71	4.50	5.00
	5	2.50	2.43	2.18	3.00	2.50	2.30	2.25	1.57	1.75	1.33
	6	3.83	3.43	3.45	4.67	4.00	3.60	3.70	4.29	4.00	4.67
	7	3.17	4.43	4.00	3.67	3.50	4.10	2.70	2.86	2.50	3.33
	8	1.67	4.57	3.09	3.00	2.00	3.50	1.85	1.86	2.00	1.67
	9	4.17	4.43	4.36	4.33	4.50	4.30	4.65	4.57	4.75	4.33
	10	2.33	4.29	3.18	3.33	2.50	3.50	1.90	1.29	1.50	1.00
	11	2.83	4.14	3.45	4.33	2.50	4.10	3.20	2.71	3.25	2.00
	12	3.67	3.86	4.00	3.33	3.00	4.20	3.05	3.43	3.25	3.67

Part One	Item No.	Lib. - Cons.	Mixed- Women	Educ - Non-Ed	Cont.- Non-C.	Eng - Non-E.	Eng. - Con.	Eng. - Lib.
Language	1	1.45	-1.15	0.45	1.59	-1.25	-0.54	-0.42
	2	-0.38	-0.55	0.25	-1.06	-0.33	-0.14	-1.33
	3	0.55	-0.79	-1.00	0.00	-1.17	-0.50	-0.33
	4	-1.45	-0.45	-1.60	-0.19	-0.25	-0.11	-1.08
	5	-1.36	0.61	-0.90	0.91	-0.83	-0.36	0.00
	6	0.79	-0.24	0.50	-0.44	-1.08	-0.46	-1.25
	7	0.88	0.15	0.30	0.25	-0.58	-0.25	-0.42
	8	-1.12	-0.79	-1.00	0.28	0.17	0.07	-0.67
	9	-1.40	-0.61	-0.50	0.32	0.42	0.18	-0.42
	10	-0.83	-1.39	-0.80	-0.31	2.00	0.86	-0.17
	11	-1.29	-0.45	-0.55	0.37	0.42	0.18	-0.25
	12	-1.07	-0.42	-1.40	-1.14	-0.25	-0.11	-0.75
	13	-1.19	0.70	0.05	-0.13	-0.17	-0.07	-0.17
	14	1.33	-1.30	0.50	-0.11	0.25	0.11	-0.08
	15	-1.17	0.03	-0.15	-0.39	-0.25	-0.11	-0.08

Part Two	Item No.							
Composition	1	-1.07	-0.42	-0.70	0.60	1.17	0.50	0.00
	2	1.19	-1.55	-0.05	0.64	-0.67	-0.29	-0.33
	3	-1.26	-0.36	-0.65	0.07	-0.75	-0.32	-0.92
	4	1.43	-0.39	0.20	-0.01	0.50	0.21	0.50
	5	-0.19	-0.61	-0.15	-0.01	0.50	0.21	0.83
	6	1.24	0.18	0.15	0.59	-1.25	-0.54	-0.92
	7	-0.12	0.03	-0.50	0.02	-0.17	-0.07	0.33
	8	0.45	1.18	0.80	0.20	0.58	0.25	-0.92
	9	0.60	0.33	0.45	0.26	0.67	0.29	0.83
	10	-1.33	-1.06	0.00	-0.26	1.08	0.46	1.08
	11	1.02	-0.36	0.05	0.62	-0.17	-0.07	0.33
	12	0.60	-0.52	-0.60	-0.65	-0.58	-0.25	-0.42
	13	-0.81	-0.27	-0.40	0.14	0.25	0.11	0.92
	14	0.02	-0.15	0.05	-0.55	0.00	0.00	-0.17
	15	0.67	-0.82	0.90	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.33

Part Three	Item No.	Lib. - Cons.	Mixed- Women	Educ - Non-Ed	Cont.- Non-C.	Eng. - Non-E.	Eng. - Con.	Eng. - Lib.
Literature	1	-0.36	0.30	-0.45	0.10	0.58	0.25	-1.25
	2	-1.31	1.58	-0.10	0.18	0.75	0.32	-0.08
	3	-1.67	0.18	0.15	0.38	-0.42	-0.18	-0.08
	4	1.69	-1.27	0.35	0.74	-0.33	-0.14	0.17
	5	-0.55	-0.55	-0.45	-0.06	-0.33	-0.14	0.83
	6	-0.48	-0.09	0.45	0.01	0.92	0.39	0.58
	7	-0.21	-0.03	-0.20	0.33	0.75	0.32	0.25
	8	-1.76	1.15	-0.45	-0.24	0.08	0.04	0.08
	9	-0.69	-1.58	-0.95	0.36	0.67	0.29	-0.17
	10	-1.10	0.67	0.20	-0.21	0.25	0.11	-0.08
	11	-0.48	-0.52	-0.25	-0.06	1.42	0.61	1.08
	12	0.05	-0.91	0.30	-0.56	0.25	0.11	-1.08
	13	0.52	0.21	-0.70	0.44	-1.50	-0.64	-0.17
	14	-0.98	-0.55	-0.45	0.07	0.42	0.18	-0.42
	15	-1.00	-1.06	-0.35	-0.35	1.17	0.50	-0.50
	16	0.29	-0.61	0.20	0.42	-0.17	-0.07	0.50

