minnesota english

University of Minnesota
JAN 13 967
Duluth Campus Library

Volume III, No. 1
January, 1967

MCTE

minnesota council of teachers of english

minnesota english

Journal of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English

Volume III, No. 1 January, 1967

CO-EDITORS: Stanley B. Kegler and Duane C. Scribner
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

THE MINNESOTA COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

PRESIDENT: Gloria Erwin, Stillwater Senior High School

VICE-PRESIDENT: Brother H. Raphael, St. Mary's College, Winona

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Anna Lee Stensland, University of Minnesota, Duluth

TREASURER: Bruce Aunan, Central High School, Duluth

CHAIRMAN OF EDITORIAL BOARD: Edna Downing, Sanford Junior High School, Minneapolis

Annual membership of $2.50 for teachers, $.50 for students includes publications. MCTE is an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English, open to elementary, secondary, and college teachers and others interested in improving the teaching of English. Membership is available from Anna Lee Stensland, MCTE Executive Secretary, 413 Humanities Building, University of Minnesota--Duluth, Duluth 55812. Manuscripts and other correspondence concerning Minnesota English should be sent to Duane Scribner, Peik Hall, University of Minnesota--Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement

LANGUAGE PROGRAMS FOR THE SEVENTIES

J. N. Hook

Jo29 '67
Feb 13'68
My 8'68

(For both elementary and secondary teachers, this article looks at current developments in school language study by way of an imaginary journey to the future. Dr. Hook, professor of English at the University of Illinois, was keynote speaker at the MCTE Fall Regional Workshop at Mankato.)

Come with me, please, into the year 1976, the two hundredth anniversary of the American Revolution. We shall talk about classrooms with programs designed to effect another kind of revolution, a revolution in the teaching of the English language--the language of George Washington, of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Whitman, of Lincoln and Churchill and Kennedy, the first or second language of almost a billion of the earth's inhabitants in 1976.

In the 1950's and 1960's it became increasingly apparent to Earthlings that for mutual ease of communication it was highly desirable for most or all to share a common tongue. Once Latin had served this purpose for the well-educated of the so-called civilized world, meaning, in the semantics of that time, in main the countries of Western Europe. A scholar could travel in England, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, parts of Middle Europe, and Scandinavia, and be understood by fellow-scholars in all those countries because he and they both knew Latin. He could not, however, speak with the peasants or the other unschooled ones. Some internationally minded business men also used Latin as a medium for conducting their affairs.

Gradually, though, the use of Latin declined. In the days of Spanish power and then of French power, pockets of Spanish and French speakers came into existence almost around the globe. And then explorers from some islands just west of the European mainland began probing the far corners of the earth. Many of them settled abroad--in North America, in parts of South America, in Africa, in parts of Asia, in Australia. Their language, English, became the official tongue in some of these lands. And people in other lands found it useful for them to learn it, too. By the early 1960's perhaps as many as a third of

the world's inhabitants had at least a smattering of English. In Scandinavian countries, every child studied it, because English was the language of trade, and Scandinavia was dependent on trade. In Russia it was more widely studied than any other foreign language. Japan had eighty thousand teachers of English, four-fifths as many as taught it in the secondary schools of the United States. In India, even after independence, English was a standard school subject. In Peru and Colombia public address systems broadcast English lessons to people sitting on benches in the town square. English lessons appeared in hundreds of daily papers around the world. English was one of the official languages of the United Nations. And in 1966, William Benton, United States ambassador to UNESCO, recommended that English be designated the semi-official second language of the world, despite the outraged protests of Charles DeGaulle of France, who believed that French should be chosen.

Through the early 1960's the United States government had become increasingly aware that language could be a force for international understanding and had begun expending money on teaching English abroad. It set up libraries in foreign countries; some of them were pillaged and burned, but others remained. It sent teachers abroad to teach other teachers some of the best ways to give instruction in English; they went to Africa, to Asia, to South America, to the islands of the Pacific. Its soldiers picked up a few words of the languages of the countries in which they were stationed, and the natives of the countries learned still more English. The Center for Applied Linguistics encouraged scholarly research in the learning and teaching of English while it helped Americans to learn how to learn foreign languages. The United States Information Agency sponsored series of English textbooks for study abroad, and provided leadership so that emerging nations of Africa or developing nations of Asia and South America could master this tool of international communication and trade. Even Russia helped in the teaching of English; she prepared her own English textbooks for use abroad, with their built-in lessons in opposition to "American imperialism."

By 1976 the work of some fifteen years has begun to show results. An American or British traveler can go almost anywhere in the world and be confident that he can order a meal or talk about the weather and be understood. Only in the remote fastnesses of China or central Africa might he find no one with whom to converse.

The method used in teaching English to the hundreds of millions in foreign countries emphasizes the oral language. This is the natural way to learn a language. The infant obviously does not learn his native language by studying its grammar and reading it. His mother does not say to him, "A noun is the name of a person, place, or thing." Instead, she says, "Ball. See the ball. Do you want the ball? This is a ball. I'll roll the ball to you. Roll the ball to me." After a while, the infant says, "Baw," and he's on his way. Soon he, too, through imitation first of words and then of the sentence patterns he hears--soon he will be saying, "Roll the ball." Later, as he grows older, his sentences will become more complex. By the time he reaches school age, he will be using most of the sentence forms that adults use, yet he has not encountered a grammatical term and probably has not read more than a few words.

English Teaching in the U.S.A.

The teaching of English in foreign countries has influenced the teaching of English in the United States in 1976. Language is basically a spoken thing. Even the word language goes back to the Latin word for tongue, not to the Latin word for pen. But during most of our educational history, after the first or second grade, we ceased emphasizing the spoken language and stressed the written and printed forms. Study of grammar, the description of the language, is abstract, Dora V. Smith has pointed out that the technical study of grammar is as abstruse a subject as the calculus in mathematics. But in years gone by, even elementary school youngsters have had to parse and diagram sentences.

Now, though, in 1976, the emphasis has changed. In the grades, children practice orally the patterns that are least familiar or most difficult for them. They play with sentences, seeing which parts fit together, which are movable, which incapable of being shifted from one place to another. They supplement oral practice, in the lower

grades, by "rolling readers," developed in part by Priscilla Tyler. These are small cubes, with a single word printed on each face. The child rolls the cubes in a certain order, and a sentence results. He reads the sentence, rolls again, and a different sentence comes up. But he finds that if he changes the order in which he rolls the cubes, there is no sentence--just nonsense. The seven-year-old thus learns a basic fact about the English language: word order is important. It is the guiding principle of the whole language. In earlier instruction, often based on the teaching of Latin, word order was not stressed. For that reason, a number of problems in sentence structure remained with children for the rest of their lives. Dangling modifiers, squinting modifiers, and countless other kinds of incoherence result from lack of a clear understanding of the principles of word order.

