minnesota english

Journal of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English

Volume I, Number I

October, 1965

minnesota english

Journal of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English

Volume I, No. 1 October, 1965

EDITOR: Stanley B. Kegler
University of Minnesota--Minneapolis

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Duane C. Scribner
University of Minnesota--Minneapolis

Annual membership of $2.50 for teachers, $.50 for students includes subscriptions to Council publications. The Minnesota Council is an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English. Membership is open to elementary, secondary, and college teachers who are interested in the improvement of the teaching of English. To obtain membership, send the correct amount to Dr. Anna Lee Stensland, Executive Secretary, Division of Humanities, University of Minnesota--Duluth, Duluth 12.

MANUSCRIPTS AND other Minnesota English correspondence should be addressed to Duane Scribner, Associate Editor, 350 Peik Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

THE NEW RHETORIC AND TEACHING: A BEGINNING LOOK

By Carol Staloch Loomis

(This article provides some basic information about the new emphasis on rhetoric, reviews several proposals for rhetoric courses, and concludes with suggestions for including rhetoric in high school English courses. Mrs. Loomis is a graduate student at the University of Minnesota and a teacher in the Circle Pines schools.)

I
Various Views

A "new" rhetoric with a broader viewpoint and subject matter than conventional rhetoric has begun to influence the teaching of English in secondary schools and colleges. Although traditionally the term "rhetoric" has meant the art of speaking eloquently and persuasively, Hans Guth defines it today as "the art of writing effectively and responsibly." Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren define it more broadly as "the art of using language effectively." Most advocates agree that rhetoric goes beyond writing and speaking to include other techniques of communication and that it means comprehending and analyzing as well as persuading. Father Daniel Fogarty provides one of the most inclusive definitions: "Rhetoric is the science of recognizing the range of meanings and of the functions of words, and the art of using and interpreting them in accordance with this recognition."

Three main new philosophies of rhetoric have emerged in the last thirty-five years. One philosophy is that of I.A. Richards, who defines rhetoric as "the art of adapting discourse to its end."[1] Richards feels that the single most important concern in rhetoric is comprehension, efficient interpretation. He believes that rhetoric should be "a study of misunderstanding and its rem-

edies," "a persistent, systematic inquiry into how words work." Richards deals with all aspects of communication--speaking, listening, writing, and reading.

To Kenneth Burke, the key term for the new rhetoric is "identification," the speaker's identification with his audience as well as the individual's identification with a group.[2] The goal of his rhetoric is cooperation and the achievement of peace. Burke believes that by using language, man attempts to put his "personally projected world" into the kind of order that allows him to relate himself to others, so that "in his organized system of interdependency, he may satisfy his needs." His search for internal and external order, Burke believes, from his inner, subconscious conflicts to the highest kinds of conscious abstraction, involves rhetoric. Rhetoric should build on the "consubstantiality of men, their shared modes of feeling, thought, and action."

The General Semanticists, some of whom are Alfred Korzybski, Samuel I. Hayakawa, Wendell Johnson, and Irving J. Lee, propose that rhetoric should especially teach principles of effective communication through group discussion. They emphasize the importance of mutual cooperation rather than the imposition of one will on many others. The General Semanticists would teach people to use terms so basic that they cannot be defined, instead of terms which can be ambiguous.[3]

These three theories agree upon the "newly recognized importance of language as the key to man's understanding of himself and his control of his own progress."[4] They agree that discoveries about language by disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, and sociology have influenced the development of the new rhetoric and that those discoveries should be taught as part of the new rhetoric. The new theorists would teach the philosophy of rhetoric as well as the practical aspects. Aristotle's principles are not disregarded by the new rhetoricians, but much is added to them.

II
Proposed Courses

In Roots for a New Rhetoric, Father Fogarty incorporates these three theories into a proposed college course in rhetoric. His course would be introduced with a discussion of the uses of language in literature, the public arts, and the new sciences. It would include discussion of propaganda, advertising and entertainment media, and language as used in sciences such as psychiatry. The course itself would be divided into three main parts--a philosophy of communication, a science of communication, and an art of communication. The philosophy of communication includes the study of the nature and functions of language, words, abstraction, definition, and some of the theories of Richards and Burke. The science of communication includes the study of the psychology and sociology of communication and related findings from biology, anthropology, psychiatry, and linguistics. The art of communication teaches practical rhetoric--written composition, discussion, conversation, public speaking, professional writing, and non-verbal means of communication.