Part Four	Item No.							
Curriculum	1	1.52	-1.36	0.10	-0.32	0.75	0.32	-0.92
	2	-0.45	0.09	-0.10	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.17
	3	-2.36	0.48	-1.00	-0.31	0.54	0.23	0.38
	4	0.98	-1.58	-0.60	0.01	-0.50	-0.21	0.67
	5	0.07	-0.82	0.20	-0.68	0.42	0.18	-0.75
	6	0.40	-1.21	0.40	0.59	-0.67	-0.29	0.17
	7	-1.26	0.33	-0.60	0.16	-0.83	-0.36	-0.67
	8	-2.90	0.09	-1.50	0.01	0.33	0.14	0.33
	9	-0.26	0.03	0.20	-0.08	0.42	0.18	0.58
	10	-1.95	-0.15	-1.00	-0.61	0.50	0.21	-0.83
	11	-1.31	-0.88	-1.60	-0.49	1.25	0.54	0.42
	12	-0.19	0.67	-1.20	0.38	-0.42	-0.18	-0.42

References

Applebee, Arthur N. (1974). Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana. (p.1).

- (1992). Stability and Change in the High School Canon. English Journal. Volume 81. Number 5. September, 1992. (pp. 27-32).

Basic Issues Conference, An Articulated English Program: A Hypothesis to Test. In Stone, George Winchester. (1961). Issues, Problems and Approaches in the Teaching of English. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Basic Issues Statement. (1959). Publications of The Modern Language Association. (p. 6).

Booth, Wayne C. (1989). Foreword. In Lloyd-James, Richard and Lunsford, Andrea, The English Coalition Conference: Democracy Through Language. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana.

Braddock, Richard, Lloyd-James, Richard and Schoer, Lowell. (1963). Research In Written Composition. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana.

Brinkley, Ellen H. Intellectural Freedom and The Whole Language Movement. Unpublished Manuscript. Department of English, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Cheney, Lynne V. (1988). American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools. National Endowment for the Humanities. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C.

Commission on the Curriculum. (1952). The English Language Arts. National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign.

Clapp, Ouida. (1986). The English Curriculum Today. In Farmer, Marjorie N. (1986). Consensus and Dissent. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana.

Dixon, John. (1967). Growth Through English. National Association for the Teaching of English. Reading, England.

Finn, Chester E., Jr. (1991). We Must Take Charge: Our Schools and Our Future. The Free Press, New York.

Glatthorn, Allan A. (1980). A Guide for Developing an English Curriculum for the Eighties. National Council of Teachers of English.

Hartwell, Patrick. (1985). Grammar, Grammars and the Teaching of Grammer. College English. Volume 47. Number 2. (pp. 105-127).

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). Cultural Literacy, What Every American Needs To Know. Hougton Mifflin Company, Boston.

Mandel, Barrett J. (Editor). (1980). Three Language Arts Curriculum Models. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana.

McLuhan, Marshall. (1962). Understanding Media. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Moffett, James. (1988). Hidden Impediments to Improving English Teaching. In Moffett, James. (1988). Coming On Center. (Second Edition). Heinemann Educational Books, Inc. Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Provenzo, Eugene F. (1990). Religious Fundamentalism and American Education. State University of New York Press, Albany.

Reich, Robert B. (1991). The Work of Nations. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.

Rice, J. M. (1904). Educational Research: The Results of a Test in Language and English. In Forum. Volume XXXV. (pp. 209-93 and 440-57).

Schwartz, Audrey James. (1991). Organizational Metaphors, Curriculum Reform, and Local School and District Change. In Klein, M. Frances. (1991). The Politics of Curriculum Decision-Making. State University of New York Press, Albany.

Shafer, Robert E. (1969). The Attempt to Make English a Discipline, The High School Journal, Volume 52. Number 7. (pp. 336-351).

- (1986). Dartmouth and Beyond. English Journal. Volume 75. Number 3. March, 1986. (p. 23).

Simmons, John S. (1968). A Gap To Be Narrowed. Teaching the Teacher of English. Part II. (Oscar Haugh, Editor). National Council of Teachers of English. (pp. 15-20).

Squire, James R. (1991). The History of the Profession. In Flood, James, Jensen, Julie, Lapp, Diane and Squire, James R. (1991). Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts. Macmillan. New York.