Teaching Usage in 1976

Matters of usage, in 1976, are also approached largely through oral practice. The child whose parents say "Me and him was walkin' along," the experience of many years has shown us, is not likely to be converted to "He and I were walking along" by grammatical analysis of the pronouns and the verb. But when through games and oral repetition the child has heard many times "He and I were walking along" that sentence comes to seem natural to him; he begins using it and other sentences like it in school; eventually it becomes part of his language. At home he may still conform to the usage of his parents, because conformity is important to him; he feels the need to belong in his environment, and language conformity is essential to belonging.

This brings us to another facet of the English language teaching of the 1970's. In earlier times, when a child said "ain't" or "Me and him was walkin' along," his teacher told him that his language was wrong. "There's no such word as ain't," many teachers said. The child, in his infinite wisdom, knew better; of course there was such a word as ain't; he heard it every day; he could even find it in the dictionary. And why should the teacher say that it was wrong to say "Me and him was walkin' along"? His parents said things like that. His friends said it. Why

should the teacher say that his parents were wrong? What made the teacher's language always right and his own language and that of his world wrong?

The schools of the 1970's, in contrast, do not make much use of the words right and wrong. The teachers do talk a lot about dialects. They say that everyone speaks a dialect or several dialects. In fact, every person speaks at least a little differently from every other person. He has his own personal dialect, or idiolect. Dialects vary according to regions of a country. They vary also in smaller regions. Chicago has its own speech peculiarities; so has Philadelphia, or New York, or Minneapolis. Rural Minnesota has some speech oddities infrequently heard in the Twin Cities. In England, when one travels from one shire to another, he notices considerable change in dialect. In Yorkshire, different parts of the shire have very different speech habits. Dialects vary also with time. Middle English differs in many ways from Modern English; the double negative, now largely frowned upon in formal English, was a perfectly acceptable construction in Chaucer's day. Old English is almost as different from Modern English as if it were a foreign language. Even eighteenth-century English varied in many ways from Modern English. In pronunciation, for instance, one usually heard tay for tea, jine for join, Lunnon for London, goold for gold. In syntax, the eighteenth century seldom used the passive voice; one did not say, "The house in being built." Instead, it was "The house is building."

Some Other Differences

So students are shown that dialects differ according to geography and according to time. They differ also in other ways. We shift dialects depending upon where we are and whom we are talking with. The language we use at a ball game is not the same as that we use on a more formal occasion. And we use somewhat different language in talking to a child than we use in talking to a grandmother, a still different one in talking to grandfather, and others when we are talking with a lawyer or a bank president or a possible employer.

Dialects vary also in prestige, we teach our children. In the courts of kings in centuries gone by, the language

of the king and courtiers was the most prestigious. It is said that the lisped Spanish c, as in Barcelona (Barthelona), is due to a speech defect of a Spanish king; his courtiers wanted to talk as the king did, and other people imitated the courtiers, so many Spaniards even today say Barthelona. In the United States, too, some dialect forms are more prestigious than others. Ain't isn't wrong, but it happens that in the twentieth century it is frowned upon by most users of the prestige dialect. "Me and him was walkin' along" happens now not to be prestigious, though it is perfectly clear. The etiquette of the prestige dialect demands that as a rule we refer to the other person before we refer to ourselves; it also says that him and me are used in some parts of a sentence but not in other parts. And it says that in some circumstances we use one form of be (was), in other circumstances we use another form (were).

The prestige dialect is no more "right" than any other, but there are many times when we should be able to use it. We let our students realize that this dialect will be demanded if they go to college, that many employers insist upon it, that front doors open to its users, and that users of nonprestigious dialects may have to go to the back of the house. We do not try to eradicate the children's non-prestigious dialect forms, we do not say that their parents who use those forms are in the wrong, but we do try to make it possible for them to know the prestigious ones, to practice using them, and hopefully to switch as easily to these forms as they switch dialects when they go to a ball game or talk with someone not their own age.

Grammar in 1976

Teachers in the 1970's teach grammar, too. The developments here have been very interesting. For years teachers taught what has come to be called traditional grammar. This was essentially a grammar based upon Latin, despite the fact that English is a Teutonic language, not a Romance language. It had strengths and weaknesses. Its strength was that it was a relatively complete system, developed over many years, and capable of describing after a fashion almost any sentence in the language. Its weaknesses were that its classifications were sometimes faulty, as when schoolbooks placed words like very and words like suddenly into the same category, adverbs, even though these words are used in quite unlike ways; second, its definitions were often inadequate, for example "A sentence is a group of words expressing a complete thought" (a sentence is not necessarily a group of words, and nobody knows what a complete thought is); third, it pays no attention to the basically spoken nature of language; and fourth, it fails to recognize the kernel sentences from which all others are formed.

The structuralist grammarians, in contrast, emphasized the oral language. They discovered elaborate principles of phonology, including the suprasegmentals of stress, pitch, and juncture that contribute so much to our making ourselves understood when we speak. They consistently stressed form rather than meaning; whereas the traditionalists defined a noun, for example, in terms of its meaning, the structuralists defined it in terms of the form changes and the structures, the environments, that are characteristic of the noun. They paid much less attention to syntax than to morphology. This, together with their lack of emphasis on meaning, was their greatest weakness.

The generative or transformational grammarian, in contrast, emphasized syntax. He found that basically the English sentence is a simple statement, a kernel. Through a number of changes that can be precisely described (called transformations), negative structures, questions, and other variations are possible; they all are built upon a relatively small number of kernels. The transformationalists have described sentence structure in such precise mathematical terms that now, in the 1970's, they have made machine translation not only possible but also readable and idiomatic, and they have programmed computers that can "write" complex explanations at unbelievable speeds or even compose formula stories and write poetry. Unfortunately for teaching purposes, transformational grammar has become so complex by 1976 that only graduate mathematicians and linguistic specialists can understand it, and none of them all of it.

So the schools have had to form their own grammar, and the task is still going on. Our school grammar of 1976 is a blend of traditional, structural, and transformational. Traditional has supplied much of the terminology; struc-

tural has presented the oral elements, especially pitch, stress, and juncture, and has clarified morphology; transformational has provided most of the syntax.

Some false conceptions about the reasons for teaching grammar have been eliminated in 1976. Teachers used to believe that if students could cerebrally comprehend grammar, they would inevitably write and speak "better." Despite many studies that revealed that grammatical understanding was no guarantee of "good" usage, teachers kept on doggedly, sure in their own minds that the researchers must be wrong. We now regard grammar as basically a cultural study. Language is one of man's greatest possessions, and any person who claims to be educated should know how it works. Beyond that, some still believe, grammatical knowledge may help some students to become at home with some of the less usual sentence forms, and to improve their own writing on the more sophisticated levels. Also, a detailed knowledge of grammar contributes to ease in reading poetry or other difficult literature.

So in 1976 we still teach grammar, but not for exactly the same reasons that we once did.