Hans Guth's suggested curriculum, in English Today and Tomorrow, includes a rhetoric that is mainly traditional and concerned only with written composition. He suggests that students first read widely to obtain ideas and then be taught to strive for fluency, conviction, concreteness, focus, expressiveness, and responsibility in their writing. The curriculum includes study of semantics, logic and strategy of rhetoric, and elements of style.

Richard Ohmann, in the article "In Lieu of a New Rhetoric," suggests a college rhetoric course which contains many but not all of Father Fogarty's proposals. Ohmann would first teach a study of the nature and function of language, including structural grammar and usage. Next his course would cover semantics. The third part of the course would be devoted to the uses of language, definition, description, classification, analysis, narration, and comparison, including types of proof and coherence and order. The main part of the course would be concerned with four problems involved in expository writing--the relationship between a piece of writing and its content (use of precision, example, value-laden terms, generalization), the relationship be-

tween a piece of writing and its author (awareness and attitudes reflected), the relationship between a piece of writing and its audience (tone, emotional distance, diction), and the expression of a world view.

The phrase "world view" is an important emphasis of the new rhetoric. Since the new rhetoric engages in the pursuit as well as the transmission of truth, the student must formulate a world view from his experience and reading. His writing or speaking or conversation should then reflect his convictions, values, and ideas about his world. In this sense rhetoric encompasses the nature and problems of man, training a student to read, think, and communicate critically and intelligently about "the great, persisting and unresolved problems" of his civilization, about the problems of "war and peace, race and creed, poverty, wealth and population, democracy and communism."[5] Thus rhetoric is concerned with the content as well as the form of discourse.

III
Proposal for a Secondary School Rhetoric

There is little evidence that much of the new rhetoric is now being taught in the secondary schools. Yet the proposals of the new rhetoric might be very useful for the secondary English curriculum. It is evident that the influences of advertising, television and the newspapers, the use of group discussion to reach major decisions through mutual cooperation, the interdependence of human beings in a mobile and highly complex society--that all of these situations require tactful, clear, responsible use of language and the ability and disposition to tolerate another's point of view.

Some schools teach segments of the new rhetoric such as semantics, interpretation of advertising and propaganda, and use of figurative language. Often instruction in these areas is haphazard, however, and not related to the main goal of understanding and using words effectively. Schools with language-centered curriculums tend to teach more of the new rhetoric as part of the general language study. The English curriculum of the University of Minnesota High School, for example,

includes communication theory, types of communication, semantics, discussion and problem solving, critical thinking and listening, and types and functions of discourse.

A course in rhetoric such as Father Fogarty's could be adapted for use in the secondary schools in a curriculum both carefully planned and sequential for grades seven through twelve. A rhetoric emphasis related to both literature and language study with thematic arrangement of material would probably work best. Through carefully chosen literature the student could develop an awareness of universal problems. Ethics could be discussed in relation to literature study when appropriate. In his language study the student could inspect shades of meaning, connotation, and denotation. Junior high students could study mass media, advertising, and propaganda, and express their ideas in themes and serious group discussion. Senior high students could study these aspects more deeply, write longer expository themes, and work on basic matters of style. They could be taught logic, principles of argument, and critical thinking. Because most students in the typical school do not take a formal speech course, techniques of public speaking should be covered in the English classes.

To teach rhetoric successfully the instructor himself would need special preparation in the philosophy of rhetoric, philosophy itself, logic, ethics, sociology, linguistics, political science, psychology, history, and some of the sciences such as biology or physiology.[5] He would have to be well-read, alert and sensitive to moral values, with a well-developed philosophy of life and the ability to use language well.

References

1. Daniel Fogarty, S. J., Roots for a New Rhetoric, p. 130.
2. Kenneth Burke, "Rhetoric--Old and New," Journal of General Education, V, p. 202.
3. Fogarty, pp. 92-115.
4. Ibid., p. 122.

5. Karl R. Wallace, "Towards a Rationale for teachers of Writing and Speaking," English Journal, L, p. 386.

For Further Reading

Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert Penn Warren. Modern Rhetoric, 2nd Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958.

Burke, Kenneth. "Rhetoric--Old and New." Journal of General Education, V (April, 1951), 202-209.