Rhetoric in 1976

The boundaries between grammar and rhetoric have meanwhile become somewhat blurred, thanks to the research of such men as Kellogg Hunt and Francis Christensen. Hunt, in 1962 to 1964, examined sentences written by fourth graders, eighth graders, twelfth graders, and professional writers. Differences in the sentences written by these various groups were not mainly in length. Fourth-graders, who tend to string ideas together with and or so, write sentences about as long as those of older students and professional writers. The difference lies in the degree of compactness of sentences. A twelfth-grader or a professional writer crams more ideas, more information, into a sentence of twenty words than does the fourth-grader. He has mastered such subordinating devices as the phrase or the dependent clause or the appositive; he often reduces a whole sentence to a phrase or even a single word. The fourth-grader writes, "I saw a dog, and it was big and brown." The twelfth-grader or often even the eighth-grader writes, "I saw a big, brown dog." As a result of the

work of Hunt and others, in our teaching we now place much more emphasis on combination of independent elements, on subordination, on compactness of expression. Our students therefore often write sentences that are rhetorically more effective than those most students wrote in the sixties.

Francis Christensen in the sixties pointed out that in our stress upon the basic parts of a sentence--subject, verb, and complement--we often overlooked or minimized the importance of modifiers. These modifiers, he demonstrated, are often what give a sentence its life. They determine the tone, the style, often the meaning. He illustrated by taking a passage from a professional writer like Walter Van Tilburg Clark, stripping it to its essentials, eliminating the subordinate elements and most of the descriptive terms. The style became dull, choppy, lifeless. The reinsertion of the modifiers brought it back to life. Many, perhaps most, of our students used to write stripped-down sentences. Teachers now, in the seventies, try to help them to see the details that should be added and to insert those details in rhetorically effective sentences.

Some Changes in Methods

Classroom methods have also changed greatly in the past decade or so. Though the closed-in classroom, one teacher facing thirty or so students at the same hour day after day, is still with us, it is by no means the universal that it once was. The emphasis has been increasingly placed upon giving each student what he needs most at a particular time. In the old days, if five students in a class of thirty did not understand the use of the semicolon, we gave instruction in the semicolon to everybody, even though five-sixths of our students were wasting their time. Today, upon identifying the five students who need work on the semicolon, we place before them a piece of programed material that in a few minutes teaches them the semicolon inductively and gives them practice in its use. Meanwhile the other twenty-five are working on other programed materials, either more or less sophisticated, that they as individuals need. Programing does not work well with everything; in literature, for example, it is useful mainly in teaching certain concepts such as plot devices,

or the identification of certain literary items such as meter or metaphor. A program often gets in the way of appreciation, and hence has limited use in the teaching of literature. But it can be used extensively in the teaching of some facets of language. Grammar can be programed. Usage can be improved through programing, especially when the program is supplemented by oral work. Punctuation can be taught by programing, and the programing can be reinforced by oral work stressing juncture. Spelling, though still a problem, can be programed, and instruction via programed spelling is much more individual than in the conventional method of handing everybody the same list on Monday and giving a test on Friday. Vocabulary can also be strengthened through programing. One eighth grade in Manhasset, New York, for instance, through a program came to be quickly at home with many useful but fairly difficult words such as composure or juxtaposed.

A Variety of Equipment

Besides programing, schools are using other relatively new devices. Thanks to federal help, most classrooms are much better equipped in the 1970's than they used to be. Record players, tape recorders, television sets, film and film-strip projectors, and opaque and overhead projectors are standard equipment in most schools. Almost every English classroom has a room library, with many of the books changed frequently; the room has a dictionary for every child and single copies of other useful reference books. The biggest problem that some teachers face is choosing from the wealth of films, slides, transparencies, programed instructional materials, books, and other materials that have become available. As a result, many school systems now employ media specialists whose principal function is to screen possibly useful material and tentatively recommend certain items for the more careful consideration of the teachers in the various departments.

Some of the more advanced schools in 1976 have installed computer-controlled learning rooms. A learning room is a small cubicle, just large enough for one student and equipped with earphones, a small TV-like screen, and a microfilm reader. The student enters the room and dials the call number of material he or his teacher believes he should use. What happens next depends upon the nature of the material. The computer center electronically takes the necessary steps. If a film is to be viewed, it appears on the screen. If the material is a lecture or lecturette, the sound comes through the earphones. If it is programed instruction, the screen may once more be used, or else the microfilm reader. If it is a book, the pages appear on either the screen or the reader, and the student "turns the pages" by pressing a button.

Team teaching is also used in many of our schools. The experiments of the sixties, though not uniformly successful, did show that some material may be effectively presented in large groups, that some things necessitate small group discussion and practice, and that some may be most effectively studied by individuals. Today we know more about what fits best into each type of instruction. Team teaching is not more economical than other instruction, but it does have the value that it can take advantage of special faculty strengths. Thus a teacher who is especially well grounded in the English language may play a leading role there, perhaps conducting the large-group sessions and planning the discussion groups and individual work in language. Other experts take the lead in other parts of the total English program.

As I said before, the stress in 1976 is on helping each individual student where he most needs help. Wide adoption of non-graded school plans has helped to facilitate this development. We have long known, for example, that thirty twelve-year-olds will have almost thirty different degrees of readiness for various parts of our instruction. Yet in the past all students had to move in the same lockstep fashion through every grade. In the non-graded school, though the system provides tremendous problems in scheduling, a student's age or his year in school does not determine what he studies, Instead, the stage he has reached in his own educational development is the major determinant. He is placed with other students who have reached about the same level, regardless of their chronological age, and, as I have said, a considerable share of his time is spent in individual work.

Two of the most important parts of the language program in 1976 I have not yet mentioned. One of these is the history of the language; the other is lexicology.

The English language has a fascinating history, and its relationships with other of the world's languages are also interesting. In the elementary schools in the seventies, when children are studying about other countries, something is usually said about the languages of those countries. If they are related to English, the relationships are pointed out. Thus the other Teutonic languages--particularly German and the Scandinavian languages--may be called sister languages. The Romance languages--Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Rumanian--are among the cousins of English. More distant cousins include Greek, Russian and other Slavic languages, Iranian, and even some of the languages of India. Older children may draw trees of language to illustrate how all the branches I have named, and still more, have grown from a single root and trunk. And since English has borrowed heavily from many languages--not just the Latin and Greek and French of which we are likely to think--students in junior or senior high school may study some of those borrowings and perhaps draw a river to represent the English language, with tributaries of other languages feeding in--first Celtic, then Latin, then Danish, then French, then more Latin and some Greek, then Dutch and Italian and Spanish, and finally a large number of smaller tributaries representing many other of the world's nations. The source of the river, of course--the Lake Itasca of English--lies in Northern Teutonic, the north part of Germany and the Scandinavian countries from which the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes emigrated to the British Isles. Such study is not wasteful of time. It adds some words to students' vocabularies, it is a reflection of historical developments, and it shows some of the interchange that has long gone on between speakers of English and speakers of other languages. It is an important contribution to the culture and to the human awareness of our young people.

The history of the English language, in addition to revealing borrowings from abroad, has other cultural and intellectual values. One is that it helps to account for the existence of dialects, about which I talked earlier. Another is that it demonstrates the fact that language is constantly changing. Nothing can be done to halt the forces of change. As long as users of a language exist, it will change, because the users are themselves undergoing

change, having new experiences, developing new ideas, using new tools, finding new means of entertainment. The history of the language also reveals and explains many of the characteristics of the language, such as why so many of our short, everyday words are among the oldest, why most musical terms are Italian, why homonyms exist, how a word has changed its meaning over the years, how fashions in slang change almost as rapidly as fashions in dress, how people and places got their names, or how sentence patterns have evolved through the centuries. This kind of information makes students more aware of what they are doing when they speak or write; it makes them more meticulous in their use of language and more appreciative as consumers of language--for example, as readers of literature.

The New Lexicology

The last feature of English language instruction that I wish to discuss is lexicology. This term was seldom used ten years ago, in 1966. It is used now to refer to all facets of the study of words; semantics, vocabulary development, derivation, application, dictionary making, and stylistic effects dependent on selection of words. Thus it is much broader than lexicography, a term with which it was once confused.

Many children and youth can be fascinated by words. The interesting stories of word origins appeal to them--for example, abundance; unda in that word is Latin for ocean or waves; abundance pertains to plenty, and nothing on earth is more plentiful than the waves of the ocean. The child who adds abundance to his vocabulary, or reinforces its meaning for himself, also adds abundant, abundantly, and possible undulant, undulate, undulation, inundate, and even redundant. In our classes the teachers and students often talk about words. They experiment with them in sentences, noting the effects of using this word or that. They talk about why a professional writer chose this word instead of another. Interest in words is constant, not just something that appears in an isolated unit now and then.

Dictionary-making, or lexicography, is another facet of lexicology. Much of the furor over the Third Edition of

Webster's, in the early sixties, was caused by popular ignorance of lexicography. Our students now learn that dictionaries are intended to describe, not regulate. They learn also how lexicographers work, how they determine a word's meaning, and the other information they present. Students prepare their own definitions; they compile their own dictionaries of teen-age slang or other specialized topics. They thus become knowledgeable about dictionaries and simultaneously increase their knowledge of words.

The study of semantics has been revived in the seventies. It was a popular subject in the late forties and early fifties, and then became much less so. Basically, semantics shows the ways by which language can move men. It distinguishes reportorial language from the language of emotion. It explores connotations and not just denotations. Its study is important for the student as a user language and as a reader of literature. Teachers of the sixties, we now believe, were mistaken to reduce their emphasis on semantics.

The English language program of the seventies differs generally from that of earlier decades in being richer. All through the nineteenth century and the first six decades of the twentieth, with the exception of the classes of a few unusual teachers, the language program was an impoverished one. It consisted mainly of grammar and usage, with only incidental attention to the other aspects. It ignored the richness inherent in the language. It repeated grammatical analysis and usage rules ad nauseam. In many schools the language program used to be essentially a negative one, whose chief purpose was to tell students what they should not do. Our language programs in the seventies, in contrast, are affirmative. They offer students a rich diet of information about dialect, history of the language, lexicology, usage, and grammar, They engage students in constructive tasks, not just the correction of error.

At the beginning I said that English in the seventies is being used increasingly around the world, that it is the major language of international communication. As the several hundred million native speakers of English learn more about it and use it with increasing effectiveness, they serve not only themselves but also the cause of increasing understanding among the peoples of the globe.

LET'S TEACH COMPOSITION --IMPRACTICALLY

Gene L. Piche

(Can some other justification than practicality be found for the teaching of composition? Mr. Piche, a lecturer in secondary education at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, explored this question at the MCTE Fall Regional Workshop at Detroit Lakes.)

Let me take as a theme for these remarks a quotation from Kenneth Burke's most provocative essay, "A Linguistic Approach to the Philosophy of Education."

> And there is always the aura of promise in education, a promise implied when it is not made explicit . . . . Courses in vocational training draw especially on such hopefulness, on the willingness of the student-customer to be assured that if he takes the course, he will somehow have a much better chance . . . to experience the deliciously immoral thrill that occurs when a slight gesture made accidentally at the right time, disproportionately calls forth an abrupt unloosening, an indecent downpour of revenue.[1]

Now it may be difficult to guess in just what terms I'm applying Mr. Burke's observation. Most of us don't find either the unloosening or the revenue achieved in teaching composition engagingly illicit. Nevertheless, his subtle cut at a preoccupation with the "practical" is, I think, relevant. But that's giving you the judgment before arguing the case.

To attempt the case I'd like to begin by pointing to certain developments in the history of teaching composition which emerged during the last quarter of the last century. A conspicuous feature of that teaching and the rhetorical theory on which it rested was its acceptance of a utilitarian objective consonant with larger social and economic factors contributing to the rise of English as a school subject. The theory, itself, represented a considerable narrowing of the traditional body of rhetorical information and precept. That restricted theory, along with

an avowedly practical objective, impelled us toward mechanical estimates of literacy and made it difficult to think of our subject as possessing any ordered, coherent structure. It has led, to paraphrase Mr. Burke, from our putting composition too exclusively under the "sign of the promissory."

* * * * *

I.

The teaching of reading, writing and speaking took place over long centuries of Western educational history within the boundaries of the trivium of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic or logic. By the time of the Renaissance, the capstone of those studies was rhetoric. And rhetoric from antiquity had provided a body of theory and advice underlying the production and criticism of language invested with a social purpose. It included a theory of inquiry or invention, closely allied to logic, which helped the student to discover what to say and what best to say about it. It also included a theory of arrangement or organization of the whole composition, and a theory of style, which at the very least attempted to bring to a conscious level the resources of figure and trope, of diction and prose rhythm. The general theory of language provided by the trivium remained the core of traditional education. Rhetoric itself, as a theory of practical discourse, provided a rationale for the development of the student's own composition as well as a critical theory for attending to the writing and speaking of others. By and large, the general emphases of that theory persisted until well into the last century.

By the last half of the last century, for reasons that are extremely complex and fall within the uncertain boundaries of intellectual and social history as much as within the history of composition teaching in the schools, that general body of theory was breaking up. The traditional rhetorical canon of delivery was given over to the elocutionists, which meant that composition came to mean only written composition. The province of dialectic, and with it most of the traditional theory of invention, was carried away with courses in logic becoming less and less frequent in the high schools by 1900. Considerations of

the presumed attitudes, knowledge and values of audiences, implicit in traditional rhetorical theory, were dissipated and ultimtately distributed among the various social and behavioral sciences. What remained was a severely narrowed, if not trivialized theory of arrangement and style.