Fogarty, Daniel, S. J. Roots for a New Rhetoric. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Guth, Hans P. English Today and Tomorrow. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Ohmann, Richard. "In Lieu of a New Rhetoric." College English, XXVI (October, 1964), 17-22.

Richards, I. A. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Squire, James R. "Five Rules for Sequence." NEA Journal LIII (November, 1964), 14-16.

Wallace, Karl R. "The Primacy of Substance and Ideas in the Teaching of Practical Discourse." English Journal LIII (January, 1964), 1-9.

-------, "Towards a Rationale for Teachers of Writing and Speaking." English Journal, L (September, 1961), 384-391.

Walter, Otis M. "On Views of Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIX (December, 1963), 367-382.

WHAT MINNESOTA TEACHERS WANT IN ENGLISH INSTITUTES

By the MCTE Committee on English Institutes

(Last January the Minnesota Council asked John Maxwell, English consultant for the Minneapolis secondary schools, to supervise a survey of Minnesota elementary and secondary teachers to determine what they felt should be included in NDEA institutes for advanced study in English. Mr. Maxwell's general summary, adapted from the final report of the committee, is followed by summaries of the responses of elementary, junior high and senior high school English teachers.)

Those who work closely with teachers will not be surprised with the results of the survey on English Institutes which was carried out last spring. They will know, as the report reveals, that English teachers are heavily concerned with "how-to" matters. Generally, this kind of concern is heaviest at the elementary school but remains substantial even among high school teachers.

The survey reveals two prime concerns: how to teach composition and how to teach reading. These are matters which teachers are expected to be concerned about; but the survey shows something of the intensity of their concern and their desire for very specific help in coping with the problems.

There is a lesser but consistent desire to know more about language, both the content and the methodology for teaching it. No doubt much of this concern arises from the considerable professional discussion about linguistics and the "new"grammars.

Perhaps some will be discomfited by the general lack among teachers of a perceived need to know more about literature. While the critical observer might respond that teachers don't know their own deficiencies, the more sanguine will hold that the extensive treatment of literature in typical undergraduate programs and the general love of literature (which led so many into teaching English in the first place) make teachers more

secure about their capabilities as teachers of litera ture.

From the beginning of plans for NDEA institutes, i has been apparent that the colleges have presumed teach ers need to know more about English content. While thi may be true, and while the CEEB institute model ha tended to further this view among planners, the follow ing survey shows that teachers in elementary and second ary schools, by and large, are not aware of the presume relationship between more content and better teaching Colleges may wish to attend to this understanding.

The following pages are not intended to suggest th organization of future institutes. They are a summar of what teachers are concerned about. The hope implic it in these pages and the many reports on which they ar based is that the colleges and universities will mak substantial recognition of the problems of teaching a well as adding to the "furniture of the mind."

Concerns of Elementary Teachers
(Summary by Arthur Elfring, Robbinsdale Schools)

Faculties in seventeen elementary schools across th state showed major concern with problems of teachin composition and reading.

Teachers want to know how to help pupils write cre atively and organize their writing effectively. They want to know more about helping pupils gain variety in sentence structure and richness in written vocabulary. Some teachers want help in teaching discrete skills, particularly handwriting and spelling. A few thought the bases for evaluating children's writing are tenuous and need clarification.

Elementary teachers seem deeply concerned about the inability of students to read with understanding. When this inability exists, teachers observed, appreciation and interest in literature are impossible. There was a general wish to know up-to-date methods for increasing comprehension. Of associated concern is the problem of increasing the skills of listening. Some teachers want information about available materials in teaching chil-

dren's literature and a few want to develop their own skills in interpreting literature aloud.

The teaching of basic reading skills (word attack, phonics, structural analysis, etc.) is a third topic of concern. Teachers want to know what methods of teaching reading are most effective, how best to handle individual differences in reading, and what are the most valid instruments for evaluating reading achievement and ability.

There is concern about linguistics among many elementary teachers. What are the applications of linguistics to the elementary program? Does it offer means of improving usage patterns and punctuation? What implications exist for the teaching of grammar (i.e. structure) in elementary grades? What might constitute scope and sequence in grammar?

Half of the teachers indicated that they would like institutes organized to focus on increasing information on teaching all aspects of the language arts; the remaining half hoped they would be organized to deal with selected teaching problems. Teachers want help in dealing with the extremes in their classrooms, the gifted and the slow learner.

From the survey results, it seems apparent that if institutes are organized with clear understanding of the problems of elementary teachers, improved classroom performance can be expected.

Concerns of Junior High School Teachers
(Summary by Mrs. Cornelia Nachbar, Bloomington Schools)

Approximately two hundred teachers' voices were heard in the responses from thirty-two junior high schools across the state.

These faculties urged consideration of the unique problems of the junior high school teacher. While most of the teachers have specific academic specialties, they teach in schools which often maintain they should be "teaching a child not a subject." Confused perhaps by this arbitrary dichotomy of content and methods, teachers thought they needed more work in content--and then

spelled out their specific questions in terms of either methodology (how to go about doing something) or the establishment of choices (which course of procedure should be followed).

When speaking of content, teachers most frequently called for information on (1) composition, (2) structural linguistics or other courses in the "new" grammar, and (3) reading. A limited number identified such topics as children's literature and speech and communication.

Frequently, responses were perhaps irrelevant. Some made stirring statements about the appropriate goals of --for example--teaching literature; others included desperate pleas like "How do we cut down on the size of our classes?" or "can a substitute for book reports be found?" Perhaps the idea of the institutes was too novel for the respondents to be able to imagine what their purposes or benefits might be; hence, reactions were often confined to minutiae or extended to the impossibly general.

By far, the most concern was expressed about the teacher's preparation for teaching writing. It often was listed as the only crucial problem. Other concerns under methodology asked:

*How does the teacher present grammar, and what grammar should be taught?

*How can teachers do a better job of teaching reading?

*What literature should be taught to junior high school students and according to what sequence? What allowances should be made for individual differences in reading ability, maturity, and so on?

When asked "What English content should NDEA Institutes be concerned with?" teachers asked that information be given on (1) adolescent literature, (2) linguistics and history of language, and (3) composition (for themselves and how to teach it). Occasional responses asked for background in literature and dialectology and semantics; some wanted to know how to teach literature and reading to learn "new and varied approaches."

By more than a 2-to-1 margin, teachers in junior high strongly favored institutes organized to focus on teaching problems with relevant English content brought in, rather than content courses with attention paid to teaching problems. It is relevant to point out that teachers were quite emphatic in their plea for what they called "practical" institutes rather than ones concerned primarily with theory. A number believed that English teachers from secondary schools should be involved in institute planning and teaching.

A majority of teachers favored organizing an institute on a single teaching problem. The problems most frequently cited were teaching the slow learner and the gifted, teaching composition, and teaching block-time classes effectively (the slow learner problem was an overwhelming first choice).

The inescapable conclusion from most of these responses is that the 1965 NDEA institutes are not concerned with the kinds of problems that the junior high school teacher is most aware of. Except for a few specific courses, the teacher seems to feel that he has enough subject mastery for the level on which he is teaching, but he appears to need specific help in learning how to go about doing his work (particularly teaching writing) and how to decide what work should be done.

Concerns of Senior High School Teachers

(Summary by Mrs. Edna Sanders, Minneapolis Schools)

As might be expected, the problems of most high school teachers of English can be grouped under the headings of composition, language study, and reading. Composition ranks as the principal problem (by an insignificant margin) when teachers are asked what troubles them most. Knowledge about language has a slight edge when teachers are asked what they most need to learn.

A great majority prefer to take courses in which the emphasis is on increasing knowledge rather than focusing primarily on teaching problems. They approve courses with the "teaching problem" approach for those who deal specifically with the slow learner and the gifted; otherwise, they would like to see the problems they are wrestling with (scope and sequence, relative emphasis on

literature and composition, etc.) handled locally on the curriculum-building level (several asked whether NDEA assistance could not be provided for groups of teachers to work on tailor-made programs).

Although they want knowledge primarily (information and not exhortation), teachers expect NDEA institute courses to be taught by people who are aware of their teaching problems. Below, under the three main subject areas, are listed: first, the kinds of information needed, and second, the problems involved in teaching them.

COMPOSITION

1. Teachers themselves want to learn how to write.
2. They want criteria for evaluating composition.
3. They want to learn what research shows about writing.

When they return to their buildings they are faced with the problems of: (1) sequence, articulation; (2) the role of composition in the English program; (3) motivation; (4) relative role of exposition (over-emphasized, they say, in some schools; under-emphasized in others).