The extent of that process of reduction can be gauged by contrasting the kind of general theory of language which traditional rhetoric had represented with the principal doctrines which emerged at the same time that English teaching became a major responsibility of the secondary schools. Largely deprived of the functionalism that marked the best of the old, late 19th century theory can be summarized fairly quickly.[2] First there was the doctrine of the forms of discourse, which from about 1870 have come down to us as narration, description, exposition, and argument. The forms of discourse were augmented by a theory of arrangement largely restricted to the doctrine of the analytic paragraph and the topic sentence. It became what has been called a "geometric theory of the paragraph," and it included a great deal of sound advice about "unity, coherence, and emphasis." Most of the theory had been deduced and announced by a now little-remembered Scotch rhetorician, Alexander Bain, whose shadow is, unfortunately, very long. It falls on the latest edition of Warriner's handbook just as it has fallen on countless numbers of such books for roughly one hundred years.

I find it interesting to assume that what was happening to the theory of rhetoric and composition was in accord with larger social and educational developments which, in fact, probably hastened the process. American high school English was, of course, born in the post-Civil War period. It was a period of vast growth in American technology and American industry which created a need for a larger class of white collar workers to handle an increasing amount of paper work. The society had an expanding need for citizens armed with something beyond the primitive literacy of the common school. In the general contexts of industrialization, urbanization, and the growth of a middle class, the high school grew rapidly. And with the expansion of those schools, English grew. The subject--fighting for position against the opposition of the classicists--was given major support in the last decades of the century by a young Harvard president who led a movement in which the

importance of English, principally defined as written composition, was argued again and again. But the argument emphasized that it was to serve a utilitarian object--that it was to provide a "practical" rhetoric. Making good on that object, Harvard first, and then practically every other major college, instituted a series of entrance tests in English, emphasizing composition and stressing a practical doctrine of "correctness." A Harvard examiner, describing the tests in 1893, reaffirmed their object: "The composition must be correct in spelling; the candidate must know the rules of punctuation, and he must be able to apply them; he must write grammatically, in clear, simple, idiomatic English."[3]

Now, what I have described is a tyrannically compressed view with a great deal more assertion than proof. The point has been, simply, to emphasize the debilitation which was well under way as English as a school subject came to a position of relative importance. The theory of language which remained to inform the teaching of composition tended to be restricted to a prescriptive doctrine, a body of "advice" thought to be more practical in providing a growing number of high school students and college freshmen with minimal written skill. Professor Albert Kitzhaber reaches pretty much the same conclusion when he discusses the legacy of rhetorical theory informing our composition books:

> As for rhetoric, the majority of handbooks present a dessicated rhetorical doctrine that has probably done a good deal more over the years to hinder good writing than to foster it--the position of the topic sentence and mechanical rules for developing expository paragraphs, sets of critical abstractions which the student is urged to apply to his paragraphs and themes like a foot rule to a piece of lumber . . .[4]

That doctrine of formal correctness, emphasizing mechanical features of the composition process, came to be the principal set of standards by which our teaching and the evaluation of our teaching was informed. It isn't simply that it is a narrow, severely limited kind of theory (which on its face seems to have been largely unproductive). More importantly, it remains locked in by its initial assumption of a narrow utilitarian or practical purpose. Translated, that means to me that the content or the theory which we accept must always be brought to the bar of practicality and made to show proof of its effect in improving the student's immediately measurable skills. And, often enough, the canons of admissible evidence in answering the question are limited to considerations of a "practical" kind of formal correctness. Armed--or, rather, disarmed--with that kind of objective, restricting the scope of the theory we might admit, we simply don't have much of a show.

There is, of course, another kind of difficulty posed by our legacy of slim but practical theory. We're all familiar with the problem that develops when we raise questions of sequence and order in composition. I suspect we've long been uneasy about the perennial, episodic approach to the paragraph which neither goes nor grows. But at least since the appearance of Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education, that uneasiness has become a positive embarrassment. Bruner's argument, you will recall, was for our ordering of school studies by defining their intellectual substructures, by isolating major concepts which are points about which the theory of the subject accumulated. From these conceptual centers, he wrote, we might construct orderly, coherent curricula. Such concepts would identify the process or rhythm of the curriculum, organizing instruction in a sequence of spiraling additions of detail and maturity. But it has remained pretty difficult to imagine Bruner's good advice applied to teaching composition. What subject? What conceptual centers?

Finally, in spite of our practical objective, we face the embarrassing knowledge that we don't know much in any very precise sense about the actual behaviors involved in the act of composing. We do know from research--and even more poignantly, from our own experience--that whatever those behaviors are, they are not subject to very rapid change or development. That being the case, it becomes even more disconcerting to be in a position where all of what we teach is subject to a practical accounting in

terms of a narrowly defined--and hardly to be found--kind of progress.

Well, then--what do we do? Throw out all standards? No more paragraph exercises? No more attention to correct spelling, punctuation, word choice? Is this still another attempt, another part of the conspiracy, to destroy the nation's moral fibre by pushing the doctrine of "anything goes"? Not at all. Certainly there are conventions of written and spoken form that are important, although in the case of much of our prescriptive advice, we may not be teaching the conventions that actually prevail. Instead, what I'm moving toward is a tentative admonition: not that we accept "anything goes" but that we look to see if we have anything going.

II.

The first step, it seems to me, might be to take a long hard look at our philosophy of composition teaching. We decided long ago that the teaching of literature should not be hemmed in by immediate bonds of practicality. The linguists among us have taken to justifying the study of scientifically accurate descriptions of English as liberal and humane and invested with an importance larger than its immediate utility in improving skill. They don't reject the objective of increasing skill. They transcend it in the name of the behavior most exclusively human--language. We might follow their lead, insisting on the human meanings of the problems of choice and address which each of us faces as he writes or speaks. In this view, composition might become an important part of a general study of language, at once incorporating a perspective broader than either phonemics or the paragraph. At the very least, it might provide a basis from which we could candidly, but with some logical consistency, defer questions of improvement too narrowly defined.

By deferring immediate questions of practicality we might free ourselves to more seriously entertain questions about the conceptual structure of the language-composition curriculum. If we were able to identify such a structure or sub-structure of knowledge about the process of communication--importantly related to acts of interpreting public discourse as well as composing it--we might be able to arrive at some sort of defensible sequence as well. But

the question of sequence must remain part of the prior question of whether we are willing to accept an intellectual frame larger than the paragraph. It implies the priority of our willingness to assert the importance of teaching knowledge that, whether or not it immediately results in our students' knowledge how to produce better paragraphs. Now, if we can make some kind of judgment like that about our purpose, what concepts or understandings might be--just might be--important?