LANGUAGE

1. Information about the "new grammar."
2. History and development of language, etymology.
3. Semantics.

Related problems of methodology and organization: Teachers need

1. Materials on the three subjects listed above, written on the high school level to put into the students' hands.

2. They would like to hear the results of some research that would establish some solid facts about what should be taught. (What should be attempted in the teaching of usage? What are the basic or essential concepts to be taught about grammar? Does any teaching of grammar affect composition? If so, how?)

Back in the classroom, they will be concerned with motivation, scope and sequence, and--basic dilemma--whether language is to be taught as a separate discipline. If so, how can it be integrated? If not, how can it be articulated?

LITERATURE AND READING

1. Contemporary literature.
2. World literature.
3. The humanities.
4. Literary criticism.
5. Philosophy in literature (more a history of ideas than is typically included in the humanities approach).
6. How to teach reading at all levels. (This is a request for diagnostic, remedial, and development al techniques, specific "how-to's" for use in the heterogeneous class. They also ask for methods of stimulating the competent but lazy and undiscriminating readers--in these same classes.) This was not a "first" choice but it was mentioned on every questionnaire.

In the classroom, the problems encountered are all related in some way to the wide range of individual differences. What literature is suitable for the whole group? What techniques can be used to teach the "common" reading to different levels of ability? What materials does one use for multi-track reading? How does one juggle the tracks? Is any sequential program possible in literature?

MISCELLANEOUS

(On the whole these were requested less often than those mentioned above.)

1. Special education for slow learners and gifted (already mentioned).
2. Speech. (What is its place in the curriculum? Teach it as part of composition?)
3. Listening.
4. Use of new tools (all types of audio-visual material, also programmed).
5. Curriculum.
   A. for the non-college-bound
   B. enriched, accelerated, college preparatory

C. evaluation and revision of state course of study
D. core teaching, team teaching

SUGGESTIONS OFFERED BY TEACHERS

1. The obvious one--more specific information earlier about the institutes, the requirements, the content, and what follow-up is required or expected.
2. Suggestions, variously phrased, dealing with bringing the program closer to the high school. For example: (1) use a high school summer school as an experimental laboratory, (2) use high school facilities for a summer session, (3) send traveling experts to work with curriculum study groups in their own schools, (4) use more high school teachers as instructors, (5) offer afternoon and evening classes during the school year.
3. Short workshops, two to four weeks, for those who can't take a summer.
4. Although current emphasis on institutes for teachers with less than an English major or only a B.A. may be necessary, couldn't there be more opportunities for teachers who have had more work in English?

GLEANINGS

ACCORDING TO a representative of the U. S. Office of Education, the following (in that order) were the most commonly used books on language during this summer's NDEA English Institutes for Advanced Study:

1. Roberts, Paul. English Syntax. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
2. Allen, Harold B. Readings in Applied English Linguistics, Second Edition. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
3. Francis, W. Nelson. The Structure of American English. New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1958.

TWO STUDIES: HOW LANGUAGE DEVELOPS IN CHILDREN

By Barbara J. Nelson

(Patterns of development of language in children have implications for teaching in both elementary and secondary schools. Miss Nelson is a graduate student at the University of Minnesota.)

Walter Loban and Ruth G. Strickland have conducted separate longitudinal research projects concerning the language used by children in the kindergarten or first grade through sixth grade. Walter Loban's study was concerned with children's use and control of language, their effectiveness in communication, and the relationships among their oral, written, listening, and reading uses of language. Ruth Strickland's study was designed to analyze the structure of children's language in the first through the sixth grade, to compare it with the structure of the language in the books in which children are taught to read, and to ascertain, at a selected grade level, the influence of any apparent differences on the quality of children's reading skill.

A major hypothesis of the Strickland study was that a study of children's speech, its structure, and its patterns of arrangement and flow may offer suggestions for the construction of better reading textbooks for beginners and possibly for older children as well. Major questions guiding Loban's research were: (a) Just as in physical development, are there predictable stages of growth in language? (b) Can definite sequences in language development be identified? (c) How do children vary in ability with language and gain proficiency in using it?

The same new method of segmenting the subjects' oral language was used in both studies. To the syntactic and meaning approaches to language, the phonological approach was added. The resulting approach made maximum

use of both structure and meaning. First the subjects speech was segmented by oral intonation patterns int "phonological units." Second, "communication units," which are subdivisions of the larger phonological units, were identified by the semantic meaning being communica ted. Third, elements impossible to classify phonologic ally or semantically made up tangles of language calle "mazes," which were not counted as communication units. The material between parentheses is a maze: "...(an' an have to) I have to get my hair combed."