First, we might begin at the level of concepts of language origin and acquisition. We might teach students something of what we know, or think we know, about the origins of language in the species. We might include some discussion of the principal psychological explanations of the process by which it is acquired. Introducing speculation about the origins of the remarkable system they've already mastered, we might impress them with the magnitude of the quantum leap taken in the dim history of the race when man discovered language so that he could develop culture. I suspect that such discussion, in addition to saying something of what it means to be human, might provide some attractive possibilities for student compositions as rich in fancy as some of those produced by more mature scholars and writers. And lest we assume that such speculation has little to do with composition or rhetoric, tradition, here at least, is on our side. Hugh Blair, whose Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres was the composition text committed to memory by American school boys for half a century, included a most fanciful lecture on "The Rise and Progress of Language."

A second concept or cluster of concepts that we might want to consider could be called the "culture concept." It has, I think, potential for combatting a pervasive kind of linguistic ethnocentrism that we sometimes inveigh against with our students. I don't think we need to peddle a crippling subjectivity, but we might be able to illustrate the close relationship between language and culture. We might, in the process, be able to suggest the way in which the structure of his language may predict certain features of the manner in which the writer or speaker selects a point of view, validates his assertions, or describes time and space.

The lesson to be learned is that typical ways of order-

ing our own observations of the "world out there" are influenced by the structure, the grammar of our language. We don't need to push the concept to the spongy ground of metaphysics, but we may at least generate discomfort for the 16-year-old naive realist who says "what he means and means what he sez--and you better believe it." To know, to be conscious before you compose, that you are both free and determined is a heady theme which we exploit richly elsewhere. From language and culture to sub-culture and dialect we might work our way, establishing a basis in theory for taking up questions of usage which are a traditional, if much abused, rhetorical problem.

A third group of concepts comes here under the term "communication." That term, like some others of our time, has become alloyed with a lot of base metal. The general demise of the more or less hopeful movement of the '40's that seemed to bring fresh air into freshman composition did not, apparently, live up to its promise. But viewed as a center, or focal point, the concept of communication as process might direct us to a body of principle and theory both very old and very new. Under a heading like communication, which I suspect would be more promising to a tenth grader than "rhetoric," we might begin by describing what he does when he writes or speaks in terms of "the communication model." And the model would, of course, include the interrelating elements of speaker (writer) addressing an audience on an occasion (that is, in a social, historical context) with a speech (a text i.e. with the agency of language) conditioned by a purpose. We might give him hypothetical and very real examples to demonstrate how each one of the elements in the model reciprocates with and shapes features of the other. We might even wish to tell him that the model was Aristotle's and ask him how he thought it compared with more recent ones developed by engineers or by literary critics like Kenneth Burke or I.A. Richards. We might also wish to compare the traditional types or functions of oratory--deliberative, forensic, ceremonial--with the standard doctrine of the forms of discourse--narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative--to see if these categories described any useful set of expectations about contemporary public discourse.

In addition to some such basic elements of classical

rhetorical theory, the communication concept ought to lead us to the development of materials and instruction informed by the more contemporary rhetorical perspectives of some social scientists. A unit on the process of persuasion could profitably include attention to what we know from research bearing on the differential effects of communication resulting from varying the order of presentation of arguments; effect studies based on comparison of media; results of manipulating assumptions about the expertness of credibility of the speaker or writer. We've known for a long time that we hear (even when we're reading) what we want to, but the social psychologist's description and ingenious experiments demonstrating the selectivity of our perceptions has a kind of scientific muscle that is too much lacking in what we tell students about writing and speaking. The semanticists, both General and generally, have encouraged us for some time to look at these problems--all of which emphasize the "limits of logic," and of language. I can't help believing that it is important for students to develop a sense of the fragility of all acts of human communication. Particularly in an age dominated by the hard sell, by arrogant assumptions made by "image-makers," it seems important that we develop with our students what has been called a "tragic" view of communication. It would be a view dominated by the clear admission that total understanding does not occur when two people communicate--and that the writer or speaker always plays for limited and marginal gains.

Something like this kind of study of the process of communication informed by the multiple perspectives of the semanticist, the psychologist and social psychologist, and the literary critic, might lead us to some broad considerations of modern prose style. In the upper years of the senior high school, having emphasized the limits imposed by his language, by his choice of role, and by the demands of his readers, he might be encouraged to see with better vision a contemporary prose style which tries to achieve directness, but which turns back on itself, modifying and circumscribing its breadth of assertion. He might better understand the implicit irony, so often signaling the writer's sense of his own limits. He might at least understand a prose whose rhetorical movement is less balanced--less symmetrical. And if the style is man--we might spec-

ulate with him that in some measure we write and speak like this because we no longer inhabit a universe perceived as ordered, balanced, symmetrical, continuous. That is to reemphasize that writing is a way of seeing.[5]

* * * * *

In what has been more exhortation than argument, I described the dissipation of traditional rhetorical theory as it tended in the last century to be replaced by the teaching of "composition." The older theory had in many respects been a philosophic theory which attempted to classify and describe the conceptual structure of acts of instrumental writing and speaking. The new term, "composition," was most often preceded by the adjective "practical" as if to emphasize that what it wanted was not theory but results. I'm not sure we got much of either in substituting a utilitarian object for one which had been at once practical and liberal.

Given that objective, we taught composition. Rather, we corrected compositions. Small wonder that the NCTE's recent national study of high school English programs, involving direct observation of classes in grades 7 through 12 in 168 presumably superior schools, reported few instances of composition teaching, but many instances of assigning and grading student writing.[6] Part of that problem, I think, rests on the extremely limited theory of "composition" which we inherited and our willingness to limit our function to a practical theory of correctness. Impressed by the arguments of corps of junior executives insisting on our guardianship of the semicolon, the teaching of composition became the dreariest of our enterprises.

In the name of a point of view both "new" and traditional, I've suggested that we consider an expanded conception of our subject. From concepts related to the broader study of language--its nature, origin and acquisition, its mediation of culture, its central position in the processes of human communication--we might develop a more genuinely liberal view of the teaching of practical discourse. But if we developed such a language-composition curriculum, would they write and speak better? I don't know. But I'd like to argue that we ask another question first. Would this kind of information, this kind

of knowledge, contribute to their understanding of a human dimension? Would it--could it create a self-awareness about language and the range of both choice and consequence in using it? If we can answer yes to either or both of those questions, then we may have enough to go on. We may have enough to make the language-composition component both important and liberal. We may be able to quiet our doubts until we can perfect better methods and better instruments for evaluating progress and purpose.