In the "First Level of Analysis" of the studies, com munication units were classified by a system of basi structural patterns, such as

Subject-Verb
Subject-Verb-Object
Subject-Linking Verb-Predicate Nominative

Nine patterns were discovered, showing the frequency and variety of structural patterns used by the subjects. To simplify this analysis, symbols were used: 1=Subject; 2=Verbs used as predicates; M=the movable parts of the sentence (words, phrases, or clauses with no fixed positions).

In the "Second Level of Analysis" the component parts of the patterns displayed at the first level were examined. For example, do some children use more subordinate patterns than others? What does study of a child's use of verbs reveal? What repertoire of movables does a child produce?

The Loban Study

In addition, the Loban study classified subjects' speech into such categories of function as Generalizations and Direct Questions. He also categorized such features of style as Fluent to Halting and Conventional in Usage to Unconventional in Usage. Four other methods of analysis derived from other research were applied: (1) amount of subordination, (2) classification of conventional usage, syntax, and grammar, (3) classification of vocabulary according to frequency of use in the language, and (4) classification of vocabulary according to diversity.

In addition to vocabulary tests, intelligence tests, and a test of ability to use subordinating connectors, the following ratings were procured: teachers' estimates of the subjects' language ability, reading ability, writing ability, socioeconomic status, health, and school attendance.

Subjects were 338 children chosen to represent a stratified sample of a larger universe of children; choice of subjects was based on representativeness of sex, racial background, spread of intellectual ability, and socioeconomic status.

A brief summary of the Loban findings:

A. Fluency with Language

1. During the first seven years of schooling, the subjects speak more words in each succeeding year of measurement. They also increase the number of communication units and the average number of words spoken in each unit. The high subject group uses more words and units than does the low group, maintains its initial superiority over those low in language ability, and uses a greater amount of subordination.

2. During the first four years of schooling, the lower group says less than the higher group and some members have more difficulty saying it (their average number of words in mazes increases), although the subjects as a whole decrease the number of mazes and words in mazes.

3. Both the low and high groups use the same number of words from among the 12,000 most commonly used words in the English language; the low group shows a higher incidence of words selected from the next 20,000; and the high group gains ascendancy in the use of the least commonly used words of the English language.

4. As measured by spoken style of language, the high group is significantly more fluent than a random group selected from the total sample, but their readiness of response does not differ from that in the random sample. The low group is less fluent than the random group and may be somewhat slower to respond in speech.

B. Effectiveness and Control

Except for the linking verb pattern (used more by t high group) and the use of sentence patterns that a incomplete (used more by the low group), the differenc in structural patterns of the two groups are negligibl However, one of the important findings of the study w that at this level of language development, not patte but what is done to achieve flexibility within the pa tern proves to be a measure of effectiveness and contr of language. For example, the nominals and movable e ements show marked differences when low and high grou are compared.

C. Conventional Usage and Grammar

In the elementary school, difficulty with use verbs is the most frequent kind of deviation from co ventional usage. One major problem is concord; anoth is consistency of verb tense. Subjects rated most pr ficient in language are also those who manifest the mo sensitivity to the conventions of language.

D. Tentative Thinking Through the Use of Provisional a Conditional Statements

Those subjects most proficient with language are t ones who most frequently use language to express tenta tiveness.

E. Reading and Writing

Those high in general language ability are also hig in reading ability; those low in general language abili ty are also low in reading ability. The gap between th two groups widens from year to year. Writing ability i related to socioeconomic position; those in the highes three socioeconomic categories rated above average i writing while those in the four lowest socioeconomi categories rated below average in writing.

F. Coherence of Spoken Style

The high ability group seems to be no more coheren in spoken style than a random group, whereas the lo group is less coherent than the random group.

G. Interrelations Among the Language Arts

In this study, reading, writing, listening, and speaking show a positive relation. Subjects in the lowest and highest quartiles in writing are also lower and higher in reading achievement. The highest correlation in the study is between vocabulary and intelligence as measured by the Kuhlmann-Anderson group test of intelligence, where the product-moment correlation is .884. Vocabulary, success with group tests of intelligence, and proficiency with language constitute a cluster of traits (or possibly, they are different manifestations of the same trait).

Some of the implications of Loban's findings:

1. Teachers could use the research design utilizedby Loban in analyzing their student's language.
2. Future research in language will probably develop and use Noam Chomsky's transformational analysis.
3. Clear stages of development in children's language are as yet unmarked.
4. Since, at this level, not basic sentence pattern but what is done to achieve flexibility within pattern proves to be a measure of proficiency, teachers can best aid pupils' expression when individuals or small groups with similar problems are helped to see how their own expression can be improved. Teachers should be guided by research in determining what to emphasize or to ignore; that is, they would need to be aware of the structural problems behind the semantic difficulties.
5. Instruction should do more with oral language,because students lacking skill in using speech will have difficulty in mastering written tradition. Competence in spoken language appears to be a necessary base for competence in writing and reading. Teachers could use tape recorders, and in the future they might use television tapes, which are now being designed for mass production. Gleason's suggestion that the separation of speech and English is absurd is well founded, it seems. Perhaps in the future English teachers will have more training in speech.
6. Language proficiency may be culturally as well as individually determined. Perhaps children from lower socioeconomic groups should be encouraged to do more

reading in class.

7. The positive relation between oral language and listening suggests that teachers might spend more time improving students' abilities to attend to what is said.

8. Future research is needed on the extent to which interrelations exist among the language arts.

9. It is probable that different aptitudes in language require different teaching techniques.

10. Teaching practice in the primary schools should not keep most students at the same reading tasks.

The Strickland Study

Ruth Strickland studied 575 children selected by random sampling, and schools from which students were enrolled covered the ethnic and socio-economic range of the community. The sample for some grades, however, was skewed somewhat toward the upper level in intelligence, occupational status, and parental education.

Some conclusions of the study:

A. Comparison of the Language Used by Children with the Language of Reading Textbooks

1. There appeared to be no scheme for the development of control over sentence structure which paralleled the generally accepted scheme for the development of control over vocabulary.

2. The basic subject-verb-object pattern was the only pattern to appear in the samples of practically all of the books.

B. Relationship of Language to Reading and Listening at Sixth Grade

1. The question of relationships between children's use of oral language and the skill they develop in oral and silent reading is one which seems to need study.

2. Children who ranked high in silent reading comprehension, oral reading interpretation, and listening comprehension made more use of the common structural patterns than did children who ranked low on these variables.

C. Relationship of Children's Oral Language to Textbook Language

The oral language children use is far more advanced than the language of the books in which they are taught to read. Evidence is needed as to whether children would be aided or hindered by the use of sentences in their books more like the sentences they use in their speech.

D. Importance of Phonological Study

It is possible that children need help in recognizing and understanding the entire phonemic scheme of English, both basic phonemes and suprasegmental phonemes of pitch, stress, and juncture.

A Suggestion for Teachers

Since the research indicates that children in elementary school have oral command of all the complex sentence patterns that they are likely to use, writing programs need to be developed which build on such understanding and use. One method might be for a child to speak to the class for five minutes or so while the rest of the students write down what they think the topic sentence is. Their judgments could be given to the speaker so that he could analyze the effectiveness of his speech and improve it. Immediate feedback would be provided in this way.

For Further Reading

Loban, Walter D. The Language of Elementary School Children. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963 (Research Monograph No. 1).

Strickland, Ruth G. The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relation to Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children. Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, 38 (July, 1962).

FROM THE PRESIDENT

By Philip R. Sauer
Bemidji State College

This first issue of Minnesota English fulfills a long-cherished dream, a hope that some day our Minnesota Council might have an official journal. Officers and members of the Council have long felt that the Minnesota English Newsletter, so well edited by Thomas Bacig and Rodger Kemp, had evolved to the point where it should become a scholarly publication. Such a journal would then be devoted to articles of lasting pertinence on the teaching of the language arts at all levels. It would become a clearing house for venturesome new ideas. Its aim would be to improve English teaching in our state. It would keep members informed of new developments and would allow them to share their research.

Although Minnesota has been recognized as a leader in the field of English, having produced several eminent NCTE presidents as well as erudite scholars, there has up to now been no one who would devote his time and energies to the editing of such a journal. The Council therefore feels pride in the fact that Stan Kegler and Duane Scribner have agreed to edit Minnesota English. Both men are highly qualified leaders in the field. Kegler's work as a director of Project English at the University of Minnesota as well as his leadership in the National Council is well known. Scribner as immediate past president of MCTE and a faculty member at Moorhead State College has also established a fine reputation among teachers of English

With these two editors at the helm all members of the Council share with me, I am sure, the conviction that this new enterprise has been well launched and has the promise of a bright future. We all feel, moreover, deeply grateful to the first co-editors of our new journal. "Now, by St. Paul, the Work Goes Bravely on!"