Footnotes

1. Modern Philosophies and Education, The Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1955).
2. Fortunately, more detailed interpretations are available. See, for instance: Donald K. Smith, "English, Speech, and the Language Arts: Disorder and Latter Day Sorrow," in The Changing Role of English Education, edited by Stanley B. Kegler (Champaign, Ill.; NCTE, 1965); John P. Hoshor, "American Contributions to Rhetorical Theory and Homiletics" and Marie Hochmuth and Richard Murphy, "Rhetorical and Elocutionary Training in Nineteenth Century Colleges," both of which appear in History of Speech Education in America, edited by Karl Wallace (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954).
3. Byron S. Hurlbutt, "College Requirements in English," in Twenty Years of School and College English (Harvard University, 1896), p. 47.
4. Themes, Theories and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963), p. 16.
5. In the identification of conceptual clusters, I am indebted to discussions with Prof. Donald K. Smith regarding certain of the Minnesota Project English materials. Moreover, something like these emphases have shaped a course in "Rhetorical Studies" which we have taught for the past two summers to NDEA fellows.
6. James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee, A Study of English Programs in Selected High Schools which Commonly Educate Outstanding Students in English, USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 1994 (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1966), pp. 192-194; 218.

LINGUISTICS AND THE TEACHING OF READING

Mildred A. Carlson

(The work of linguists is providing assistance for elementary teachers of reading. Miss Carlson provided a brief survey and suggested some further reading during the state meeting of the English section of the Minnesota Education Association in October. She is consultant in elementary curriculum for the Minneapolis public schools.)

Over the years, we have heard about sight-word and phonic methods of teaching reading. Each has had a variety of interpretations and each has motivated the development of materials for children and teachers. Recently, some new kinds of materials have appeared on the scene with emphasis upon phonemic clues for reading, for example, Words in Color and the Initial Teaching Alphabet. Some materials focus on sequences with small learning increments and immediate feedback of success; for example, the programed materials. Other materials introduce vocabulary and sentence patterns more nearly like children's natural speech; for example, the Bank Street Readers. We are beginning to have an influx of still another type of material which we need to learn to understand and evaluate--the linguistic reading materials.

Linguists, scientifically examining our English language, believe that their observations and generalizations can make the teaching of reading more effective. To understand their points of view we need to look at their definitions of reading.

Fries says:

> . . . reading rests upon habits of unconscious identification of graphic shapes that represent the language signals of our language code. . . . Real reading is productive reading--an active responding to all the sets of signals represented in the graphic patterns as they build up, and the carrying forward of such a complete cumulative comprehension as makes it possible to fill in the intonation sequences, the special stresses, and the grouping pauses . . . (2: p. 124, 131)

Carroll says:

> Reading is the activity of reconstructing a reasonable spoken message from a printed text, and making meaning responses to the reconstructed message that would parallel those that would be made to the spoken message. (1: p. 62)

Lefevre says:

> . . . what reading requires is recognition and interpretation of the graphic counterparts of entire spoken utterances as unitary meaning-bearing patterns. (3: p. 652)

Each of these linguists emphasizes the decoding process yet none ignores meaning responses.

Considerable distance remains between reading specialists and linguists when it comes to outlining a schematic plan for teaching reading. But the major ideas presented by different linguists, or the writers who try to interpret linguistics, may have the potential to influence the teaching of reading, to give reading instruction greater depth. These ideas do not characterize any single method but rather suggest possibilities for teaching reading with or without materials that are labeled "linguistic."

Linguistics might make some contributions to reading instruction through:

**a spelling pattern focus to develop independent word recognition skills.

**intonation as an aid to comprehension and effective oral reading.

**understanding and appreciating our English language.

The most publicized and commercialized of the linguistic ideas is the use of regular spelling patterns to teach effective and independent word recognition skills. Letter contrasts or patterns are analyzed visually and audibly. Words representing familiar patterns are woven into story content. Children discover the patterns and develop their own generalizations about them--internalized generaliza-

tions. The writings of Bloomfield and Fries are reflected in many of the materials based on spelling patterns.

But linguistics offers far more than spelling patterns. The intonational signals of meaning--pitch, stress, pauses --help relate the melody of speech to the printed page. A child who changes graphic symbols into natural-sounding speech must understand what he has decoded. Dr. Donald Lloyd, in a paper before a regional council of the International Reading Association, said: "One hour of intonation will do more for your reading than ten hours of word attack."[5] Word calling and fragmentary word study can be deadly to reading comprehension. Intonational emphases seem quite in contrast to the narrower spelling pattern approaches, but the two as complements might strengthen both word recognition and comprehension skills.

Frequent use of oral reading is encouraged by the linquist. The child hears as well as sees as he makes an oral response to the graphic shapes. His familiarity with the reading vocabulary is reinforced. His verbal interpretation, often accompanied by non-verbal signals, provides the teacher with clues to his understanding, or lack of understanding, of the context.

The linguists encourage us to study our language, to grow in our understanding and appreciation of it. They call our attention to the structure of words, the structure of sentences, and the structure of longer units of meaning. This leads into the study of word origins and derivatives. It leads to observations of the functions and beauty of language. Dialectal differences become interesting phenomena, not handicaps. Experiences with syntactical patterns of sentences and syntactical elements that extend into paragraphs or passages become aids to understanding and appreciating literature.

As materials labeled "linguistic" have arrived on the market, we have tried to examine them and their teaching suggestions. Some of them have been and are being tried in classrooms on an exploratory basis. This year we are part of a field trial of one set of materials that was developed to teach beginning reading. Ten first grade teachers in Minneapolis are using these materials with children from both disadvantaged and more advantaged backgrounds. These materials are based on a total language

approach integrating reading, writing, speaking, listening, and spelling experiences.[6] Words and concepts are presented and reinforced in three ways: word analysis during the preparation time, word analysis and meaning check in the connected story content, and reinforcement through kinesthetic means during the writing phase.

To simplify the reading task, stories are built with words based on patterns that are phonemically regular. Irregular words are introduced as sight words whenever they are needed for good sentence structure. Children are guided into discovery of important differences between words--visual and sound contrasts. This is a whole word approach. Phonics is internalized by analyzing spelling patterns (what you see) and relating them to word patterns (what you say) rather than blending isolated sounds. What the child decodes makes sense, so the context provides a check on his correctness in decoding. The approach combines sight, sound, and meaning.

In addition to patterns in words, there are patterns in the sentences. The first unit begins with simple sentences, adding sentences with prepositional phrases, sentences with double subjects, and questions. After several units there is a good variety of sentence patterns and some development of literary style. From the beginning, children are urged to group words as phrases and to notice words that signal phrases. Capital letters and punctuation marks become other recognizable reading signals. Intonation contours are emphasized so reading truly becomes a counterpart of speech.

This integrated linguistic approach utilizes the elements of linguistics identified earlier: spelling pattern focus, intonation as an aid to comprehension, learning to understand our English language. Last year we were impressed by both the reading and spelling power developed by some first grade children with limited experiential backgrounds. Some test data will be available this year, but our most significant evidences of successful teaching will be attitudes of children toward reading, the extent to which they self-select and read books from the reading center in the classroom, and the personal stories they create at the chalkboard or on paper.

For Further Reading

1. Carroll, John B. Language and Thought. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

2. Fries, Charles C. Linguistics and Reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1963.

3. Lefevre, Carl A. "A Comprehensive Approach to Reading," Elementary English XLII (October, 1966), pp. 651-659.

4. Lefevre, Carl A. Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

5. Lloyd, Donald J. "Reading American English Sound Patterns," Reading Aloud--Language Patterns, Sounds of Words, Interpretation, Proceedings of Chicago Area Reading Association, New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

6. Sabaroff, Rose. "Breaking the Code: What Method? Introducing an Integrated Linguistic Approach to Beginning Reading," The Elementary School Journal (November, 1966), pp. 95-103.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS
Winter, 1967

Jan.	13	Overhead Projector Workshop	Wayzata
	20-21	Minn. Coll. Conf. on English Teacher Preparation--Speech	Minneapolis
Feb.	9-11	Institute for Eng.Lang. Tchrs. in '67 Summer Institutes	Minneapolis
	17-18	Tchr. Prep. Conf.--Composition	Minneapolis
March	10-11	Tchr. Prep. Conf.--Eng. Lang.	Minneapolis
	20	Institute Application Deadline	
	24-25	CCCC Spring Meeting	Louisville
	30-31	Conf. on Eng. Education	Athens, Ga.
	31	Tchr. Prep. Conf.--Literature	Minneapolis
April	1	Conf. on Eng. Education	
	14	Newspaper Workshop	Hibbing
	28-29	Tchr. Prep. Conf.--Methods	Minneapolis
May	5-6	MCTE Spring Conference	Rochester
	19-20	Tchr. Prep. Conf.--Concerned Public	Minneapolis
Aug.	20-24	International Conference on Teaching English	Vancouver

ENGLISH AND READING INSTITUTES FOR 1967

(The information below is a listing of NDEA Institutes in English and Reading for the Summer of 1967 to be held in Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Where information was received from directors in Minnesota, it is provided. A complete list of English and Reading institutes throughout the United States can be found in December issues of NCTE publications.)

INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH: S-1, master's in English or equivalent; S-2, bachelor's with English major or equivalent; S-3, no more than a minor in English; E-1, concentration or graduate work in English; E-2, bachelor's degree not in English; E-3, no bachelor's degree.

Iowa

U of Iowa, Iowa City, For Dept. Chm. and Supervisors; Comp. 9-12; June 14-Aug. 9; Carl H. Klaus, Dir.; S-1,2.

Minnesota

College of St. Teresa, Winona; Theatre Arts, with optional participation in Winona Summer Theatre; 9-12; June 19-July 30; John E. Marzocco, Dir.; S-1,2,3.

Macalester College, St. Paul; Linguistics, Literary Criticism; 3-9; June 19-Aug. 4; Jack Patnode, Dir.; S-2,3; E-2.

St. Mary's College, Winona; Advanced Writing, Rhetoric; 9-12; Brother H. Raphael, FSC, Dir.; S-2. Purpose: to upgrade the personal preparation of teachers in the field of composition. Two courses: Advanced Writing for Teachers, in which participants will study and apply principles of good writing under direction of experienced teachers of writing; Historical Development of Classical Rhetoric and Developments in New Rhetoric. In addition, a third course will study teaching of writing in high school. Participants may earn nine semester hours of graduate credit, six in English and three in Education, but courses need not be taken for credit. Institute intended for teachers who feel that previous work has not prepared them to handle teaching of writing in high school; preference given to

teachers with limited course work in composition and rhetoric and to teachers whose past record indicates serious concern with professional development. Institute will be in session five days a week; dormitory and dining facilities for men and women available on campus, with room for one or two family groups; residence on campus desirable. Applications available early in January; March 20 deadline for applications.

University of Minnesota, Duluth; Children's Literature; K-6; July 17-Aug. 19; Anna Lee Stensland, Dir.; E-2. For elementary teachers interested in gaining more knowledge about children's books and greater competence in judging them. Limited to 22 teachers K-3 and 22 teachers 4-6, first priority to teachers in northeastern Minnesota, second priority to rest of Minnesota and Wisconsin (significant proportion from outside northeastern Minnesota). Applicants must have five years of experience and be under contract to teach in K-6 in 1967-1968. Components: Literature for Children, including sampling of old and new poetry, fanciful literature, folk literature, picture books, realistic fiction, biography and essay; Critical Approaches to Literature, survey of important ways literature is discussed to enjoy with discrimination, recognize the spurious, and respond maturely to the genuine; Storytelling, including study of purposes and values of storytelling, selection of stories, preparation and telling of stories; Demonstrations, two non-graded elementary classes in which children read and talk about books and literature; Workshop, in which participants read and discuss significant books, write reviews, and read reviews. Up to seven credits available.

North Dakota

North Dakota State University, Fargo; Applied Linguistics, Myth and Symbol in Literature, Curriculum, and Teaching Methods; 3-12; June 12-Aug. 4; Hale Aarnes, Dir.; E-2,3; S-2,3.

Wisconsin

Dominican College, Racine; Applied Linguistics; 7-9; June 19-July 28; Sister Regina, Dir.; S-3.

Lawrence University, Appleton; Rhetoric, Drama, Composition, Literary Analysis; 9-12; June 19-Aug. 4; Herbert K. Tjossem; S-2,3.

Marquette University, Milwaukee; Rhetoric; 9-12; June 21-Aug. 2; Joseph Schwartz, Dir.; S-2.

Mount Mary College, Milwaukee; Teachers and Supervisors of Advanced Placement and Honors Courses: Fiction, Drama, Poetry, Composition, Language; 10-12; June 19-July 28; Sister M. Chrysostom, SSND, Dir.; S-2.

University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee; Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Heterogeneous Groups: Literature, Language, Research; 9-12; urban populations of 50,000 or more; June 18-July 28; Virginia M. Burke, Dir.; S-1,2.

* * * * *

INSTITUTES IN READING--1, specialization in reading, approximately at master's level; 2, courses in reading beyond the basic course; 3, at most, one course in reading.

Iowa

Clarke College, Dubuque; General; 1-8; June 26-Aug. 4; Sister Mary Edward, PBVM, Dir.; 3.

Minnesota

University of Minnesota, Duluth; Teachers and Reading Specialists: Remedial; 1-6; Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, North Dakota, South Dakota; June 18-Aug. 11; Vernon J. Simula, Dir; 2-3; focus on early identification and prevention of potential cases of reading disability, diagnosis and remediation; 28 experienced elementary teachers who wish to begin necessary requirements for remedial reading, 8 experienced remedial reading teachers who wish to begin requirements for consultant or supervisor.

South Dakota

University of South Dakota, Vermillion; General; 4-8; South Dakota and North Central States; June 12-Aug. 4; Cecil Kiplin, Jr., Dir.; 3.

Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee; Diagnostic and Remedial; 1-12; Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Ohio, Wisconsin; June 19-Aug. 11; Arthur W. Schoeller, Dir.; 2.