FROM THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

By Anna Lee Stensland
University of Minnesota-Duluth

THE NEW Minnesota English is only one sign that the Council is on the move. The organization ended the last year with about 1200 members, which should be a force of some influence in the state. The three fine regional conferences held in the fall of 1964 carried the organization to schools in areas of the state which had not heard of the Council. The Morris Conference brought together teachers from the western areas of the state, the Bemidji Conference penetrated isolated schools in the north, and the Rochester Conference carried the Council to elementary and secondary teachers in the southeast.

The awarding of six summer NDEA institutes to the state demonstrated the alertness of Minnesota colleges to English problems. This past summer saw the completion of the report of the Committee to Advise on NDEA Institutes and the circulation among colleges of the successful 1965 proposals, all of which should make the 1966 institutes even better.

The new school year begins with the NCTE-MCTE co-sponsored Conference on the State of English, which should result in recommendations, reports and perhaps resolutions on three very significant issues: teacher awareness of new developments in English, teacher load, and certification and preparation of teachers of English.

All of these developments are directed toward one main goal: better communication and exchange among English and language arts teachers. The mail to this office continues to mount, but too much of it is simply routine--memberships, requests for information, and registrations for conferences. This is necessary and we want it to increase, but might I suggest that you also communicate to this office your concerns, suggestions for projects, and, yes, your complaints too. What seem to you to be very obvious problems or projects may go unnoticed by your executive committee because of our ge-

ographical locations or our differing positions on the educational spectrum. If you have a concern or a pet project, why not write the executive secretary? Minnesota Council may not be able to do anything about it, but your executive committee will listen and consider.

MINNESOTA COUNCIL does not yet have a location for the Spring Conference at the end of April or the first of May. A decision should be made at the Advisory Board meeting at the end of October. Is anyone willing?

FROM THE EDITORS

With this issue, Minnesota English begins what its editors hope will be steady growth in size, quality, and appearance. Two more issues (in January and April) are planned for this year, to be supplemented by the Minnesota English Newsletter.

For this first issue we have tried to provide, from what was easily available, articles which would be of interest at several levels and which would deal with a variety of subjects. Future journals will continue to publish such articles, and we hope that so many manuscripts on so many subjects reach our office that the editorial decisions will be difficult and continuing significant attention can be paid to the problems and promises of teaching English in Minnesota.

Minnesota English has several purposes. It should provide communication among members of the Council in particular and teachers of English in general. It should publish information about research, curriculum development, and useful practices for Minnesota schools. We hope that it can also provide a respectable medium for the publication of worthwhile articles by English teachers at all levels in Minnesota.

We hope Minnesota English will stimulate you to respond in some way. We need articles and reviews, information and opinions about teaching English in Minnesota. Most of all, we need ideas. Don't be bashful.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Fall, 1965

Oct. 1	State Dept. Workshop on Use of Overhead Projector	Worthington
1-2	MCTE-NCTE Co-Sponsored Conference (Invitational)	Robbinsdale
7-8	NEMEA English Section	Hibbing
14-15	NMEA English Section	Bemidji
	SEMEA English Section	Rochester
	WMEA English Section	Moorhead
15	State Dept. Workshop on Use of the Newspaper	Brainerd
21	MFT State English Luncheon	St. Paul
21-22	CMEA English Section	St. Cloud
	Cap-Henn MEA English Section	St. Paul
	SWMEA English Section	Mankato
29	Newspaper Workshop	Marshall
Nov. 5	Overhead Projector Workshop	Rochester
12	Newspaper Workshop	Benson
19	Overhead Projector Workshop	St. Cloud
25-27	Annual NCTE Convention	Boston
Dec. 3	Newspaper Workshop	Wayzata
10	Overhead Projector Workshop	Burnsville
17	Newspaper Workshop	Mankato
27-29	Annual MLA Convention	Chicago
Jan. 14	Overhead Projector Workshop	Mounds View
21	Overhead Projector Workshop	Duluth

Minnesota English is a member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement