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ABSTRACT

This study is an analysis of changes in English teaching since about 1900.

Part 1 of the thesis gives the author's reasons for undertaking the study, and then examines the contrastive concepts of Bernstein's Classification and Framing construct as an initial theoretical orientation. A socio-historical survey follows which demonstrates how the pedagogy of a middle-class dominant consciousness was institutionalised. Original material from the Public Record Office, described here as the 'Ashridge' files, is used and the importance of the 1921 Report indicated.

A 'Bridgehead' review chapter links Part 1 with Part 2, which starts by mapping the growth of a new consciousness in English teaching. Now because this reflects a different ideology from the older consciousness it is instrumental in the institutionalisation and transmission of a working-class pedagogy. As this has political implications its relevance is discussed at the end of Part 2.

Part 2 also attempts to sharpen the theoretical focus. Thus 7 models of English are described and together with some empirical evidence gathered from a sample of NATE and English Association members located within an octant version of the Classification - Framing construct. This is later made relevant to paradigm theory which follows a discussion of the subsuming initiation / growth rationales and, more briefly, a bi-polar analysis.

Thus the final part of the thesis discusses the relevance of paradigm theory and suggests that paradigms describe competing arenas of ideological discourse about the institutionalisation and transmission of English in schools.
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PART ONE
SECTION 1 : INTRODUCTION

OUTLINE OF THE PROBLEM.

This study is basically an attempt to construct a representation of English teaching derived from certain sociological criteria with particular although not exclusive reference to secondary schools. At present no more than descriptive accounts of the development of English teaching exist. All of these deal with changes in praxis as an external response to historical events which are themselves sociologically undifferentiated. None of them attempts to show how English teachers actually come to construct and to modify and change what it is they believe about English teaching and especially how that change achieves what can be called communal visibility. 1

In recent years there has been a growing feeling amongst many English teachers - myself included - that the nature of contemporary English teaching especially in secondary schools was insufficiently understood. Many English teachers have felt uneasy and thus insecure about what they are doing, both so-called traditional and progressive. Many have been acutely aware of the criticism of other teachers who themselves have often had difficulty in seeing the coherence of the work of English departments in schools. It is of course well known that the National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE) was formed partly in response to an urgent

1. This term refers to the degree to which we are able to talk about similarities in ideology and transmission among groups of English teachers. The activities of NATE and the English Association are relevant to its application which, it is hoped, will become clear in the final part of the thesis.
need to open up meaningful professional discourse on both the theory and practice of English teaching. One recent NATE conference underlined the problem when a commission of members joined to discuss a description of English as 'Curriculum or Chaos?'

One of the characteristics of much of contemporary English teaching is that it has increasingly spilled over into other areas of the curriculum. This has particularly been the case since the 'Creative Writing revolution' of the early sixties, because of which many English teachers have included more and more variegated stimuli in the hope of encouraging a creative response in modes of writing and general discourse from a multiplicity of contexts, many of which had previously been deliberately excluded from the classroom. This invasion by the outside world was the truly novel feature of the growth of creative writing. As Shayer has pointed out (1972) creative writing itself was not exactly new. There is evidence to suggest that children wrote creatively, albeit on a much more limited scale, at least 40 years before. However it is the increase in the interest in creative language during the sixties which is important. It certainly had a profound influence on how many English teachers have come to view the nature and the function of language and what is acceptable as literature. Instead of strongly-classified contents and a traditional transmission pedagogy, many English teachers, in common with a generalised movement in the organisation of the curriculum, have turned to project and thematic work and the use of source books rather than remaining slavishly bound to the often arbitrary demands of the course book.

---

2. This has, of course, been true for a longer period in primary education.
If we accept, then, that in the past 15 years for many English teachers the traditional areas of the subject have become increasingly permeable, this has been reflected in the fact that the invasion of everyday knowledge derived from extra-mural social contexts has meant that English seems to have more and more 'communal' objectives. Given the increasingly social nature of English as an emergent factor, it seemed appropriate to try to trace how this had come about. Thus equally it seemed logical to go back and find out how the highly insulated and externally relatively impermeable language/literature type of English teaching had become established and how the changes which I saw around me and which I had perhaps unconsciously adjusted to in my own teaching had come about. However at this preliminary stage I realised that a straightforward sequential account on its own would not be sufficient. I would have to search for a more rigorous approach, one which involved the application of a carefully articulated sociological construct. This would be needed to represent the intrinsic nature of what appeared to be emerging as two globally opposed positions in English teaching. So far as a subjective and impressionistic inspection of a pragmatic situation was able to reveal, I was aware of two positions within these global orientations (1) a permeable v. an impermeable characteristic\(^3\)

(2) a traditional transmission pedagogy versus a contemporary, more open-ended pedagogy. At this initial impressionistic

---

3. Permeable/impermeable refers:

(a) to the weak/strong insulation between English Language and Literature in the institutionalisation and transmission of an English pedagogy;

(b) to the weak/strong insulation between English defined as Language and Literature and other subjects in the curriculum.
stage I was unable to differentiate these two positions. However it was precisely the elusiveness of the nature of these two major orientations and their own relationship to them which seemed to be causing uncertainty and demands for rationalisation amongst so many English teachers. Like many of my contemporaries I had become aware during the earlier part of my teaching career that if you taught so that you rejected notions of insulation and the barriers between language and literature, if you rejected the notion of compartmentalising, that is if you were suspicious of the eternal stability of the states of knowledge in English, then the ways in which you taught would be profoundly affected.
CHAPTER 1.

FIRST THEORETICAL PROBE - 'STATES OF KNOWLEDGE' AND 'WAYS OF KNOWING'

I was prompted to explore this basic distinction between 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing' after reading Basil Bernstein's paper on the classification and framing of educational knowledge. It seemed to me that here perhaps was a way in to finding a means of beginning to map an analysis of the problem confronting so many English teachers.

Bernstein's paper is relevant to this thesis in two respects, first as a means of opening up the field of investigation at an initial conceptual level and second as a basis for presenting and interpreting some of the empirical work later on. I should like to deal here with the first relevance - that of a theoretical probe. In more detail, this involves our looking at ways in which the underlying construct and the proposed model for the curriculum outlined in that paper relate to English teaching. In this way a preliminary mapping can be attempted. However, before discussing Bernstein's paper it is necessary to define some of the very terms he employs.

Classification: This refers to the relationship between contents of the curriculum. Bernstein differentiates two degrees, strong and weak. Where there is strong classification the contents are well insulated from each other by strong boundaries - i.e. traditional, well-defined subject areas are in evidence. In English there is also a strong boundary between Language and Literature. Where there is weak classification there is reduced insulation between the contents of the curriculum which are thus
blurred. In Bernstein's thesis attention is focused on boundary strength, thus classification refers to the structure of the curriculum. In this thesis it is applied specifically to the structure and boundary strengths between Language and Literature as English, and between English and other subjects which all make up what Bernstein defines as a Collections Code. (See below)

Frame: This refers to the form of the content in which knowledge is transmitted and received, that is to the specific pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught. This also refers to what may or may not be taught within a pedagogy. Thus where there is Strong framing there are sharp boundaries between what may or may not be transmitted and received; where there is weak framing the boundaries are blurred. Strong framing reduces the options available in the pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught; weak framing makes a range of options available. Thus frame refers to the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organising and pacing of knowledge. It will be shown later how major notions about the differentiation between a transmission/reproduction pedagogy and a 'negotiations' pedagogy relate to these definitions.

Collection codes: Although Bernstein distinguishes a variety of collection codes, his view of an exceptionally strong classification, but relatively weaker framed collection of subjects is closest to the definition employed in this thesis. However the notion of strong framing is seen to be relevant to such a 'collection' of insulated subjects transmitted and received within the pedagogical relationship described above. Its 'weakenes' is relative to a European form of collection which Bernstein suggests is exceptionally strongly framed.
Integrated codes: Bernstein is careful to point out (p.209) that the notion of integration refers to "the subordination of previously insulated subjects or courses to some relational idea, which blurs the boundaries between the subjects." He distinguishes between teacher-based and teachers-based integration. The first gives an individual teacher the option to use his time as he pleases in terms of degrees of Classification and Frame and usually operates in the First School; although it can operate at any level in English teaching should the organisation of the curriculum provide for such an option. However it is the second use of the term which is relevant to this thesis, especially where integration involves teachers of different subjects. To underline the possibility of integration between Language and Literature as well as being centred on a synthesising or relational idea we may note that Bernstein concludes that "integrated codes may be confined to one subject or they can cross subjects". (p.210)

Bernstein's first major point is that "educational knowledge is a major regulator of the structure of experience" (p.202). From this it could be said that English is a major process of that structuring because the phenomenon of regulation is dependent upon language, which mediates experience both internally and externally.

In terms of the educational knowledge code the form of this code which is made manifest linguistically is dependent upon a variety of sociological criteria. English can be said to cover the sociolinguistics of all knowledge.

On page 204 Bernstein writes of the relationship between subject contents (inter-subject relationships) which stand in either a closed or an open relationship. Organisationally, insulated relationships have always been traditionally manifested in terms of the components of
the English syllabus. However in an open relationship intra-subject connections will also have to be examined (e.g. poetry - grammar - novel, etc.) This would seem to reflect a priority being given to educational objectives. These objectives can be realised only within a flexible social context, unlike organisational objectives which tend to perpetrate a rigid social relationship within a classroom. It is a shift in the social relationships which affects the classification and framing of intra-subject relationships. This relates to both internal and external organisational objectives.

On page 204 Bernstein moves on to the concept of contents of the curriculum. An underlying concept maintains a system of contents in a special relationship to one another. In terms of English that underlying concept appears to have been considerably modified. We now tend to think less of clearly defined discrete categories; the more open a curriculum becomes (i.e. permeable) the more its raison d'être becomes less specific in terms of organisational aims. The sociological nature of this has yet to be described.

Earlier I made reference to the invasion of the classroom by the outside world and the repercussions this is having for English teaching. Bernstein writes of the relationship between the non-school everyday community knowledge of the teacher and taught and educational knowledge transmitted in a pedagogical relationship. English does not appear to fit in here in this way because this concept presupposes two bodies of prescribed knowledge. However in English teaching the whole idea of prescription has been considerably weakened (and not only in the narrow grammatical sense). To sum up more precisely part of the argument so far: the current very weak framing of much of English teaching is a direct function of educational objectives derived from extra-mural sources.
Bernstein points to this as part of a generalised pattern. He suggests that a weaker frame in England between educational knowledge and everyday community knowledge has come about because of the needs of the so-called less able. English has certainly been a key area in this because direct access to different kinds of knowledge is made through language. If the relatively strong classifications in England are related to boundary maintenance this may severely limit the positive effects, because by reducing the options of what is taught the only flexibility is in the teacher-pupil relationship — and this is clearly determined by the open or closed nature of what is taught. A preliminary reaction to Bernstein's distinction between the two types of knowledge as they apply to English is that he seems to think that social control is perhaps more a matter of political manipulation rather than political expediency. On p.215 he says "when frame is relaxed to include everyday realities it is often and sometimes validly, not simply for the transmission of educational knowledge, but for purposes of social control of forms of deviancy." However this would tend to deny the educational validity of extended areas as the proper ground for English teaching. Perhaps it is true to say that language (however derived at the level of framing) may be the only educational experience which allows the organisational objective of harnessing 'uncommonsense knowledge' for the purposes of 'educational knowledge'. Thus it would seem at this stage of the investigation, i.e. at the beginning of the mapping process, that we might assume that English is operating increasingly within weak frames and weak classification (i.e. intra-subject; I am now suggesting a variety of 'English' activities). Thus there appears in such English teaching to be little or no distinction between and therefore no natural insulation between the linguistic
organisation of everyday life and the 'cultural materials' of the school (e.g. posthumous texts, historico-literary themes, techniques of criticism, 'states of knowledge' about grammar or books). In this way whatever this investigation reveals, it appears that English has a shrinking mystique. The form of educational transmission hitherto based on strong classification and framing has been considerably weakened because it has become far more experientially broad-based. Until recently (and of course it still exists) the intra-subject boundary maintenance within a frame (i.e. between teacher and taught) has largely been perpetrated in the interchangeable structural rituals based upon what Barnes claims to be the exclusive 'language of secondary education' (Barnes et al, 1971).

On page 7 above reference was made to the phenomenon of English teachers constructing their own notions of the 'reality' of English teaching. It is clear that Bernstein sees this as a process of socialisation which determines concepts of what educational knowledge is and how it should be transmitted. He suggests (p.213) that children and pupils are early socialised into the concept of knowledge as private property - especially in selective schools. This appears to go against the notion of the breakdown of that belief as a feature of modern English teaching and acts both as a caveat against accepting the disappearance of the belief and evidence for the persistence of traditional pedagogy based on such a belief. Random evidence would seem to suggest that there may be some sort of dichotomy which would point up two different orientations in English teaching. Bernstein's suggestion that any collection code involves an hierarchical organisation of knowledge allows for further articulation of these orientations and also helps to describe the differences between 'states of knowledge' and
'ways of knowing' which was the original mapping construct abstracted from Bernstein's paper. His suggestion would not appear to be true if we thought of the intra-subject components of English as a network based, roughly, on an horizontal plane. Many contemporary English teachers believe it no longer viable to think in terms of linear progression in a vertical dimension. The idea of interrelated cross perspectives in an horizontal dimension allows new realities to be created by linking, by creating constellations rather than building in one dimension (until the ultimate mystery is revealed!) In this way the concept of impermeability cannot be inevitable; it allows philosophical generalisations based on essentially inter - as well as intra - disciplinary study to come about. We would always ask "Is man/art/love.....? The permutations are infinitely open-ended, but they are entirely linguistic. Thus many English teachers might believe that English is a 'web' discipline. It provides the most important species of revelation - through language. This leads on to the distinction Bernstein makes between 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing' (an interesting but very disturbing revelation of this can be inferred from David Holbrook's 'The Exploring Word' (1967). A symbolic structure of assessment would be based on ways of systematising 'states of knowledge' - implicit in the idea of the impermeability of knowledge. Thus because the frame is very strong it is a form of knowledge which is highly resistant to being changed from without. The more open the frame the longer the educational dialogue is needed because the code is being changed from 'states' to 'ways'. This seems to have profound implications for the teaching of disadvantaged children, strategies for whom have fostered many developments in modern English teaching. Thus 'states of knowledge' appears to streamline organisational objectives.
However 'ways of knowing' are entirely dependent upon children being given the time and opportunity to make experience explicit in their own terms. It focuses on how knowledge is created e.g. the principles behind the construction of grammar.

Following on from this perhaps it is true to say that if the pedagogical frame is weakened, the pupil will no longer need to learn what of the outside should be excluded. He will be thinking more in terms of its necessity as a means of making explicit linguistic organisation of his total environment. The external community is a natural extension of the classroom. In this way education as esoteric would cease to exist merely as 'states of knowledge'. Seen from the perspective of 'ways of knowing' these will be shorn of mystique and presented as part of a network of intellectual and aesthetic potential; but the process of response and revelation will be extrinsic. Linear curricula might cease to exist as hierarchical necessities in their own right. The intrinsic component, artificially implanted, will be seen to be a myth.

On Page 218 Bernstein, talking of a permeable curriculum where there is a merging between the two kinds of knowledge, introduces a new concept which seems to connect logically with the argument so far expounded. He says "with integrated codes the pedagogy is likely to proceed from the deep structure to the surface structure". As far as English is concerned this implies making connections linguistically along lines of a network which will bring about 'ways of knowing' (i.e. how to 'connect', infer, abstract, induct). This is the deep structure. The surface structure would consist of what is (a category, nomenclature, the concrete, deduction); the internal symbolism of a poem - or its prosody; the interrelation between character and plot; the recognition of a
figure of speech or a part of speech; the structural components of a known and categorised linguistic unit etc. The principles for generating new knowledge (i.e. for the individual especially) would be in depth at the level of creativity or at the level of literary criticism. Thus 'states of knowledge' would provide the tools for the 'ways' to be objectified into meaningful statements. It is perhaps analogous to suggest that in the poetry of Keats the original empathic connections with experience are objectified into recognisable organisational states of that original sensitisation. Clearly revelation of 'ways' may also only come in a school through the restructuring of social relationships in the area where educational knowledge is generated.

The relative speed with which recognition of 'ways of knowing' have invaded the theory of modern English teaching has had implications for English teachers' consciousness about their professional task. On p.223 of his paper, Bernstein suggests that with integrated codes both the role and form of knowledge may involve resocialisation. This appears to be happening to many English teachers today and has helped to illustrate not only the fact of different orientations but the communal visibility of those orientations (The major voice is, of course, NATE, which significantly was formed as recently as 1963). This resocialisation has meant, perhaps at one extreme, that many English teachers enjoy the ambiguity of a role which no longer ties them to a concept of linear progression. Such teachers welcome the fact that they no longer have to be over-explicit and categorical. However the really significant point of this resocialisation is that a teacher must accept that his authority has been substantially modified. Within a relationship based on linear progression, on 'states of knowledge' and teacher control and initiation resided the means of his authority. Thus it is clear that boundary-
maintenance systems reinforcing strong classifications and frames must be related to linear revelations of 'states of knowledge'. The organisation of knowledge in such a collections code system has perpetuated the rigid linguistic patterns of closed institutions.

Resocialisation or socialisation into viewing English as a means whereby ways of knowing are revealed and facilitated clearly throws up the problem of evaluation and with it inevitably some sort of political dilemma for many English teachers. Strong framing is based on an acceptance of hierarchical principles as a means of evaluation. As long as the teacher acts as a selector or a sponsor the means of judging the pedagogy (i.e. what has been achieved by the pupil through revelation of 'states of knowledge' by the teacher) will necessarily be assessed by examination - purely an organisational objective. For many contemporary English teachers the business of teaching should be a continual linguistic dialogue within a new social relationship. They predicate their approach on an exploration of connections (e.g. looking at how other people have 'connected' - in novels, plays and poems). They believe that examinations in English should be both inter and intra-subject related within a socially-oriented framework. Perhaps in this orientation the 'states of knowledge' will be implicit. Such states have traditionally been located in prescriptive and proscriptive attitudes to linguistic competency. Many English teachers, however, now recognise that these are superficial 'states of knowing' and reject the notion of the impermeability of knowledge as an embedded ideology whose vocational and pragmatic implications appear to be all too clear. In fact the whole process of collection codes can be said to be one of containment and circumscription - a body of manageable knowledge which may be 'achieved' by organisational 'linear flow' methods. This is a
condensed symbolic system verbally circumscribed and with fewer linguistic permutations.

Bernstein characterises the movement away from a collection to an integrated code as symbolical of the contemporary crisis in society's basic classifications and frames and "therefore a crisis in its structures of power and principles of control" (p.221). In many ways the contemporary confusion that many English teachers feel about English epitomises both the process of curricular change as well as the crisis, and this can best be illustrated perhaps by seeing a constellation of a variety of 'English' activities as a microcosm of those processes. The constellation focuses on ways of systematising disparate linguistic orderings of experience which describe the tensions of life; the points of departure into new 'ways of knowing'. In itself, in its own unique linguistic organisation of materials which are so ordered it questions the legitimacy of collection traditions with their associated structures of power and principles of control.

To sum up:

1. Bernstein's paper generates sufficient constructional power for a preliminary mapping of the nature of English teaching.

2. A preliminary mapping outlined two major orientations which appeared at this stage as descriptively anchored to notions of strong and weak educational classification and framing.

3. Implicit in these two orientations is a notion of socialisation which takes into account both individual and communal constructions of the realities of English teaching and how that reality is represented in individual and collective consciousness.

4. The first conceptual model, albeit at the level of a theoretical
probe, isolated a construct which compared and contrasted 'states of knowledge' with 'ways of knowing' in English teaching.

Three pointers to the development of the study also arise from Bernstein's paper:

(i) In terms of English content, we shall have to look at the intrinsic factors which make for strong and weak insulation, i.e. the strength of the boundary between the contents.

(ii) We shall also have to trace the history of framing - i.e. the strength of the boundaries between what may or may not be an accepted mode of transaction and transmission in an 'English' pedagogical relationship.

(iii) As a minor consideration, if changes in the knowledge code at the secondary level are dependent upon changes in selection, organisation and pacing of knowledge at the tertiary level, then some time in the future the relationship between the 'schools' of English and English in the schools will have to be thoroughly examined.

Finally, I believe that Bernstein's paper helped to make more visible my own construct of the realities of English. I was able to begin to make a coherent pattern out of a series of uncoordinated beliefs and attitudes to English teaching by submitting them to the conceptual discipline provided by Bernstein's model. Later I again needed to use the model to create a dichotomy for interpreting some empirical data.

At this stage two hypotheses seemed to be in evidence:

(1) Teachers of English construct a notion of the 'reality' of 'English' knowledge and its mode of transmission which can be classified both individually and in consensus groupings (see Note at the end of the chapter). It is the task of the thesis to trace the process of different conceptions of 'reality' and make visible the inherent contrasting patterns.
(2) If the traditional pedagogical assumptions which have supported a subject of the curriculum are challenged by a methodology coordinating new knowledge about the process of learning, then the implications for the subsequent organisation and content of that subject are increasingly subject to overt politicising. In the case of English teaching, because of the crucial role of language in the creating of consciousness, that politicising goes beyond methodological considerations.

The first hypothesis articulates the greater part of the thesis; the second points up the results of that articulation and, it is hoped, will be seen to be partly predictive.

In order to marshal evidence to test these hypotheses and to provide a description of the historical 'topography' of English teaching necessary for any ultimate mapping construct, it seemed important to make a selective socio-historical survey of the development of English teaching. It is hoped that this survey reflects how the major pedagogical orientations so far outlined operates in the English curriculum.
Note

In "Language and Learning" James Britton draws our attention to the work of George Kelly, an American psychologist, who in 1963 published "A Theory of Personality". In this book Kelly outlines his personal construct system. Kelly's theory is that man constructs a representation of the world which is maintained under constant modification. In an earlier article (see "Journal of Curriculum Studies", Vol. 1, No. 1, 1968) written with Bernard Newsome, under the title 'What is Learnt in English Lessons?', Britton shows the link between Kelly's conception of man and a scientist's view in as much as for Kelly man is a predictor. "His psychological processes are essentially ways of construing the universe; without these .... he could make nothing of the universe. His particular choices among alternate ways of construing actualities constitute his personality. He understands another man in so far as he is able to construe the world in the way the other man does" (op.cit., 1968, pp.68–69).

Thus the process of 'construing' or 'representation' is a 'fixing in consciousness' which helps in any predictive process. On Page 193 of "Language and Learning" Britton suggests that this predictive process is a store of expectations which the human individual builds up as a "cumulative representation of his interactions with his environment". For Kelly the notion of prediction was crucial. On Page 12 of 'A Theory of Personality' he states that "a construct system is tested in terms of its predictive efficiency". Moreover when Britton comments (op.cit. 1970, p.18) that what is fixed in consciousness is there to go back to we may assume that personal consciousness (what Kelly would call "present interpretations of the universe", op.cit. 1963, p.15) is subject to revision or replacement. Although Kelly's theory cannot be applied
to the formation of group consciousness, it is worth noting here because of the way that people like Britton have brought the theory to bear as a psychological explanation of the individual 'reality' construction of English teachers.
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SECTION 2 : A SOCIO-HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF DEVELOPMENTS IN ENGLISH TEACHING UP TO 1930

Introduction

This section of the thesis is a selective socio-historical review of English teaching up to about 1930. After about 1880 one may conveniently divide up the period into convenient divisions relating to the development of English teaching. Thus Chapter 2 deals with a preliminary survey up to 1880 which helps to establish the most important earlier historical facts concerned with the history of English studies before concentrating on some features of the 19th century consciousness.1 It is important because it is predictive of attitudes and opinions which were to have repercussions well into the 20th Century. Some discussion of Matthew Arnold’s part in generating and maintaining perspectives on that consciousness is attempted and is thought to be especially important as his influence has remained crucial up to the present time. Chapter 3 is also historically convenient in that it attempts to map in some detail the operation and significance of the Revised Codes, at their most influential in the formulation of late-19th Century consciousness.

1. This is a major descriptive concept employed in the thesis. It is a useful means of explicating the ideological commitment of teachers to styles of practice. However by using the term the author is not suggesting that there is a homogeneity of commitment and practice among those whose beliefs appear to be similar. For some a particular consciousness is clearly a way of being, for others merely a way of teaching. Later on in the thesis it is hoped that some differentiation among degrees of commitment to group consciousness will become clearer.
Again, these had an effect on English teaching which was to hold steadfast in the early years of the 20th Century, especially affecting elementary schools. Chapter 4 starts at the turn of the century with the passing of the 1902 Education Act and the expansion of secondary education. Convenient mapping sequences can be presented first up to 1910 and then up to 1920 (i.e. Chapters 4 and 5). Both of these decades culminate in major official documents affecting the institutionalisation and direction of English teaching, particularly the 1921 Report which merits a chapter to itself (Chapter 6). The Report acts as a focal point for any discussion of the growth of English teaching. The final chapter of the section, Chapter 7, deals with reactions to the 1921 Report and finishes at 1930 for two reasons. First, the Ashridge Files, on which Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7 particularly rely, are very sketchy after about 1925. Second, after 1930, it seems appropriate in terms of the balance of the thesis to link the developments of the earlier part of the century with more contemporary developments by means of a 'Bridgehead' review.
CHAPTER 2
SURVEY TO 1880 AND THE INFLUENCE OF
MATTHEW ARNOLD

A Survey to 1880.

In order to open up any substantive socio-historical account of the
development of English teaching it is proposed to start with the
historical framework offered in the earlier part of the 1921 Report.
This particular account is being chosen as a starting point because it
is the first section of what is generally accepted as the single most
significant review of the scope and practice of English teaching.
In addition this section of the Report illustrates the significant
influence of classical studies on the emergent English curriculum.
This and the general context of English teaching will be dealt with
first.

Within this framework and building on to it, it is proposed to make
some presentation and analysis of the content of the English curriculum
as a reflection of contemporary educational thought and socio-political
outlook; that is an attempt will be made to try to determine how the
contemporary ethos shaped and reacted to the teaching of English, both in
method and content. As a corollary the influence of Matthew Arnold will
be discussed.

The 1921 Report in its historical section minimises the validity of
Latin by stressing its degeneration even in medieval times from the
spirit of classicism. "Latin ... was a technical subject. Its study
was not humanistic but utilitarian. Classical literature was little
read. The medieval system of school education allowed little freedom
to the intellect but rested on a basis of authoritatively fixed ideas." (Para. 21). It is interesting that two humanists of the 17th Century, Sir Thomas Elyot and Roger Ascham, both discountenanced grammar. For example, Elyot, "Grammar, being but an introduction to the understanding of authors, if it be made too long or exquisite to the learner, it in manner mortifieth his courage"; whilst Ascham complained that "to read the grammar alone by itself is tedious for the master, hard for the scholar, cold and uncomfortable for them both." Already in the 16th Century there were glimpses of the claims that English would be making in the future. Perhaps Vives in his "de Tradendis Disciplinis" (1523) gives the first sign of this. "Let the teacher know with exactitude the vernacular language of the boys ... unless he speaks in the language of his country, he will mislead the boys." Later on, in 1581, Mulcaster put things into a perspective that time was to take long over establishing as an educational truth. "I honour Latin, but I worship the English ... Necessity itself doth call for English." Generally speaking the writings of the 16th Century educationalists were somewhat doctrinaire and clearly were not widely accepted. For example, Mulcaster's ideas had no effect on his own school's curriculum, St. Paul's. Thus down to the 17th Century Latin remained as the major instrument of communication. As Professor Gordon reminds us, "The result was that when English eventually became a school subject, the aims and methods of Latin teaching were adopted without hesitation and without any essential changes. This tended to perpetrate...pedagogical exclusiveness" (P.2, Gordon, 1947).

In the 17th Century perhaps it was not merely coincidental that the religio-political movement of Puritanism was of great significance in the development of the teaching of English. Although the Puritans'
educational beliefs were often doctrinaire they showed good sense in emphasising the nobility of biblical English and had a great champion in Milton. It will become clear later that Milton is particularly significant to the creators of the 1921 Report; in his "Tractate on Education" he reasserts the early humanist principle. To him the learning of Latin and Greek languages was merely a means to studying Latin and Greek authors in which could be found "things useful to be known". Perhaps it was John Locke who finally illustrated that the practical importance of Latin was difficult to defend. In 1690 he published "Some Thoughts Concerning Education" in which he brings weighty argument to bear in favour of teaching English. What he had to say at first augered well for English. However, if we examine his subsequent pronouncements on the status of English, we can see how its influence was not going to be allowed to spread. In place of "Themes, Declamations and Verses in Latin" he suggests themes in English and the reading of "those things that are well writ in English ... Since 'tis English that an English gentleman will have constant use of." However, the implications of his remarks are that this is a necessary evil and eventually the gentleman will turn to Latin and Greek. "These are the learned languages fit only for learned men to meddle with and teach. English is the language of illiterate vulgar." Already, then, an influential educationalist is demonstrating what we now recognise as a fundamental difference between a middle-class and a working-class pedagogy. Two class identities and statuses are being reinforced by two types of education based on two different languages.

Thus although under the pressure of political, religious and cultural change the practical importance of Latin had been drastically diminished, the curricular traditions based on its study persisted.
Paradoxically, English became a penal offence as an instructional medium and its inability to establish a viable educational identity was not helped by the cultural atmosphere of the 18th Century which gave rise to a new philosophical basis to the curriculum, i.e. the principle of discipline. As the Report points out in Paragraph 35, "The acceptance of (the theory of Education as a disciplined process of learning)... is in the main responsible for the continued domination of formal linguistic studies in the schools in the 18th and 19th centuries." At any rate it is clear that the pedagogical aims of such a philosophy of education are those which stressed the achievement of learning only after long and arduous study. The content of education is presented as a series of obstacles. (This inevitably links well with later elitist and sponsorship notions of education). If the curriculum sets out to train separate faculties by means of the 'uncomparable instrument' of classical languages, it is going to lead to a 'collections code'. And conversely any global notions of education, i.e. the pervasiveness of English emanating from a central position in the curriculum must inevitably be allied to egalitarian principles.

Perhaps the first major breakaway from rigid, classically-based notions on education came in the 18th Century with the foundation of the Dissenters' Academies. These institutions not only taught a curriculum based on a different philosophy of religious belief and practice, but demonstrated that certain sociological conditions were present whereby the commercial middle-classes were able to mount an educational challenge to the classically-trained aristocracy. In order to inculcate their new beliefs this new middle class had to institutionalise any curricular changes. This particular development also had significance for the growth of university education in the 19th Century. This will be dealt with later on.
It could be argued that as an indirect result of social and economic changes, not least changes in political sensibility about reform and the more egalitarian outlook of non-conformist religion, by 1850 there were signs of a basic education being established for an increasing number of children who were neither rich nor clever. However the recommendations of the Newcastle Commissioners (1858-1861) represented a victory for anti-humanism. Their policy of payment by results and of objective testing meant that English had suffered the first of many blows at the hands of the quantifiers. However, English found an immediate and outspoken champion in Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, who protested bitterly at the Newcastle curriculum. In 1866 he refers to "the aversion to letters which a mean mechanical drudgery of spelling, writing and ciphering would produce." More significantly for our purposes he showed the very sociological principle at work which the 1921 Report sought to change. "Why is apparent sanction given to the idea that the schooling of the workman's child ceases at eleven years of age, and that he can do no more than learn to read, write and cipher in the elementary school." (Para. 47). Indeed P.W. Joyce in "School Management" (1864, pp.165-167) contended that composition in "the highest sense of the term" could "only be mastered by a mature intellect", but the ability to write a common letter, or any simple statement, in plain intelligible language, with correct spelling, fairly punctuated, and free from ..., obvious or gross grammatical errors was all that could be expected in ordinary national schools. This, of course, becomes the basis of the elitist view of education largely articulated through English in the schools which the Newcastle Codes helped to institutionalise in our education system. Administratively it reflects, albeit unconsciously and overtly, the official Education Department's view of
the differences between secondary and elementary education in terms of
the English curriculum. But at both an intellectual and imaginative
level the Codes were arid and inhibiting. School "readers" of the
period show how reproductive rather than narrative composition was
favoured. As far as accuracy was concerned, from copying elementary
pupils graduated to transcription, thence to dictation. Oral composi-
tion, which was closely modelled on written composition, became an in-
creasing part of the English syllabus in 1871, 1876 and 1882 as the Codes
were revised. School books reflected the theory of oral composition.
As Mullins points out Collins' "Illustrated English Readers", 5 books,
1877, contained in addition to poetical and literary prose pieces, many
passages of useful information, all of which were prefaced by a list of
difficult words, broken down into syllables and pursued by questions
clearly requiring oral answers as a preliminary to the written exercise.

Throughout the 1860's and 1870's in periodic reports Matthew Arnold
commented on the enervating atmosphere in the elementary schools as a
result of the 1862 legislation.

1869 Not for the first time Arnold attacked the mechanical
and restrictive nature of the exam system. He lamented
that though the letter of the law was satisfied "the circle
of the children's reading has been narrowed and impoverished
all the year for the sake of a result at the end of it, and
the result is an illusion" (Matthew Arnold, "Reports",
1852 - 1882, p.126).

1871 He again deplored the content and style of reading books
used in elementary schools which rendered "the mighty engine
of literature in the education of the working-class ... little more than the giving them the power to read newspapers
... What is comprised under the word literature is in itself the greatest power available in education; of this power ... in our elementary schools at present no use is made at all."

In this respect Arnold was particularly anxious to extend the influence of poetry. The institution in 1871 of English literature and grammar as a "specific" subject to be taught to individual pupils in Standards IV, V and VI and for which extra grants were paid, went some way to meet his desire. "The status of recitation in the elementary school was raised; this had the effect also of extending English as a subject since it had to be sufficiently distinct from ordinary Reading Book lessons" (Mullins, 1968).

1874  "It seems as if, during the last four and twenty years, there had been effected no progress at all towards giving our elementary schools what they most want, the mental apprehensiveness and resource which letters impart".

1878  "A power of reading, well trained, and well guided, is perhaps the best among gifts which it is the business of our elementary schools to bestow .... yet it is bestowed in much fewer cases than we imagine."

1880  Arnold's 1880 Report is a good example of the centrality of literature argument which so characterises the development of English teaching up to the present day. (More will be said

1. The notion of 'improvement' and moral uplift is also contained in the practice of recitation - based on the false idea of transfer as a feature of contemporary faculty psychology. It is interesting to note how the practice of recitation was encouraged by the newly-formed Education Department, and although Inspectors' Reports of the 1870's and 1880's often criticised the obscure and trivial pieces, they clearly endorsed the value of learning by heart.
about this argument and its implications as the thesis develops

"the acquisition of good poetry (was) a discipline which (worked) deeper than any other discipline in the range of the work of the school", it tended "to form the soul and character; to beget a love of beauty and of truth", suggested "high and noble principles of action"; inspired "the emotions so helpful in making principles operative".

B The Influence of Matthew Arnold.

For our purposes it is relevant to make some examination of the influence of Arnold's views on literature (including his views on the classics) and its relationship to life; on education, class and society and on culture, his great organising and articulating concept. Taken together these form the basis of a rationale which has become a major socialising force in the historical development of how generations of English teachers have constructed both individual and communal conceptions of the teaching of English.

Perhaps the major part of this socialisation has been a conviction that Arnold is right in his view that literature acts as a major source of revelation of life's sensitivities, profundities and significances. This certainly relates to a notion of tradition in English teaching and studies which is taken up by F.R. Leavis and T.S. Eliot wherein "to know how others stand, that we may know how we ourselves stand" is a motivating and organising precept. Indeed the central core of Arnold's belief lay in the moral guidance proffered by great literature, particularly poetry, viz. "Great poetry must have moral standards in its interpretation of
human conduct" (P.13 in introduction to "On the Modern Element in Literature", 1857 in The Reynard Arnold, 1967). In this way, perhaps inevitably, Arnold believed that the literature of ancient Greece was a "mighty agent of intellectual deliverance" (in 'On the Modern Element in Literature' (1857) Reynard, P. 269) and therefore highly relevant to modern times. He made a plea on behalf of classical literature in his inaugural lecture "On the Modern Element in Literature" (Reynard, P.269-283 passim). In it he suggested not only the relevance of classical literature to the current social situation, but also thought its elevating influence made it the finest instrument of education for the culture he had defined in "Culture and Anarchy". He was committed to presenting and preserving acceptable values and standards which would endure amid the flux of changing society. In "The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold", W. Connell comments "it was, however, more than ever necessary, then, to exercise a critical intelligence that could judge events and thoughts by reference to a standard elevated above temporary advantage and passing interest in order to set humanity upon its rightful path" (P. 71).

Mention has been made of Arnold's belief in the moral and spiritual efficacy of great poetry. As has already been indicated this belief has become a major conviction of generations of English teachers. Such a conviction has given rise to what might be called the 'cultural-heritage' model of English teaching. A very early but relevant statement of the cultural-heritage position may be found in 'The Study of Poetry' from "Essays in Criticism", Second Series, 1888 (Reynard, 663 passim). Here Arnold stresses the high purposeness and
seriousness of poetry\textsuperscript{1} - but it must be a poetry of a high order of excellence. He conceived of a high destiny for poetry. "In poetry, as a criticism of life under the conditions fixed for such a criticism by the laws of poetic truth and poetic beauty, the spirit of our race will find ... as time goes on and other helps fail, its consolation and stay" (Reynard, P. 664).

However, Arnold's views on what should become part of the consciousness of the different social classes have a certain ambivalence. In 'Education for the Middle Class' (Reynard, P. 334) he suggests that the 'culture' of the best should be extended to all social classes. Thus his notion of relevance would transcend class and the notion of an élite be contained in what should be studied rather than in by whom. However in 'Ferment and Stir in the Middle Class' (Reynard, pp.336-343) he does make a distinction between the middle class who enjoy an education in the public schools and the working class. For the latter he thinks amusement and enjoyment are educative and quickening but firmly advocates a full intellectual life only for the middle classes. It was their cultural improvement that he sought and he roundly criticised the contemporary commercial and industrial middle classes for their materialist aspirations. Thus, although he acknowledges that no class had a monopoly of culture (see 'Barbarians, Philistines, Populace', Reynard pp.498-501 passim) his real intention was to improve the character, the quality and the learning of the middle classes. He saw it as vitally im-

\textsuperscript{1} Although it would be a distortion to conflate the work of Arnold and P.R. Leavis this reference may be taken as an indication of an affinity of consciousness between the two men. Thus Leavis, selecting out a great tradition of writers, is foreshadowed by such statements from Arnold as "Chaucer has largeness, freedom, shrewdness, benignity; but it has not this high seriousness. Homer's criticism of life has it, Dante's has it, Shakespeare's has it. Burns comes short of it" ("Essays in Criticism", Second Series, 1888, Reynard, p.675)
portant that they should be 'improved' so that they might act as a more legitimately superior but benevolent governing/executive class. In 'Democracy' ("Mixed Essays", Reynard, P. 566) he suggests that if the middle classes remain as they are, "narrow, harsh, unintelligent etc. they will not be able to give the lower classes direction, and anarchy will result."

From this it might be reasonable to infer that Arnold's notions of equality did not really extend beyond a fusion between the established upper classes and the industrial and commercial middle classes. His support of the establishment of public schools was towards that end.

His pronouncements on inequality are idealistic, perceptive and yet at the same time show how he shares a contemporary consciousness which as yet had not come to grips with the true nature of social inequality and the implications of egalitarianism. He is capable of perceiving that "it is by the humanity of their manners that men are made equal" ("Equality", Reynard, p.587) and in "Mixed Essays" 1879 (Reynard, p.546) he asserts that "inequality .... thwarts a vital instinct and being thus against nature, is against our humanisation." Again in "Equality" (Reynard, p.588) he believes "our shortcomings in civilisation are due to our inequality - upper classes materialised, middle classes vulgarised and working-classes brutalised" ..... "our love of inequality is really the vulgarity in us, and the brutality, admiring and worshipping the splendid materiality" ..... "with such inequality as ours a perfect civilisation is impossible" (Reynard, p.592). On the other hand he seems to have had some contempt for the lower class, "it does not insist on the rights of man, what it wants is beer, gin and fun" (Reynard, p.587).

We have already seen briefly that Arnold believed that the only way in which English society might be improved (i.e. improved in terms of its
moral, spiritual and intellectual outlook) was through the education of the middle class. He believed sincerely, if without much sociological insight, in the quest for unity. As John Dover Wilson points out in his edition of "Culture and Anarchy" this was to be one of Arnold's lifelong tasks and was to be constantly in the forefront of his thinking. His later advocacy, both of increased state participation in education, and of an improved middle-class education through which all sections of the community might be linked together, was its chief manifestation in the field of education." He wanted the middle class to be "elevated", to possess "a high reason and fine culture". Perhaps Arnold is sociologically naive when he thinks that high culture is commensurate with equality.

Arnold's views on culture are presented almost entirely in a non-sociological perspective. His conceptions are essentially, if somewhat unconsciously, elitist and suggest an hierarchical evaluation of what man should be worthy of being conscious of; what are the most morally and spiritually apposite means of the revelation of that consciousness, of an heightened awareness and a refined sensibility. His hope for culture is eloquently, but naively, egalitarian - "culture does not try to teach down to the level of the inferior classes, it seeks to do away with classes - to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere" (Culture and Anarchy," 1869, Reynard, p.493). Thus the men of culture are the true apostles of equality. In this sense "equality" is to be achieved through a prescribed transformation (again this is an important ingredient of socialisation into the 'cultural heritage' model). Arnold says that the great men of culture had a passion for diffusing, for humanising knowledge "to make it efficient, outside the clique of the cultivated and learned" (Reynard, p.493).
Connell suggests Arnold's 'aristocratic' conception, Man's urge towards perfection, became for Arnold "the essence of his chief dogma of culture" (op. cit. p.28).

Indeed this is the first point that Arnold makes about the role of culture in society in the preface to "Culture and Anarchy". He also asserts that culture is organic and living not a mere body of knowledge. As has already been suggested, he also claims here that culture is an instrument of social amelioration. A clue to the real nature of what Arnold wanted can be found in Connell's comments on Arnold's conception of culture (op. cit. p.162). "Any narrower view (i.e. than 'total perfection') of culture based on merely esoteric literary knowledge, Arnold totally rejected because it offended his passion for social quality." This, rather than a sociologically argued definition of equality, lies at the centre of Arnold's socio-cultural concern and desires. 2

Some reference to Arnold's views on the teaching of English have already been made in respect of his official Reports. However it is important to note that Arnold believed that if the teaching of English

2. Because of Arnold's lack of precise and informed sociological argument and his vague egalitarianism it is interesting to conjecture how far what Arnold rejected has in fact been taken up whilst his true intellectual and socio-cultural position has been vaguely interpreted. This seems to have been especially true in late Victorian times when the desire for upward social mobility became an obsession. The narrow view of culture was clearly exclusive and therefore immediately appealing to those people who wished to obtain and/or maintain an elite status. It is thus easy to see how a dominant socio-economic norm became institutionalised especially as the assumptions about the exclusive and 'improving' nature of literary and other artistic 'cultural' accomplishments were never seriously challenged at the time.
could be improved then the schools would begin to exercise a sufficiently civilising influence. As has already been intimated the notion of the centrality of English (very much taken up in the 1921 Report) goes back to Arnold. He regarded literature and poetry in particular as the humanising elements in the curriculum whilst the remaining subjects were the 'knowledges' despite his argument that culture could be approached from many sides. Connell comments (op. cit. p.183) "in his treatment of literature (Arnold) showed how a direct application of his concept of culture should be made." Arnold advocated that the pursuit of total perfection through getting to know the best which has been thought and said in the world should be carried out in school work by the best models of classical English poetry suitable to the age and attainment of the pupils. "Good poetry does indeed tend to form the soul and character, it tends to beget a love of beauty and of truth in alliance together ... it suggests .. high and noble principles of action ... ." However Arnold did not attempt to explain how good poetry can beget a love of truth (Indeed it is now only too well known that inhuman people can be enthralled by sublime art). Its essential optimism and faith in the ameliorating and transcending quality of great literature is perhaps one of the major assumptions which have formed the basis of the socialisation of many English teachers. This is now called into question by an age less optimistic and more sceptical than the Victorian age, whose beliefs all too often seem to have been predicated on a certain complacency and undifferentiated idea of relevance. It is clear that many English teachers still hold at least partially to Arnold's view but the difference now is that it is a belief which is no longer immune from scrutiny and challenge.

Finally it is necessary to note that Arnold helped to perpetuate
and gave authority to the belief that Latin grammar was a satisfactory basis for the better understanding of the English language. Certainly he seemed to believe in the theory of transfer when he asserted that Latin grammar developed clarity and exactness. (In the same way he believed that Greek literature, being the best, was able to transfer its 'noble serenity' and 'true insights' and thus encourage the moral development of the child).

To sum up: Matthew Arnold's ideas are important not only because of their civilising influence, but, as we shall see later, because of the sociological repercussions of those principles. Although he was chiefly concerned in refining and humanising the commercial and industrial middle classes, his influence on English teaching is profoundly significant in two ways. First, although his concept of egalitarianism was in no way socially radical, his ideas are based on making the 'best' available to all, which accorded well with the later emphasis on humanism by the leaders of professional opinion within the English teaching community. Second, his views on literature which I here have suggested formed the basis of a 'cultural-heritage' model became a major shaping force in the growing prestige of English in the curriculum after 1900.

3. It is typical of the consciousness of the age that Arnold himself had no concept of an indigenous working-class culture
References

Arnold, M. Reports, 1852 - 1882

Board of Education (1921), The Teaching of English in England (The 1921 Report). The Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to inquire into the position of English in the educational system of England, HMSO.

Bryson, J. (Ed.) (1967), Matthew Arnold, Poetry and Prose, The Reynard Library, London, Rupert Hart-Davis (Referred to in the text as 'Reynard')


CHAPTER 3

THE POSITION OF ENGLISH AT THE END OF THE 19th CENTURY.

A descriptive account of the development of the English curriculum in schools during this period would almost certainly emphasise the extension of prescribed reading as a feature of the Revised Codes of the 1880's before their abandonment after 1890 with the inevitable curricular implications of that action. However it would be wrong to assume that what was no longer official Education Department policy after 1890 was necessarily abandoned by all teachers of English or that in some way these teachers had no influence on the pedagogical implications of the Codes and therefore their subsequent abandonment. It seems reasonably safe to infer that the instructions and official policy statements issued by the Education Department in the period in respect of English in schools acted more as a directive than as a guide to English teachers. For example this is reflected in the surer institutionalisation of the Department's pronouncements on English caused by the publication of school readers - always a guide to the practical articulation of curricular theory. (Nelson's New Royal Readers are most representative). However this is not to suggest that official policy was necessarily always either reactionary or shortsighted. We shall see that after the 1902 Education Act and the formation of the Secondary Inspectorate, Inspectors were often progressive, humane, conciliatory and cooperative.

However during the final decades of the 19th Century innovation was piecemeal; there was some controversy over methodology and no clear concerted movement can be plotted. A significant publication was the final Report of the Cross Commission, 1888, which helped to bring about
the end of payment by results, a central feature of the Codes. "This led to an increased freedom which accommodated a fuller use of the spoken word and its more significant place in the classroom" (Mullins, 1968, p.204). Certainly after 1890 more freedom was given to the teacher, especially as Circular 332 accepted Froebel's notions about the need to involve the pupil in the learning process physically and psychologically. The 1895-96 Instructions to Inspectors reinforced this notion, also stressing the importance of teachers creating interest, enjoyment and understanding. Significantly the need of good school libraries was mentioned and there was also a growing tolerance to the approach of elementary schools towards pupils' reading. Mullins (p.20) points to the publication of "The Suggestive Handbook of Practical School Method" (1897) by Thomas A. Cox and R.F. McDonald as indicative of this. Independent silent reading is advocated and the inculcation of a "taste for good literature". The authors insist that only passages of the highest literary value be provided. These include biography, travel, adventure, descriptions of scenes and events, the narrative of heroic deeds, history, science and imaginative literature.

The 1882 Code had brought grammar and etymology together as a 'class' subject called English. However the Cross Commission reported that this was not popular among teachers or children. The Commission thought that English should be taught primarily to provide children with an adequate knowledge of their mother tongue and hinted that English ought to consist of more than exercises in grammar.

On the previous page I intimated that the formulation and implementation of official curricular policy may very well have been affected by a creative and articulate minority of English teachers. Of course it is also reasonable to assume that the greater majority of teachers
habitually accepted official policy. Although I have suggested that no clear movement can be plotted and there was no such organisation as an association of English teachers some indication of the nature of contemporary professional opinion can be gleaned from the Journal of Education, a publication which traditionally gave space to teachers' views as well as reporting the activities of the Guild of Teachers. Examination of the files reveals not only reaction to the curricular issues of the day, but something of contemporary socialising and shaping ideologies - sometimes in a startlingly perceptive and prophetic way.

The relevant issues for 1880 are concerned with the adverse effects of the Codes, especially on reading. The issues of October and December suggest, as might have been expected, that the Codes were fiercely contested. The writer in the October issue (a Mr. Stevelly) forcefully points out "one of the many absurdities to which we have grown accustomed and therefore tolerant in elementary schools is that though much time and energy is (very properly) given to reading aloud, silent reading is entirely neglected, and no opportunity is offered to the pupils of acquiring the habit of reading. A small volume of "pieces" every 6 months is all the literature provided for them throughout their school course. Some of the Inspectors have lately pointed out this serious defect and have recommended a school library of amusing books as a part of the school apparatus." (p.231). He draws attention to the published reports of two Schools' inspectors. "I must regret", says Mr Cowie in his last report, "that so few schools are provided with a library. Children who acquire a taste for reading ought to have access to a stock

1. The Journal of Education is being selectively used as a major source of evidence in this chapter because of the problem of finding out the actual views of teachers at that time.
of wholesome and interesting literature." Mr Pennethorne, in urging the establishment of libraries says "It seems to me impossible to educate a child on one or (at most) two reading books in the year read over and over again." Mr Stevelly concludes "We are not quite satisfied with Mr Pennethorne's notion of 'to educate' which he evidently thinks is a purely literary matter, but we heartily agree with him about school libraries." He recommends the purchase of Robinson Crusoe and the novels of Scott, Dickens, Cooper and Marryat.

The writer in the December issue begins by quoting from the Instructions to Inspectors issued under the 1878 Code. ("J. of Ed.", 1880, p.271) "They (the Lords of Council) begged the Inspectors to see that history and geography were taught so as to 'awaken the sympathies of the children' whose attention in history should be directed to the interesting stories of the lives of noble characters, and to incidents which tend to create a patriotic feeling of regard for their country and its position in the world; and in geography to the special features of their own neighbourhood, to the interests of the colonial and foreign possessions of the British Crown." The writer comments that all of this is directly subservient to moral and practical ends, "history was to be a course of hero worship and especially of English hero worship; and geography was to be narrowed to local topography, with a side glance at the Colonies, such as might suggest a desire to emigrate." He goes on, "This anxiety and this desire were not lost upon the watchful army of book-makers; from that time to this, every new set of reading books that has been offered for use in Elementary

2. My underlining.
3. My underlining.
Schools has been contrived so as, if possible, to catch its latest precursor in the characters that are morally and economically 'improving' and not to fall behind it in variety of information about "common things" at home, in the Colonies and the foreign possessions of the Crown." The writer applauds the 1880 Code in which notions of practical virtues and thrift were dropped as were "elevating poetry and didactic stories" "It is an inestimable gain, though only a negative one, to have got beyond the view that would give either a goody or a practical bias to all instruction."

On Page 273 having called for the banishment of payment by results, the writer again attacks the 'book makers' for following the Lords in Council so slavishly - "And it seems to us that there would be a distinct gain to the cause of education if these obedient writers and compilers would allow some little consideration of the requirements and possibilities of children's minds to temper their eagerness to meet the requirements of the Council. He called for a dead pause in the production of New Standard Reading Books.

About a year later these sentiments are echoed in an article by Elizabeth Christie entitled 'Literary Culture for National School Children' ("J. of Ed." Nov. 1881, pp.280-282). She in her turn advocates the compulsory withdrawal of the Nelson Royal Readers. Referring to her own previous suggestion that books for Standard II should contain fairy-stories she thinks that these can hardly be found to be more trivial than the fairy stories now used. "It is desirable that the children of the working-class should as far as possible read the books that are most widely known among the children of the upper classes. A common education is a strong bond between individuals." This anticipates George Sampson by 40 years! It is interesting to note that her
advocacy of an extension of working-class reading was incorporated in the Revised Code of 1882.

Another feature of some of the issues of the "Journal of Education" in the last years of the 19th Century was discussion of the place of English in the public schools. This is an important consideration because it represents the beginning of a debate which widened out into a drive by the English teaching profession for greater status and greater curricular significance for the subject. In the July 1881 issue (pp.147-152) the issue is given a thorough airing in an article by an anonymous writer entitled 'On the Teaching of English Literature in Public Schools'. He reminds his readers that "the idea of teaching literature in public schools is of very recent growth". He asks whether they had any business at all teaching literature. He reiterates the commonly held contemporary view when he says fiction is "best given at home, and where a boy comes from a cultivated home, the schoolmaster will do little for him in this direction" (p.147). However his views on the nature and function of reading and on examinations and assessments are very progressive for the time. He believes in encouraging a catholic taste in reading not in imparting knowledge and goes on "I should suggest that whatever is taught in this line should not be examined in at all, in order to secure freedom for the teacher, and to prevent the entrance of slavish cram" ... "And for a similar reason, we ought not to bind ourselves by obligations to give marks in schools, or ask more questions than we please." He goes on to criticise the etymological approach and those who have an eager appetite for difficulty. His views on poetry are also progressive. He talks of young children's delight in rhythm. "First will come the spirited ballad, with plenty of rhythm and appealing to a side of imagination developed at a very early age" (p.148).
However it is in the final part of his article that the writer produces some interesting evidence of the points of view of 9 contemporary teachers on the teaching of literature and the place of English generally. Each of the 9 teachers' comments are included. Teachers A, B and I refer specifically to essay writing. Teacher A would not confine the writing to prose, whilst Teacher B advocates that teachers must show enthusiasm and encourage the enjoyment of writing. Teacher I says that he always supplies the matter and lets the boys put it into form. In literature he concentrates upon editing a Shakespeare play. Teacher C says there are three stages in literature teaching: (1) a very minute examination of a text with careful analysis of the language — especially for the boy who does not take classics. (2) an analysis of the structure and development of character (in a play) (3) an attempt to stimulate curiosity — he confesses he does not know how to do it! This is not surprising since the first two stages and especially the first hardly can have prepared pupils to be flexible and therefore receptive to such an approach. Teachers E, F and H all represent a similar point of view.

Teacher E: "Many persons have urged the addition of English for its own sake: I am inclined rather to plead for it for the sake of classical scholarship. I find that want of command of English is a very serious hindrance to boys in their classical work." (p.150).
Teacher F is at a loss to know what to exclude to make room for English teaching. He adopts a directly reproductive method of teaching composition and believes that pupils should translate poetry from other languages into English verse. "I see no reason to reject etymology." (p.150).

Teacher H agrees with F that literature is inaccessible. He clearly contributes to a contemporary belief that English studies may have insufficient intellectual rigour... "there ought to be some difficulty to exercise the boys, otherwise, I fear, the work is not likely to be abiding in its effects" (p.152).

Teacher G's view clearly has a different emphasis from the rest. "No books should be given to children which require, as an essential to their enjoyment, a knowledge of the mental development and circumstances of the author, or which requires knowledge and experience of life." She sees literature as a means of providing a cultivation of the feelings as the bases of the culture of later life - the whole is basic to enjoying a "higher literary study".

In view of the total absence of any contemporary empirical studies it is worth reflecting on these views as a glimpse of prevalent 'reality constructions'. First, it appears that English is still very much in the shadow of Classics, because, as is well known many teachers thought of English literature as either irrelevant in the classroom or unnecessary duplication (we have seen on page 50 above that they thought English literature was best read at home). Moreover, for many English teachers language study was based entirely on classical models. Second, the models of English teaching here presented are reproductive and teacher-initiated. Thus there is some evidence of consensus. All of this is important in the mapping process because it is representative of probably the most
prevalent paradigmatic position and helps to build up the pattern
which the chapter on paradigm theory will seek to clarify.

However it is in an article by S.E. Winbolt entitled 'The Present
1895) that we find a very uncompromising statement of the primacy of
classical education. For those able to enjoy such an education the
rewards are high. "Literature is the basis for the ideal classical
instruction, to be given wherever the combination of purse, position
and mental capacity exists, and to carry with it the highest rank and
honour, the most valuable diplomas, and most coveted social privileges"
(p. 60). Referring to the notion of education in "liberty and civic
virility", Winbolt says that "classics are the natural palestra for
such a course." Indeed he sees classics as the true vehicle of a
liberal education and as such what he advocates is something of a state-
ment of the contemporary Arnoldian liberalism. He strongly supports the
idea of the moral commitment of the teacher. He even advocates the
moral side of grammar "showing how nearly related are precision and
propriety of terms in the sphere of ideas to integrity in the commerce
of things, and how conducive to goodness are a clear mind and exact
language." His views on linguistic heritage point up a very important
aspect of the socialising force of contemporary patriotism and the way
that many teachers saw it the duty of the education system to encourage.
He says (p. 62) "The patriotic aspect is still more attractive. We must
teach respect for the sense of words as used by our ancestors, and study
our parts in that light, and represent a language faithful to etymology
and tradition as an integral part of the national genius." On page 63
he tries to meet the criticism that the present is neglected. He con-
cedes that "personal experience and intercourse are beyond doubt
necessary to education but "the child's true presence is the past". Such sentiments underpin notions of tradition, heritage and conformity and, of course, help us to make tentative statements about prevailing constructions of reality and in due course the necessary historical perspective in order to vindicate the application of paradigm theory.

On the other hand the "Journal of Education" also contains evidence that some public school opinion was not at all happy about the neglect of English. In a paper originally read at Eton College on 15th June 1889, C. Lowry publishing it as an article in the "Journal of Education" (1 July, 1889, pp.334-338), refers to the English language and its literature as "the most natural, the most attractive, and the widest field of instruction" (p.334). He says that until recently he was content to leave English teaching rather to "home influence, to fortunate school friendships and to the extra-professional care of zealous masters" (p.335). Now, he says, he wants English to be taught in schools. Clearly realising his presence in a stronghold of classical learning, he makes a shrewd plea on behalf of English by suggesting that the early classical teaching of boys could profit from learning English, yet at the same time he clearly condemns both etymologising and the practice of teaching and examining English as though it were a foreign language.

The issue of 1 May 1890 contains a report on the Cheltenham Conference of the Teachers' Guild. In a discussion on English in schools there is a clear approval of there being a distinct break between the teaching of language and literature. On the one hand it appears that teachers thought of language work as the accumulation of skills and functions, whilst literature should serve as a model of precept and a repository for morals. In a sense this general view is character-
istic of many teachers at the turn of the century. One can also see in the views expressed at the conference some of the likely conditions and constraints acting on those members of the teaching profession who hoped to encourage the firm establishment of English in the curriculum, especially in terms of its independence from the influence of other subjects. For example a Mr W.H. Midgley in a sense is arguing for the centrality of English, but perhaps necessarily in terms of what contemporary language scholarship would approve. He said that they could "search the world through and they would find no language comparable to English for the study of philology" (p.276). A Mr T.C. Snow also represented a very commonly held view when he said that the English language was best taught indirectly by using good English in lessons on other subjects; that if any other language was taught in a school then the English was best taught in the lessons on that language by drawing attention to the differences between the two and that even where no other language was taught, no person should be considered justified to teach English who had not been trained to some extent in early English, including the elements of Teutonic philology, Latin and early French. A Mr Fitzgerald's commentary on classroom procedure stressed the contemporary reproductive model when he insisted on the need of constant paraphrase.

Thus, by way of summing up, in terms of the curricular rationale obtaining in English teaching at the turn of the century, the following factors may be isolated:

1. Stress is placed on primary literacy in terms of functional skills.
2. Mechanical expertise in writing is primary.
3. The neglect of speech work.
a belief in the intellectual and moral improvement through the rational means of literacy

the importance of the "class reader" as a repository of 'improving' sentiments.

Mullins suggests (op.cit. p.257) that in the mid-19th century the evangelical moralists prevailed. However by the end of the century notions of worldly and national success had modified their influence, bringing in the idea of 'useful knowledge'. Thus in an expanding industrial and commercial society information acquired a high status.

By and large these factors used the precepts of Classics as an operational model. Thus the activity of English consisted of paraphrasing, parsing, dictation, reproduction and etymology. Shayer reminds us (op.cit. p.6) that this is the classical fallacy based on what we have seen to be false notions of 'transfer' and faculty psychology. Shayer also suggests that the position of English teaching in 1900 is based on three other fallacies - the Old English fallacy, the Grammar and content fallacy and the moral fallacy. The latter two appear to be indicated in 1, 2, 4 and 5 on the previous page. Reference to the growth and institutionalisation of English in the Universities is certainly relevant. (See Appendix at the end of this chapter).

Thus, in a way, Shayer is also pointing to the fragmented nature of English in 1900 which would seem to give some justification to Mullins' schema for dealing with the development of the English curriculum. Mullins takes each fragmented aspect of the curriculum and follows it through a specified period of time, on the way referring to contemporary school text books, particularly classroom readers. However neither Mullins nor Shayer attempt anything beyond descriptive accounts of what was going on in schools and the way this was either reflected or
anticipated by official policy. Mullins in no way creates a construct for classifying or explaining changes or orientations in English teaching, whilst Shayer is content to say (op.cit. p.1) that the various materials available (textbooks, reports etc.) sort themselves out into distinct patterns which are "near enough to be acceptable as a defining framework". Now, given that Shayer's book is admirable for drawing our attention to the wealth of published material and his delineation of that material acts as a useful preliminary mapping, because it lacks an overall analytical framework it does not seem to go far enough. His descriptive account does not really explain the ways in which the framework was modified and changed. In his account we are unable to move backwards or forwards in time to point up the significance of what an organising as opposed to a descriptively defining framework may reveal. In no way does his book throw light on the part played by the teachers' 'reality constructions' in the institutionalisation of English teaching. Although descriptively he is aware of overlap and anachronism, he has no way of mapping the institutional significance of such historical incongruity.

If the five points isolated on pages 55/56 above suggest something of the curricular rationale obtaining in 1900, contemporary contributions to the "Journal of Education" suggest that three themes were uppermost in the minds of those teachers who were prepared to think carefully about what it was they were doing. These are:

(1) Reaction against the illiberal and restricting Codes - and their residual effects.

(2) Pleas for the extension of English Studies - especially in public schools.

(3) Closely allied to this the centrality of English argument.
(As we shall see all of these are vitally important in the way in which English teaching develops after 1900).

If the Codes were primarily intended to be a solution to the problem of mass illiteracy, in what they advocated as well as in the way these basic skills should be transmitted, there is deliberate socio-political intent. Generally speaking the Codes provided for the majority of the nation's children, educated perforce in elementary schools, with a uniform substandard education in the hope of producing a conforming and 'improved' work force. For the majority such 'improvement' was primarily 'moral' and should be apprehended in its simplest form within a very basic kind of literacy.

It seems that any notion of a unifying theory must always take into account the way in which education as an institution reflects the wider status quo and acts as a transmitting and socialising medium for the conformity patterns of society. It seems clear that the organising educational theory prevailing in 1900 related to the status quo in two senses:

1. to condition the middle class to their role of leaders by means of a sort of spiritual nationalism
2. to condition the working class to a docile, functional and supportive role by the pedagogical means listed on pages 55-56

Thus, noting Britain's expansion in world power, prestige and status, one may trace the influence of the growth of nationalism and patriotism on education. As far as the middle class was concerned Matthew Arnold had attempted to 'spiritualise' the effects of this process, but as far as the working class was concerned, patriotism was to mean loyalty and obedience to a governing middle class so that based
on continued industrial and commercial expansion the fortunes and
prestige of Great Britain could continue to grow.4

As we have seen already, the "Journal of Education" provides
useful commentary. Two articles in 1900 and two other articles, one
written in 1902 and the other in 1905 serve to illustrate the points
made in the previous paragraphs. The first, contained in the issue for
March 1900 is entitled 'The Teaching of Patriotism' and is written by a
Mr E.E. Kellett who calls for instruction in civic duty. He refers
specifically to the necessity of teaching Shakespeare's history plays -
e.g. Richard II, King John and Henry V. He makes an interesting point
when he suggests that a sense of patriotism is a more noble sentiment
than the social arrogance of the public schoolboy. He sees working on
patriotic themes in a school debating society or school magazine as a
necessary counter to morbid sentimentalism.

However Alice Zimmern in her article in the September 1900 issue
entitled 'Literature as a Central Subject' visualises patriotism in a
much wider context. On p.557 she refers to the fact that both France
and Germany treat literature as a subject of primary importance "and a
means of inspiring an enlightened patriotism and implanting noble
ideals". The whole tone of her article reflects the influence of
Matthew Arnold. Thus on page 558 we can see a blending of Arnold's
'cultural-heritage' position with that of patriotism - "Literature reveals
the glories of the past, linking it in to present and future. It helps
us to love our land."

1. Accelerated by the First World War and the unavoidable social
implications of Arnold's notion of culture based on making the
'best' available to all, the obvious inequality inherent in this
rationale became a crucial issue in the compilation and the presentation
of the 1921 Report.
However it soon becomes clear that the real purpose of the article is to make a plea for the recognition of the centrality of English in the curriculum. Alice Zimmern’s first major point is that, indirectly, she thinks English literature should be taught by those who are properly qualified, "The great danger in literature teaching is its tendency, in the hands of insufficiently qualified teachers, to degenerate into linguistics. It gives them something definite for purposes of questions and marks." (p.558) Her second point concerns working in close cooperation with history teachers – the basis of the correlation controversy which had such a bearing on the drive of English towards autonomy. She also calls for a redistribution of English time with more emphasis on literature and less on analysis and parsing. Her final point again highlights the problems of examinations, and, as we have seen before, calls for a solution which has a contemporary ring. "Abolish the examination; at any rate in its present form ... The examiner, after learning what the work of the class had been, might set an essay on a literary subject, or better still, give a choice of several subjects, from which each pupil will choose one .... There might also be an oral exam, which would really be a sort of chat with the class, some discussion as to the books read, leading questions as to plot, characters, peculiarities of style etc." (p.559). All of these points become central to the continuing debate on English teaching in the early part of the 20th Century, culminating in the 1921 Report.

It is also worth drawing attention to P.A. Barnett’s article 'English Literature and English Schools', 1 March, 1902 as further expression of the 'cultural-heritage' model. Once again, like many of his contemporaries, Barnett starts by deploring the fact that literature "has comparatively little recognition in English schemes today". (p.209)
He criticises the usual practice of treating English literature in the same way as Classical texts are treated. It is the special business of literature to cultivate the feelings "and our school procedure treats it too exclusively as a gymnastic of what the psychologists call the intellect." (p.209). "Belles lettres...are at once the great storehouses and the greatest nurseries of emotional ideas and are therefore of supreme importance to the common man." (p.210) He calls for the abandonment of much analytical and exegetic work and is aware that in order for his views to bear fruit English, as he conceives it, will need more time devoted to it. "We may fairly hope too that much of the time now wasted in mumbling meagre bones of Latin and Greek by pupils who get so little profit therefrom will be diverted to the flesh and blood of English. It will at the same time be necessary to resist stubbornly the encroachment of premature laboratory work in physical science on the small school time available for less abstract studies." (p.210) His final point might very well be one of the very earliest statements of the application of Arnold's transcendental notions about literature to the role of the literature teacher. Its passing reference to patriotism also helps us to see how the 'cultural-heritage' model was in accord with the contemporary ethos. "We ought never to forget that for the English teacher English literature is the least specialised, is the most common property, is the most general instrument of humanisation and is therefore the stronghold of the teacher as such: for the first and chief business of the English teacher is to make his pupil a good man and a good Englishman. His obstinate grip on this subject will, I believe, ultimately go far to determine whether he shall be a teacher or an instructor, whether he shall concern himself with the pupil on the side of his largest sympathies and capacities for action, or whether he is to be, like the dancing master or
shorthand instructor charged, in his character of specialist, with a less significant part of his pupils' moral and intellectual life." (p.210)

Note referring to 'The Education of the Masses', by E. Henniker Grant ("J. of Ed.", July 1905, pp.497-499).

This article represents an extreme critique of the situation at the turn of the century and is included for comment at the end of this chapter (a) because it is highly unlikely that it was written by a teacher and (b) because its reactionary tone is unusual even 70 years ago. However it may very well have been representative of an influential point of view within the middle class.

The author begins by referring to advances made in mass education since about 1860. He bemoans the fact that there seems to be very little discipline among ordinary children. They are criticised for taking frequent seaside trips and changing their jobs too often when they begin working. On p.498 he reviews the situation in the 1860's. "Forty years ago there was, of course, an appalling amount of ignorance, a newspaper being an unheard of luxury among the lower classes. Boys and girls were taught a small amount of book learning, a goodly amount of discipline, a wholesome respect for those in authority; the boys were taught civility and a craft, the girls docility and needlework. Every lad's aim was to work on "master's" farm, or take a place at "squire's", as his father did before him; whilst his sister's ambition was to take service in some squire's or parson's family. In the towns it was much the same. The servant difficulty was non-existent; there were plenty of able-bodied, good-natured young country girls; employers could rely on hard-working, honest working men." He goes on to criticise the fact that working men's interests are not identical with their
employers - and blames the contemporary system of education for it ...

"of what use are higher mathematics, science, music and fancy needlework to the boys and girls who will have to earn their living as labourers and servants." On p.499 he suggests that there is insufficient attention to the moral training of boys and girls. He notes the "impudent, aggressive ways of many children in lower-grade schools. Their language is not edifying - teacher has forgotten to teach them their manners." He admits that the teacher's task isn't easy as he often has to counter "evil and degrading home influences". He wants men who can "teach the youth of the age to become respectable, truthful members of society". His final emphatic comment is perhaps an expression of the docility and conformity required of a future tractable and subservient work force.

"If, however, we neglect moral training and cram with book learning a boy of hereditary low brain power, of inherited low principles and tastes and embryo intelligence; if we put into his head that he is as good as you are and your equal, when as yet he is nothing of the kind; if we utterly ignore the broad principles of right and wrong, uprightness and respect to those above him, presently we have the loafer, the ne'er do well and the full-blown hooligan."
APPENDIX
The Institutionalisation of English Studies in the Universities up to 1920. An account based on the first part of the 1921 Report

As is well-known the first major establishment of English studies in this country was in the area of Anglo-Saxon studies which remained immensely influential well into the present century. However, about the middle of the 19th century a new orientation may be observed. Under the influence of German educational ideals and methods, Anglo-Saxon studies became divided so that language was divorced from literature and approached almost exclusively through phonetics and philology. The 1921 Report comments that this tended to alienate from the study of English all but the small body whose interests and outlook were scientific rather than literary and "who handled linguistic problems in the spirit of the chemist or physicist". (Para.202). Evidence quoted by Professor Chadwick (Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Cambridge) is worth reproducing. Having traced the origins of the influence of philology and German educational ideas, he goes on "What was overlooked by our authorities was the fact that they were modelling an examination course on a course intended for research students". (Later evidence quoted by eminent academics of the time will show how complete the reaction was by 1921). Indeed, the very narrow range of German philology meant that interest in language stopped abruptly after the Chaucerian period. The study was in reality comparative philology and not English itself.

There was an inevitable reaction against the German influence, a reaction which was to a certain extent nationalistic but sharpened by deteriorating relationships with Germany herself at the end of the 19th century. At the same time, as the Report notes, "There was a growing
realisation that Elizabethan and 18th century English are as well worthy of study by the linguist as the earlier phases of the mother tongue". Opinion hardened against the German influence and in this there is at least a glimmer of an awareness of a sociological element in literature. For example, in his evidence to the Departmental Committee, Professor Wyld (at that time Merton Professor at Oxford, but formerly Professor of English Language and Philology at Liverpool University) stresses the idea of the organic unity of English and asserts that post-Chaucerian problems are "more interesting, more vital, more living, more literary, more human than before Chaucer". (Para. 204).

By 1920 the reaction had become complete and university work in philology and phonetics as a main first degree study was on the decline. Both Professor W.P. Ker (Professor of English Language and Literature at London) and D. Nichol Smith (Reader in English at Oxford) confirmed the 1921 Report's conviction that "in University work philology and phonetics should be given a subordinate place." The Report itself notes a shift to "humane and aesthetic significance of language as an expression of thought". Sir Walter Raleigh (Professor of English Literature at Oxford) stated in evidence to the Departmental Committee, that English literature could be the basis of a liberal education, but needed to be freed from slavery to philology and phonology except so far as these bear on literature. Thus the Report comes to the conclusion that philology should be reserved for the postgraduate stage.

However, opinion is divided about the viability of compulsory Anglo-Saxon itself. A great divergence is noted between those who advocated an insulated division between language and literature and those who believed in a single "School". The Report produces evidence for and against Anglo-Saxon as a compulsory study for Honours degree students in English.
Those who were in favour of its retention stressed:

(1) the continuity of the spirit of English from the earliest times to the present day. Chief supporters were E. de Selincourt (Professor of English Language and Literature at Birmingham), Sir Walter Raleigh, Dr. R. W. Chambers (Reader in English Language and Literature at London) and Miss E. E. Wardale of St. Hugh's College, Oxford;

(2) the direct linguistic descent of modern English.

D. Nichol Smith thought it essential that all students whose main interests were literary should be able to read Anglo-Saxon and Middle English.

Those who were opposed to Anglo-Saxon had two major objections. First, they believed that time occupied in learning Anglo-Saxon would be more fruitfully employed in studying works of a higher literary value than are found in Anglo-Saxon. Second, they pointed out that English literature owed more to "Mediterranean and French sources and influence than to Teutonic influences". This was a view put particularly strongly by Professor Chadwick. "It cannot be too clearly recognised that compulsory philology is the natural and mortal enemy of humanistic studies". He resolutely asserted that it was a mistake to compel students of modern literature to read anything earlier than Chaucer. "The poetry (of Anglo-Saxon) is too remote from that of modern times both in form and spirit, while the prose is of little interest except to students of history". (Para. 208). Similar points were made by F. L. Attenborough of Emmanuel
college, Cambridge. It is clear that the development of the university "Schools" has been vitally affected by such divisions of opinion.

The Report itself concludes that "from the point of view of language as well as that of literature, it is desirable to give the Honours' students an alternative to Anglo-Saxon, but this conclusion in itself shows a characteristic desire to compromise when faced by two contending and institutionally powerful lobbies. Thus it goes on, "In saying this we must not be understood to undervalue Anglo-Saxon or in any way to discourage its study". Indeed, the Report's final point on the issue is to emphasise the strength of Anglo-Saxon's claim for consideration. "Anglo-Saxon is the chief key to our knowledge of English life and ideas for a period of some five hundred years". (Para.210).

The first academic teaching of English began in Scotland and Ireland. In 1860 the two universities at Aberdeen amalgamated. English, chiefly composition, was taught by the Professor of Logic. Between 1860 and 1880 the chair was held by Professor Bain who illustrated his lectures on composition by frequent references to English prose and poetry in extract books compiled by himself and published for the use of the class. In 1880 he was succeeded by Professor Minto, a literary critic and historian of English literature. Although his main teaching was in Logic he also dealt with particular authors as well as giving an overview of English literature. In 1893 a separate chair of English Language and Literature was founded at Aberdeen. The other Scottish Universities also established Chairs of English Language and Literature in the latter part of the 19th century. In 1861 a chair was founded at Glasgow, to be followed in 1897 by a similar chair at St. Andrews.

In Ireland, in 1845, the foundation of the three Queens' Colleges in Belfast, Cork and Galway made provision for joint Chairs of History
and English Literature. From the start, however, literature predominated. It was not until 1908 that the subjects were separated. In 1867 a chair of English was established at Trinity College, Dublin. Edward Dowden was the first holder.

In England the first University Commission reporting on its work in 1850 did nothing to promote the study of English at Oxford and Cambridge. This is somewhat surprising in view of the regulation by which lectures had to be given in Latin having been rescinded before the middle of the 19th century. However, after the second Commission’s report in 1877, eventually, in 1885, the Merton Chair of English Language and Literature was established at Oxford. Its immediate impact was linguistic but in 1904 this aspect was transferred to the Rawlinson Chair of Anglo-Saxon, and the Merton Professorship of English Literature was instituted. In 1908 further expansion took place when the Goldsmith’s Readership in English and two University lectureships were provided. By 1920 an additional Chair of English Language and Literature was instituted. By this time also there were about a dozen lecturers and tutors, mostly connected with the women’s colleges.

At Cambridge, in 1878 the Elvington and Bosworth Chair of Anglo-Saxon was founded. In 1896 a lecturership in English was instituted, tenable for five years. In 1911, the King Edward VII Chair of English Literature was founded. It is interesting to note that whilst at Oxford the university has played the larger part in the development of English teaching in the university, at Cambridge the colleges have been more instrumental. This has clearly had some effect upon F. R. Leavis’s contribution to English studies.

At other universities developments were contemporaneous with those at Oxbridge. However, in all of the provincial universities, Literature
and History were at first combined. It was not until Literature was established as a separate chair that the subject began to fashion a separate identity. For example, at Liverpool a Chair of Literature and History was founded in 1881. In 1884 a separate chair of literature was established. In 1897 a Lecturership in English Language was instituted which in 1904 was converted into a Chair of English and Philology. Expansion continued after the First World War when in 1919 a second Chair in English was founded. A lectureship in poetry founded at the same time was first held by Lascelles Abercrombie. Similar developments took place at Newcastle, Leeds and Manchester universities.

At London, English had always had some importance. The foundation of University College and Kings College largely as a result of non-Anglican pressure had, in the tradition of the Dissenting Academics, ensured that English was included in the syllabus from the beginning. However, except for one chair at University College nothing further was done until after 1910 when L.C.C. grants helped to found university chairs of English at University College, Kings College and Bedford College. These were rapidly followed by Readerships at University College and Kings College, together with a large number of lecturerships.

It appears, however, that the academic institutionalisation of English as a university teaching and research subject did not automatically mean similar provision for student places through scholarships. In Paragraph 231 the 1921 Report draws attention to the fact that at Oxford about 100 Scholarships and Exhibitions were awarded annually at this time for Classics with about the same number at Cambridge. There were also numerous scholarships for Mathematics, History and Natural Science, whilst at Oxford there were only one or two English scholarships. Of 19 scholarships annually awarded by London University,
English had the opportunity of competing for four scholarships together with French, German and Italian. At the provincial universities no entrance scholarships appeared to be awarded for English alone. It is this particular lack of provision which is strongly criticised by the Report. "It is essential that English should have a chance proportionate to its importance in the curriculum". It thinks that lack of provision at London is all the more surprising because the university had always given prominence to the mother tongue. In respect of post-graduate scholarships, the Report quotes Professor Chadwick as stating that Cambridge has abundance of endowments for post-graduate work in Classics, but practically nothing for English Studies. "The future of our 'Schools' of English obviously depends upon the encouragement we can give to young scholars". (Para. 215).

The Report sums up its own views on the position of English in the universities in Paragraph 229. "English must henceforth be recognised as a study that has a first claim on the support of every English university, old and new. It will be the main source of the culture of the millions of English-speaking men and women in the British Empire and United States. Hence it will be the duty of the universities of this country to make due provision for their English Department, not as a newcomer with doubtful claims, but as a legitimate heir too long kept by circumstances out of his rights." The Report concludes this section by urging the expansion of English Departments in the universities and giving Professors, Readers and Lecturers rises in salaries commensurate with the importance of their position, together with security of tenure.
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CHAPTER 4.
FIRST STEPS TOWARDS THE FULL INSTITUTIONALISATION

So far we have been largely concerned with the nature of the institutionalisation of a limited, segregated and highly controlled type of English teaching in the elementary schools. Reference has also been made to the controversy surrounding the much slower acceptance of any sort of English Studies in the public schools. However after the passing of the 1902 Education Act and the expansion of secondary education which that Act provided for, the first two decades of the 20th Century reveal steady progress towards a fuller and more differentiated institutionalisation of English in the schools. Because of the newly-created Board of Education's initiative, largely encouraged by a specially formed and highly able secondary inspectorate, the spread of the influence of English studies in secondary schools acted reflexively on the practice of English in the elementary schools. During the first ten years of the 20th Century there were five schedules or Regulations for elementary schools and three for secondary schools culminating in the 1910 Circular.

However the first public pronouncement of the Board of Education's policy towards English came in the "1904 Regulations for Elementary Schools". These Regulations contained inklings of the later and fuller articulation of Arnold's notions about the link between character building and formative reading. The general characteristics of the Regulations are largely grounded in an ethos which thought it suitable to recommend texts whose outlook is that of the settled and given past. Thus the recommended texts have a strong historical bias and are presented in a way
so as to suggest direction rather than guidance. (However they did provide for a "graduated course of instruction, suitable to the age and capacity of the scholars". This in itself is an interesting shift in focus when one compares the arbitrarily imposed 'subject' centredness of the Codes). In this way the "1904 Regulations" are innovationary, but the overall characteristic of changes in English teaching in the decade after 1902 is that they are modest and show the sorts of inconsistencies one might expect where the consciousness of an age is still largely authoritarian and whose intellectual appraisal of the nature, function and significance of both language and literature is traditionally and therefore retrospectively generated. (Although the 1921 Report attempts to reconcile these inconsistencies the differential between intellectual, aesthetic and socio-political consciousnesses is still considerable).

These inconsistencies may be illustrated by reference to a Memorandum accompanying the final draft of the Regulations [Ed. 44(a), Ashridge Repository, 22 September, 1904]¹. The Memorandum records the Board's

¹ The section of the thesis which relates to the period 1904 - 1924 makes reference to a series of declassified Board of Education files housed at the Ashridge (Herts) Repository of the Public Record Office. The files relevant to this thesis begin with the 1904 Memorandum and continue in some detail, although unevenly, until 1924. Thereafter there is some material up to 1942, after which they are no longer available under the Official Secrets Act. All of the files relate to the day-to-day decision-making leading to the final drafting and publication of official Board of Education policy statements relating to English teaching during this period. The most fully-documented is the 1910 Circular and, unfortunately, the least fully-documented the 1921 Report. The reason for this uneven and inconsistent survival of documentation is apparently due to the arbitrary system of file removal and destruction prevailing in recent times. According to Mr A.H. Cunmer, the Deputy Departmental Records Officer and my authority for this information, many of the particular files relating to this period were apparently given over as waste paper during the Second World War.

+ From 1 January, 1974 the Department's records dated to 31 December 1947 were open to public inspection.
insistence that schools submit a series of graduated exercises connected with texts in use — as set out in the last paragraph of P.1 of the 1904 Regulations. The Board also insists that a corrected set of exercises be kept for an inspector to see when he visits schools. On the other hand the memorandum also refers to the fact that some freedom should be allowed to the teacher. Equal thoroughness is not thought necessary.

However taken with the "1905 Suggestions" (the change in nomenclature in itself is a significant shift in emphasis) two progressive features may be noted in these early policy pronouncements. First, it was asserted that the writing of English is a skill not appropriate only to prospective clerks but related to human life, its interests and its needs. As with the 1904 Regulations, the "1905 Suggestions" say that composition should have its origins in the child's interests and form part of every lesson a "common bond unifying the whole curriculum" (p.35). This latter point certainly takes up one of the contemporary issues — that of centrality — and because it is given official expression by the Board is indicative of a direction for future policy-making. In this at least is the origin of one of the major features of the 1921 Report.

Secondly the Board advised that the language of the school was not to be a "tongue isolated ... from the English of the home". However in the context of the contemporary view of the school as an improving milieu and an institution for reproducing and proffering culture it is clear that the contemporary knowledge of the nature of language and the prestige of phonetics necessarily precluded any fully articulated notion of sociolinguistic relevance. But the novelty of the view is worth recording, although its essential limitations and lack of impact can be illustrated by reference to the persisting notions of correctness.

The increased activity leading to regular issues and revisions of
regulations relating to English teaching is particularly well reflected in a conference on the Teaching of English in London Elementary Schools which took place in October 1909. This Conference came about as a result of a series of meetings held in London between December 1906 and November 1908. The issues raised in these preliminary meetings are of particular interest as a reflection of how the English teaching contemporary consciousness was tackling the problems that needed to be solved in order to further the institutionalisation of English. The original working party in referring to the Conference the notion of considering the underlying principles of English teaching were breaking new ground in the debate on the teaching of the subject. The introductory note to the proceedings of the Conference includes a statement which suggests that they were sensitive to the new consciousness and concerned to pinpoint its significance. They directed the Conference to "consider the principles which underlie the teaching of English, including the teaching of literature; the objects aimed at; how far the present text books, methods and training of teachers help to attain these objects; whether changes should be made in these respects; whether, in fact, greater attention should not be given at an earlier age to reading stories to children in the words of a masterpiece of English literature, and whether a certain stage of advancement in the art of reading, writing and arithmetic should not be regarded as sufficiently satisfactory for school
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purposes, and whether formal drill in these subjects should not be abandoned in order to leave room for a more extensive teaching of English, especially as to a large extent detailed grammatical knowledge can be acquired incidentally while seeking the main objects of the instruction." (LCC Conference Report, October 1909, p.1).

It is interesting to note that F. S. Boas and George Sampson are instrumental in the formulation of both the Report of this Conference and the 1921 Report. Their influence may account for the extraordinary liberal progressivism of the first statement made in Chapter 1. "The mother tongue is more than a subject, even the most important subject, in the timetable. It is not too much to say that it is part of the personality of every pupil, and that unless full opportunity is given for its development, boys and girls will be prevented from making the best of themselves in later life, either as individuals or as members of the community." (p.1). This sort of 'global' statement about the significance of English teaching is taken up and becomes part of the contemporary consciousness of English teaching as the century progresses. Within it are the beginnings of a psychological and sociological perspective on English teaching which after being further articulated and legitimated by the 1921 Report is given substance by the later applications of the theories of developmental psychology and sociolinguistics.

The Report also reiterates what had clearly become established as a truism in English teaching - namely that ever since 1870 and even after the abandonment of the Codes, the teaching of English in elementary schools had been conducted on "uniform and somewhat unprogressive lines". (p.2).

The Report suggests that the increased institutionalisation of English in schools (the impetus from the 1902 Act) and Colleges and Universities (see Appendix to Chapter 3) is indicative of the claim
English is making of what English teachers see as its rightful inheritance in the curriculum. This shows how the accumulated weight of a significant part of the contemporary consciousness demonstrates a shift in defining what is to be considered 'knowledge'. Of course it is thus inevitable that the drive to claim this 'rightful inheritance' is likely to be challenged by those areas of the curriculum which think that their hitherto legitimately institutionalised positions are at risk. However as further evidence that English is claiming its inheritance, the Report quotes (1) the increasing demand for more and better-qualified English teachers in secondary schools.

(2) the improvement in English textbooks "which follow one another so rapidly from the press."

One of the reasons advanced for this is the increased knowledge of American and continental methods of teaching the mother tongue.

But, as we have previously seen in connection with the 1904 and 1905 official publications, even the Report of this Conference shows some discrepancies between its conception of the deeper and wider issues attaching to English teaching and the methodology it advocates. On the one hand it is hidebound by the contemporary knowledge of the nature and function of non-standard speech, concentrating, as is the usual practice of the times, on phonological issues. For example it refers to the unpleasant 'twang' of cockney speech as "unworthy of being the speech of any person in the capital city of the Empire" (p.4). That statement does as much as any to date the Report. On the other hand it must be allowed that the Report is innovationary in its attempts to come to grips with the deeper significances and thus shows a willingness to attempt an informing rationale. In this the Report denies an essential part of the 19th Century ethos as it had been consistently applied to English teaching, "We do not
think ... that the English lessons should be made the vehicle of direct moral instruction. But we are fully conscious that it is through them, for the most part, that the imagination must be fired, the emotions purified, the general ideal of life enriched for the boys and girls of the London Elementary Schools." (p.5). Thus, in a sense, they are responding to the cultural heritage ideal which shifts the emphasis from directly transmitted moral conformity to indirectly received moral socialisation. Although the fact of a socio-political and ethical status quo may be ultimately preserved the liberal consciousness which articulates this type of rationale would deny the direct correlation between precept and compulsory transmission at the level of crude indoctrination which so characterised the traditional 'moral skills' model. This at least is a step towards the informing theory which receives its major initial articulation in the 1921 Report. Moreover, of course, it is a step towards the institutionalisation of the English teacher as the person perhaps most responsible for effecting this as a profoundly significant species of socialisation. The creators of the 1921 Report were also not slow to see these sorts of implications.

As the LCC Report is clearly committed to increasing the status of English teaching in London it is not surprising to find that it makes detailed recommendations about the time to be devoted to 'English subjects' in the Elementary School. The claim is both formidable and uncompromising. In general terms the Report recommends that the weekly time to be devoted to English subjects should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1(a)</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>11 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 -11 years</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>11 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 -14 years</td>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In more detail the Report suggests the allotment of weekly time to the various branches of English as follows:

### TABLE 1(b)

**Boys' Schools** (Girls aren't mentioned in this context)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>9-11</th>
<th>11-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phonetics</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading (formal)</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Writing (mechanical)</td>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1/2 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spelling and Dictation</td>
<td>1 hour 10 mins.</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grammar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/2 hour</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Composition (a.oral,</td>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.written) (mainly oral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Literature (including</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recitation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                             | 10 hours | 10 hours | 9 hours |

These tables suggest that the conference members were well aware that the only way in which their desires for English could be fulfilled was by securing as much time as possible for the various parts of the subject. Table 1(b) indicates that a chronological reduction in time for basic reading and writing skills is recommended whereas the conference seemed anxious to promote the allocation of increasing time to grammar, composition and literature which would not only be more suitable for older children but also stressed the more prestigious elements of the
subject. It was clearly thought by the liberal-minded conference that elementary school children should have some opportunity of doing work which would be of advantage to them. This and the Report's obvious concern to combat the worst effects of a city environment is indicative of an early notion of compensatory education.

Mention has already been made of the Report's advocacy of the necessity of developing certain social elements in English teaching. As this relates directly to the purposes of this thesis it seems relevant to show how, despite the teacher dominated pedagogic model remaining more or less intact, the future implications for the development of social aspects in English teaching may be located in this Report. It suggests that children might cooperate in framing simple narratives upon subjects— all of which would provide an opportunity for sharing a social experience. Despite the continuing production of manuals of composition, the Report stresses that "composition finds its material in every variety of school activity, and every form of living experience" (p.31).

The Report's observations on grammar are idealistic, but in keeping with the generally progressive spirit. Whereas it has been shown to be largely true to say "that in the days of codec's English meant little more than English grammar" it would be difficult to agree that even a majority of contemporary English teachers would have supported the Report's belief that there was overwhelming consensus that grammar was discredited as a "series of deductions from principles which were postulated instead of being formulated after carefully guided observation" (p.40) [a fuller discussion of the controversy over grammar will be made in the chapter on the 1921 Report]. Thus it is doubtful that "the tendency today is one of extreme reaction" (p.40) is an accurate reflection of contemporary theory and especially practice in the teaching of mechanical skills. However
the Report is probably on safer ground in terms of contemporary attitudes when it advocates "some definite grammatical instruction". The Report thinks this kind of instruction is especially necessary to combat the adverse influence of home and street in London.

The case that the Report makes out for grammar is representative of the basis of a model of 'skills' teaching which persists right to the present day and which the 1921 Report is always ambivalent about. Indeed a feature of the development of English teaching is that the ambivalence increases as the theoretical basis for the model is challenged. Clearly the nature of the model is based on notions of prescription and proscription. The raison d'être expressed remains pedagogically viable for at least 50 years and points up not only a crystallising 'truth' in contemporary consciousness about the nature of language but heralds a period of immunity for that 'truth'. This concept of surviving permanence seems to accord well with the theory of paradigm advanced in a later part of the thesis. The details of the 'truth' or 'knowledge about' language seems to give it the usefulness and rigour which serves as a means of the establishment and legitimation of English studies in the curriculum. Thus we see grammar being vindicated because it is seen as necessary for learning foreign languages; we see the contemporary notion of grammar serving as an introduction to the principles of abstract reasoning and finally as "a means of establishing the principles which govern the clear and accurate construction of sentences, of illustrating the principal variations of form and of elucidating the more common difficulties" (p.43).

Chapter 10 of the LCC Report deals with English Literature. The first comment indirectly illuminates a shaping and controlling force in the teaching of English which has only been mentioned briefly so far -
namely the repercussions of officially sanctioned policy on publishing and the effect of the publishers' lists on the content of lessons. We have seen something of the proliferation of graded readers as a direct result of the codes. Now, the Report points out that "a cry has gone up for the replacement of the graded miscellaneous reader by the continuous reader" (p.47). It says that because of this the supply of new graded readers has practically ceased while continuous readers of every type and quality are pouring from the press (p.47).

The Report itself in recommending readers is clearly attempting to apply some sort of integrating and correlating factor. Three types of reading book are recommended:

1. The miscellaneous Reader
2. The "connected Reader"
3. The "Continuous Reader"

However, unlike its reflections on oral and written English, the Report shows that the relationship which the child has with the text using the teacher as an intermediary is highly individualistic. This accords with the contemporary ethos in English teaching which exhibits very little awareness of how a group oriented and initiated approach can alter attitudes and responses to literature. (More will be made of this later when the notion of individual excellence is discussed).

An almost certainly authoritative reaction to the LCC Report may be found in an article entitled 'The LCC Conference on the Teaching of Shakespeare's plays also helps to show this. "The full comprehension of his writings depends largely upon the reader's experiences of life" (p.54). Thus the Report does not see Shakespeare's plays as a means of providing shared exploration and thus created rather than recreated experiences of life.
English' published in "The School World" in January 1910. The writer allows us to see that the influence of the Report will probably be considerable because of the reputation of those who produced it - summed up as "neither iconoclasts or dreamers" (p.4). He also draws attention to the fact that the qualifications of teachers - pursued so zealously elsewhere in the contemporary debate on the means of increasing the institutionalisation of English teaching - were to be left unconsidered until a future conference (in fact the 1921 Report takes up the issue). The writer reiterates the current thinking on oral English when he suggests that through a model of speech and phonic principles children shall come to speak without faults" (p.4). (In his later pronouncements on dialect he merely echoes the thinking of the Report suggesting that neither he nor anyone else for that matter had a clear idea about the intrinsic nature of language and its implications for individual and social learning.) As far as the institutional role of the teacher vis-a-vis the role of the taught is concerned this type of teaching reinforces hierarchical relationships. The notion of the classroom as a place for reducing social cleavage is still some way off and we have to wait for the 1921 Report to make it visible. However the writer of this article expresses the continuing strength of the underlying contemporary assumption - which had its antecedents in the traditional public school attitude to English teaching - about the relationship between English and its differential efficacy in the classroom. "English is not taught, it is learnt; and all discussion from the teaching side begins from the wrong side." He goes on to ask how members of the conference acquired their attitudes and skills and answers, "We obtained it by heredity or by imitation of people we admired or by our social upbringing or by facilities for entering a library unchecked or by being let alone ... appreciation of
English and all that it means belongs to a caste." (p.5). Given the contemporary drive to improve the status of the subject and the quality of its teachers that statement is perhaps unconsciously and inevitably élitist. At least that particular movement in English teaching would help to explain the tenacity of the belief that the full appreciation of literature is a means of verbal breeding and therefore social advantage. The continuing consciousness of that advantage did not always admit of modification. The reference to heredity will help to explain why.

Perhaps the most significant factors shaping the institutionalisation of English in the secondary schools in this period are the formation of the secondary Inspectorate and the founding of the English Association in 1907. As has already been intimated the work of the former is only patchily recorded in the Ashridge files. However in respect of the drafting and final publication of the 1910 Circular on English Teaching there is not only detail of the Board of Education's work (including that of the Inspectorate) but also of the work of the English Association.

The 'Ashridge' File (Ed 44a) clearly indicates that the initiator of the 1910 Circular was Sir Robert Morant, the Liberal President of the Board of Education. It is he who in a minute to Mr W. N. Bruce, a Principal Assistant Secretary at the Board of Education, draws the Board's attention to the existence of the English Association under the presidency of Mr Arthur Ackland "and which is bringing the whole question of the proper study of English Language and Literature into proper prominence, with important questions as to best methods etc." He gives a directive that the matter be brought up to him again in the following October (1909) "with suggestions for a small committee to consider afresh what
the Board should issue in respect of the teaching of English language and literature in secondary schools, on larger lines and composed in concert (to some extent) with the best people on the English Language Association." This in itself is a revolutionary step because for the first time a subject association had been invited to help shape official policy and is indicative of the genuine attempt made by the Board of Education to act in a cooperative manner towards teachers rather than arbitrarily as did the old Education Department. It also marks the beginning of the real influence of the subject association because it creates an operational precedent for the Board of Education whose official curricular policies from now on are the result of consultation with subject associations.

Sir Robert Morant's memorandum refers to a document sent to him some little time before showing the extent of the claimed improvements in English teaching following the 1906 Regulations (sent by W. N. Bruce). His intention is to collate and expand the improvements in a major policy statement. This intention is expressed in the final part of the Minute, "very likely something suitable could be devised as an exordium to the circular, in respect of the very great improvements believed to have come about in the last few years in our Secondary Schools in regard to this branch of the Curriculum, suggesting particular sources of these improvements, and deducing further suggestions for further improvements."

It is worth following the detailed build-up to the 1910 Circular because it not only shows something of how contemporary consciousness shapes the decision-making of the more amenable corpus of officials responsible for English in the secondary curriculum, but also in detail how the process of institutionalisation is affected by that official corpus.

The first meeting of the committee was held on 26 February 1920 with all the members except Dr. Heath present. What is of great interest is that Professor Sonnenschein had already sent a letter enquiring whether the Board were prepared to adopt the Classical Association's Report on Grammatical Terminology. This represents the official beginning of the not inconsiderable struggle of English to shake off the very real pressure of Classics to bring any future study of English grammar into line with its conception of the real reason for acquiring grammatical competency — namely as a service to learning classical languages. That the committee "agreed that details of Grammatical Terminology were outside the scope the circular" is significant because it clearly indicates a genuine desire on the part of the Board of Education and the Inspectorate to reflect contemporary thinking about the independence of English from Latin grammar. It is also a credit to the integrity of the Board that they should see both the intellectual as well as the ethical case for doing this as so many of the contemporary inspectorate were classical scholars (see Appendix to this chapter). Moreover J. W. Mackail, the Chairman, had been President of the Classical Association.

In the 1904 Regulations a list of suggested books had been appended in order to guide teachers. However we have seen that the publishers ensured that these books became institutionalised and thus not only helped to shape children's consciousness arbitrarily, but also very
often rendered teachers with little or no real choice. The 1910 Circular Committee whilst believing that the 1904 list had been of very great value "particularly in the influence which it had had on the publishers in the past" thought that the Board would be "ill-advised to repeat or revise it" (Minutes of 26 Feb. meeting) "on the other hand it would be useful and indeed necessary in the body of the circular to illustrate arguments by concrete examples both of books that should be read and of books that should not be read at various stages. It was understood that the English Association were contemplating the issue of a list of books suitable for secondary schools" (ibid). This represents a certain liberalising of attitude, although it is clear that the Board expected that the English Association's selection of suggested texts would obviously meet with their approval.

Now despite the general feeling in the Board of Education that the teaching of English had improved in secondary schools (as indicated by W. N. Bruce's original report to Sir Robert Morant in 1909) the drafting committee showed commendable thoroughness in calling for evidence of how English was actually being taught in those schools where teachers were confined to using a poor selection of texts. Thus J. W. Mackail asked Carr to collect some cases of schools exemplifying how not to teach English literature. On March 3rd a circular letter asking for this information was sent to six Inspectors, Messrs Battiscombe, Bridge, Trayes, Stephens, Urwick and Winthrop Young.

On March 7th 1910 Battiscombe replied from Weston Super Mare. He thought that there were two prevailing faults as far as the teaching of literature was concerned:

1) Inadequate treatment of the subject due often to lack of sufficient time, but chiefly to scarcity of competent teachers of literature.
(2) undue limitation of the range of work by the syllabuses of external examinations. He notes that "schools are unwilling to devote time to any book which is not prescribed" and refers to "narrow syllabus limited by examination requirement".

This clearly led to what today we would recognise as the problem of relevance - e.g. his report of Langford Grammar School, Somerset, where "heavy country lads of 14 or 15 were floundering hopelessly over Childe Harold".

On March 14, 1910 Stephens replied from Newcastle-on-Tyne. He reports of the inordinate length of time given to single texts - e.g. at Dame Allen's Endowed School for Boys, Newcastle, which had undergone a full inspection in October 1909. He says that in Form III two terms were given to the teaching of Lambs' Tales, whilst the third term was taken up by revision of the text. In the higher forms, taking the Cambridge Local syllabus, between 70 and 80 lessons were occupied with "Julius Caesar" (Stephens hastens to add that this school was not working under the Board's regulations).

Examination of the other Inspectors' replies reveals a variety of malpractice. In a number of schools several forms were not reading any prose for as long as two years, whilst because of the demands of examinations only one text was being read during a whole year. For example at Woolwich Polytechnic Day Secondary School (Full Inspection 5 - 9 October, 1908) "Julius Caesar" was being read by no fewer than 8 forms in the Upper School (200 pupils). There were in all 140 copies in stock.

Schools were also criticised for studying unsuitable books. For example at Sheffield Central Secondary School for Boys (Full Inspection
9 - 12 November, 1909) Forms V and VI were reading Milton's "Areopagitica" (set by the Northern Matriculation Board) "which was too difficult both for master and boys". Schools were also criticised for sacrificing a graduated course of reading in order to obtain a chronological sequence of authors or to find time for studying the History of English Literature (e.g. Windsor: Clewer St. Stephen's High School, Full Inspection, 11 - 13 November, 1908 and Bridgnorth School for Boys, Full Inspection, 8 - 9 March, 1910).

In these reports is contained the evidence necessary for any official implementation leading to a more viable institutionalisation of English studies based on more time allocation, better qualified teachers and a more carefully thought out policy on the main content of English texts - i.e. literary texts.

It was at their meeting on the 15th February 1910 that the initial drafting committee agreed to consult with a small group of people "mainly composed of persons of experience in the teaching of the subject in secondary schools". Two important statements come out of this meeting: (1) the recognition that in consulting the English Association a precedent for consulting other associations has been created. However the Board's reaction whilst innovationary is understandably cautious. Thus (2) "we must be prepared sooner or later to recognise these organisations of expert opinion all along the line, and must face the inconvenience of their standard of merit and efficiency being at present very uneven."

4. My underlining.

5. On 27 January 1910, after preliminary correspondence with Arthur Acland, the Board had officially approached the English Association "to give them the benefit of expert advice in the matter as regards both Boys' and Girls' schools".
Correspondence during February 1910 clearly indicates that the Board wishes to remain firmly in control of both the procedure and extent of consultation. They wished to prepare an outline draft after which a fuller version would be deferred until the outline had been discussed with representatives of the English Association. In this correspondence the Board suggested that the English Association limit their representatives "to 3/4 persons who have had practical experience in teaching the subject both in boys' and girls' schools". In response to the Board's request the English Association nominated three of its most prominent members to serve on the joint committee. These were Percy Simpson, Headmaster of St. Olave's Grammar School, Tower Bridge; Miss C. L. Thompson, Miss L. M. Faithfull, Principal of the Ladies College, Cheltenham, and Mr. J. H. Fowler of Clifton College. Having drawn up an outline of the proposed revised English Circular in May, 1910, the Board sent it to these representatives in June 1910 for their consideration before the first joint meeting on 15th July.

The outline itself suggests that the Board is keen to formulate the objectives of English teaching rather than spell out the methodology whereby those objectives might be obtained. That is why the draft outline acknowledges that the methods to be adopted in individual schools will depend on a variety of circumstances. At this stage the committee also refused to mention specific books. The overall objective of English teaching is defined as "to train the mind to appreciate good literature and to cultivate the proper use of the language both in speech and writing" (Outline of English Circular, 1910, p.1).

The draft outline seems also to have taken into consideration the growing contemporary desire for continuity of method and outlook to be fostered in the English classroom when it distinguishes that the three
main branches of literature (poetry, prose and drama) "must not be
treated as separate branches of the subject, and in any given class
the same teacher should be responsible for all three so far as
possible" (p.2).

As might have been expected the outline Circular stresses the need
for acknowledging the importance of English in the curriculum as well
as the need for properly qualified teachers. However the importance
of English should not be as an isolated subject. The committee's
recommendations on correlation show their fear that not only may the
basics of English be neglected but also the special benefits of concen-
trating on "good literature and the proper use of language both in
speech and writing" may be lost. They are ready to concede however
that "correlation on sound lines ... may become valuable in the later
stages" (p.3). Furthermore the Committee is particularly anxious that
English is seen to have a distinctive, legitimate and curricularly viable
subject matter and they make a special point about digression. "The
teacher of English should be most careful to keep closely to his subject,
all the more because discursiveness is so tempting." (p.3)

So anxious, however, is the Committee to implement further the
'cultural-heritage' model that they come down strongly in favour of
recitation. They even suggest that it is not necessary for a pupil to
understand the full meaning of a passage before committing it to memory.
"A boy should steep himself in a piece of poetry before he tries to
understand it." Significantly, however, they also suggest that the
teacher is left to choose the passages.

In view of the changes in consciousness of English teaching after
1910 it is worth recording that this outline of the 1910 Circular shows
us something of at least the officially approved articulating pedagogical
rationale for the teaching of literature. This indicates that the traditional 'cultural-heritage' model, firmly based on the classics and presenting these as areas of some intellectual complexity, wherein lay guiding moral precepts and aesthetic revelation, was to be firmly entrenched in the schools. Perhaps it is here that the Classically determined socialising pattern of the Inspectorate and the Board (see Appendix 1 at end of this chapter) determines a construct about the reality of what will be ultimately worth knowing as a permanent feature of any further improvements in any future institutionalisation of English teaching, viz "all literature is a foreign language and requires to be learnt. Detailed study should, therefore, be treated primarily as a construing lesson." (p.4).

Thus the outline circular's pronouncements on novels may be put in context. It becomes fairly clear later on (see chapter on the 1924 Suggestions, p.215) that at this time because of the dominance of the literature of the past and the influence of the 'extra-mural' tradition of the public schools' treatment of literature in general, let alone the reading of novels, that the novel was regarded on the whole as trivial or subversive. "Novels are not suitable for class reading. The teacher may select novels to be read at home – with occasional discussion in class." (p.7).

As far as grammar is concerned once again the drafting committee show that they are members of an educational generation which really did not know the underlying principles of language. On Page 2 of the Outline Circular they make a distinction between those pupils who are learning Latin and those who are not, suggesting that the former did not need any formal English grammar teaching. Thus the two grammars are obviously seen as complementary. However on Page 12 we find the following
observation, "The formal teaching of English Grammar in the past was based upon the established principles of Latin grammar, and was valued partly because it was supposed to be a sound species of mental drill. It has at last come to be realised that the principles and rules which have been ascertained to govern the use of a highly inflected language such as Latin are almost wholly inapplicable to the case of English."

For composition they suggest that the teacher be allowed to be responsible for the choice of subjects (This is in keeping with one of the guiding principles). They clearly hoped that in composition work the notion of slavish imitation and reproduction would disappear for ever.6 "Composition set to the younger pupils should consist mainly of direct description of what they have seen and read. They will then have the matter before them before they begin to write" (p.8).

The first proof of the Outline Circular was produced on 31st May, 1910 showing very few alterations. More emphasis was placed on oral composition which "should form the larger part of the exercises given in the preparatory forms".

On July 11, 1910, just four days before the joint meeting between the Board of Education Committee and the four members of the English Association, Percy Simpson sent to the English Circular Revision Committee the English Association's views on the outline. This appears in the 'Ashridge' File (Ed.44a) as a series of statements against which the initial reaction of the Revision Committee have been written. Percy Simpson's comments are in themselves a useful indication of the views of the only association of English teachers in existence at that time.

6. However this was not likely to happen in the schools which is an indication of the sort of teacher conservatism to be set against the Board's relative progressivism which is illustrated again in respect of 6th Form options mentioned in Chapter 7.
(1) In commenting on the Board's desire that the study of texts should come before a knowledge of literary history, the English Association's view is that such knowledge is essential, especially for children from 16 - 18 years. (The Board makes no comment)

(2) The English Association also believes that it is often impossible to have one teacher for the three branches (The Board agrees)

(3) Simpson says that the English Association believes in the form-teacher approach. Children should be "taught by a teacher who knows the children well and understands their needs and capacities. The composition, too, should be set by the teacher who sees most of the form's work and can bring the composition into relation with other subjects" (The Board agrees)

(4) Thus the English Association believes that History and Literature may be usefully correlated, e.g. Burke and the French Revolution. "Many English poems and prose works are unintelligible without a knowledge of the historical conditions under which they were written." (The Board makes no comment)

(5) Perhaps sensing its possible constraining influence (especially in view of his immediately previous points on correlation) Simpson says that the English Association group would like the paragraph on 'digression' omitted (See p.82) (The Board disagrees)

(6) Whilst approving of paraphrase, Simpson says that "poetry expressing deep feeling should of course be avoided". (The Board makes no comment)

(7) In contrast to the Board's views on teachers initiating composition work, the English Association's attitude is that children should be allowed to make suggestions and that where
the subject is narrative only the barest outline should be
given. "We question whether a good deal of preparatory dis-
cussion is necessary - leave something to the child's invention"
(The Board agrees)

(8) In contrast to the Board's view the English Association group
think that verse composition is more valuable for junior pupils
"who have not reached the stage of self-consciousness" (The
Board makes no comment)

(9) The English Association disagrees with the Board about 'going
carefully through each exercise with the pupil' because there
is insufficient time. In any case they believe that most
mistakes fall into a very few classes (The Board's comment:
'about common mistakes, yes')

Apart from some difference on the projected spheres of influence
of English teaching and one or two differences over emphasis, the views
of the two consulting groups show a high measure of agreement. However
Simpson's report also includes a section headed 'omissions'. In this
may be found an important articulating principle of the English
Association's approach to the teaching of English, and, of course,
especially the teaching of literature. "It is not so important to get
a specialist as to get teachers who have a feeling for literature and can
communicate it" (Simpson also calls on the Board to give some guidance
to teachers and asks if they could give some definite advice by printing
a short but select list of books which teachers of English literature
ought to read. The Board declines. It is interesting to note that
even the English Association seems to invest the Board with an ultimate
and legitimate authority in these matters, even though they themselves
have been brought in to advise the Board in the very same area!сходства,
Simpson indicates an English Association view which has much fuller expression later on when he says that he hopes that the Board will lay more stress on the aesthetic side of teaching.

Thus on 15th July 1910 the English Circular Revision Committee met with representatives of the English Association. Immediately the Board expressed the spirit in which it hoped to present the circular. The Minutes of the meeting record that the members were "anxious... to avoid producing anything like a syllabus" (p.1). That Mr Simpson replied that the English Association were glad to hear this because they were contemplating the issue of a syllabus themselves is a clear indication of the role that the English Association were now beginning to set for themselves. Perhaps as the Board was anxious not to give directives about what should be taught, the English Association saw this as their chance to promote a content for English teaching which more closely represented the views of its membership which in turn was much more likely to represent the views of Secondary English teachers generally.

On the question of the same teacher being made responsible for all three branches of literature teaching, the English Association contingent was able to persuade the Board's representatives that this was much less likely than they had supposed. The English Association representatives were also able to persuade the Board to accept their definition of the value of digression by equating it with the comparative method of teaching. Miss Faithfull apparently swayed the matter by having her point about the danger of discouraging general cultivation accepted. Both parties agreed on the value of paraphrase, vindicating it as the surest way of testing pupils' understanding.

It was clearly a matter of expediency and the recognition of their
necessity for the institutional survival of English that brought the delegates to the conclusion that the claims of examinations should not be ignored by teachers.

By and large, then, there was a very high measure of agreement between the two parties and the evidence in the 'Ashridge' file suggests that in the planning stage the Board was genuinely prepared to amend their views in the light of the English Association's recommendations. Although the Board was not anxious to issue booklists as such it is interesting to find in the file detailed specimen lists of English texts for use at various stages which had been submitted by the English Association for the Board's perusal. (See Appendix 2 at the end of this chapter for these specimen lists of texts. It is worth comparing these lists with those included in the 1924 "Suggestions". In so doing any evaluation about the overall socialising rationale is made more explicit).

Thus one may assume that when the final draft of the Circular was published on 22nd December, 1910, more than any other previous official pronouncement, it was highly representative of the consciousness of English teachers at that time. In the published version the original outline is filled in by an introduction which serves as some sort of descriptively oriented reinforcing theory. Some of the vaguenesses which have always been a feature of any attempt to produce an integrated rationale for English teaching until recently are in evidence. The Board shows its flexibility and a touch of permissiveness when the Circular asserts that English is the last subject in which a teacher should be bound by hard and fast rules. Referring to the diversity of conditions in which English is taught in secondary schools (evidenced by Inspectors' reports and one of the reasons for revision of earlier
publications) the Circular suggests that "no external authority can or ought to offer detailed guidance".

As the Outline draft indicated, the Circular is quite clear about the necessity for improving the qualifications of teachers. It dismisses the idea that anyone can teach English. The revised Circular has most to say on literature and composition which it insists are not separate subjects because they are organically interconnected. In this way perhaps the primacy of writing and reading for precision of expression and understanding is established. The place of grammar is made subordinate to literature and composition from which, the Circular said, it should never be isolated. In this way the Board's notion of English as a living organism in process of constant change is given some substance as is the assertion that the rules governing Latin are almost wholly inapplicable to English. The earlier inconsistency seems to have been quietly dropped, although there is no reference to it in the preliminary discussions.

Literature: "This Circular deliberately avoids suggesting specific books as suitable. Two guiding principles are put forward:

(1) The books should be of real merit as literature.

(2) The books should be difficult enough to demand genuine effort from the class, but not so difficult as to be beyond their grasp."

Thus it is not surprising that fiction is discussed as involving "little or no mental effort" (p.5) and the old 'control of consciousness' notion may be found in the pious demand that everything read should be "wholesome in subject and spirit". In order for this to be effected literature should be given in a pure form, untramelled by
history and with sufficient time, presumably, for the learning of long extracts. On page 22 the Circular observes "There is one thing far too little cultivated at the present time, viz the learning by heart of copious extracts from the English Classics. This is not so much a method as a presupposition of all methods ... in every class repetition from memory should form an essential part of the instruction in Literature." However, despite the children at times being allowed to select poems or passages for themselves, the Circular reminds teachers that they have to exercise care in the choice of passages. In this way, despite their genuine desire not to be autocratic, the Board surely indicates how the Circular will have an influence over teachers. Indeed the Board's recommendations ensure that the transmission triad of teacher, text and pupil maintains the respective hierarchical relationship between teacher and taught. This is shown in such statements as "similarly in prose the Higher forms of a school should read in detail a few masterpieces of a more elaborate kind taken from the writings of the most famous essayists, historians, letter-writers and biographers" (p.27) (Examination of Appendix 2 to this chapter will show how the English Association's selection accorded with this generalised description).

Other aspects of the Circular's recommendations on literature had also been anticipated in the outline - namely the advocacy of paraphrase and the attempt to put the history of literature into some sort of perspective, i.e. it "should only be used to give stimulus and suggestion" (pp.35-36 passim).

Composition: The Circular very clearly indicates a model for the notion of progression based on the linear acquisition of increasingly
complicated skills. This model has served English teachers up to the present day and is still basic to any structured and more formalised approach to the teaching of writing, despite the increased sophistication in the description of the structural components of written messages (See L.E.W Smith's "Towards a New English Curriculum", published in 1972, as an example of this).

In detail, the 1910 Circular advocated a mainly oral approach to composition in the preparatory forms. Thereafter "the practice of composition will proceed through the paragraph or group of connected sentences to the complete essay or theme" (p.38). Moreover "the mechanism of the composition is determined by the subject-matter. Both alike will be accordingly graded in complexity as the pupil advances in the school" (p.39). As with literature, the Circular clearly expects the teacher to fulfil his hierarchical obligations and especially in the preparatory stage both initiate and lay down firm guide lines about the choice of subject matter and the sequences of writing. However "any attempt to cultivate a formal literary style is to be deprecated" (p.46). Analysis is suggested, although it should be mainly oral and "not be made into a regular feature of the instruction at any stage of the course" (p.50).

The main sources of reaction to the 1910 Circular are to be found in the Board of Education's own internal correspondence, preserved in the 'Ashridge' file, Ed.44(a) as well as in the contemporary educational press. It seems that the scope of the Circular did not entirely satisfy the English specialist HMI's two of whom in particular, Scott and Philips, thought that the Circular should have dealt with elementary education in detail rather than incidentally. However the most detailed criticism comes from HMI Dr Edwards. His major criticism points out the vagueness and ambivalence in the Board's thinking about the relative
positions of Latin and English grammar which have already been discussed on Pages 92/3 above. He says that some critics of the Circular "Suspect the artificial and unnecessary encouragement of Latin at the expense of English" (Letter, 30 Jan. 1910). He refers to the Latin Circular (No. 574) which preceded the English Circular and which did not confine itself to Latin, but dealt also with English and the English Language. Edwards says the critics think that at least as much should have been said in favour of English Language as had been said in the Latin Circular about Latin language. He believes that the Latin Circular cast aspersions on modern English. He quotes from that Circular's statements which are clearly hostile to the institutionalisation of English. "Latin is the most valuable help to understanding the general principle of the European languages" and best "corrective to the loose phrasing which easily arises from the syntactical freedom of modern English".

Edwards blames the Board for not firmly countering these aspersions on English and accuses the Latin Circular of going out of its way to try to kill the study of English Language by stating (p. 2) that it should not be necessary for boys who learn Latin to go on receiving separate instruction in formal English grammar (after the age of 11). He censures the Board for not giving any definite guidance on this matter. (Reference has already been made to the Board's inconsistency on Pages 92/3 above). Edwards also uncompromisingly exposes the Board's ignorance of the linguistic aspects of language. What he has to say in comparing English and Latin, however, points to the future real and scientifically effected divergence of the two grammars as the basis for a pedagogic model. "The question naturally arises why should the study of the structure of a dead inflectional language be
recommended by the Board and why should the study of the structure of a living analytical language be discouraged or forbidden" (p.4).

He contends "that the phenomena of all living languages can be observed and systematised accurately and usefully" and asks "why leave the readers of the Circular in doubt whether there is such a thing as English Grammar at all" (p.6).

Edwards' views on phonetics and oral English (he accuses the Board of their neglect) look forward to a later controversy over pronunciation, class and job opportunity. "It is thought that the question of the pronunciation of English is intimately connected with the complete success of the Free Place system which the Board has enforced. The effect of small sound-changes and divergences of pronunciation in the separation of classes of society in England is almost comparable with the effects of caste marks in India" (p.6).

Implicit in his final remark is an early criticism of the concept of correctness in speech.

The correspondence in the 'Ashridge' File (Ed.44a) also reveals that it was felt that the publication of Circular 753 was no occasion to mention the cooperation of the English Association. One can only conjecture that given the warning signs of the Classical Association's initial pressure over grammatical terminology, the Board thought it prudent not to be seen to be fostering the interests of another subject association. (In any case such a public acknowledgement may have been difficult to ignore in the future should the Board not wish to consult with a subject association) In a way the consultation with the English Association may be viewed as some sort of experiment which having proved satisfactory from the Board's point of view was likely to be repeated.

This certainly became the case a few years later when more substantial

---

7. The Report of the English Association's Executive Committee for 1910 (actually referred to in the Ed.44a File) has no such inhibition and specifically mentions the invitations from the Board of Education to consult with the Revision Committee.
publications were being prepared on other major areas of the curriculum.6 We shall also see that the Board's sensitivity over the whole subject of grammar caused problems which were reflected in the 1921 Report. The internal evidence also suggests that the Board was by no means entirely satisfied with the Circular. Just before its publication Mackail is particularly critical about the overall tone of the Circular (Minute, 7th December, 1910 to W. N. Bruce and R. Carr). He thinks that it reflects too much compromise and thus lacks spontaneity and originality. He indirectly accuses the Committee of failing to "strike boldly for definite statement and positive stimulus". All in all he believes the 1910 Circular to be dull. However, as has already been indicated, he believes that the experiment of inviting outside cooperation has been very gratifying. He welcomed the spirit of cooperation and the valuable suggestions and useful information given, and notes that the English Association representatives had said that both they and the association as a whole had greatly valued the privilege of criticism.

A note appended to this Minute by W. N. Bruce on December 8th is rather ironical when one remembers that it had been Bruce who had originally suggested to Sir Robert Morant that after the 1906 Regulations the teaching of English had improved. He writes "This Circular is rather formidable in size .... but I think its length is justified in view of the great neglect of the subject hitherto, and of the very low standard of the teaching even now that the subject is beginning to get fair treatment in the timetable. I doubt if there

6. After the 1918 Education Act the Board of Education published Reports in four major areas of the curriculum: Natural Science, Modern Languages, English (the 1921 Report) and Classics.
are more than one or two schools to which we should care to send a
foreigner to see effective teaching in the Mother Tongue".

Sir Robert Morant himself also submitted a Minute (on 16th
December 1910) shortly before the publication of the Circular. He
seems to have been particularly anxious that the spirit of the Circular
must be applied to younger pupils as much as to those over 12 and
suggests that Mackail draft something to that effect. However, given
that the Circular was intended to be a major policy statement and thus
a very real shaping force in the further institutionalisation of English
teaching, Morant is disturbed that its contents may be interpreted as
irrelevant to those who are not going to be literary specialists or
even merely interested in literature. He refers especially to scientists
and suggests that they be reminded "that they need quite as much as other
folk to possess the faculty of expressing clearly what they mean to say
and that the absence of this faculty and the lack of training in this
English expression or composition has been amongst the most serious draw-
backs that have hindered scientific men and others from achieving success
even in the very subjects in which they are most interested and most
proficient." He asks that an insertion be made in Section 2 incorpor-
ating his observation. On the same day Mackail sends a Minute to the
Advisory Committee accepting both of Morant's points.

Examination of the reactions of the contemporary educational press
shows that the Circular was received with mixed feelings. "The Standard"
(5th January 1911) is scathing, dismissing "principles" as platitudes and
criticising the Circular for lack of information on how composition and
literature might be taught. "In any case", the review adds, "English
teachers and others are not sufficiently skilled in the art of expression
themselves to help pupils." Indeed the whole tone of the review suggests
a reactionary consciousness as these were the beliefs about English teachers held 20 years before. If for no other reason than dispelling such exaggerations, the drive towards improving the qualifications of English teachers was a matter of some urgency. This reactionary consciousness is further evidenced by the review's attack on the Board's idea that grammar belongs to a dead language. "There is a close affinity between English and Latin." Perhaps this sort of comment helps us to put the Board's official pronouncement into a more realistic contemporary context. (It may also throw light on the Board's ambivalence as an attitude which was the natural result of a desire not to alienate a powerful contemporary lobby).

The review's comments on the Board's lack of guidance on methodology contains a certain amount of irony and throws doubt on the wisdom of not publically acknowledging the contribution of the English Association to the Circular. "That excellent body, the English Association, has been joined by large numbers of teachers, many of whom have published through the association valuable suggestions, compared with which the Circular of the Board of Education is merely an indication that the officials are at length becoming dimly aware that something really ought to be said about the teaching of English."

Reiterating what we ascertained from the Inspectors' Reports (see pp.87-89) the review also criticises the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board "which sets papers for hundreds of secondary school pupils annually (and) still insists upon the learning by heart of all the notes on a play of Shakespeare." However the review's assertion that the English composition set an essay on a subject of which the pupil is very often necessarily ignorant contradicts Jessie Smith's findings (See discussion pp.107-112). Apart from "The Morning Post" (11th January, 1911) which
criticises the style and structure of the Circular, other reviews are more favourable, if not enthusiastically so. "The Times" (6 January, 1911) thinks that the Circular will give a lead and is "an authoritative indication of method". The "Journal of Education" (1 February, 1911) thinks that "the Circular's reticence about methods and texts is eminently wise" (Reference is also made to the fact that the Circular will be sent to Eton and Winchester, "though it is not intended for the likes of them"! 7) "The Manchester Guardian" (9 January, 1911) seizes on the grammar point. "Undoubtedly the wrong way to teach English is by grammar." The reviewer says that the Board has given no specific instruction on the teaching of English - perhaps rightly. Its reflections present the now fast crystallising 'centrality' argument.

"The teaching of English in schools is like the teaching of morality. It should pervade every lesson rather than be the subject of any one lesson ... English is the Medium of instruction and the teaching of English is therefore the test of the efficiency of the teaching of other subjects."

A later reflection may be found in "The Times Educational Supplement" (7 February, 1911) in a letter from F. H. Colson of Cambridge. Given Miss Smith's information gained from two public school correspondents (see page 109/9 below) his views perhaps represent the real shift in a consciousness which had hitherto always questioned the basic acceptability of English in the curriculum. "I suppose that 'English' as an important school subject has come to stay for the present." However his next point is partly prophetic, even if his analysis of the final result of the institutionalisation of English teaching is not. He says

7. My underlining.
that he thinks that a future generation dissatisfied with the results of teaching the mother tongue directly will revert to the old position "that it can only be taught indirectly through translation from and into another language". Although the latter point could hardly again be irrefutable, even in 1910, certainly there is some evidence today that in some schools English has disappeared in the form which the 1910 Circular had helped to institutionalise further.

So far this chapter has been mainly concerned with the Board of Education's part in the early moves to institutionalise English in schools. Indeed the only evidence which the 'Ashridge' file reveals of teaching at the grass roots is the extant Inspectors' Reports already referred to on pp. 87-89 above. However the contemporary educational press reveals a contribution by an outsider which it is very important to refer to here because it is almost certainly a unique view.


The preamble to the report contains some interesting sociological reflections on the state of English education at the time and it is perhaps true to say that only a more sociologically aware foreigner and perhaps necessarily an American, given the socio-political differences between the United States and British systems of education, could have made these observations. To her eyes the hierarchical system was glaringly obvious. "Education in England has been aristocratic, the privilege of a class (p.266). "There is still little relation between the elementary school, which is for the masses and the secondary school. They are, frankly,
differentiated” (p.267). She points to the hierarchy in Scotland and London where "in addition to the regular secondary schools there are higher elementary schools organised by the LCC and providing a superior elementary education for specially selected pupils... This is the higher education of the people. True secondary education, as we understand the term, instead of being a commonplace as with us, is to a large extent the special privilege of birth or of ability" (p.267). However her approval of elitism is scarcely disguised - and she suggests that she holds to such views because of a reaction against the "evils of false democracy" which she says characterises American schools. She says this would be impossible in England because of "the frank differentiation of education according to the ability and probable future of the pupil" (p.288). She stresses that the future belongs to children with ambition and ability and believes in a "restriction of opportunity to those who will profit by it" (p.288).

On Page 269 she puts her finger on first the reason for the neglect of English and then for the poverty of provision for English studies. "English has not been considered important for the elementary schools i.e. for the common people, it has not been considered necessary for the secondary schools and for the children of culture and ancestry." Her analysis is sociohistorical in that it reiterates the effects of the hierarchical status quo on English teaching and describes a state of affairs which the Board of Education had begun to rectify necessarily at the pedagogical and curricular level even if the socio-political description still held good.

Moreover her reflections on the way in which the public schools began to take up English studies suggests that it was for social reasons. She quotes Dr Lyttleton of Eton and Mr C. G. Steel of Rugby as saying
that traditionally a thorough classical training had been the hallmark of an English gentleman — and implicit in this was the easy mastery, the elegant use of the vulgar tongue. However with the lessening importance of classical training and the substitution of mathematics and modern languages, the scientific schools and the Army in particular (and apparently it was the Army which had first effectively protested to the public schools against ignoring English) were having to cope with the anomaly of an Englishman — a gentleman socially — without the easy command of the mother tongue. Thus according to Miss Smith's informants, English had become a recognised necessity, taking its place in the curriculum of the great public schools and universities.

Miss Smith's reflections on the time allocated to English teaching do point up the failure of the 1910 Circular to improve on those allocations. She refers to an address by Miss Clements, January 11th, 1908, on "The Teaching of English in Girls' Secondary Schools" (Published as Pamphlet No. 6 by the English Association in 1908) where it was reported that out of 65 of the most representative secondary girls' schools in England only 10 give over 3 hours to English in the 6th Form, and in only 13 do the 4th Forms get as much as 3 hours teaching a week.¹⁰

¹⁰. It is very important to note that the 1910 Revision Committee had also read Miss Clements' paper. In Percy Simpson's views on the Board's Outline Circular on behalf of the English Association (see pp. 95-96 above) his request that the point on 'digression' be omitted has written against it 'No — called for by Miss Clements' paper'. Thus whilst feeling on safer ground in making points about the scope and content of English, the Board were clearly evasive about the other aspect of Miss Clements' paper — namely the question of subject time allocation. That they were willing to suggest generally rather than specifically that more time should be allocated to English in the curriculum shows a measure of political expediency in view of the hostility of some other subjects to the institutionalisation of English.
Her analysis of the detail of English teaching in elementary schools shows that she saw the teaching of explicit skills as the major characteristic. "The composition work ... includes training in the conventions of letter writing. The pupils are drilled to use short, clear sentences and great stress is laid upon form, arrangement, neatness and accuracy of work" (p.272). However as far as literature is concerned the improvements which the 1910 Circular built on are in evidence. Miss Smith points to the reading of nursery rhymes, poems, ballads, fairy tales, stories of all sorts and Shakespeare plays. She also observes that "much emphasis is given to intelligent loud reading - put our American schools to blush" (p.272).

In the secondary schools she notes that although the headmaster or senior English teacher may choose the texts to be read, plenty of freedom is allowed to the class teacher. However it is significant that at Eton English includes history and geography - i.e. the sorts of texts approved during this period by the Board of Education. (Inspection of Appendix 2 and the recommended texts appended to the 1924 Suggestions show this kind of influence which, emanating from the great public schools may very well have been thought the best for everybody).

It is very interesting that Miss Smith should remark on the lack of work in exposition and argumentation in the schools she visited. "From the lowest forms the students are given practice in describing things seen, in telling stories, in writing dialogue. In the upper forms there is debate and much emphasis is laid on précis writing. But the technique of description, narration, exposition and argumentation is not attempted ... A good deal of work is done in the lower forms with the paraphrase and reproduction." The emphasis on précis work suggests a desire to foster a skill which is basic to the civil servant; perhaps
this was seen as the most relevant intellectual skill to be taught in view of the secondary schools being the recruiting ground for higher clerical grades. Presumably, in order to fill administrative posts, the university would refine the skill as well as encouraging the more intellectually demanding activities of exposition and argumentation.

On page 285 Miss Smith says that she is convinced that in England as in America there is an awakening to the value of the study of English. She demonstrates that she is aware of the new English movement in the LCC Schools (she would almost certainly have known about the LCC's working party on elementary schools' English). She also notes that Winston Churchill in an address delivered on 7th February 1908 urged that increased prominence be given to English in the educational system of the country and refers to the Goldsmith endowment at Oxford (See Appendix 1 to Chapter 3). However, she says, the most significant event is the organisation of the English Association and quotes that part of Sidney Lee's address on the purpose of the association which refers to the desirability of securing a prominent place for English in the curriculum and which sees the English Association as a forum for those "who have faith in the power of English literature to humanise life and learning" (i.e. the Arnoldian ideal as the major articulator of the curriculum).

Miss Smith visited the following schools: (only 16 mentioned in her article)

Cambridge and County School
Boroughmuir School, Edinburgh
Ibrox Elementary School, Glasgow
Bellahorston Academy
Manchester Grammar School
Miss Smith's account is significant because it points up the institutional effects of the implicit but dominant ideology which was supportive of the hierarchical organisation of British schools. We may infer from her account that this ideology is implicit within the consciousness of the Board of Education and the Inspectorate. This in itself helps to put any present-day notions about the 'progressiveness' of the Board of Education into sharper focus. Moreover it also provides an illuminating perspective on the coming institutionalisation of English.
APPENDIX 1 : The Recruitment, Background and Qualifications of the Inspectorate between 1902 and 1920.

A. Items selected from Public Record Office File, Ed 23/608

'Date and origin of Inspectors', housed at the Land Registry Office, London.

(i) The recruitment of the secondary inspectorate after 1902

Minute from Mr Oates to Mr Pullinger (Board of Education) dated 14th October 1920.

Oates reminds Pullinger that before 1902 all Inspectors had to possess a First Class Honours degree because of their close dealing with subject experts in the colleges and universities. He suggests that such high qualifications are not so important for Elementary Schools' Inspectors.

Minute, presumably also from Mr Oates to Mr Pullinger and undated, referring to the need for First Class Qualifications in the Secondary Inspectorate. (By 1920 there were 117 Elementary and 46 Secondary Inspectors at the Board of Education).

Of the 34 HMI's mentioned 19 possessed one or more First Class Honours degrees from Oxford or Cambridge, 4 had been Fellows at their colleges, 4 had "first rate qualifications in modern languages", and 4 others were ex-Headmasters. An illuminating comment about the prestige and therefore the influence of such men follows. "To reduce the proposition of first-class men would seriously reduce the capacity of the whole body, as well as exposing it to damaging criticism from a profession which naturally looks on high academic qualifications as an important factor in its judgment of men."
The Minute also includes a list of schools in which the Inspectors had previously taught as assistant masters:

- Clifton
- Dartmouth
- Osborne
- Merchant Taylors (2)
- Uppingham (2)
- St. Paul's (13)
- Tonbridge
- Malvern
- Rugby
- Eton
- Kings College School
- Strand School

None of these schools was on the Board's Grant List.

B. Item selected from Public Record Office File, Ed.23/129 (Land Registry Office), 'Special Qualifications of Inspectors'.

This item is of especial interest because it includes detailed background information about the English Inspectorate at a significant time for the institutionalisation of English in schools, June 1911. Inspection of later files yields no such similar information. The details of the Senior Inspector category have been incorporated into a table for easier reference.

In order to point up the comment in the text of the thesis (p. 86 above) about the classical education of the inspectorate at that time, all classics qualifications have been underlined in red.
TABLE 2. Qualifications of the English Senior Inspectorate, June 1911.

**MEN INSPECTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF INSPECTOR</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIVISIONAL INSPECTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.H.B. Dale (later chief inspector)</td>
<td>19 Dec. 1871</td>
<td>M.A. (Oxon), 1st in Classical Mods. 1892; Craven Scholar 1891; Ireland Scholar 1892; Derby Scholar 1895; 1st in Lit. Hum. 1894; Fellow of Merton, 1894. Taught Latin and French</td>
<td>22 April 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.M. Field</td>
<td>8 May 1852</td>
<td>M.A. (Oxon), 1st in Classical Mods., 1873; Gaisford Greek Verse Prize, 1874; Gaisford Greek Prose, 1875, 2nd in Lit. Hum. 1875</td>
<td>13 Feb. 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF INSPECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.P. Scott</td>
<td>29 Feb. 1856</td>
<td>M.A., LLD (Cantab.), Le Bas and Member's Prize for English 1872 and 1877</td>
<td>1 June 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Alexander</td>
<td>11 June 1850</td>
<td>B.A. (Oxon), Newdigate Prize Poem, 1874, 3rd in Classical History, 1874; Chancellor's English Essay Prize, 1877, Sacred Poem Prize, 1878</td>
<td>14 May 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Bancroft</td>
<td>7 June 1851</td>
<td>M.A. (Oxon); 1st in Classical Mods. 1892, 3rd in Lit. Hum. 1894</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF INSPECTOR</td>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td>QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.M. Battiscombe</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1868</td>
<td>1st in Classical Tripos, 4 April 1892, Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J.R. Bridge</td>
<td>8 June 1875</td>
<td>B.A.(Cantab.), Powis Medal 1896, 1st in Classical Tripos, 1897, Scholar of Trinity College Dublin, 1896, Professor of English, Calcutta, 1900-1901</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.W. Cape</td>
<td>13 June 1874</td>
<td>B.A.(Cantab.), 1st in Classical Tripos, Part 1, 1896, 2nd in Ancient History Oxford Course in Education</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.F. Davidson</td>
<td>22 June 1868</td>
<td>1st in Classical Mods., 1889, 1st in Lit.Hum. 1891</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.H.B. Grindrod</td>
<td>11 July 1863</td>
<td>M.A.(Oxon), 2nd in Classical History, 1890</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.E. Hales</td>
<td>23 July 1873</td>
<td>M.A.(Oxon), 1st in Classical Mods., 1893, 2nd in Lit.Hum., 1895, Two years as a medical student</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF INSPECTOR</td>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td>QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hale</td>
<td>14 Apr. 1854</td>
<td>B.A. (London)</td>
<td>26 Apr. 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hartley</td>
<td>20 Dec. 1874</td>
<td>B.A. (1st class), 1897; 1 Nov. 1904 in English Language, M.A. 1898, Teacher's Diploma 1897; Univ. Extension Lecturer, 1902; Lecturer in Education at Leeds, 1900-1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. M. Haslam</td>
<td>24 Nov. 1876</td>
<td>B.A. (Cantab.) 1st in Classics</td>
<td>14 Sept. 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. W. Irvine</td>
<td>4 June 1868</td>
<td>B.A., M.D., Dublin 1st in Modern History, English Literature and Classics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Leaf</td>
<td>15 May 1870</td>
<td>M.A. (Cantab.), 1st in Classical Tripos, 1892; Fellow and Tutor of Peterhouse, 1894-1899; University and College Lecturer in Classics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A. McNaughton</td>
<td>8 Jul. 1875</td>
<td>M.A. (Cantab.), M.A. (Edinburgh) 1st in Classical Tripos, 1899, Skeat Prize, 1898, Edinburgh University Medal for English Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. T. Monro</td>
<td>2 Feb. 1848</td>
<td>M.A. (Cantab.), English Essay Prize, 2nd in Maths Tripos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. N. Morley</td>
<td>8 Aug. 1879</td>
<td>B.A. (Oxon), 1st in Mods 14 Sept. 1908 and Classics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF INSPECTOR</td>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td>QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D.M. Oliver</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1852</td>
<td>B.A. (Oxon), 3rd in Classical Mods., 1872; 1st in History, 1874</td>
<td>1 Apr. 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Parsons</td>
<td>16 Apr. 1850</td>
<td>B.A. (London)</td>
<td>29 Sept. 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D. Fawle</td>
<td>12 Feb. 1872</td>
<td>M.A. (Cantab.), 2nd in Medieval and Modern Languages, 1896; Student at Jena</td>
<td>30 Sept. 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J.G. Winn</td>
<td>23 Aug. 1876</td>
<td>B.A. (Cantab.), 3rd in Natural Science Tripos, 1899</td>
<td>5 Nov. 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Winthrop Young</td>
<td>25 Oct. 1876</td>
<td>M.A. (Cantab.) 1898; Assistant Master at Eton, Chancellors English Medal, 1897-1898</td>
<td>28 Nov. 1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF INSPECTOR</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.A. Dickson (special responsibility for Training Colleges)</td>
<td>12 Dec. 1872</td>
<td>M.A. Dublin, 1904; B.A. (Cantab.), 3rd in Classical Tripos, 1894; 2nd in Classical Archeology, 1895</td>
<td>1 May 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.L. Monkhouse (special responsibility for Training Colleges)</td>
<td>15 Mar. 1875</td>
<td>B.A. (London), 1st in English Language and Literature</td>
<td>7 Feb. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.M. Morris</td>
<td>4 June 1874</td>
<td>Diplomas in Domestic Subjects, French, German and Spanish</td>
<td>9 Sept. 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A. Munday</td>
<td>23 Mar. 1861</td>
<td>LLA (St. Andrews), 1st in French, Education and History</td>
<td>23 Mar. 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P. Shearson</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1871</td>
<td>M.A. (Dublin); Somerville College, Oxford, Final Honours School, Language and Literature</td>
<td>24 Jan. 1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File Ed.23/129 also contains details of 13 Junior and 16 Sub-Inspectors of English in Schools. Although generally younger, the Junior Inspectors have comparable qualifications to their senior colleagues. On the other hand, the sub-Inspectors, whilst possessing fewer University degrees have, perhaps significantly, more teacher training qualifications. Their work appears to be connected exclusively with the elementary schools.
**APPENDIX 2.**

The English Association's Specimen Lists of English Texts for use at various stages, 1910. Mr Rouse and Miss Thompson were prominent members at the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Rouse's List</th>
<th>Miss Thompson's List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE I - Age 12-13</strong></td>
<td><strong>STAGE II - Age 13-14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Crabbe Longfellow, Sograb &amp; Rustum, News from Ghent to Aix, Merchant of Venice: Trial Scene, Patriotic poems</td>
<td>Bunyan's Holy War, Rossetti: The Gulliver, Don Quixote, Kingsley's Heroes, Parts of As You Tanglewood Tales, Like It, Julius Froude's Mabinogion Northern Sagas, Malory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope's Homer Parts of Golding's Ovid, Idylls of the King, Earthly Paradise, Childe Harold, Ode on the Duke of Wellington</td>
<td>Pilgrim's Progress, Trips to the Moon (Lucian), Hakluyt and Purchas: Armada etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rouse's List</td>
<td>Miss Thompson's List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POETRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROSE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAGE IV - AGE 15-16**

**Comedies of Shakespeare**
- As You Like It
- Midsummer
- Night's Dream
- Paradise Lost
- Odyssey

**Foundations of British Empire:**
- Works of Drake
- Raleigh
- Frobisher
- Hawkins, John
- Smith's Adventures - mostly from Hakluyt and Purchas, Philip
- de Comines - Edward III
- Cavendish: Wolsey, Lives of - Henry VIII, Elizabeth, Mary, Queen of Scots, Henry VI.
- Defoe's Plague and Fire, Napier's Battles in the Peninsular
- Josephus: Fall of Jerusalem
- Borrow's Bible in Spain
- Lavengro, Gil Blas, Poe's Tales, Irving's Sketchbook
- Fielding's Voyages to Lisbon
- Sir Roger de Coverley
- Sterne: Story of the Bird
- Macaulay: Biographical Essays

**Shakespeare:**
- All Historical plays

**More's Richard III**
- Steele - Essays
- Goldsmith - Citizen of the World
- Memoirs of Lucy Hutchinson
- Letters of the Duchess of Newcastle
- Selection from Ston
- Letters
- Sterne: Selections from Sentimental Journey
- Stevenson Journey with a Donkey through the Cevennes
- Anson: Voyage Round the World
- Roper's Life of More
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Rouse's List</th>
<th>Miss Thompson's List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POETRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>POETRY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROSE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROSE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAGE V - Age 16-17**

- Goldsmith: Village Etc.
- Milton's Odes.
- Paradise Lost
- Shakespeare - Historical Plays & Tempest.
- Spenser
- Sidney, Gray
- Sonnets of Milton & Wordsworth
- Chapman's Iliad
- Phaer's Virgil

**POETRY**
- Essays by Goldsmith, Lamb, Addison etc.
- Eothen
- Macaulay's History & Essays
- Prescott's
- Marico & Peru
- Southey's Nelson
- Walton's Angler & Lives
- Johnson's Poets
- Knelles' History of the Turks
- Stories from History of France, Spain, Low Countries etc.
- Bede's Ecclesiastical History
- De Quincey-Youth, Mail Coach etc.
- Decameron
- Herodotus
- Xenophon's Oeconomicus
- Cyropaedia
- North's Plutarch
- Plato: Apology & Crito & Phaedo
- Ciceroon Friendship & Old Age
- Scipio's Dream
- Livy: Campaigns of Hannibal
- Thucydides:
- Retreat from Syracuse

**PROSE**
- Spenser: Faery
- Queene I & II
- Keats: Odes
- Pope: Rape of the Lock
- Chaucer:
- Prologue, Knight's Tale & Nun's Priest's Tale.
- Dryden:
- Absalom & Achitophel
- Shelley: Adonais
- Collins: Odes, here or in Stage VI.

**POETRY**
- More: Utopia
- Bacon: Atlantis
- Selections from Clarendon's History
- Cowley's Essays.
- Sheridan: The Rivals
- Goldsmith: She Stoops to Conquer.
- Selections from Boswell's Johnson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Rouse's List</th>
<th>Miss Thompson's List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POETRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>Essay by Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethan</td>
<td>Dryden, Cowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masques &amp; Lyrics</td>
<td>Hazlett, Lamb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected pieces</td>
<td>Letters by Cowper,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of other</td>
<td>Montague, Cicero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethan</td>
<td>Advancement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramas.</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson Agonistes</td>
<td>Areopagitica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Comus</td>
<td>Sidney &amp; Puttenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>on Poetry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>Longinus &amp; Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>on the Sublime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of</td>
<td>Microcosmographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry with</td>
<td>&amp; other characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimens.</td>
<td>(Overbury, Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theophrastus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landor's Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erasmus Folly &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More's Utopia &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker-Ecclesiastical Polity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley:Minutes</td>
<td>Philosophy IV-VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbon's History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thackeray:English Satirists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Georges</td>
<td>Browning: Saul,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarto,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammarian's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funeral,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abt Vogler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fra Lippo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lippi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strafford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marlowe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward II &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Faustus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Jonson:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Every Man in His</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Sad Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Sad Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fletcher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faithful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shepherdess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelley:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prometheus Un-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaucer: Man of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laws' Tale,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioress's Tale,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk's Tale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray's trans-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lation of 'The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trojan Woman'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson: Vanity of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Wishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wordsworth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prelude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coleridge: Ode to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pope: Satires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burke: Thoughts on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present &amp; Discontents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson's Life of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlyle: Heroes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sartor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resartus, Past &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerson: Essay on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Quincey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelley: Defence of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poesie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leigh Hunt: Imagination &amp; Fancy, Chap. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of Literature (prose &amp; poetry) with specimens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 5.
THE INSTITUTIONALISATION OF ENGLISH TEACHING,
1910 to 1920.

A 1910 - 1915

After 1910 the movement towards the first full institutionalisation of English studies at all levels gathered pace. This movement may be observed from three perspectives. First there is the official perspective of the Board of Education, which is fairly well documented in the 'Ashridge' Files as well as being fully articulated in a number of official publications (The steady flow of such publications is a characteristic feature of the Board's first two decades). Secondly there is the methodological perspective, so well documented by Mullins and Shayer. Finally there is the perspective of the now clearly emergent English teaching profession, busily defining its sphere of influence and the range and relevance of English Studies. This perspective is perhaps best represented by the published work of the rapidly growing English Association.

In the previous chapter we saw that the 1910 Circular was not only received with mixed feelings but itself contained a number of inconsistencies. Briefly, it will be remembered the 1910 Circular had concerned itself with attempting to define and redefine the content of English teaching; however little or no guidance or even discussion had been offered on how the various components of English might be taught. This in itself was likely to mean, for example, that any cautiously 'progressive' but vague statements about the function and curricular
place of grammar would almost certainly effect little radical change in the consciousness and thus the methodology of the majority of English teachers. Indeed although Shayer suggests that the elementary teachers were likely to be slavishly dependent on the pronouncements of the Board, this is less likely to have been true of secondary teachers at the time. Moreover the increasing overt liberalising of the Board's attitudes as expressed in these official policy statements (especially their reluctance to control the development of examinations) perhaps forced the majority of secondary teachers to acquiesce to the more authoritarian and affirmative policies of the Examining Boards. (This actually came to a head when the Board's relatively anti-authoritarian position was at variance with a university entrance examination policy calling the tune for entrance qualifications, thus inevitably affecting the content of advanced work).

Mention has also been made of the way in which the increased activity of the Board of Education in the whole field of secondary education had acted reflexively on elementary education. In this sphere we have so far seen how very slowly the consciousness of teachers was being weaned from the residual effects of the 19th Century Codes. Edmond Holmes in a book entitled "What Is and What Might Be" (1911) criticised the elementary schools for continuing to acknowledge both the spirit and the practice of the Codes. His sympathies clearly lie with the teachers whom he casts in a subservient role. And it is here that Holmes is making one of the first attacks on the socio-political selectively-supportive system. His remarks are important for two reasons. First he clearly echoes the sentiments of Arnold in his belief in the essentially civilising nature of education (albeit implicit in those remarks is a notion that the quintessence of 'civilisation' and 'humanity' may be
found exclusively if not kept exclusively among the middle classes.)

His remarks also anticipate those of George Sampson a few years later and help to begin to shape the growing awareness of the relevance of seeing the whole educational system in a sociological perspective.

Secondly he talks of raising the rank and file through a genuine education based on 'self-realisation' (p.274) - what he elsewhere in his book refers to as "inner spiritual growth". (That notion strikes a chord of recognition in today's discussions on English teaching - albeit somewhat despiritualised!)

As with all of the major official documents concerned with the period after 1910, unfortunately the 'Ashridge' File has very little material showing the day-to-day decision-making of the Board of Education. Thus the next important issue of suggestions concerning English in the elementary schools (Circular 808, 1912) is not referred to in the files. Instead all of the surviving material relevant to the year 1912 is concerned with the scope and nature of the preliminary examination for the Elementary School Teachers' Certificate. I propose to deal with this material first because what is discussed relates directly to the 1910 Circular and is the first indication of how the Inspectorate and the Board of Education saw the training and the role of the English teacher.

The file (Ed. 77/4) presents a series of memoranda from a dozen or so inspectors and is concerned chiefly with the teaching of fiction. Analysis of the coordinated opinions of the Inspectors reveals significant attitudes to the major criteria which the contemporary consciousness thought relevant to the task of establishing a viable classification for English Studies. It is worth dealing with the individual inspectors' reflections in some detail.
HM Chief Inspector H.W. Orange immediately presents his case by referring to the criterion of intellectual rigour (English was still fighting a similar battle with Latin). He thought that novels involved little or no mental effort and agreed with the 1910 Circular that recreative reading fell outside the scope of schoolwork. His final statement shows that his views about English teaching were firmly located in a notion of intellectual competency. Because novels were not of sufficient mettle for the 'weapons of analysis' they should be expunged from the syllabus. "If attention is to be kept on the stretch, if the critical sense is to be alert, if the memory is to be burdened, if the weapons of analysis and comparison and recapitulation and précis-writing are to be brought into play, then these novels which are read in the spare time of the pupils cease to be a recreation and become a task, though they are unable to rise to the dignity of a study".

These remarks were written on 29 July 1911 and sent out for the perusal and comments of other inspectors. The file records these replies from 1 August to 12 December 1911. On the whole most Inspectors agree with H.W. Orange's views. HMI J.W. Headlam's reply (1 August 1911) clearly indicates that he sees questions on "living novelists" as inferior to the traditional canon of poetry and prose found previously, but believes that "this type of work has got into the examination (i.e. the Elementary Teachers') as a natural reaction against the limited and scholastic study of English literature". He also tacitly approves of Orange's notions of work (and thus 'legitimate' knowledge) when he says "when girls are working hard in school we certainly do not want to encourage them to spend their time in reading novels". HMI Owen-Edwards' reply helps to explain why in one area at least the 1921 Report's generalised legitimation of texts necessary for
the implementation of its grand purposes does not bear fruit at a more localised level. He echoes the general consensus about a hierarchy of values attaching to reading. "I think it is very unfortunate that children should be taught to believe that general reading and novel reading are the same thing. Books of travel, biographies and popular books on science - equally interesting to children - are almost totally ignored." HMI's Battiscombe and Trayes agree with Orange, whilst HMI Urwick indicates that despite the official resistance to novel reading (and of course novels were not in any way part of the Public Schools' literature curriculum) many elementary schools were beginning to encourage it. However he shows that his real concern is that because other prose is neglected composition suffers. This view as much as any other points up a central tenet of the contemporary consciousness - and thus the traditional model.

Two points of view emerge in these memoranda and are best summed up in the memorandum submitted by F.H.B. Dale. The first point of view, already represented, is that novels are rarely suitable for a real training in critical analysis and exact expression. The other point of view - one held by a number of other inspectors and teachers - is that it is essential to create enjoyment of good books and encourage wide reading. It was believed that this might best be done through fiction which might eventually help "towards appreciation of more serious and difficult work". Dale himself suggests some sort of compromise, "such experience as I have been able to obtain from examining and inspecting supports the view that, especially with the class of pupils who are about to become Elementary School teachers, the reading, to a judicious extent, of some masterpieces of English fiction in connection with school work, though not in school hours, has a value far beyond that of
mere recreation. It insensibly widens their experience, cultivates their taste and improves their English style to a degree which will not be attained by the study of serious works alone." Thus he is able to vindicate the study of Dickens, Eliot and Stevenson whilst rejecting Verne, Henty and Conan Doyle. As we have already seen this sort of selecting was to become a feature of the institutionalisation of the 'cultural-heritage' model.

However it is clear from a subsequent remark that Dale recognises the institutionalising power of examinations, a factor which has increasing significance during this period. He says "if no fiction is set in exams, many pupils will cease to read it - especially teachers, whose future is so determined by the examination." However it is left to two HMI's - Misses I.A. Dickson and R.L. Monkhouse, who had special responsibilities for training colleges - to put the strongest case for fiction. Miss Monkhouse believed that through the eyes of the great novelists and dramatists pupils can come to a sounder "reading of life" than they would be likely to form for themselves. "The first interest of young people lies in their fellow creatures." Although novels are not regarded as highly significant in terms of content or style (they are still classed as 'stories') Miss Monkhouse's view at least represents an early defence of fiction in the context of its social worth. Indeed R.G. Mayor (Board of Education) is also advancing a social reason for studying fiction when he asserts that English literature - and novels in particular - may be extended to pupils' out-of-school interests and help introduce "districts of England or social conditions unfamiliar to pupils." However the general opinion remains that living authors' works should not be represented in syllabuses.

It is interesting to note that such a debate could perhaps only take
place within the context of elementary education. There was far more official consensus about the exclusion of fiction from the syllabus of secondary schools. Indeed it seems that here is the first systematic airing of what is an implicit notion of literary apartheid, which even today characterises the consciousness of English teachers. Another factor also seems to be in evidence, one which we have met in another guise, namely that of a hierarchy of difficulties attached to English studies and that it is the task of elementary schools to dilute those difficulties and not aspire to the more intellectually demanding and therefore prestigious knowledge. That secondary schools ought to be engaged in a higher order of intellectual activity is obvious, but that this state of affairs should create a lower class of English teachers less capable and knowledgeable and clearly associated with the majority of the country’s children is indicative of an official policy itself the work of men thoroughly socialised into a status quo which had still not been effectively challenged by an uncompromising egalitarianism. Moreover once again it demonstrates that it was the classification of English into a hierarchical knowledge system based on the criterion of intellectual rigour, and closely correlated with the benefits of birth, that the Inspectorate actively and certainly most elementary teachers passively accepted. Clearly again the methodology of teaching was largely ignored by official policy. Perhaps this is understandable at a time when the institutionalisation of subjects was entirely dependent on their 'reality' being seen as a process towards increasingly complex revelation. The imbalance between 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing' is of relevance here.

Reference to 'Ashridge' file Ed. 86/26 is also relevant to the argument presented above. Material in the file suggests that because
some sort of a diluted version of secondary education is deemed necessary for elementary schools, teachers in these schools need to know only enough to be able to teach there. There is a strong emphasis on phonetics which is seen as "a necessary basis of all sound linguistic study - necessary to teachers because it provides the only scientific means of improving their own pronunciation" (Letter to the Board from Professor H.C. Wyld, Professor of Language and Philology, University of Liverpool, 16th March, 1913). The reason for this advocacy is that the teacher will be equipped to deal with "difficulties arising from Vulgarism or provincial Dialect in his class" (ibid). Although in some secondary schools - notably the public schools - language is studied to an advanced stage (this of course being taken even further to degree level), elementary school teachers are neither expected nor intended to reach such a standard. One feels that despite the view that a study of 'good literature' is thought more important for both elementary school teachers and pupils than a knowledge of the nature and development of the English language, such a view fixes elementary school teachers as of necessarily lower intellectual calibre than secondary teachers in the consciousness of the Inspectorate. This is stated explicitly by HMI Leaf (Minute, 18 March 1913) "The task of understanding how the English language became what it is is beyond English teachers, except as a mere exercise in cram. They have not the background. They know no Latin or Greek, Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian language."

The material in this file might also be taken as a record of the attempts made to improve the professionalisation of teachers during this period. Indeed one may interpret the Inspectors' views on the expectations attaching to the training and knowledge of elementary teachers
as attempts to apply a notion of relevance (and even compensation) to the sphere of elementary education. However it is worth reflecting that right up to the 1921 Report at least - and even that publication is seen all too often to be limited by the consensus of contemporary consciousness - the frame of reference of traditional and ultimate legitimation is being preserved. The Board's concept of professionalisation is to increase both the variety and the rigour of 'states of knowledge' within the legitimated sphere of English teaching. However they do not envisage that the system which they administer in any way articulates an illegitimate and differentiating means of access to those 'states of knowledge'. The more the teacher knows about language and literature, the stronger his frame of reference and the more the pupil needs to know in order to succeed. This, then, preserves both the intellectual rigour and exclusiveness associated with secondary education. The professional status of secondary teachers is enhanced, legitimated and thus permanently fixed. On the other hand, accepting a rationale compounded of social determinism and inherited intelligence, the Board was helping to preserve and institutionalise an elitist model of English teaching. Here was reciprocal articulation of hierarchically conceived social, genetic and intellectual theories. The professional status of elementary teachers was equally legitimated and perfectly fixed, but by comparison it was a depressed status because the frame of intellectual reference was commonly attainable and thus had little or no mystique. (That the nature and intensity of professional mystique has been thought to be a major determinant of high professional status is well illustrated by the attitude of the Board).

However despite these apparent strictures on the social sensitivity and vision of the Board of Education, it must not be forgotten that
according to their lights they had the interest of the child at heart—as they saw them. Mention has been made of the notion of compensation. The Board was well aware of what was apparently mass disadvantage in language competencies amongst elementary school children. Thus the 1912 "Suggestions" appears as something of a compensatory document.

Given their views on the necessity of inducing children to reach written and spoken 'standards' it is perhaps remarkable that the Board can have such sensitive and even anachronistic comments to make about the language of elementary school children. Unfortunately there is no reference in the file about which officials were responsible for drawing up these suggestions. They are in the spirit of the 1910 Circular in that there are no specific methodological suggestions made, but, more significantly look forward to the 1921 Report in their thinking about the true contextual nature of children's speech. Indeed the whole of the document is concerned with this factor. In a 20 page issue the first part is devoted to the relation of the school to the home, the second examines the circumstances which have hindered the growth in school of the power of talking fluently and freely whilst the third part, on grammar, echoes the convictions of the 1909 LCC Report (see previous chapter).

In the first part the Board recognises the elementary school child has two languages, "a school language, which is to him artificial, and a home language for use outside school" (p.4). However it is not the recognition but the reflection which is significant—clearly putting the whole drive for the teaching of phonetics into a much more realistic perspective. "There can be no doubt which of these will survive when schooldays are over; and, indeed if the school English is stilted and pedantic it will not deserve to survive".. the teacher will not "attempt
to replace (the home language) by something more formal but less enduring" (p.4) ... "it is only on the basis of home speech that any genuine and natural progress can be made" (p.6).

The "Suggestions" claim that three circumstances have in the past tended to hinder the growth in school of the power of talking fluently and freely:

1. An insistence on an unnatural standard of quietness in schools and classes for younger children (p.6.) Children should be encouraged to talk to one another (50/60 children to be divided into smaller groups)

2. The practice of collective answering or collective repetition by the class.

3. The prevalent custom of requiring every answer or statement to take the form of a complete statement.¹

The Board suggests that the peculiarities of dialect should be preserved rather than eradicated.

The 1912 "Suggestions" were criticised by George Sampson ('The Board's New Suggestions' in "J.of Ed.Studies", Vol.1, No.3, Jan-May 1913, pp.179-184). He is quick to see that the 'progressive' spirit of the "Suggestions" will not be of much use because its rationale is too general. Implicit in his remarks is also a criticism of the Board's unsure grasp of the nature of society "which is too diverse for such provision to be of much use" (p.179). Quoting from his experience of the reactionary nature of much of the contemporary consciousness about the teaching of English, he says that he thinks that "the present

¹. These statements have tremendous implications for the development of English teaching and look forward not only to the 1921 Report but also to a much later consensus about the place of oral work in schools.
benign document will not touch the heretics" (p.181).

Indeed analysis of three other articles in the recently started "Journal of English Studies" helps to make the contemporary position a little clearer. The first article, entitled 'The Teaching of English in Public Schools' is by Arthur C. Benson ("J. of Eng. Studies", Vol.1, No.3, Jan-May, 1913, pp.151-161). First he affords us another interesting historical insight into a change in English teaching. "Half a century ago very little attempt was made in secondary schools to teach English at all. After 7 years at Eton and 4 at Cambridge, I have never had a piece of English writing criticised" (p.151). His theory of English teaching follows - it may be summarised:

(1) The teaching of English is in two distinct divisions -
   (a) expression i.e. (i) training in clearness and exactness of expression.
   (ii) training in literary form and style.
   (b) introducing boys to masterpieces in literature.

(2) English must be taught by professionals ("not ... (a man) ... who has taken a good degree in some other subject and is a competent athlete" p.156). Thus he does not believe that the subject can be taught incidentally.

Presumably this professionalism is an ability not only to be "a fine reader" but to be thoroughly familiar with the principles of style both at the level of literary example and criticism and grammatical analysis. However not only is the content rigidly compartmentalised but also the hierarchical relationship between teacher and taught should be clearly visible. The teacher initiates and controls what is taught and how it is

---

2. Of course he means public schools.
to be taught - this being the central characteristic of the transmission model. Thus on p. 157 Benson advocates "two exercises a week .. the subject may be carefully selected ... for special subjects, a master may prepare his class by discoursing in a general way, not allowing any notes to be taken. A few general counsels may be given. Boys must be told to begin by defining their terms clearly, go on to some sort of illustration, end by drawing conclusions. They should be told that they are not required to take a side ... They should then be told to think about the subject ... The essays should then be individually corrected, and the master ought to give a sketch of how it might be done" (my underlining). As has been suggested before this model of teaching inevitably stresses the ability to recapitulate and summarise as a prestigious skill. "I believe that précis-writing is one of the best mental exercises in the world ... (it) trains clearness of thought and expression like nothing else that can be devised" (p.158). However, it is a remark towards the end of his article which causes a later contributor to attack him. On p.159 he is almost certainly being heretical when he criticises classically-trained boys for their vagueness of thought. E.C. Everard Owen of Harrow School, replying in the next issue of the "Journal of English Studies" (Vol.II, No.1, May-Sept. 1913, p.30) believes that it is classical studies which allows a boy to achieve the ability of defining mood, tense and voice".... to distinguish various kinds of clauses, give the sense of words like 'aesthetic', 'cynical', 'anachronism'. However it is left to S.P.B. Mais of Sherborne School, writing in the Journal of English Studies, (Vol.II, No.3, Jan-May 1914, pp.186-197) to give the clearest picture of what might actually be going on in the public schools. His opening remarks again cast doubts on the effects of the 1910 Circular when he suggests
that nothing contained in that publication has induced public schools to move with the times "it cannot be pretended that English is taught as a subject at all" (p.187).

In fact on page 188 Mais presents a formidable indictment of the present system in relation to English teaching in the public schools— which is most interesting if not entirely convincing. "A boy leaves school at the age of 18 or 19, having had some thousand or two thousand pounds spent on his education, able hardly to write a coherent sentence, with no knowledge of punctuation, no vocabulary, no power of expression, having read practically nothing and consequently possessed of few ideas, with no interesting general conversation, apt to despise the arts and all beautiful things, in his spare time unable to employ himself by reading or writing, unable to give an account of anything he has seen or heard, ruining even a good story in the re-telling... all because he has not received thorough training in his own language". He puts the blame for this state of affairs on a system where "all the English periods in some Public Schools, in the lower and middle schools at any rate, are spent on intricate terminology definitions, parsing and tabular analysis, the very bugbears of the modern theorists" (p.197). Thus he calls for specialist masters in English— "picked men who have taken honours in a Final School of English and have a deep-rooted love of their native language and literature." He goes against the consciousness of the time in advocating modern poets and novelists for study in school; however he is very much in line with the precept model of teaching literature, stemming from Arnold. Thus on p.192 he asserts that "the teaching of English is synonymous with teaching in morality...... in the lives and works of great men, studied with care, will the boy find precedent for his own line of conduct and future happiness" (Here he
advocates Hazlitt, Stevenson and Macaulay). Now it is in his detailed suggestions on how this might be done that we see the traditional transmission model advocated. As has been suggested, perhaps this is inevitable at a time when the only way to thorough institutionalisation was a subject area classified largely in the way that other subjects—particularly Classics—had been classified for purposes of teaching and also similarly institutionalised. Thus we find Mais advocating

(1) Repetition (i.e. 'only the best')

(2) Dictation (e.g. extracts from Burke, Bunyan, Bagehot, Borrow, Pope, Dryden, Keats, Shelley, Tennyson etc)

(3) Reproduction (e.g. Pepys, Boswell, The Spectator, Gibbon, Macaulay, Chaucer, Swift, Defoe)

(4) Paraphrase (e.g. Browning, Tennyson, Shakespeare, Milton)

(However he is sensitive enough to point out that "care ought to be taken that no exquisitely beautiful passage that admits really of no adequate paraphrase should be taken" (p.193).

That many people were beginning to see the essential differences between English and the rest of the curriculum is in part responsible for the confused picture during the period. Perhaps most of that confusion was caused by the lack of an underlying indigenous rationale for English. Just as many English teachers were willing to see the institutionalisation of English as a sort of anglicised classics, so others were attacking the classificatory reproduction that this implied. Given the sustained activity of the Board since 1902 there could be no doubt that an institutionalisation of the subject was being implemented. For many such an implementation must take into account the essentially 'uncharted freedom' now facing English teaching. This was the challenge facing English teachers as it was seen by R.A. Raven writing
on 'The Recent Growth of Interest in English Teaching' in the "AMA Journal" in March 1915. For him it was no longer relevant to admit the influence of Latin and Greek on English; thus he concludes "one of the most interesting professional problems of the future is how, or whether, the new enthusiasts in English teaching can leave to the next generation a tradition or a method that will keep alive the interest and originality of their work, without destroying the freedom which is the spirit and secret of that work." (p.55)

The period between 1915 and 1921 is characterised by three factors relating to the development towards a new rationale for English teaching and its institutionalisation in schools: -

1. The work of the Board in its drive to institutionalise advanced work in secondary schools (This becomes tied up with the examination system).
2. As part of a counter-consciousness to the prevailing one so far described, the reaction against the Transmission / Reproduction model, retrospectively derived, through more creative approaches.
3. The growth of an awareness of the sociological relevance of English teaching. All of these factors have a bearing on the 1921 Report, especially the last one.

B (1) The Board's part in the Institutionalisation of Advanced Studies in Secondary Schools

This particular aspect of the Board's work is not only well documented in the 'Ashridge' File (Ed. 23/104) but in itself must be seen as perhaps the single most significant part of the full institutionalisation of
English in schools. It appears from the File that the initial impetus, coming as it happens from Wolverhampton Girls High School, accorded well with the sympathies and intentions of the Board, who on 21st January 1918 appointed a committee to consider whether any amendment was desirable in Chapter VIII of the "Regulations for Secondary Schools" in order to give the study of English its proper place in the Advanced work of secondary schools and to confer in the matter with representatives of the English Association (Report of the Office Committee on English in Advanced Courses in Secondary Schools).

The Report states that the Office Committee held 10 meetings. A Questionnaire was sent to 10 schools in which the English teaching was a special feature. Interviews were held with representatives from 7 of these schools. A feature of the decision-making is the scope and extent of external consultation. Among those individuals, bodies and organisations whose memoranda and resolutions were considered were:

2. Kent Education Committee.
6. Representatives of the Universities.
7. The Association of Headmistresses.

Joint Conference between the staffs of Girton and Newnham Colleges and Representatives of the Association of Headmasters of Public Secondary Schools.

3. Apart from the views of the MLA and EA none of the other individuals' or organisations' views are to be found in the file.
The file presents the material very systematically:—

(i) A short summary of the evidence.

(ii) Conclusions and recommendations.


(iv) English in Advanced Courses — Summary of conclusions reached by the sub-committee.

(v) A series of Minutes recording the meetings of the Office Committee.

(vi) A review of the position of English in Public Examinations and Scholarship Competitions.

However, because the series of Minutes (v) recording the meetings of the Office Committee take place first in the sequence of events leading up to the Institutionalisation of Advanced Studies these will be dealt with first.

(i) Minutes of the Office Committee, October — November 1917.

These Minutes record the day-to-day thinking of the Board on the matter of Advanced Courses in English and the extent and manner of consultation with the English Association and other teachers.

The first two meetings of the Committee took place on October 16th and November 2nd 1917 and are concerned with a general discussion about the efficacy of Advanced Courses in English. At this time, in contrast

4. The Board does not seem to have taken into account the views of the Examination Boards with whom it showed less sympathy (see ensuing discussion, pp.146–149).

5. Mr Mackail (Chairman), HMIs Miss Dickson, Messrs Dale and Phillips; Hales (Board of Education) Secretary.
to the clear public demand for the advanced teaching of Modern Languages and Science, Mackail believed that there was no articulated demand for such teaching in English in the secondary schools. He believed that a course's practical value should be the determining criterion for inclusion. Mr Dale's views clearly reflect a belief that English was not as viable a subject as others, particularly languages. He suggested that it might be suitable for pupils who were going to be elementary teachers (This accords with his earlier views, see page 130 ). However Mackail said that the Board should not legislate for a particular class.

The first measure of agreement among the members of the committee seemed to indicate an idea of 'protecting' English - if not admitting it as a main subject. Language was felt to have more priority than literature "They (the pupils) would have got their literary training another way".

On November 6th 1917 the Committee met with representatives of the English Association. The English Association put forward a more detailed defence than the file's summary includes under 2(a) 'The view of the English Association' below. The points made were:

(i) The Regulations would lead to the reduction of those taking Honours English and consequently the number of teachers of English.

(ii) English was the key to other subjects as well as to one's own ideas.

(iii) The great importance attached to English as an examination subject made in the Report of the Commission on the Civil Service and also the steps taken to promote the study of

6. Mr John Bailey, Miss K.S. Block, Dr P. Boas, Mr A.C. Bradley.
English by Oxford, Cambridge and London (see Appendix to Chapter 3). The civil service had attached importance to teaching — "One of their reasons for emphasising classics was that the best teaching in the best schools was still Classical" The English Association asked how was the best teaching for English to be secured.

(iv) Miss Block and Mr Bailey argued that "while the study of a foreign language was of great value as an intellectual gymnastic, the power to follow thought might best be gained through English Literature.

(2) A short summary of the evidence

(a) The views of the English Association

(i) The English Association was particularly concerned that the current Regulations would produce a detrimental effect on the study of English in the Universities as pupils would be debarred from taking English up to Honours Standard (This repeats (i) above).

(ii) The Association expressed its disappointment at the non-inclusion of English as a Special Subject in Article 48 of the Regulations and urged that English be included as a main subject. They put forward a Pamphlet of their own containing a model Advanced Course syllabus (Pamphlet No.37 "English Papers in Examinations for Pupils of School Age in England and Wales" May 1917).

(iii) They wanted English to be treated as a modern language and had no desire that English alone should form a course.
(b) The views of the Modern Languages Association

(i) The MLA were strongly in favour of English as a main subject, believing that French and English formed a more natural and coherent group than French and German.

(ii) The MLA also believed that the recognition of English at the top of the school would make a great difference to the attitude adopted to it throughout the school.

(c) The views of the Schools' sample

(i) All agreed that the Regulations did not secure or encourage the Advanced Study of English sufficiently.

(ii) They agreed that English with History and either French or Latin would make a good course and would give an excellent training for future teachers of English.

(iii) They also believed that the recognition of English in Advanced courses would have a beneficial effect on the status of the subject lower down the school.

(d) The views of the Board of Education

Referring to the views of the English Association and MLA in particular, the Board make an extremely significant point - one which was to indicate the problem of the actual nature of the scope and orientation of the institutionalisation of English in schools. Having conceded that it was "only natural that those engaged in teaching a subject should want to plan their own courses and put into practice their

7. Replies were received from: Fulham County; Godolphin and Latimer; Clapham High School; Wakefield Girls' High School; Haberdashers' Askes' Girls' School; Latymer Upper; Holloway County and Askes' Hatcham.
individual theories of curriculum and syllabus" (Para. 6), the Board goes on in a mood of some exasperation. "But their desire to escape restriction on the part of the Board is not a natural one only. We have constantly been aware of the clashing of the requirements of External Examinations with purely educational considerations in shaping their views. It has been throughout extremely difficult to induce them to state their requirements otherwise than in terms of University or other Examinations, and they had constantly to be asked to look at the matter in the light of the Board's new Examination policy ... it is the teachers whose views are especially coloured by the requirements of External Examinations" (Para. 6). Indeed the Board resists the idea that these should shape the Regulations, the policy and ideals of the 'External Bodies' definitely conflict with those adopted by the Board when the Regulations were first drawn up. The Board claims that Headmasters' remarks bear out this sense of conflict and dilemma for the schools. The remark of one headmaster quoted presages a truism of institutionalisation which still proves one of the most controversial issues in the curriculum. "I fear that however sound educationally a new arrangement may be we shall continue to depend, as schools, on the line taken by the Universities with regard to their Scholarships and money rewards" (Para. 8). The Board appears to recognise its own dilemma in the reflection made on this remark "while deprecating therefore any undue warping of the curriculum to meet such requirements and rejecting certain extravagant demands traceable to their influence we feel we cannot treat as merely irrelevant the tendency of teachers to think of their pupils as potential scholarship winners in English etc ... and frame their courses accordingly" (Para. 9). Other views expressed by the Board may be summed up as follows: —
(1) In para. 13 the Report discusses the still lingering notion of English as a 'soft option' and believes it "possible to devise a course which will be compatible with accuracy and clear thinking".

(2) Perhaps a more serious point is made in Para. 14 where the Report stresses that it is the lack of competent teachers of English for Advanced Courses which will divert the best pupils to other subjects. "Nor will persons of ability and good academic qualifications be disposed to undertake English teaching in schools under present conditions, for they will not be contented to teach a subject in which Advanced work with corresponding status or salary is not recognised" (Apparently a number of teachers had indicated to the Board that if English was raised to the rank of a principal subject, this "would immediately effect a marked change of attitude towards it on the part of the whole school, both staff and pupils" (Para.15).)

(3) Conclusions and Recommendations

(i) The Regulations should be modified (Para. 16).

(ii) Recommends that the importance of systematic instruction in English "such as will develop the power of reading with intelligence and writing with precision be emphasised by modifying the regulations" (Article 48). However it might be inferred that the Board is recommending this mainly for the sake of Maths and Science - again reflecting the notion that the institutionalisation of a subject is partly the result of complying with other subjects' reality constructions of its function in the curriculum - e.g. "this is
a matter of as great (if not greater) importance in the Science and Mathematics course as in the other two types of course" (Para. 17).

(iii) Accepts the claim that English should become part of the Modern studies in schools. 8

(iv) Acknowledges that there is no body of tradition in the Advanced Teaching of English and thinks that guidance in matters of principle, methods and contents will have to be sought. The cooperation of the English Association is envisaged.

(4) Observations of the Advisory Committee, 4th and 5th February 1918.

(i) Believes it is impossible to defend a scheme which excludes English literature from a Modern Studies Course (Para. 1).

(ii) Refers to schools who seek some sort of compromise between syllabuses of examinations and the Board's views. (Para. 2) - thinks the notion that schools should be controlled by universities is pernicious.

(iii) Disagrees that in order to do advanced English at the university, a pupil needs to have studied advanced English at school and asserts that a classics pupil could tackle a university course in English (Para. 2).

8. In Appendix I to the Report: "English to be a part of all advanced studies i.e. training in the reading and writing of English, in accurate comprehension and suitable expression, and in the knowledge and appreciation of masterpieces of English prose and poetry, together with such knowledge as is requisite for these purposes of the structure and history of the English language."
Summary of Conclusions reached by the sub-committee

(i) Perhaps scarcely concealing the old anxieties over intellectual rigour necessary to bear comparison with Classics and Modern languages, the sub-committee asserts that English must not become "mere desultory reading of books, but must have a definite purpose and afford worthy exercise for the intellects of the more capable pupils" (Not surprisingly, contemporary literature and novels are disallowed).

(ii) The detailed suggestion of the sub-committee on the content of Advanced work underlines this drive for rigour and thus for a rather intensive specialisation. Such a scheme would almost certainly meet the requirements necessary to range English studies alongside Classics and Modern Languages and would make for the legitimation of English necessary for the full institutionalisation of the subject.

(iii) The sub-committee suggested that work should come under four sections:

(a) Serious and intensive study of Shakespeare and Milton and of one or more prose works chosen from Burke (American Speeches), Bacon (Advancement of Learning), Browne (Religio Medici), Clarendon (Extracts), Dryden (Dramatic Essays), Milton (Areopagitica), Johnson (Lives), Gibbon (Autobiography), Wordsworth (Prefaces), Mill (On Liberty), Macaulay (Essays and Sections of History), Carlyle.

(b) A short period or periods of literature with a full amount of reading from the chief authors - e.g. Elizabethan age,
Jonson to Milton, Queen Anne, Romantic Revival or Chaucer.

(c) Language
(a) changes in vocabulary
(b) changes in sentence structure
(c) changes in grammar - imitations of prose writers; translation from other languages; verse composition in certain formal styles.

(d) Composition

6. A Review of the position of English in Public Examinations and Scholarship Competitions

Inspection reveals that in six second Level (Higher Certificate) syllabuses English is described as a Main subject and also is on a par with other subjects in a sample of scholarship competitions for places at Oxford, Cambridge and London Universities. This then suggests that provision made in the revised Regulations for admission to Advanced Study status (1918) had enabled English to be institutionalised at the higher level of secondary education.

B (2) Creative Approaches to English Teaching 1900 - 1920

In this section some reference will be made to the beginnings of a

9. The English Association published a memorandum on the Board's Regulations (1917) in which, after suggesting the detrimental effect of the omission of English on the future of the subject, and perhaps in answer to the objections to English as a 'soft option', they point out that composition may be made an important and weighty element in the work of English as of French schools - something similar to 'explication française'. According to "Instructions ministérielles sur L'enseignement du français" (1902). This is "at once an exercise in logic and composition, since the pupil seeks the leading ideas in a literary extract, and the links between them, an exercise in accurate thinking and interpretation, since he is asked exactly to define the language in relation to the ideas expressed, and an exercise in style, since he is made to feel and to realise the method of literary expression."
'counter-consciousness' in relationship both to the Classification and Framing of a variety of 'English' knowledge. However one must treat this 'counter-consciousness' with some scepticism, seeing it as very limited in its institutional effect and in no way revolutionary. No doubt Shayer is right to point out (Op.cit. p.88) that more recent emphases on creativity were anticipated at least 60 years ago; equally his information that a creativity model has been gaining some ground since 1900 would hold true. Reference may be made to two books produced in the first years of the century - Margaret Macmillan's "Education Through the Imagination" (1904) and Philip Hartog's "The Writing of English" (1907). Although Margaret Macmillan's book makes no specific reference to children's writing, her Romantic view of the child is based on an advocacy of the free play of the child's imagination in other areas of the curriculum - e.g. music, painting, drama. Similarly, although Philip Hartog's book is hardly 'creative' in a later sense of the word, that he places an emphasis on the child being allowed to express his own ideas and feelings in composition work anticipates the implications such an approach has for the 'Framing' of Knowledge (in Bernstein's sense of the word).

In the second decade of the century three publications are worth referring to in this context. First is E.A. Greening Lamborn's "The Rudiments of Criticism" (1916) (He also wrote "Expression in Speech and Writing" in 1922) which argues strongly for allowing elementary pupils to write their own poems. Again, however, a later definition of creativity would reject the imitative and perhaps artificial nature

10. There are, of course, other relevant publications, e.g. books by W.S. Tomkinson and Dorothy Tudor-Owen. For a detailed treatment of their books and those of other writers see Shayer (op.cit., chapter 2, pp.26-65 pasim; Chapter 3 pp.82-86).
of the results. Next, John Adams' book "The New Teaching" (1918) attempts to chart what he believes to be advances in the theory of English teaching. Added to what we have already seen as happening through the work of the Board of Education, Adams is largely correct in his estimate of the situation as far as the institutionalisation of English in the schools is concerned. He is certainly right when he suggests that changes for the better are beginning to appear in elementary schools; however I believe he over-estimates the notion of 'pupil-centred' modification. Thus, by and large, despite the claim implicit in the title of his book his tacit acceptance of the transmission model indicates that his advocacy of creativity was likely to bear little relationship to present-day definitions. Indeed commenting upon Adams' description of what is no more than a teacher-initiated question and answer session, Shayer observes "'Directed' was the key word, since the pupils were usually required to speak in turn, formulate their answers in complete, formal sentences, and finally copy out the resulting composition from the blackboard, the final version being as much the result of the teacher's editing and rephrasing as of the children's contributions" (op.cit. p.75). Thus Adams' conception of creativity is limited to a measure of freedom being allowed to the pupil in any formulation and exploration of a topic subsequent to the teacher's introduction of the topic to the class. Moreover, because writing is, once again, seen as the unquestionable and ultimate end of the teaching sequence and this under the control of the teacher, any real notion of its being pupil-centred is destroyed.

However perhaps most people would agree that in the realm of creativity, historically at least, the work of Caldwell Cook is the most significant. Caldwell Cook published the first Perse Playbook in 1914 and by 1917 had
published four more. Based on his work with his pupils at the Perse School, Cambridge, these books were in actual fact collections of their writings and although contributions tend to be derivative and imitative (e.g. the use of poetic diction), they are completely novel for their time. In 1917 Caldwell Cook published his celebrated "The Play Way" and it is in this book that he coordinates and collates the scattered theory contained in the Play Books. These had shown that boys first responded to the topics he set them by exploring these orally, usually in groups. The next stage was for the boys to write in as varied and stimulating a way as possible - e.g. dialogue, imaginary conversations, dramatic dialogues and even blank verse. For example, he provided the topic of 'Islands' as a source/starter and eventually allowed the child the freedom to take over and control his own imaginative articulation of the topic.

With the notion of self-expression and play as central to his theory Caldwell Cook stressed the primacy of the child's total absorption in the task in hand through interest and enjoyment. However Caldwell Cook's definition of play admits of no anarchic or unguided activity. It is rather "to do anything with interest, to get at the heart of the matter and live there active - that is Play" (op. cit. 1919 edition of "The Play Way", p.9). Thus Caldwell Cook's pedagogic model was one where pupils immersed themselves through the creative Communication acts - writing, talking and acting. "Proficiency and learning come not from reading and listening, but from action, from doing and from experience" (Introduction to "First Perse Play Book", 1912). Likewise Caldwell Cook's views on grammar were equally uncompromising. He believed that unrelated fragments (i.e. exercise-based) of grammar and spelling could be safely left to look after themselves, whilst the child was left free
to explore more fully self-expressive forms. The teacher's role was to guide, prompt and encourage — and gradually to fade into the background. Caldwell Cook's work is important for two major reasons:

1. English is seen as a unity and within this is the implicit redefinition of the subject which suggests a shift from compartmentalising already classified 'states of knowledge' (e.g. reproduction, stress on competencies gauged by reference to an externally-created standard) to recontextualising English in terms of an exploration of 'ways of knowing' in a network rather than a sequence of activities. In other words it is a shift from passive 'reception' to active 'doing'.

2. It is the first real theoretical challenge to the traditional transmission pedagogy and thus logically implicit within it are the first visible changes in notions of Framing.

However it must be stressed that because much of the contemporary consciousness was still at the stage of absorbing the necessity of finalising the institutionalisation of English teaching in schools on the terms, largely, of the more traditional curricular ethos, it is small wonder that Caldwell Cook's work had to wait at least another generation for its natural successors.

George Sampson and his sociologically oriented critique of English teaching.

George Sampson's "English for the English" (1921) is perhaps the single most significant book ever published on the raison d'être of English teaching. Despite its often sociological naiveté and for the most part quasi-revolutionary character, "English for the English" offers us the first real description of the socio-political implications of
English. As such it provides us with a valuable perspective on the nature of the total educational consciousness of the period and also acts as a useful guide to the shaping of a major future orientation within English teaching.

As was indicated earlier in this section, our chief interest in Sampson's book is because of his essentially sociologically-oriented critique. This dominant perspective also regulates Sampson's views on the centrality of English to the curriculum as well as articulating what may be described as one of the prototypes of the sort of liberal humanism which has so shaped the 'reality construction' of the majority of English teachers up to our time.

As we have seen, the concurrent 'creativity' movement had argued for the necessity of shifting attention from the supremacy of the subject matter to at least some sort of recognition of the child's perspective. Sampson's initial statement on this topic goes further than any of his contemporaries in delineating a view of pupil-centredness, but more significantly perhaps, within a socio-political context. He makes a forceful plea for seeing "Pupils as human beings first .... and only secondarily as persons destined to some form of employment.... Attempts to make the elementary schools nothing but the breaking-in ground of a Coolie class are evil in themselves, and productive of social hatred and doctrines of reprisal. I do not believe that all English children are born equally educable; but I am sure that our chief existing test of educability, namely the ability of fathers to pay large fees, is deplorably fallible" (p.IX).

However, having suggested a fundamental criticism of the education system, as the book progresses Sampson is able to say clearly what in his opinion education should entail - especially for the working-class
child. On page 6 he asserts that "men are worth educating as men, not as potential job occupiers .... the lift man must be told that if he studied in his leisure and took a science degree, he would not therefore become a director" (p.7). Sampson is highly critical of the underlying rationale of seeing 'improvement' as only upward social mobility. This state of affairs has no vision "and where there is no vision the people perish" (p.112). "The politicians must be told that when they denounce the education of children above their station they are talking blasphemy. You cannot educate children above their station, for you are educating men and women; and in this world there is no higher station" (p.7).

On page 8 this idealistic view is continued with reference to the "state of manhood" as the only calling, that "children should be prepared against their occupations."

Thus Sampson is suggesting that the education system is unjust where it forces some boys to leave school and go out to work whilst others "more fortunate boys leave the preparatory schools to go to public schools" (p.11). Given this injustice Sampson claims a prior importance for elementary schools. "The schools that educate the greatest number of people in the greatest need of education are surely of the greatest importance" (p.16). Moreover he denies that it is the job of the elementary school to produce "tame and acquiescent labour fodder" and "subdued and patriotic hands" and says that the safety of the world, the future of civilisation and power will always be with the masses and "the job of the elementary school is to humanise the masses" (p.16).

Having introduced the notion of humanism, Sampson then proceeds to the main argument of his book - namely that English Studies should be established as the major means of promoting educability and fostering a humanistic outlook in the individual child. Now in order to mount a
persuasive argument Sampson comments unfavourably on the record of the elementary school system since the era of the Codes. He begins by claiming that English is the most important subject in the elementary schools and talks of the Ptolemaic centre of elementary education. "For fifty years teachers have been trying to make the elementary schoolboy know something when they should have been trying to make him be something" (p.17).¹¹ He believes that the unfortunate children who have to leave school too early "lack language most of all" (p.23). Sampson injects a note of urgency thus revealing the extent of his commitment and conviction. "The tragic position in the elementary school is that English cannot wait." He sees English as the only real means of combating an adverse environment. He is convinced that the teaching of English is a holy and militant mission against "evil knowledge" which he equates with ignorance. His judgment is a moral one, his solution the spiritual and moral efficacy of English. "The Harrow master may, perhaps, relax his vigilance for English, the Hoxton master never" (p.24). Thus he talks of purifying and cleansing elementary school children's language and anticipates a very modern concept of English as a "condition of school life" (p.24) and asserts "the lesson in English is not merely one occasion for the inculcation of knowledge it is part of the child's initiation into the life of man" (p.25). Thus at school English should be treated (a) as a tool and (b) as a "means of access to formative life and beauty" (p.38).

¹¹ This sentiment accords in spirit at least with the views of Caldwell Cook and says a little more perhaps about an aspect of the consensus of the counter-consciousness.
This item is the main feature of Sampson's centrality argument and incorporates his famous statement "Every teacher is a teacher of English because every teacher is a teacher in English" (p.25). Sampson was alert enough, however, to realise that any claim that English might have to the central place in the curriculum would necessarily involve a direct challenge to the position of classics — especially where it was defended by extremists. Instead of attacking classics for its linguistic or nationalistic irrelevance he keeps to his main perspective and criticises its dominance on egalitarian grounds. First he asks why, if classics is the instrument of human culture, has no one demanded that it should be applied to the lower and lower-middle class population? If Greek is so precious why doesn't everyone learn it? (p.28) He says "can it be that the unrecognised or unproclaimed motive of our classical extremists is the perpetration of social inequalities" (p.28) However his conclusions on classical education suggest that there is something in the intrinsic nature of classics that makes it not only intellectually exclusive but where it is institutionally dominant, inevitably divisive. "A classical education is something for the aristocracy of mind, in whatever social class it is found, it is not an education for the masses, in whatever social classes they are found" (p.32). This would certainly help to explain how a cultural monopoly had retarded and distorted the system. Sampson is appearing to claim that institutionally classics has been the repressive instrument of a socio-political élite. It had seemed to possess an impeccable philosophical raison d'être (made visible by its massive and traditional legitimation) which had only been called into question since the turn of the century. Thus in this context Sampson is representative of the liberalising of consciousness.

Sampson's concept of a two-fold function for English — i.e., as a
tool and a humanising force - is worked out in a programme which is worth examining. If we look at his notion of language competence we see that, inevitably, he is constrained by the intellectual parameters of his time. He believes in standardised speech first of all as a means of effecting improved communication. "Let the central authority for education clearly demand that in all English schools standard English speech alone must be used, and we shall soon find our way in the right direction without elaborate and disputable prescriptions" (p.45). If this judgment is sociolinguistically suspect his views on children's speech seem to operate within suspect aesthetic criteria. Given his humane way of approaching the subject of 'correction' (p.47 passim) one must beware of such statements as "I have never encountered any boys who resented correction genially made; and I have usually found that they really do want to learn how to speak nicely" (p.47).

It is a notion of 'corporateness' which articulates his views on both speech and writing. On page 48 he says "correct and lucid speech.... is one of the first and last necessities of corporate existence", and having advocated a balance between "statement and creation" he makes two points about composition. First he believes in collective composition (pp.65-67 passim) i.e. making a class magazine to produce 'class consciousness'. Secondly he criticises the belles lettres tradition as diverting children from sincere expression. The principles of reducing social cleavage and inducing moral wholesomeness can be seen operating here.

As far as teachers are concerned Sampson believes in the "transmission of the spirit" (p.79). He says that there is no necessary correlation between academic qualifications and a suitability to teach English. Indeed this accords with the attitude of the English
Association which was being similarly expressed at about the same time. If the teachers are sensitive and dedicated to literature then the results will eventually be beneficial. It is interesting to note that this particular aspect of the qualifications of English teachers has become as important to the development of institutionalised English teaching as the initial drive for more academic and political objectives.

It is important to try to sum up the sociological and socio-political nature of Sampson's critique: If one examines his aspirations for the working class in terms of "immaterial communism" one may isolate a species of social engineering. Sampson wanted the working-class to be "happy as well as respectful and obedient" in order to "bring social tranquillity nearer" (p.IX). Sampson was particularly concerned to avoid class conflict and envisaged English as the most likely means of helping to reduce this. He was sufficiently well appraised of the socio-cultural differentiation of the contemporary school system to realise that there would have to be some fundamental changes in the concept of the institutionalising of different cultures. Pursuing his notion of social integration he advocated, in theory, a common school. Although he admitted that such a school was at present impracticable he believed a common basis of education was not and "the one common basis of a common culture is the common tongue" (p.39).

However in suggesting that the working class must be conditioned (however humanistically) to a conformity in no way fundamentally challenging the socio-political status quo, he shows a tacit acceptance of the status quo. Having criticised the inequalities caused by the class system at the beginning of the book (Preface vii - xv passim) Sampson modifies the spirit of his argument when on page 44 he says "How far the removal of class difference is either desirable in itself or a proper aim in itself or a proper aim of education is debateable."
By page 89 he is rather more sure and is able to offer a rationalisation. "We have to proceed in education, as evolution itself proceeds, upon the principle of conservative innovation - the principle of attempting no more of the unusual than the system can healthily absorb." In other words what appears to be potentially revolutionary at the beginning of the book is modified as the argument proceeds. But certainly as far as advocating a more significant and crucial role for English is concerned what Sampson had to say at the time was progressive. Indeed his claim for a higher purpose for education in the face of employers' expectations is both brave and forthright.

However, finally, Sampson's socio-political position accords with liberal humanism and in an illuminating way points to the weak political commitment of liberal-humanism. Perhaps this is a basic weakness of the liberal humanist position in as much as it implicitly demotes the culture of the masses whilst struggling to believe in the virtue of socio-political egalitarianism. The resulting ambivalence causes what might be called the liberal paradox. It might be said that this liberal paradox has characterised English teaching ever since and has only been seriously challenged as a valid position from which to launch theory and practice in English teaching in recent years. Moreover the paradox in as much as it demonstrates that whilst real political commitment is difficult to establish shows that commitment to literature is very intense. One might then suggest that the liberal humanist position in English teaching (of which Sampson is a noted early champion) is

12. This is one reason why it is difficult to talk of an ideology of liberal humanism in that sense of the definition which demands explicit political commitment.
predicated on a transcendental model as far as literature is concerned. The commitment to this position and the acceptance of its informing values points up the truth that English literature has no tradition of political revolution.

However acceptance of the transcendental model illuminates the socio-political position of the liberal humanists. Although Sampson points to the essential exclusiveness of Classics (i.e. the study of Latin and Greek is not universally available) the transcendental model of English (going back to Arnold) almost certainly meant that English would be institutionalised similarly to Classics (the evidence so far presented in terms of improved qualifications, advanced studies and the obsession with 'rigour' has already pointed to this end). Thus logically English would come to be identified with the same intellectual and socio-cultural hierarchical system in education as Graeco-Roman classicism - mainly because access to its functions, interpretations and significances were classified in terms of degrees of linguistic and literary complexities, that is as subject-centred, esoteric knowledge (i.e. 'states of knowledge' to be achieved through effort). Moreover it is doubtful whether Sampson's scheme for improvements in speech and writing could enable the majority of children to have that access.

Thus any summary of Sampson's significance, whilst acknowledging his conviction, his eloquence and his humanism must take into account an element of sociological ambivalence (one might have said naivety in assessing his idealistic views about the irrelevance of upward social mobility to the working-class) and philosophical conformity. More precisely one might contend that Sampson is using a plausible and

---

13. That is, literature is seen as a means of spiritual therapy and renewal.
attractively egalitarian argument as an expedient for vindicating the centrality of English in the curriculum. However as we have seen this 'egalitarianism' (not unlike Arnold's) in no way challenges the fundamental socio-political rationale of the time. Thus Sampson appears to be saying that once social harmony has been achieved through social engineering in the schools through English and a real status quo achieved, the transcendental model will preserve it.

Finally, although Sampson sees English and its curricular significance largely in sociological terms, and as such lays down an important principle for the future association between language and egalitarianism, (perhaps it would be truer to say that he saw a distinction between education and occupation,) his style and his solutions are ultimately spiritual, philosophical and moral.
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CHAPTER 6
THE 1921 REPORT

A Introduction

As has already been stated (see chapter 5, p. 128) the 'Ashridge' Files contain no material directly concerned with the Committee and discussion procedures leading to the preparation, drafting and final publication of the 1921 Report. However so comprehensive is the Report itself (378 pp, 314 paras.) and so significant its general orientation that it might be argued that this omission hardly detracts from its prospective influence on English teaching, especially as other documents from the same period are available to give us further evidence of the Board's attitudes and evaluations.

However because of the nature and scope of this thesis it is proposed to approach this major document from two linked perspectives:

(1) To make some analysis of the curricular assumptions and professional implications of the Report.

(2) To suggest that as the 1921 Report looks forward towards innovation as such it will serve as a contrast to the 1924 "Suggestions" which implies conservation.

1. List of members of the Departmental Committee:

Sir Henry Newbolt (Chairman); Mr John Bailey (English Association); Miss K.M.Baines (HMI); Dr F.S.Boas; Miss H.M.Davies; Miss D.Erright; Professor C.H.Firth; Mr J.H.Fowler (Clifton College and English Association); Miss L.A.Lowe; Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch; Mr George Sampson; Professor Caroline Spurgeon; Miss G. Ferrie Williams and Mr J. Dover Wilson (HMI). Apart from a number of HMIs and Educational Associations, significant individual witnesses included: Caldwell Cook, P.J.Hartog, E.A.Greening Lamborn.
The 1921 Report is worthy of close and detailed examination because
(a) apart from Shayer's 8 page coverage in his book, no detailed
treatment of the Report has yet been attempted, and
(b) the Report is the first composite historical survey to trace the
manner in which English became established as a subject, not only in
the schools but also in the universities (see Appendix to Chapter 3).
This is especially important to the schools and other educational
establishments in as much as the graduates of the university 'schools'
approached the teaching of English in the spirit of their university
courses. (So much has been implicit in the drive for standards,
'rigour' and qualifications in the institutionalisation of English up
to this period in time).

Bearing in mind this experience in common to the leaders of the
English teaching profession, the 1921 Report strives to systematise a
pedagogical and professional identity for English teaching (see
pp. 179–197 below). It makes a bid on behalf of English to establish
the notion of the subject as being the nucleus of the curriculum, based on
sound humanistic and egalitarian principles. What is of special sig-
nificance, however, is that this claim to centrality is presented in
sociologically oriented if not always sociologically specific language.2
This sociological orientation has some educationally political as well as
more widely political attitudes as a basis. Thus where it can be
discerned the sociological element is presented in evaluative terms.
Indeed it is only able to be made visible because the 1921 Report makes
a serious business of collapsing the educational viability of some of

2. On pages 77-78 of his book, Shayer (op.cit.) points out the
frequent similarity in phrasing between Sampson's "English for the
English" and the 1921 Report.
the traditional parts of the English curriculum.

Perhaps it is not surprising that sociological conditions in England at the end of and just after the First World War seemed ripe for the centrality of English to be claimed. (Again this might be seen to relate to Sampson's assessment of the situation). As a result, there was 'concern' for a more just society and so it is easy to understand the Departmental Committee's determination to broaden the influence of the humanistic element in the curriculum. In this respect it is possible to see many links between the 1921 Report and the doctrinaire progressivism of the last decade. Thus, perhaps it might be true to say that the 1921 Report is important in the development of modern English teaching because it presents the first systematic theory which preceded much of its attendant practice by nearly half a century. The reason for this is, paradoxically, also partly inherent in the 1921 Report itself and also partly a result of subsequent historical factors. Perhaps the clue to the long period of slack before practice began to take up the theory might be inherent in a point made by the Report which is highly relevant today, namely that unless teachers are competent and enthusiastic they will "fall back upon conventional appreciations, historical details and minute examinations "of words and phrases" (para.11). However, it might also be argued that there is another factor besides this psychological theory of change - namely the influence of the institution upon the implementation of specific as well as general pedagogic innovation. Thus, it is interesting that the 1921 Report, perhaps demonstrating a sociological naiveté, does not develop its own inherent theory of sociological change (i.e., its 'new' conception of the English classroom as a place for personal rather than hierarchical relationships).
The earlier part of the 1921 Report lays down the guiding principles and communicates the spirit in which English should be conceived, born, nurtured and matured. The influence of Matthew Arnold, suitably modified, can be seen. The Report stresses the essentially socialising nature of English, especially literature. In Paragraph 64 there is, perhaps, the first real hint of an integrated studies approach with English, again, being cast in the principal role of integrating agent.

Three quotations will serve to illustrate this. "We prefer to emphasise again the point that every teacher is a teacher of English, because every teacher is a teacher in English". (Para. 64). (Sampson's direct influence is obvious here.) "The undue isolation of English has often made the teaching, not only of English but of other subjects, ineffective". (Para. 64). "We wish to see English constantly overflowing its own compartment, and penetrating into all the rest". (Para. 64).

Thus, it is not surprising that the 1921 Report can claim that English is not so much a subject as the body and vital principle of all school activity. It calls upon teachers to throw off the chains of the tradition of the older codes which we have seen were still adversely affecting methods and curriculum. "Teachers seem, at times, to be unaware or afraid of their liberty, and to desire the restrictions that no longer bind them". (Para. 58). More specifically, the Report emphasising the importance of English in the Elementary Schools (which it considers to be "absolute and unchallengeable") suggests uncompromisingly "The Elementary Schools might exert a more permanently humanising influence on its products if it were not for the mistake of some teachers in treating English as they treat Arithmetic, for example, namely as a mere subject, with a limited matter of its own, and a right to no more than a limited share in their vigorous exertions". (Para. 59). (See Sampson, op.cit.1921, p.24).
Although Sampson's influence is manifestly obvious, the emphasis upon humanism which is so characteristic of the 1921 Report can be traced more directly to John Dover Wilson, a member of the Departmental Committee. In 1918 Dover Wilson had written a very important pamphlet, published by the Board of Education in 1921 and entitled "Humanism in the Day Continuation School". In his pamphlet Dover Wilson faced the immediate post-war future of the young industrial worker very squarely. "It is not technical instruction we stand in need of so much as informed humanism". (p.5). This advocacy was also clearly prompted by an awareness of the steady deterioration in the attitudes of adolescents towards English. Dover Wilson remarks how boringly and badly taught English had been since the turn of the century. He quotes from a report on the work done in evening schools at Huddersfield which was issued by the Board of Education to the local education authority in 1913. The Board's commendations show the real attempt being made to break away from the rigid formal approach to English. As we have so often seen this approach consisted almost entirely of Classical Literature and Composition (always to be modelled on the elegant essay). Instead, such a subject classification is collapsed at its boundaries and instead of the novel (which would often be the case today) "it was suggested that ... modern social and industrial history of a simple character adapted to the young adolescent" should be made the centre of the English course. It was further suggested that literature should be confined to "recreative readings". Heroic or narrative poems were recommended, together with some Dickens and Charles Reade. Categorically, there should be no

3. 'Ashridge' File (Ed.77/12) Teaching of English in Public Elementary Schools in the County Borough of Huddersfield, 1912.
attempt to teach literature. All composition should be based on historical themes which the Board maintained were more suitable than novels for themes.

Dover Wilson himself was eager to add his own justification of such an approach. "What this new vast chaotic society needs above everything else is a sense of history, a sense of common purpose and a sense of its own significance". (p.32). Because of industrialism, Dover Wilson asserted, people of modern England had hardly begun to acquire a "culture" of their own. He believed it was there to be developed "from the stuff of their own lives and work. An indigenous culture belonging to industrialism itself is needed". (p.32). This was a revolutionary thought for the time and its effects can clearly be seen in the "community orientations" of the 1921 Report. Thus Dover Wilson suggests (p.33) that "the New Humanism is built on the basis of the students' immediate economic interests and environment - foundations of Industrial Culture of the future". However, his intentions are finally communal. "Humanism enlarges the sympathies and strengthens one's powers of judgment in regard to character. The milk of human kindness is a wonderful lubricant in the social machine". (p.25).

B The Report's views on grammar and classics

Following an introduction which lays down the Departmental Committee's philosophical ideals for its vision of English teaching, the 1921 Report makes what at first appears to be a purposeful and explicit attack upon the pedagogy of grammar and classics. Indeed, it seems as if the Departmental Committee, again echoing Dover Wilson's earlier attempts to exclude the teaching of formal grammar (op.cit., page 93) had some obsession with the problem to which it constantly returns. It
is clear that its members felt caught in a dilemma. The spirit of humanism does not quite account for the fact that grammar not only cannot but perhaps should not disappear altogether. Perhaps the logically derived sociological implication of such an advocacy might have clearly meant to the Departmental Committee that their indirect support of the collapsing of the social hierarchy implicit in the weakening of the influence of grammar and this visible at the micro-cosmic level of the classroom, would be seen to commit them to a larger egalitarian package. That is, their attack upon explicit grammar and its demonstrated correlation with educational exclusiveness might have implications which they would have felt uneasy in supporting. However, this attack on formal grammar does accord with the Report's advocacy of oral work and less formalised writing. Such a pedagogical content represents an implicit exploration of context and challenges a narrower, more controlled exploration of meaning in arranged contexts. This notion of less formalised, more open-ended exploration gives rise to a further notion of group co-operation which accords with egalitarianism in the sense that the concept of ultimate correctness has been removed. In this section of the Report the uneasiness of the Departmental Committee does lead to a certain equivocation which again may have lessened the impact of their recommendations in some way and partially account for the delay in the implementation of many of their views on English teaching.

The Report sets up the controversy in the form of a confrontation between Mr. Barton, headmaster of a Direct Grant, old-established Grammar School, and Mr. Ballard, an educational psychologist representing a more progressive approach. It devotes equal amounts of space to the two arguments. The Report concludes from the two witnesses' evidence
that they both think grammar is necessary, but neither is happy about doing it! Other evidence is brought before the Committee and the net result is one of confusion, with confliction over age, method and viability. The whole issue, apparently, was much complicated by the requirements of modern language teachers. Having collected all the evidence the Departmental Committee bravely resolves "to set the problem in its proper proportions". (Para.256). It suggests that Messrs. Ballard and Barton are using grammar in a different sense. The Report tactfully reduces the division between the two men by further defining their points of view. In effect, they say, Ballard is attacking too much prescriptive grammar, whilst Barton is advocating a linguistic approach.

The Report goes on to present the evidence of Professor Wyld (Baines Professor of English Language and Philology at Liverpool University) who makes illuminating and relevant comment, the gist of which is that grammar does not make prescriptions and proscriptions, but descriptions. The Report endorses this and draws attention to the multiplicity of grammar books which attempt "to lay down the law". "Undoubtedly, therefore, an abatement of the traditional claims of grammar, a recognition that its position in the curriculum is justified because it is the essential groundwork of all other study and for no other reason would go some way towards rehabilitating its prestige in the schools". (Para.257).

In Paragraph 265 the Report sums up its discussion on grammar. The main points made are:

1) The sole justification for teaching grammar is that it forms the necessary introduction to the study of language, seeing that it is not a body of doctrine upon speech but a scientific description of the facts of language.
2) Grammar has been badly taught in the past because
   (a) its nature has been misunderstood and
   (b) the formulation of its rules has followed the
       old Latin grammar books far too closely.

3) The proper grammar to study in school is not English
   grammar, but pure or functional grammar.

   The Report then refers to the 1910 Circular which, it will be
   remembered, had taken a similar stand. "English is not a language the
   growth of which ended and the usages of which can therefore be collected
   and expressed in settled formulae, but is a living organism in process
   of constant change. In the past the formal teaching of English
   grammar was based on Latin grammar. It is now recognised that this
   was a mistake founded on a whole set of misconceptions. The rules
   governing the use of a highly inflected language like Latin are almost
   wholly inapplicable to English". (Para.266).

   Thus it is clear that the 1921 Report is not only systematically
   attacking current pedagogical notions on grammar but also advocating
   that a linguistics approach offers a much more exact description of
   language. Now as we have seen it was a lack of linguistic knowledge
   which had been a fundamental weakness in thinking about language
   teaching. It intimates that it looks forward to the increasing
   visibility and acceptance of the linguistics approach to language.
   It talks about the important unifying tendency of English. The
   linguistics approach would gradually cause the prejudices and diffi-
   culties of intercourse between the classes to disappear. "An
   education, fundamentally English would, we believe, at any rate bridge,
   if not close, this chasm of separation". This is a good example of the
   ideological nature of much of the Report. The weakening of elitism
seems to be one of the purposes of the Report but it is presented on strongly appealing humanistic grounds, with English as the most viable educational means to that end. Thus it is the community spirit which English can engender, the commonality it can create and its essential accessibility for everyone that the Report urges. "The English people might learn as a whole to regard their own language, first with respect, and then with a genuine feeling of pride and affection ... Such a feeling for our own native language would be a bond of union between classes ... This feeling, if fostered in all our schools without exception, would disclose itself far more often and furnish a common meeting ground for great numbers of men and women who might otherwise never come into touch with one another ... Literature will influence all who are capable of finding recreation in something beyond mere sensation. These it will unite by a common interest in life at its best, and by the perpetual reminder that through all social differences human nature and its strongest affections are fundamentally the same". (Para. 15). It must be stressed that the egalitarian sentiments implicit in this section may be inferred from what is sound pedagogical reasoning.

In its treatment of the influence of Classics, the Report included evidence from those educational sectors which clearly embraced entrenched ideas about the curriculum in general and the place of Classics in particular. The evidence of the Preparatory Schools is worth looking at in this context. In Paragraph 95 we read that despite an attempt in 1910 by a Committee of the Headmasters' Conference to emphasise the necessity of a thorough training in English (later reaffirmed and developed in the Report of the Joint Standing Committee of the Headmasters' Conference and the Association of Preparatory Schools) the Preparatory Schools were hamstrung by the Public Schools' entrance
scholarship examinations, the majority suffering so that a few could gain scholarships at Public Schools. Some improvement, however, is noted. For example, some Public Schools, notably Harrow, had decided to attach great importance to English in their entrance scholarship examinations. (At least the 1921 Report showed that the lesson of such evidence had not been lost on the Departmental Committee. "It is obvious that where examination requirements exercise such power, English, unless it is included in those requirements, will be practically eliminated from the school course". (Para. 96). This may explain the equivocal attitude towards examinations elsewhere in the Report.

As we have seen, one of the problems confronting the institutionalisation of English teaching was the entrenched attitude of representatives of the private sector that they could believe in the low intellectual calibre of English. "English was not difficult enough to give the hard mental training which was one of the advantages of a classical education". (Para. 97). This is a challenging statement and one which the Report had to answer effectively if it were to establish the full educational viability and especially the notion of the centrality of English. Its attack is varied, systematic, but somewhat cautious. It begins by saying that the Departmental Committee have never contemplated that English should replace Classics. "But instead of the study of the Classics being forced on all indiscriminately, we would use English as a sifting ground to differentiate those who possess linguistic ability and literary instincts and are likely to make sufficient

4. Indeed the argument can be traced back as far as 1867 when J.W. Hales presented a long list of difficulties to prove that English has a grammar as difficult and interesting as Latin. (Quoted in 1921 Report, Para. 259 from 'Teaching of English' by J.W. Hales in "Essays on Liberal Education", ed. Dean Farrar, 1867).
progress with Latin or Greek, or both, to justify their taking them up". (Para. 101). This, however, seems to concede that Latin and Greek are of a higher order than English, although in view of the powerful contemporary lobby in favour of Classics, the expediency of this statement is understandable.

C The Shaping of the identity of English Studies and Teaching.

So far in this thesis we have seen how a number of factors (i.e. the work of individuals; the prevailing consciousness; the work and attitudes of the Board of Education; the foundation of the English Association) had begun to delineate an identity for English teaching. It is my intention in the next section to show how the 1921 Report contributed to the shaping of that identity.

One of the chief objectives of the 1921 Report is to show how interest in English literature was on the increase after the end of the First World War. In this way weight is given to the encouragement of English in the field of extra-mural study seen by the Departmental Committee to be one of the major target areas for the expansion of the influence of the spirit of English. The figures are worth reproducing. (Paragraph 247. Oxford University Extension Delegacy figures).
TABLE 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Courses in English Literature</th>
<th>Average Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Courses in other Subjects</th>
<th>Average Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913-14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6,701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Report suggests, the interest in English literature was partly diverted to other subjects, especially historical and social. However, after the War, by 1921 all the signs were of interest picking up in all courses but proportionately very much more so in English literature.

The Report then goes on to quote figures from the three largest extra-mural organisations - at London, Cambridge and the W.E.A. First, figures supplied by the Registrar of the London University Extension Board. (Para. 247).

TABLE 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Courses in English Literature</th>
<th>Terminal Entries</th>
<th>Number of Courses in other Subjects</th>
<th>Terminal Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913-14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, the First World War figures supplied by the Cambridge local examinations and lectures syndicate. (Para. 247).

### TABLE 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Courses in English Literature</th>
<th>Average Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Courses in other Subjects</th>
<th>Average Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913-14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trends for the two university organisations are similar but in the immediate post-War period the signs are that all courses, but particularly those in English literature, are well attended.

Third, the W.E.A. figures. (Para. 249).

### TABLE 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1914-15</th>
<th>1915-16</th>
<th>1916-17</th>
<th>1917-18</th>
<th>1918-19</th>
<th>1919-20</th>
<th>1920-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of tutorial classes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tutorial classes taking literature</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3, 4 and 5 show similar trends with the latest figures, for
1920-21, showing that relative to other courses, English is increasing its popularity. However, the Report does remind us that the figures for all years, not just the War years where this might have been expected, women and teachers made up large percentages of the classes.

The 1921 Report is obviously concerned that literature should be appreciated by many more people - especially of the working class. It stresses the aesthetic and subjective aspects of literature rather than the intellectual and objective for such students. Teachers in this area, it emphasises, should have a passion for literature and a power to communicate it. They should have interpretative gifts and be aware of the positive elements of the provincial culture and local dialect of the area. The way to establishing the appeal of such courses should be undertaken through arousing students' social interests. (This again relates to the main philosophico-sociological orientation of the Report). Thus Paragraph 252 advocates that "a preliminary course on modern industrial History or Social Philosophy, with ample illustrations from the pages of Carlyle, Ruskin, William Norris and Matthew Arnold will often make a fruitful beginning". Stressing a socio-psychological aspect the Report asserts, "the vital thing is to make it obvious from the outset that literature is alive, that it is the sublimation of human thought, passion, feeling, that it is concerned with issues that are of universal interest, that in short it is flesh and blood and not stucco ornamentation".

5. Here we are able to point to the 1921 Report's real potential for generating changes in consciousness. This particular dichotomy has become crucial in the later differentiation between a middle-class and a working-class pedagogy, so much so that as a basis for organising the whole curriculum it has caused real conflict among teachers, educationalists, administrators, politicians and the general public.
The ideal is that students should learn to create their own literature. Professor Noorman of Leeds University is referred to as a passionate advocate of this approach. His dream of a folk poetry and a folk drama, of a great art rising spontaneously from the community is cited. He is quoted as saying, "But before a modern folk-poetry can arise there must be a recognition of the spiritual oneness of the folk and the creation of a folk-imagination of which folk poetry is the direct and concrete expression in symbolic language of art". (Para.252). The Report believes that the twin objectives of spiritual unity and the uplift of popular imagination can only come about "through a general acknowledgment of the paramount place which the native speech and literature should occupy in our schools and in the common life of our people". (Para.252).

These objectives link naturally with the explicitly sociological objectives of much of the Report, more detail of which will be dealt with later. However, the Departmental Committee was in a pedagogical dilemma inasmuch as the social expansion of English, indeed the very criteria by which it was claiming centrality meant that it was vulnerable to the encroachment of other subjects. Dover Wilson had anticipated the problem earlier when he says on Page 69 of his pamphlet "Any attempt to drag literature at the heels of history or geography, to make it merely illustrative material for the Knowledge-subjects is to be strongly deprecated". In the same way, the 1921 Report says it is a mistake to treat literature as a branch of History or Sociology. The Report asserts

---

6. This is precisely what contemporary advocates of a working-class pedagogy have moved towards claiming that there is sufficient variety and drama within a working-class lifestyle for this to happen. In this way, it is claimed, the pupil works in and creates out of more vital and viable cultural experiences than the traditional school curriculum has been able to provide. See particularly Chapters 11 and 13.
that such a development would not allow for what it calls "the eternal element". This seems to be a highly significant point because in it, on behalf of English, the Report appears to be saying that English is at the very heart of the curriculum and supplies the life blood for its functioning. However, at this juncture the explicated philosophical rationale at least as a continuous, 'packed' statement so necessary to substantiate as well as define the 'eternity' of English is not forthcoming. On the other hand, that it is elsewhere and that it is mainly sociologically conceived and orientated is easier to substantiate by reference to specific sections of the Report. The rationale must be distilled from that evidence.

More specifically, the Report concludes that "the time needed to be set apart for English composition could be greatly reduced if teachers of history and science exacted a higher standard of English in oral and written work than that which they at present often accept; nor need English composition always be a thing separate from the written work in a special subject, such as history, geography or science". (Para.110). The Departmental Committee notes that the Report of the Prime Minister's Committee on the Teaching of Natural Science asserts that "in all schools where no time, or only a limited time, is given to the teaching of a modern language, it is essential that English subjects should be regarded as of at least equal importance with Science, and receive corresponding attention". (Para.118). Although the Modern Language Association cast English in a handmaiden's role to foreign language learning, they do suggest that if pupils show complete lack of aptitude for the learning of a foreign language, they should be given additional time to study the mother tongue. (Para.118). However, on this point the Departmental Committee brings to bear the evidence submitted by the Secondary School
Inspectors who are quoted as saying, "a course of English suitable for this (the secondary) stage should be in weight, seriousness, importance and difficulty, at least equal to the work which is done by pupils in ancient or modern languages". (Para.119).

However, the association with Classics continued to present something of a political dilemma. In an attempt to claim parity of esteem for English the Report advocates that "a candidate for Honours in a Classical 'School' should be given opportunities of illustrating his studies of these Classics by their English parallels or derivatives". (Para.197). Perhaps to appease the still powerful Classics lobby, the Report appears to be deliberately protecting the interests of Classics by saying "we believe that such a regulation would not only be a just recognition of the importance of English and of the fact that all foreign literatures are best approached by an Englishman through English, but would bring added life and new interest to the Classical 'Schools' and Classical studies. Professor Grierson (then Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature at Edinburgh University) remarked to us and we agree with him that Classical studies would be in a securer position today if their teachers had always recognised that the study of English literature was an essential supplement to them". (Para.197).

In connection with this the Report's section on the place of English in the public schools should be examined. Perhaps this section is a real test of the sincerity of the Report's advocacy. The evidence indicates that the public schools did not see English as a core subject in 1921. Witnesses on their behalf seemed reluctant to think of English competing with other subjects. They believed in an informal and indirect approach to the teaching of English. One witness claims that "the schoolmaster devitalises literature". This concern for those from the
public schools for risks arising from incompetent teaching is dealt with sympathetically in the Report's commentary. Some sort of vindication of the public school caution over recognising the pedagogic status of English is expressed. Concession is made to the traditions and development of public school education. The Departmental Committee itself is cautiously optimistic about the future of English in the public schools. "From one Public School after another we hear that Literature, Music, Art, the urgent problems of modern social and political conditions are awakening a keen interest. We cannot help thinking that as a result of this new vitality which the schools claim to be experiencing, the classroom atmosphere will change sufficiently for the national literature ... to find a larger place in it". (Para.127).

Although the Report is full of worthy idealistic sentiments about the aesthetic and spiritual benefits of literature, at the same time it shows a realisation that the pedagogic strength and influence of a subject is closely correlated with its place in the examination system - the classic dilemma of the teacher of literature. However, in this respect the Report draws an important distinction between two aspects of English here - the power of communication in English and the appreciation of literature as art. "The first of these is entirely susceptible of being tested, and consequently of being encouraged by examinations". This is probably why the Report gives its approval to examinations up to Advanced Level and for the Civil Service. The Report quotes evidence submitted by Sir Stanley Leathes (the First Civil Service Commissioner) who told the Departmental Committee that the Civil Service Commissioners "hold very strongly that effective teaching and practice in the use and comprehension of English is a subject literally of first importance in all education at whatever age". (Para.268). In examinations for junior
appointments (18-19\(^2\) years), English was tested by an essay, a précis and a general paper. "In the opinion of the Commissioners précis writing was an excellent test both of competence in the use and comprehension of English and also of business-like ability". The Report, however, cautions that too much time should not be spent on this activity. Mention is made of the English Association's pamphlet, No.37, "English Papers in Examinations for pupils of School Age in England and Wales", which recommends English as a compulsory subject consisting of two papers, one in composition, one in literature. The Report itself is strongly of the opinion that English should be compulsory"... including either in the form of a précis or otherwise a test of the power to grasp the meaning of a piece of English of appropriate difficulty". (Para.272). At the Higher Schools Certificate level the English Association recommended that "all candidates, whatever their subject or group of subjects they offer, should be required to pass in English essay". It was thus a short step from urging English as a qualifying subject in the matriculation examinations of all universities to claiming that it should be recognised that no-one is fit to pursue university studies who has not a fair knowledge of English. (This became an acknowledged principle by the 1960's).

Not unexpectedly, however, the Report tells of the misgivings of witnesses on the suitability of examining English literature. The Headmaster of Sherbourne (Mr. Nowell Smith) wanted examinations in English "reduced to vanishing point" because they prevented schools from doing "all sorts of things they might otherwise do". (Para.275). The Headmaster of Eton (Dr C. A. Allington) "feared that examinations might tend to spoil the teaching". Perhaps the Report demonstrates expediency when it says "to exempt Literature alone from its scope would
simply exclude the teaching of literature from a number of schools". (Para.276). The Departmental Committee indicate their own attitude by hiding prudently behind P. Hartog (ex-Academic Registrar of the University of London and in 1921 the Vice-Chancellor of Dacca University). "It may be held, and I should agree, that culture is as individual a thing as conscience; that culture may be killed, that it cannot be caught by examinations. Yet teachers who realise all this, who think examinations in their subject mischievous rather than helpful, implore the authorities to include it in every possible examination syllabus. Why? Because under the present regime a subject that is not examined in is likely to disappear speedily from our teaching curricula". (Para.276).

It was obvious to the members of the Departmental Committee that the implementation of their notions of the centrality and enhanced status of English depended almost entirely on the quality of the subject's professional teaching corps. The purpose of the Report at this point was to propose not only a new and positive identity for English teachers but also to suggest ways of professional training and organisation which have eventually been instrumental in shaping the institutional and pedagogical destiny of the profession. Thus, in Paragraphs 159–189 the Report draws attention to the ineffective professional organisation of teachers and teaching institutions. Teachers at the time were poorly paid and had inadequate facilities, especially libraries. Teachers had been badly trained and turned out unconvinced of the ideals of a liberal education. Thus, in order to ensure that English teachers should be afforded a new respect and status, the Report stresses the many varied qualities needed. First, the Departmental Committee saw that this was bound up in the need to dispel assumptions that English is an easy
subject to be taught by anyone willing. They advocate the employment of university specialists who should be given "the same powers of direction as are usually given to the senior teacher in Mathematics, Science or Modern Languages". (Para.129). As for non-specialists, they should have "good knowledge, interest, and the gift of communicating their own enthusiasm". (Para.130). The ideal English teacher will be one who combines "a sensitiveness to the aesthetic and emotional appeals of literature with reverence for exact knowledge and an appreciation of the use of language as an instrument of exact thought". (Para.131). Such a person, the Report says, "we look to the universities to supply". This is clearly an attempt to legitimate the claim to higher professional status for teachers of English by pointing to the very considerable personal, academic and professional accomplishments needed. It is another and vital aspect of the Report's attempt to create an identity for English and English teachers.

Perhaps the most persistent and conscious message, both implicit and explicit of the 1921 Report was that the Departmental Committee were intent upon creating a new vision of social unity with English studies as the major unifying agent. Given the impetus of the general atmosphere of euphoria which pervaded the country after the First World War, there was a desperate determination to establish the principle of unity in all walks of life. Dover Wilson had recognised the urgency of finding a new principle of unity and we have already made reference to his advocacy of the humanistic element in the shaping of that vision. "Humanism ... embraces ... all those subjects which deal with man as man: man as an individual soul ... man as a social being with obligations to his immediate society, his nation and the whole human race". Dover Wilson op.cit.1921, (p,36). Not surprisingly, therefore, at an
early stage in the 1921 Report, the Departmental Committee make an explicit statement about the provision of equality of opportunity. It is clear that they envisage English as playing a vitally important role in the movement which would be directed to "the provision of equal intellectual opportunities for all". (Para.17).

Later on the Report presents specific contexts in which the social purposes of English may be illustrated. For example, the teaching of poetry (referred to in Para.92) may be seen as having social as well as an aesthetico-spiritual significance. This social purpose which reflects a shift from hierarchical to interpersonal relationships in the classroom is one of reducing social cleavage. "There is no lesson like the poetry lesson for producing that intimacy between teacher and class which makes a school a happy place". (Para.92). Thus, there is a shift of emphasis from impersonal, separate, autonomous analysis to an explicit, equal-feeling response where an experience of sharing will initiate against hierarchical notions defining the relationship of teacher and taught. It is in its explicit references to the principle of reducing social cleavage that the Report stresses the social context in which English is to operate. It will be a tool to make people articulate for social and political purposes. It would be difficult to justify inferring from this that the egalitarianism of the Report did not contain a political bias. It seems that the departmental committee genuinely believed that the implementation of philosophically and pedagogically sound English teaching would help working people to use it where it was most needed, i.e. "to be of service not merely in commercial life but also in those political and social activities such as trade union meetings and the like, which are becoming the preoccupation of an ever-increasing number of working people, and where sincerity and clear-headedness are matters of national concern". (Para.145).
However, on the other hand, the Departmental Committee was fully aware of the possible resistance to its attempt to "missionise" with English amongst working men. It realised that to many such men literature was judged to be a middle-class activity. "Literature seems to be classed by a large number of thinking working men with antimacassars, fish knives and other unintelligible and futile trivialities of 'middle-class culture' and as a subject of instruction is suspect as an attempt 'to sidetrack the working-class movement'." (Para.233). The Departmental Committee is obviously very concerned about changing this attitude because its central missionary role has been to stress continually that "literature ... binds together by passion and knowledge the vast empire of human society". (Para.233). Once again this demonstrates the transcendental conception of literature. It is this particular conception which characterises many modern English teachers and gives a uniformity to their personal role analysis. Because of the high degree of conviction with which it is held this has strong sociological implications both for what is taught and, more importantly, for how it is taught.

Inevitably, because of its determination to use English as a means of social therapy, the Departmental Committee make more and more explicit statements about egalitarianism. In Paragraph 234 they show obvious concern that the working-classes "see education mainly as something to equip them to fight their capitalistic enemies". Thus, although socially laudable, perhaps it was too idealistic and politically naive for them to believe that things could be otherwise. This desire of the working-classes was clearly socially divisive as far as the Departmental Committee were concerned. However, having established that they believe this "social problem" is directly the business of literature, they say
"on the other hand we believe that, if rightly presented", poetry will be recognised by the most ardent social reformers as of value, because while it contributes no specific solution of the social problem it endows the mind with power and sanity, because, in a word, it enriches personality". (Para.235).

This particular concern of the Departmental Committee again may be traced directly to Dover Wilson's earlier pamphlet. In Paragraph 158 the Report states "a humanised industrial education is the chief means whereby the breach between culture and common life may be healed". Thus, the Report argues that because since industrialisation a man's working life had lost all significance in relation to life as a whole (Para.235) this had led to wage slavery and this in turn was the cause of all social unrest. "Because of it there was no longer any literature springing from the lives of the people as in the medieval age, when they sang ballads and took part in their guilds, in plays and pageants. Literature now expressed the point of view, for the worst part, of the middle and upper classes, and working men felt that any attempt to teach them literature and art was an attempt to impose upon them the culture of another class".

However, the Report suggests that working men still appreciate poets like Burns "because he made them feel with him the essential truth of things". (Para.235). A writer like Jack London was read because he represented life as a struggle - a social struggle against Nature in which one gained success by co-operation. The Report stresses that it is urgent that the connection between literature and life is brought out. The Report then makes an illuminating comment when it says (Para.235) that whatever the cause, modern literature "including the so-called democratic poets like Wordsworth and Shelley" no longer springs from the life of the
people, nor is generally recognised as having any direct bearing upon
the life of the working-classes.

The Report also criticises middle-class attitudes to literature.
"It is safe to say that more than 90% of middle-class people have ceased
to read poetry in adult life". An historical explanation for this
follows. Essentially, poetry sprang from the life of the people.
However, enormous changes in social life since the 16th century,
greatly accentuated by the Industrial Revolution, created a gulf between
the world of poetry and the world of everyday action. (Para. 237).

The notion of reducing social cleavage is envisaged as taking root
primarily in the most relevant institutions for the provision of
education for a wide public, namely the day-continuation and technical
and commercial schools. It seems that the Departmental Committee,
guided by Dover Wilson's pamphlet, sought to work out the sociological
and pedagogical implications of the sort of English they were advocating
in the Day-continuation school. These implications are then applied
more generally and in some respects much more tentatively to other
schools.

The recommendations made are expressed in some detail. First, a
sociolinguistic component is stressed in Paragraph 143 where the Report
is dealing with English in the Continuation School. "We are likewise
conscious that English will be on its trial in the new Continuation
Schools ... and that it will succeed in proportion as its teachers bring
it to bear directly upon life and show that it helps to make more
intelligible those processes of life which are most familiar to the
taught". This additional role obligation for teachers is thought to be
of particular importance in commercial and technical schools. Here, the
Report suggests that technical subjects' teachers should have courses of
instruction in the Humanities because "the social implications of industry are hid from them". (Para.152). As for Higher Education, the Report devotes four pages to the work of Professor Aydelotte, Professor of English at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who was striving to create a link between the engineer and society through literature which isolated essentially human problems. The Report's emphasis is entirely social. The quotations taken from Professor Aydelotte's article, 'The Problem of English in Engineering Schools' (An essay in "The Oxford Stamp", 1917) indicate the attempt to promote social unity which underlies his work. "They (his students) are ready to read poetry and fiction and drama with real human interest... They have a glimpse of the real function of literature - to unify life and to show men its meaning". (Para.157).

The Report also believes in the important concept of participation and audience. Here is the micro society which coheres because of English. Thus, the Report states (Para.148) that reading aloud, recitation and dramatic performance are the right methods of dealing with literature in schools. Again, we can see that the method advocated is the result of acknowledging that a student's social and economic circumstances determine his level of interest and adaptability. The social purpose is strongly implicit in the plea for dramatic performance.

In making suggestions about course content for training college students, the Report advocates a study of contemporary literature. Again, a social purpose is stressed. "We think that the students are far more likely to perceive in literature not merely a school subject but the most direct communication of experience by men to men if they are encouraged to find out how the life of their own time has been interpreted by contemporary writers". (Para.182).

7. This represents a more unanimously liberalised attitude than in the discussions recorded in Ashridge File (Ed.77/4) See pp. 128 - 132 above.
At this point it is necessary to mention that the Report, backed up by the work of the English Association, saw clearly that the subject could only develop along the lines it was advocating, especially in the teaching of literature, if some professional control of the syllabus, some autonomy, could be gained. The English Association had recommended\(^8\) that literature should be a compulsory subject in the School Certificate "provided that each school should, to suit its own peculiar circumstances, draw up for itself a list of texts to be studied, and should determine for itself the lines on which its syllabus should be treated. Purely external examinations in English Literature in which there is no direct contact between the Examiner and the teacher cannot be approved ... Since the style of question set determines the method of teaching, examining bodies usurp functions which properly belong to the school". (Para.278). The Report went further and suggested that teachers should be allowed to offer their own options. However, it was to take over forty years before provision in the C.S.E.made it possible for different modes to operate. Perhaps this is partly due to a difficulty the Report itself immediately advances. This difficulty was the practical one of equating papers and questions which has since proved to be a long-standing hurdle.

In the context of defining a professional role for English teachers, it seems that the Report represents the early struggle of the profession to shake off some of the less desirable implications of the 'handmaiden' role other subjects, especially Classics and modern languages, had tried to impose upon it. The caution and occasional equivocation of the Report suggests that this role was a fairly substantial part of the con-

\(^8\) Pamphlet No.37, English Association, op.cit.
ditions for the early acceptance of English. Thus, it is not surprising that the Departmental Committee saw that the close association of English with the universities was an important determinant not only of the pedagogical status of the subject in the curriculum of all types of educational institution, but also of the teacher's professional status. What was advocated in 1921 has only recently begun to take a substantial step forward - namely the progression towards an all-graduate profession. "We look forward to the time when a really large proportion of our elementary school teachers will be persons who have completed a full university training." (Para. 186).

The Report is also forward looking on a number of pedagogical points. First, it has some very up-to-date comments about the teaching of grammar. Once again, it is most explicitly progressive when talking about further education. Referring to English in the evening school, the Report states most emphatically that parsing and analysis is "discouraging and uninteresting to the very large majority of the students, and this alone is a sufficient justification for its rejection under a system of voluntary attendance". (Para. 141). The Report goes on to point out that there is no necessary connection between learning formal grammar and speaking and writing correctly. It advocates that any instruction in grammar should emphasise the priority of usage and should be taught incidentally as the occasion arises.

Second, the Report looks forward to the recent emphasis (since 1960) placed on the importance of communication for business men. The whole field of industrial communication is anticipated. "Manner of speech is of the greatest importance to business, whether in the relations of the employer to his principals or of a representative to outside business men". Literature also was thought to be of great importance in the
preparation for a business career.

Although it has been my purpose to show how the recommendations of the 1921 Report were innovatory both in principle and practice, in some ways it is not altogether a revolutionary package. Although, as has already been intimated, its general suggestions, especially in respect of oral work, are educationally very forward looking, in certain areas the Report's position is noticeably equivocal. Mention has already been made of its caution over its relation to Classics. Thus, one sees that in such specific areas the Departmental Committee was strongly influenced by a prevailing climate of opinion. One could argue that on the one hand the sociological conditions for the implementation of many of the proposals and recommendations of the 1921 Report had not sufficiently evolved to make them officially acceptable and practicable. On the other hand less conducive sociological conditions still prevailed to affect the nature of those recommendations which had tried to reconcile diametrically opposed orientations to the content and practice of English teaching.

Certainly the 1921 Report is suggesting a more palatable and humane approach to English teaching particularly where it is (a) fulfilling a social role and (b) being applied to a more broadbased section of the population (e.g., in all those areas of further education). In the 1921 Report the egalitarian and progressive elements contained within English teaching were given a first shaping. Since that time their exact nature, especially in curriculum development, has been more sharply defined through subsequent research (e.g., in work in sociolinguistics and the nature of children's language development). In this way their logical necessity for pedagogy as well as their political implications at the level of teacher commitment have become more visible.
It is perhaps relevant to put the 1921 Report more firmly into the context of its time and remind ourselves that it was one of four major reports precipitated by the 1918 Education Act—the others being on Natural Science, Modern Languages and Classics. Indeed, given the relative lack of official material we are fortunate that the 'Ashridge' files help us to see how the Board of Education viewed the direction of the implementation of the four reports (Office Memorandum No.55, Board of Education Office Committee on the "Four Reports", 'Ashridge' file, Ed.12/212). The Committee appointed to consider this made their report in June 1922. Their brief had been to comment upon proposals for action made to the Board in the Reports and consider issuing a statement for the benefit of Heads of Schools and Colleges within the Board's purview of the practical lessons to be gained from them.

The Four Reports fundamentally agreed on a wider recognition of humanistic ideals—and indeed refers to Para. 4 of the English Report (1921) "It is, in a word, guidance in the acquiring of experience"—or again, from Page 19 of the Classics Report "it is not only on their knowledge of the physical phenomenon of the universe that the happiness and welfare of most men depend, they depend rather on their knowledge of the minds and characters of themselves and of their fellow men."

Moreover we are reminded (page 8) that in respect of secondary schools "the reports exhibit a striking unanimity in the importance which they attach to English as a foundation study" (e.g. Science Report, Section 56, Classics Report, p.112, Modern Languages Report, Conclusion 35). In addition the committee agrees that, despite the claims of the other subjects for time that for pupils in the final stages, English is of outstanding importance" (Para.22). The Board was particularly anxious not to dictate to schools what they should do about balancing
the curriculum and tried to show its flexibility by saying, in Para. 25, that as far as English is concerned and bearing in mind Sampson's famous maxim the number of periods given to it must be a variable factor dependent upon the whole organisation and spirit of English study in a school.

As far as the elementary schools are concerned the Committee seems to be at some odds with the 1921 Report's reasons for stressing speech training. On the one hand it believes that standardised speech would lessen the differences between educated and uneducated speech, but on the other does not want to discourage the use of genuine dialect. The committee does, however, seem to agree that English should be the nucleus of the curriculum in the elementary school.

It seems that in respect of other educational institutions the English Report had the most to say, especially about the training of teachers. The committee recognises the importance of English in Training Colleges and asserts that the Board will improve the standard of English in the Preliminary Certificate Examination. (However as the First and Second level Examinations increasingly took over the function of selection from the Preliminary Certificate examination, the standard was in any case assured).

In its conclusion the Office Committee's Report refers specifically to English, believing that "the English Report presents its subjects in aspects which hitherto have not been put forward with all the same clearness and force". The Office Committee thought that the distinction which the 1921 Report drew between training of the power of communication and training of appreciation of literature as an art (i.e. intellectual and humane culture) was a valuable contribution to educational theory.

In keeping with their usual dissemination practice the Board seemed
anxious to issue a revised Circular in English (This is first mentioned in a Minute, 27 July 1922, T.A. Spencer to Chief Inspector Fletcher, 'Ashridge' File, Ed. 12/214). This is the beginning of the 1924 "Suggestions" which will be discussed shortly.

One outcome of the Four Reports was the issue of Circular 1294 (December 1922) which was the result of a specific point made in the deliberations of the Office Committee referred to on the previous page—namely the problem of balancing the curriculum. Among other points this Circular dealt with the overcrowded condition of the curriculum and offered the schools greater opportunities of freedom in dealing with this difficulty. They were also offered the opportunity of omitting subjects from the curriculum altogether—at least for some pupils at some stage of the course. The board invited the schools to submit their proposals, but because after a year very little seemed to have happened, on 27 December 1923, E.H. Pelham sent out a memorandum to his inspectors asking them to inform him of the impact of Circular 1294 and whether they had received any definite proposals and also whether they had any explanation to suggest for the apparently small response to the Circular.

Between 27th January and 29th February 1924 replies were received from 5 Divisional Inspectors and 34 District Inspectors. These indicated:

(i) very little had been proposed by the schools (examination of the replies reveals only two proposals received—one was turned down and the other accepted).

(ii) very few departures in practice.

(iii) that the schools were overwhelmingly constrained by examination requirements and the strong subject (and perhaps increasingly departmental) loyalties of specialist teachers who
were enjoying higher status and in the case of secondary English teachers, a newly-won legitimation.

A few specific replies will serve to fill in the details:

1. "Schools cannot experiment below this stage (First Secondary Exam) without risking the candidates' chances of obtaining credit or matriculation certificate - and most Headmasters regard this risk as too great."

2. "Another reason for expecting no immediate response to the Circular is that schools, while welcoming this statement of the Board's policy are waiting to see its effect upon the regulations of examining bodies."

3. "The First Examination is becoming increasingly important as an entrance to business, e.g. the Headmaster of Firth Dale, Sheffield, states that even in this period of acute trade depression he has placed successfully every boy who has left with the certificate."

4. "A girl cannot get into Training College unless she has taken the matriculation."

5. "Only an exceptionally strong man or woman could stand against the forces that support the present curriculum, tradition, public opinion, economy, vested interests, previous training, inertia and the desire for a peaceful life. The teachers are recruited naturally from the unenterprising section of the community, particularly in the case of men, and are trained at school and university tamely to accept the opinion of others. Moreover to most Headmasters the ideal product is an examinational prodigy who will do brilliantly at university. The other pupils must follow haltingly in his track."

6. "Educational opinion likes to be regarded as radical but it is singularly conservative in its application."
The Board's reaction is contained in an observation made by Chief Inspector Fletcher (19 March 1924). He thinks any revolutionary change is to be deprecated, but also says of examinations that "they must conform to any changes in curricula". Sensing the climate of opinion amongst subject specialists, Fletcher says that he would rather see the schools going on working quietly, "a committee would be a sounding board for all the enthusiasts".

The relevant contents of 'Ashridge' File Ed. 12/214 do underline the Board's dilemma over the effects of examinations and perhaps help to explain why the revised Circular on English teaching so enthusiastically called for in the wave of euphoria occasioned by the publication of the 1921 Report appears to be reactionary. (The 1924 "Suggestions" which will be discussed shortly reflect a dominant consciousness about the content of English teaching).

This file also contains a most interesting and useful document which serves to summarise the position of English teaching after the 1921 Report and helps to put the 1924 "Suggestions" into perspective. This document, prepared in January 1924, under the guidance of a committee.

9. See 'The Times Educational Supplement', 5th November 1921 which takes up the whole orientation of Sampson and Dover Wilson. "The industrial classes still sorely need to be protected against the educational "lie in the soul" which is that their schools should fit them primarily for manual or mechanical work". This is taken up in Sir Henry Newbolt's remarks at an LCC Conference on the 1921 Report, reported in the Times Educational Supplement, 11th November 1922. "Education by means of English, if carried out in the schools of all classes of the community, would facilitate intercourse between all classes ... and by diminishing class distinctions would make the nation more homogeneous and a greater state." Chapter 1 of the Report of that Conference contained a declaration that the whole of the elementary curriculum should be recast and English made its foundation. This is representative of the 'revolutionary' consciousness of the time.
See also 'The Teaching of English' by G.H. Smith in "The Parents' Review", Vol.XXIII, No.3, March 1922, pp.159-165.
consisting of HMI Miss Baines (a member of the 1921 Departmental Committee) and two District Inspectors, was entitled "Report on the present position of English in Secondary Schools". The document is in three parts:

2. A summary review of the English work of the schools.
3. An Appendix collating Inspectors' Reports.


The chief interest of the first part of the Report is its revelation of the Board's view of how the position of English teaching had changed since the turn of the century. The Report refers to the then newly-formed Board's concern for the bad teaching of English in evidence after 1902. Several features were isolated as representative of the state of English teaching at that time:

(i) Unqualified teachers.
(ii) Too little time given for English.
(iii) No instruction except in formal grammar.  
(iv) Too little time given to reading.
(v) Badly-chosen recitation books.
(vi) No graduated course of study.

However since 1905, the Report suggests, a number of influences have contributed to an improvement:

1. Recognition of English as a separate subject.
2. Changes in the examination system.
3. Lengthening of school life.
5. Advanced Courses.
7. The Growth of English Honours Schools (See Appendix to Chapter 3).
(2) A Summary review of the English work of the schools

The second part of this Report presents a summary of work done in schools. The observations made are especially important in seeing the exact nature and scope of the institutionalisation of English teaching at the time. These at least point up not only the differences in consciousness obtaining at the time but suggest reasons why the Board's view of the nature and scope of institutionalisation is only a partial one.

(i) Organisation, Cooperation (Para. 14)

(a) A suggestion that there is prestige and status attached to English teaching at and above First Examination level.

(b) An awareness that Sampson's maxim is only too rarely observed.

(c) The appointment of a chief English Master in a number of schools (see detail under (3) i below, page 206)

(ii) Staff

(a) Improved academic qualifications - "but still very many who lack technical skill".

(b) The Report deplores the unwillingness of many teachers to take much interest in the art of teaching (i.e., lack of consultation, observation).

(c) The Report acknowledges that teaching in Upper Forms can be undertaken by those who have their degrees in History, Classics or Modern Languages, but who have "pursued a special interest in literature" (Perhaps this helps to account for the inclusion of historical, biographical and translated classical texts found in the 1924 "Suggestions").
(iii) **English and History**

The Report does not approve of the correlation of English and History because it obscures "the essential purpose for which boys and girls read great literature". (Although this appears to contradict 4 (a) below it shows something of the contemporary definitions of history and literature taken together. The relevance of the first was seen as the study of the factual incidence and subject content of texts in time, whilst that of the second the moralising and spiritualising of consciousness of those texts within the 'cultural-heritage' model).

(iv) **English in Examination Courses**

(a) The Board obviously disapproves of a situation where "in a considerable number of schools, novels and especially essays occupy the whole field at least up to and indeed sometimes including First Examination - to the exclusion of Voyages and Travels, Biography and History (that is the great historians), Memoirs, Letters and Oratory". (Para.21).

(b) It is with obvious approval that the Board reports "The effects of a Modern Studies course is to (a) bring the spirit of scholarship into pre-matriculation forms and (b) send up Honours Degree candidates to the university." (Para.21).

(v) **Grammar**

(a) The Board's recommendation is both diplomatic and enlightened (again showing how it was so necessary to find an acceptable formula in this still most controversial and divisive of areas) "The best work is to be found where teaching is connected with the texts read and the subject
is treated in the main incidentally rather than in formal lessons, the plan of work being drawn up with reference to the pupil's needs in other languages as well as English". (Para. 21)

(vi) Public Schools

(a) The Report suggests that English had been gaining something of a foothold in these schools, although it appears that there is no such thing as departmental organisation (This would accord with wide discretion being given to individual masters) (Para. 23)

(b) In Para. 24 the Board gives evidence of the growth of English in public schools by referring to records of the First Examination of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board - i.e. in 1909 no books were compulsory to obtain a pass in English whilst in 1923 to obtain a pass with credit, one play of Shakespeare and a verse or prose author were required. (See Appendix to this chapter for full comparative details).

(3) Appendix collating 115 Inspectors' Reports

(i) The first point noted is that the Board approves of English teachers being organised departmentally. The Inspectors' reports stress that where there is no chief English master, there is generally no organisation to shape policy. Individual schools are cited. However, it appears that the notion of English as the concern of every teacher is not commonly understood (This bears out other evidence quoted on p. 204 above).

(ii) The influence of a Classics' methodology seems to remain in
those schools where English is still taken by "classical masters who show considerably greater aptitude for the work than is commonly observed in the academically qualified English specialist". (Para. 3).

(iii) A properly graduated study of prose books other than novels is sometimes found, but far too rarely (Here is further vindication for the recommendations of the 1924 "Suggestions"). The point of rigour and "real intellectual exercise" is mentioned - inspectors seem anxious that connected thinking is added to enjoyment.

(iv) The influence of Phonetics continues to dominate all notions of oral work - the 1921 Report confirmed this.

This chapter has indicated that given the contemporary socio-political ethos the 1921 Report is moderately innovatory, especially in its views on the social context of English teaching. Reference has also been made to the fact that the Board of Education is reasonably satisfied that improvements have been made in the quality of English teaching and that English has been successfully institutionalised to the highest level in the secondary school.

However in the next chapter we shall see that the 1924 "Suggestions" are not concerned with social emphases and its more authoritarian nature reflects a reaction perhaps more representative of the way that English was actually being taught in the majority of secondary schools.
APPENDIX : Synopsis of the Examinations in 1909 and 1923 with special reference to Literature.

1. FIRST EXAMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examining Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford &amp; Camb. Schools Exam. Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To pass with credit a candidate must reach a sufficient standard in either (o) General Literature (d) Either (i) As You Like It with Chaucher's Nonne Prest Tale & Haklayt, Voyages of Hawkins, Proibisher & Drake or (ii) Tempest, with Milton's Poetry & Prose & English Essay or (iii) Julius Caesar with Spenser Paery Queen 1 (Cantos I-X) Tennyson's Enid, Coming of Arthur & Malory Selections or (iv) M.of V, with Byron's Childe Harold iii & iv & Goldsmith's Deserted Village & Vicar of Wakefield.

The foregoing texts are prescribed for detailed study. For general reading: either (i) Guy Lannering with Silas Marner or (ii) Pride & Prejudice with Esn md.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examinig Authority</th>
<th>In 1909</th>
<th>In 1923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Local Syndicate</td>
<td>To pass a candidate might take Composition &amp; one of the following: (b) J.C. (c) F.G. (d) R.III. The Marriage of Geraint, Lynette &amp; either Bacon's Essays 29-46, or Gibbon Decline &amp; Fall of the Roman Empire Chaps.1-3. (e) General Knowledge of Eng. Lit., not earlier than 1579. Candidates might not take both (b) &amp; (c) or both (d) &amp; (e).</td>
<td>In addition to Composition any two of the papers (b) to (f): (b) Henry V (c) Milton, Samson Agonistes &amp; English Sonnets or the Marriage of Geraint; Gerint &amp; Enid; Lancelot &amp; El line (d) Vanity Fair (e) Corialanus, Childe Harold (Canto IV), Old Mortality; either F.S. Oliver, Life of Alexander H. Milton or Bacon's essays (29-46) (f) General Knowledge of Eng. Lit. from 1579.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMB</td>
<td>The University of Birmingham prescribed texts for its matric. exam. &amp; Lit. might be taken in the Senior school Certif. Exam. For the Latric. Exam. of Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds &amp; Sheffield either English Lang. or English Lit. had to be taken. In Lit. one text had to be chosen from each of drama, verse other than dramatic and prose.</td>
<td>For general reading: (a) Cranford or Guy Manering (b) Modern poetry or A Book of Verse for Boys &amp; Girls (Pt. III) For special readings: Three selections, one from each of (a), (b) &amp; (c). (a) Twelfth Night or Macbeth (b) Hakluyt - Voyages of Drake &amp; Gilbert or the de Coverley Papers (c) Arnold, Balder Dead, The Scholar, Cipsy, Sohrab &amp; Rustur, Thysius or Selections from Tennyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of London</td>
<td>Examinig questions were set (c) testing general reading &amp; knowledge of English books. The General School Examination was first held in 1918.</td>
<td>(a) Either Hamlet or Merchant of Venice or As You Like It or Henry IV (1) (b) Barter: A Tre sury of Elizabethan Lyrics or Ballads (Everyman edition) or Byron Poems, Matthew Arnold Poems or Shelley: Selected Poem (c) The Pilgrim's Progress or Cowper Letters (ed. E.V. Lucas) or Lamb Essays of Elia or Homer Iliad (Butcher &amp; Lange translation) (d) Chaucer Prologue &amp; Knights Tale or Stevenson The I ery Ben etc. or Jane Austen Emma or Poems of Today (English Association). Section (d) is optional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Literature Syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examinating Authority</th>
<th>In 1909</th>
<th>In 1923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University of Durham   | For Matriculation General Questions on English Literature & As You Like It The First Examination as now constituted was first held in 1917. | Three books for special and three for general reading A. Special, One book from each of the following:—
(1) Merchant of Venice or Macbeth
(3) Either Mackover & Blackwell; Anthology of Essays 1600-1900 pp. 57-421, omitting the essays of Froude, Swinburne & Pater, or Lamb Essays of Elia, First Series or Addison & Steele, Coverley Papers |
| University of Bristol  | The First Examination was first held in 1918.                           | Either II or III.  
II (a) Henry V, subject matter, Structure, & phraseology.  
(b) Much Ado About Nothing.  
Coverley Papers.  
Quentin Durward.  
Wordsworth Selections (King's Treasures), The Love of the Wanderer (King's Treasures), III (a) Henry V  
(b) A wide choice of questions on the subject matter & literary qualities of the chief English Classics from 1579. |
### SECOND EXAMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examining Authority</th>
<th>Literature Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In 1909</strong></td>
<td><strong>In 1923</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxford &amp; Cambridge Schools Exam. Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oxford Local Delegacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Night, Coriolanus &amp; one of following: (1) Chaucer, Prologue, The Men of Law's Tale, The Pardoner's Tale, (2) Spenser, Faerie Queen, 1, (3) Burke, Speeches on American Taxation, &amp; on Conciliation with America.</td>
<td>The Oxford Higher Local was originally an examination for women, instituted in 1877 and was first held under its new title of &quot;the Higher Local&quot; in 1894. Its purpose was very different from that of the Second Examination first held in 1918. The syllabus in Eng. Lit. was, however, a substantial one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Chaucer: The Prologue; The Nun Freest's Tale; portions of Fourteenth Century Verse &amp; Prose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours paper, alternative to paper on &quot;The Growth &amp; Structure, &amp; Usage of the English Language&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Two plays of Shakespeare. 2 hours paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) A period of Literature (five alternative periods). For each period prescribed texts (A) For Special study &amp; (B) for less detailed study. Or Outlines of the History of Eng. Lit. 1350-1850, with selected books. 2 1/2 hours paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambridge Local Syndicate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cambridge Higher Local was first established in 1969. The Second Examination as now constituted was first held in 1918.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) A period of English Literature, with special reference to particular works or authors (prescribed for special study) 2 1/2 hours paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 3 prescribed books from following: Marlowe Dr Faustus; Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining Authority</td>
<td>Literature Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1909</td>
<td>In 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives of Milton, Dryden &amp; Pope Pope Rape of the Lock, &amp; Essays on Man Disraeli Sybil. 2 hours paper. (a) Early &amp; Middle English portions of Bright Anglo-Saxon reader, &amp; of Chaucer 2½ hours paper (d) is an optional subject in the case of candidates who offer a foreign language with P.II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMB The Second Examination was first held in 1918. I (a) portion of Chaucer (b) play of Shakespeare 3 hours II Set books taken from a prescribed period of E.Lit. &amp; general questions on the outlines of prescribed period (choice of five periods) 3 hours paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of London The Second Examination was first held in 1919 I (b) Questions on the English Language implying some elementary knowledge of its history (structure &amp; vocab.) with special reference to prescribed texts not earlier than 1350. In 1923 portions of Chaucer set. 1½ hours paper. II Two plays of Shakespeare. One period of English Lit. (Choice of 4 periods) with prescribed texts for critical &amp; detailed study. 3 hours paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Literature Syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examining Authority</th>
<th>In 1909</th>
<th>In 1923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Durham</td>
<td>The Second Examination was first held in 1917 or 1918</td>
<td>I for special study:— Chaucer, Prologue; Shakespeare 2 plays; Bacon, Essays I – XX; Burke, Speech on Conciliation with America; Shelley, Adonais; Keats, Hyperion; Lamb, Essays of Elia, First Series; Tennyson, In Memoriam; Browning, Caliban upon Setebos; Bishop Blougram’s Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II English Literature from 1625–1660 with prescribed texts for general reading. 3 hours paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Bristol</th>
<th>The Second Examination was first held in 1919</th>
<th>[Syllabus for 1924]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Special period (1626–1700) with prescribed authors &amp; books. Other books are suggested for general reading. 3 hours paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Either (a) Shakespeare 3 plays or (b) Shakespeare, 2 plays &amp; Chaucer (one Tale) also books for general reading. 3 hours paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Paper on general reading, including 19th Century literature. 3 hours paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Times Educational Supplement (1921) (i) Review of 1921 Report 5th November.

A. The 1924 "Suggestions"

The 1924 "Suggestions for the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools" is a forthright and purposeful document. Unlike the 1921 Report there is no introduction setting out the main pedagogical and philosophical guidelines; there is no parade of ideals. Throughout, communication objectives are stressed in which the study of books is seen as a central activity. Having reviewed recent activity (1906-1924) in the area of the teaching of English in Secondary schools (based on the material discussed in the unpublished 1924 Report, referred to pp. 202-207 above), the earlier part of the document stresses many of the pedagogical points recommended by the 1921 Report. However the 1924 "Suggestions" seem to ignore the specific social context that the 1921 Report thought vital for the fostering of effective teaching. Indeed, the "Suggestions" seems to stress the more formal and traditional operations of English after making generalisations which at least are in harmony with the spirit of the 1921 Report. For example, in Paragraph 12 the notion of personal exploration so strongly urged by the 1921 Report is reiterated, although significantly not in a social context. "It is generally a sound principle to let the pupil find out for himself all that he can". However, also in Paragraph 12, more specifically, précis, paraphrase and expansion are advocated. In Paragraph 15 it is claimed that since the 1910 circular's urging, learning by heart was being heeded in the school. Here it is thought learning 'copious
extracts by heart', particularly of verse, is suitable.

However, it is in those parts of the 1924 "Suggestions" which deal with the teaching of grammar that it appears that the letter but hardly the spirit of the 1921 Report is interpreted. Nevertheless the writers of the "Suggestions" seem to indicate that they owe something to the spirit! Thus, there is a certain inconsistency of attitude, obviously not so much of a dilemma here as in the 1921 Report, but significantly in the same area. Again, the plight of the English teacher is being taken into consideration. On the one hand he wishes his formal work in grammar to integrate with that of his colleagues in the Modern Languages and Classical Departments, whilst on the other hand he wants to appear to be up-to-date in terms of modern linguistic and grammatical research. Thus we read statements like "The teacher of English should not be afraid to take his examples from French and Latin". This particular point is clearly derived from the English Association's Pamphlet No.56, "The Problem of Grammar" published in July 1923. Here the English Association may very well have been influenced by their colleagues in the Modern Languages and Classical Associations. No such specific point is made about the co-operation between English and particularly Latin in the 1921 Report which, as we have seen, goes to great lengths to show how English has shaken off and must continue to shun the influence of Latin - particularly in grammar. Clearly, the implementation of the 1924 "Suggestions" would result in a perpetuation of those linguistic and grammatical parallels so abhorred by the 1921 Report. However, the 1924 "Suggestions" is not as authoritarian in this particular aspect as it appears to be elsewhere. In Paragraph 26 it recognises that the whole question of grammar needs specially careful treatment. "The demand for a reconstruction of our grammatical notions cannot be ignored". Again,
"The Problem of Grammar" is quoted. "English grammar is to be represented not as a set of stiff dogmatic precepts, according to which some things are correct and others absolutely wrong, but as something living and developing under continual fluctuations and undulations". (Para. 26).

Perhaps the most fundamental difference in approach between the 1924 "Suggestions" and the 1921 Report is in their attitude towards oral work. Whilst stressing the importance of oral work (Para. 35), the "Suggestions" in no way reiterates the 1921 Report's emphasis upon genuine social interaction. "The art of rational conversation needs to be cultivated for its own sake". (Para. 35). "The objectives are that a pupil shall communicate objectively and logically as a preliminary to action". (Para. 35). Indeed, the notion of oral work as being concerned mainly with intellectual manipulations is presented. Thus, the emphasis is strictly pedagogical and oral work is seen as a means of building up the ability to present ideas in an orderly fashion. In this respect the 1921 Report is cited as advocating clear-headedness as an important product of oral work. However in the "Suggestions" the whole is subordinated to the ideal that writing is the more important form of communication. Indeed, the section in the "Suggestions" on the scope and aims of written exercises contains a statement which in many ways sums up the whole tenour of the 1924 publication and emphasises the essential differences between its conception of English at the secondary level and that of the 1921 Report. "Forms of self-expression in language have some place but their use in the classroom should be rare and occasional". (Para. 36).

Oral summary is given prominence in terms of its intellectual rigour. "A boy in a middle form is set no mean task in composition if he is
required to give viva voce the successive points in a dozen pages of Prescott or Macaulay which he has studied; or a boy in an advanced class, a summary of the argument of an essay by Carlyle or even of 'The Defence of Poesy' " (Para.35).

Dover Wilson's earlier advocacy (1921) of debating as an integral part of the speech work of Day-Continuation Schools is denied in the 1924 "Suggestions". "Speaking generally of the secondary school, debates are much less entertaining and effective inside the time-table, when they are apt to be formal, than in the freer atmosphere of a school debating society". (Para.36). And yet the 1924 "Suggestions" think that formal school exercises in writing still have a part to play. (Para.36).

The tendency of the 1924 "Suggestions" to emphasise the intellectual rigours of writing and its basic unconcern for innovation can readily be illustrated by reference to the discrepancy between its approach and that of the 1921 Report in respect of verse writing in schools. The 1921 Report observes (Para.113), "Some of our witnesses set great store by the composition of original verse as an end in the study of English composition and literature ... But verse writing can only be a special tool in the hands of a limited number of teachers, and the danger is great that the principles of prosody, only half understood or perhaps entirely erroneous may be enforced in such a manner as to reduce the lesson to mere mechanical drill". On the other hand, the 1924 "Suggestions", whilst agreeing that "the delight of making verse comes quite easily", clearly implies that the whole activity is limited, perhaps necessarily, later on when "the study of metrical forms becomes severe and the difficulty of compressing thought into a measure increases". Whereas the 1921 Report implies alternative and equally valid ways of writing
verse unfettered by prosody, the 1924 "Suggestions" makes no attempt to
give a definition of free verse or suggest that children be
couraged to write other than according to the rules of prosody.

After saying that formal treatment of style is usually best avoided
in the school, the "Suggestions" quotes the 1910 circular (which seems
to be its guide at least as much as the 1921 Report), "In the highest
Forms, the teacher may occasionally set for composition a subject which
has been excellently handled by some competent writer and made use of
this for the purposes of criticism and comparison with the pupils' attempts". (Para. 37). Further, in Paragraph 36 it is asserted that
"paraphrasing ... may be a valuable exercise ... because it involves searching for words and expressions which most nearly render the meaning
of the original". It is worth noting that in Paragraph 141 of the
1921 Report a quotation is made from "Memorandum on Commercial In-
struction in Evening Schools". (Board of Education, 1919). "Para-
phrasing, especially of good literature, usually takes the form of
converting good English into bad".

As we have seen, both the 1921 Report and the 1924 "Suggestions"
agree in their views on précis as a worthwhile activity. The 1921
Report refers to it as an important art and the 1924 "Suggestions"
endorses this view, especially as a useful exercise for everyday life.
"Few exercises are more useful than a précis ... ability to make a good précis is a valuable asset in after-life". (Para. 38).

A major undertaking of the 1924 "Suggestions" is to present a list of
suggested texts to be studied year by year in the secondary school. The
1921 Report saw its brief as in no way including such an undertaking.
Indeed, its suggestion of texts is occasional and unsystematic. This is
in keeping with its whole approach when dealing with pedagogy whereas its
fervour for innovation in approach and desire that the English classroom should be a place for reducing social cleavage is presented in a forthright manner and specific pedagogy, especially in terms of texts, is largely avoided. Conversely, the fact that the 1924 "Suggestions" are specific and highly formalised in terms of subject content is indicative of its more pragmatic nature. Thus, it is perhaps useful to present an analysis of the actual texts recommended by the 1924 "Suggestions". To do this it has been decided to categorise under six headings: Travel, History, Fiction (including Myth), Biography, Essays (Belles-Lettres) and Miscellaneous non-fiction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
<th>Total No. of Texts</th>
<th>% of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiction (inc. Myth)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Myth)</td>
<td>(21 Texts)</td>
<td>(17 Texts)</td>
<td>(19 Texts)</td>
<td>(20 Texts)</td>
<td>(28 Texts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belles-Lettres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous non-fiction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To contemporary eyes the most interesting feature of this table is the incidence and nature of the fiction in comparison with the other categories.
Of the 22 Fiction texts it is significant that 16 of these are recommended for study in the first year. Thereafter fiction declines rapidly whilst a number of other categories, especially history, increase in importance. Looking in detail at the recommended Fiction texts it is interesting to note how the novel is rigorously limited. There is no contemporary fiction and the most recent 'novel' is Thackeray's "The Rose and the Ring" (1855). There is no other imaginative literature listed after 1800. The "Suggestions" clearly imply that novels have no real place in the classroom. Again, the writers of the "Suggestions" ignore the opportunity class treatment of novels affords for sharing responses to the essentially social and personal situations which is the main impact of the novel. On the other hand, in the 1921 Report the Departmental Committee also seemed to be unaware of the sociological nature of the novel and its potential as a means of encapsulating and ritualising 'processed' social intercourse which could then provide a basis for class analysis of potentially socially divisive or socially ameliorative situations. In fact, the 1921 Report again quotes from the 1919 "Memorandum on Commercial Instruction in Evening Schools" issued by the Board of Education, which clearly thinks the novel unsuitable in such institutions. This seems to be a good example, despite their differing orientations, of how both documents reflect a contemporary climate of opinion.

Analysis of titles in the other categories reveals that great emphasis is placed upon representing the pursuit of personal success in terms of certain aristocratic ideals. The greater number of titles (nearly 50) in the History and Biography categories represent the achievement of heroic figures - e.g., statesmen, soldiers, sailors, explorers, writers. Interspersed are revered classics which act in a
supportive role to the mores of a society which nurtures and gives approval to the heroic figures - e.g., Bunyan, Malory, Cervantes, Swift, Addison, Johnson, More, Burke, Carlyle and Stevenson. Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that the compilers of this list make no reference to social history or the lives of ordinary people either past or contemporary. There is very little literature recommended where children or teenagers are the central characters. Certainly Matthew Arnold would have approved of the aristocratic spirit of the list. For him it would have represented a formidable attack on the meaner economic aspirations of the Victorian middle-classes.

However, the list of recommended texts is an implicit recognition that the 1924 "Suggestions" were not envisaging the study of English literature as a closely defined area. In many ways the texts are representative of what today would be classed as a measure of integration with other subjects - especially history and geography. In terms of the 1924 "Suggestions" this is somewhat ironic! This is certainly so when one remembers that the 1921 Report because of its concern for English as central to the realisation of social ideals makes particular reference to teachers of history and geography. It is here and in its conception of the nature of the relationship with other subjects and in terms of extra-literary purposes that the 1921 Report is innovatory. Thus, from another strictly sociological perspective the 1921 Report also draws attention to the increasing importance of English and Communication in a society which at that time was explicitly recognising its essentially technological nature. Conversely, the 1924 "Suggestions", whilst not reiterating these particular emphases, does stress the important relationship between all languages and in an appendix makes a contact between English and Mathematics - a possibility not mentioned by
the 1921 Report. However, the final paragraph of this Appendix sums up the nature of the integration between English and Mathematics—but, again, it is a relationship envisaged purely in pedagogical and intellectual terms, factors which are to be conserved. Paradoxically, however, perhaps the most visionary statement made in the "Suggestions" is contained in this appendix. "Hence we have clearly the double conclusion; first, that mathematics has a quite special place in the general training in the use of speech, and second, that if a teacher of mathematics neglects this side of his duty he is failing to teach the subject itself even more emphatically than the teacher of any other subject who should be guilty of the same neglect". (Appendix 1, Para.21).

Thus, in conclusion, it appears that although the 1924 "Suggestions" offers sound practical advice in many areas of English teaching, its emphases are that classroom activity and thus implicitly relationships are essentially pedagogical. In this way it falls short of the social ideals of the 1921 Report.

The 'Ashridge' File (Ed.12/212) has two important items relating to the 1924 "Suggestions", whilst Ed. 12/235 has three. The two items in Ed. 12/212 both relate to the Board's consultation with outside bodies in connection with the final draft of the "Suggestions". Thus in July 1924 we find that both a group of teachers' representatives and English Association members are consulted on succeeding days. It so happens that in the notes of the conference with the first group, the representatives of four associations of teachers, held on 7th July, the file records the explicit criticisms of Mr Jenkyn Thomas, Headmaster of Hackney Downs, and also a prominent member of the English Association.

1. Mr Jenkyn Thomas, Mr Arnold, Mr Dunserley, Miss Muncaster, Miss Young.
His criticisms were as follows:

1. Too much is expected from pupils at all stages than is actually possible. His comment is that the "Suggestions" show "insufficient acquaintance with the ordinary human boy or girl who likes detective and adventure stories".

2. The "Suggestions" represented the views of observers rather than of teachers actually engaged in teaching (a criticism of the inspectorate?).

3. Too much dogmatism about certain methods e.g. revision of passages learnt.

4. The conscientious English teacher might be daunted.

5. There was a danger of creating a dislike of the subject.

6. The pamphlet was pitched too high. (He was invited to say where and how in writing.)

Other criticisms voiced were that there was too much emphasis on voyages and travels, whilst Misses Muncaster and Young thought there was too much grammar expected between 11 and 13.

On July 6th the same Board representatives met with members of the English Association. Dr Boas acted as spokesman, his remarks indicating that the English Association were concerned that the aesthetic aspects of literature should not be played down. He said that he wished to press the view that literature was a branch of aesthetics rather than of sociology or Art and hoped that the 1924 "Suggestions" would make that

---


3. Dr F. Boas, Dr Nairn, G. Sampson, Miss Sollon and Miss Bracken.
plain. The English Association representatives added that they did not think the note was pitched too high. Perhaps this view is understandable, given the width and depth of knowledge which the "Suggestions" sought to regularise as characteristic of English studies in secondary schools. Any syllabus based on these "Suggestions" would be supremely respectable because it would be seen to be academically formidable and intellectually rigorous. Perhaps, also the English Association's desire that specific reference to Para. 195 of the 1921 Report should be included in the 1924 "Suggestions" indicates a reaction against the sociological orientation of the 1921 Report by a representative body of teachers. In addition it might be argued that this reaction came not only on implicitly transcendental grounds but also because the 1921 Report seemed to condone a measure of correlation and thus, in the view of the English Association, there was a possibility of a diminution of the uniqueness they had fought so hard to establish. In other words, perhaps as far as the English Association is concerned the 1924 Report.

4. The English Association actually wanted the "Suggestions" to make specific reference to Para. 195 of the 1921 Report which had said that it was a dangerous mistake to treat literature as a branch of History or Sociology. The 1921 Report made the English Association's orientation quite clear. "Great literature is only partly the reflection of a particular year or generation; it is also a timeless thing, which can never become old-fashioned, or out of date, or depend for its importance upon historical considerations."

5. It is worth noting that the English Association strongly approved of the 1924 "Suggestions" list of prose texts. This can be seen by examining their Pamphlet No. 21 "English Literature in Schools, A List of Authors and Works for successive stages of study" (First printed in 1912). There is a very high correlation between this publication and the 1924 "Suggestions" [50 texts]. However W. Jenkyn Thomas' written reply to the Board (11th July, 1924) shows him at variance with the English Association in reiterating his previous point that the "Suggestions" were pitched too high - especially for the sort of boy in his own school. On the other hand, in this context, it is significant to contrast his view with that of the Headmaster of Marlborough, Cyril Horwood, who on June 29th, 1924, wrote to the Board to say "I do not think that anything is omitted that is of value and I am almost entirely in agreement with what is said."
"Suggestions" represented an opportunity to consolidate newly-won institutionalisation. Perhaps because of its successful cooperation with the English Association in the past, the Board took more notice of their views than those of the more critical representatives of the four associations. It may also have been of significance that none of the Board's committee had been concerned with the 1921 Report. However as far as the English Association representatives are concerned it is illuminating to see the relatively restrained comments of George Sampson. Apart from observing that in three different years three specific prose texts are "too mature" he clearly goes along with his colleagues in approving of the 1924 "Suggestions". Perhaps this underlines the extent to which his major sociological interest was confined to elementary education. In any case his 'centrality' argument would clearly not see English as correlated with any other subject. (Assuming Sampson's position here to be typical of a fairly general orientation of the contemporary consciousness, perhaps it is not surprising that the Dalton Plan was never popular among English teachers). The 'Ashridge' File Ed 12/235 contains a final item on this aspect which puts the problem into focus. This item consists of two communications from HMI Urwick (18 June and 17 July 1924) in which he too criticises Daltonian plans for assignment work (18th June) and in a longer statement (17th July) gives a little more detail about pedagogy than is usually the case during this period. Pointing to the distinction between "Können"

6. In this sense the 1921 Report might have been seen as exciting, challenging, but in terms of political expediency for a large number of secondary English teachers it might have appeared an untimely document because it pointed to further changes in the curriculum. Again this might be a contemporary factor helping to explain why the 1921 Report had only a limited immediate effect on English teaching.
and "wissen" Urwick thinks English is too much wissen (knowledge about) and not enough können (understanding of). He says the latter is more permanent because it is "what Aristotle calls an activity dependent upon a deliberate habit of choice". His second major point relates to the notion of individual excellence. He believes that too much work done by the class as a class will jeopardise the individual's development for later life - "it is quite possible to depend so exclusively on classwork and its derivatives as to starve and dwarf the individual."

This, again, is a viewpoint which would work against the implementation of some of the sociological notions contained in the 1921 Report. However Urwick is not denying the need for classwork, merely putting it below work designed for the individual. His final comment, like his first, is not only prophetic in its implications for the shift from 'states of knowledge' to 'ways of knowing', but also for its reference to the essential relationship between the classification and framing of knowledge. "To keep his work quite apart and separate from classwork is again unwise. It ought to enrich and vivify classwork and make that work at times rather a matter of what pupils really want to know than what the teacher wants to teach". (my underlining)

1924 - 1930

It is my intention to deal briefly with this period by concentrating on three official publications relating to the teaching of English. The first is the Hadow Report (1926); the second the 1927 "Suggestion" and the third, the Board of Education's Report of the Consultative Committee "Books in Public Elementary Schools" (1928).

The Hadow Report, in its reference to English, whilst making a more
explicit concession to the necessity of eliciting from pupils an "emotional response to literature" n verthele s a vis d teachers "to ensure that so far as pos ible every pupil .... thoroughly mastered the meaning of pa-sages studied" (p.20). This may be seen to repre nt a compromise between he desir for rigour which we have seen was so con- sistently an externally approved condition of the institutionalisation of English and what is a fundamental characteristic of the teacher of literature's inte nally articulated 'cultural-heritage' model. More- over we have also seen how the English Association had sought to make this feature first a visible and then a necessary part of the raison d'être of English studies in schools.

The 1927 "Suggestions" were published for the guidance of elementary schools, and because of this we are able to discern how much more flexible the Board is in its attitude. Mullins points out (op.cit.p.33) that the Board was highly realistic in acknowledging that the majority of elementary school pupils would not "after leaving school devote much of their time to the study of literary masterpieces." Thus we find the 1927 "Suggestions" advocating not only traditional books but more con- temporary material at the same time stressing that literature should not be treated as a 'knowledge' subject alone. However there appears to be some ambivalence underlying the flexibility. This can be seen in two respects. First, it appears to be contradictory to stress delight, enjoyment and pleasure; to recommend extracts from great writers to help pupils to become "happier and wiser" and yet also to ask for factual regurgitation and explanations of words like 'computation', 'declivity', 'conjectured' and 'ligatures'.

Secondly, pointin, up what was an influential aspect of the contem- porary consciousness about English teaching, the Board is uneasy about
"imaginative composition". Their view is that composition should be based on pupils' observation and behaviour with the emphasis on the rational use of language. (Reference to p. 217 above will show that these views echo the Board's thinking in the 1924 "Suggestions"). Indeed as Thayer points out (op.cit. p.86-92 passim) a less compromising anti-imaginative consciousness was hardening amongst English teachers. Prominent among the attacks on the "creative advocates" were Grace Bracken, who it will be remembered was one of the English Association representatives called in to consult with the Board's Committee in the preparation of the 1924 "Suggestions"; H.A. Treble who in "The Teaching of English in Primary Schools" (1927) was clearly fighting to defend standards so recently established against the "laziness and superficiality of self-expression", and E.P. Davidson who in "Modern English Teaching" (1930) characterised composition as disciplined reproduction work and constant practice in sentence and paragraph building (see Mullins, op.cit. p.87).

Shayer's comments on this reaction against 'progressivism' (op.cit.p.88 passim) are perceptive. His views may be summarised: -

(1) that there is a definite split in consciousness - sufficient to cause some entrenchment among the traditionalists.

(2) that this split in consciousness may be represented as a confrontation between the 'social imitative' of people like Treble set against the 'Romantic expressive' of people like Greeving Lamborn.

He seems to indicate that the movement towards more imaginative and personal writing has steadily gained ground since 1900 and that the shift in total consciousness has been in this direction. It might be argued that this is another aspect of the liberal paradox in as much as during
this period liberals could be identified as progressive whereas today they are often identified as reactionary by the 'progressives'.

In 1928 the Board of Education published "Books in Public Elementary Schools". Here again it is clear that the notion of literary merit is the main criterion affecting choice. Even at this stage it is apparent that notions of intellectual relevance and propriety and spiritual values are still of great importance. Thus by 1930 the basic contradiction remained wherein the tradition of rhetoric with its emphasis on reproduction, correct grammatical usage and form still seemed to stand against any avowed desire to "give pleasure and to awaken interest" and to develop in "appreciation and enjoyment of our great heritage in English Literature" (preface to "The Land of Romance and Adventure" by W. Isbet - quoted from Fullins, op.cit. p.36).

C Summary Review of the period 1900 - 1930

In this final section of the chapter it is my intention to look at the material and arguments so far presented in this thesis from three perspectives:

(1) As this account so far has been an attempt to map consciousness it is important to summarise the nature and shifts of emphasis within that consciousness, attempting to isolate dominant and counter orientations.

(2) Rising out of this initial summary it will be necessary to look again at the relevance of these specifics of consciousness to notions of Classification and Framing, particularly in respect of 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing'.

(3) It is proposed to deal with the socio-political implications
of the institutionalization of English teaching during the period after which a sociological summary will be advanced.

1) Two dimensions of consciousness have been in evidence during the period, the first, the major, has been the dominant consciousness; the second, the minor, has been the beginnings of a counter-consciousness. However looking closely at the dominant consciousness we are able to show some shifts in emphasis which help to point up, in one respect at least, the counter-consciousness a little more clearly. Within this first perspective, then, we are able to isolate two further positions:

(i) the permanent features of the dominant consciousness.
(ii) the modified features of the dominant consciousness (its basic parameters remaining intact).

(i) The dominant consciousness

Although there is some evidence to suggest changes in the content of English teaching in elementary schools - particularly in respect of texts - (compare sentiments explicit in the 1904 Regulations with those implicit in the 1927 "Suggestions") - there is very little evidence of real changes in actual classroom practice in a majority of schools. Indeed the whole of our preliminary mapping suggests that despite shifts and the beginnings of a counter-consciousness, the dominant consciousness remains firmly anchored in a strongly-coded curricula.

The nature of this dominant consciousness was made up of a number of 'collectives', principally secondary teachers, the English Association and the Board of Education officials and inspectors, who interacted, usually positively, to produce a relatively 'pure' consciousness. Thus it is true to say that the view of the prevailing 'realities' of English teaching was supported by a high level of consensus.
The detailed characteristics of that view of 'reality' represent a transmission model which in its original and unmodified form may be represented as strongly classified knowledge and its attendant pedagogy. These characteristics are:

1. Teacher initiation and control of content and style of teaching.
2. Recapitulation, reproduction, précis-writing, repetition and paraphrase as the elements of knowledge.
3. A carefully selected literature from the past, chosen to inculcate approved moral and spiritual attitudes.
4. The primacy of writing - speech is seen as spoken writing.
5. The necessity of adhering to prescribed language standards in order to preserve clarity, cogency and the purity of the language.

As we have seen perhaps the most important articulating concept of that model was the conviction that English was a subject devoted to promoting individual excellence in the pupil. The features of that concept as it operated during the period seem to be as follows:

1. As a premium was put on writing, the goal was to achieve familiarity with and success in all aspects of the reproduction model (i.e. (2) above).
2. As the 1924 "Suggestions" redefined the notion of individualism (as against the emphasis on social aspects contained in the 1921 Report) the tools for fashioning excellence were resharpened - this representing a renewed legitimation of the transmission model.

In this respect the 1921 Report's advocacy of relative
cooperation between teacher and pupil in the classroom suggests a weakening of frame. However the 1924 "Suggestions" tightened the frame, making it much stronger in terms of the sequencing of knowledge in the pedagogical relations ip. This reflects a far more uniform pedagogy which is characteristic of the dominant consciousness.

(3) In terms of literature the 1924 "Suggestions" also further legitimated the notion of transmitting a 'received' culture by advocating a wide range of carefully graded texts the mastery of which was a process of individual quest and revelation.

(4) Bound up in the concept of individual excellence was the notion that personal effort brings reward. This might be seen as an educational extension of the protestant work ethic which had contributed to the growth of industrialism in the 19th century. Again this points up part of the liberal paradox of how this might be reconciled with a notion of social amelioration not tied to sponsored mobility.

(5) Thus the notion of individual excellence accorded with initiation into an educational elite and became a major determinant of the sequences of learning built into the secondary school syllabus.

Cultural aspects. As at this time there had been generated no clearly argued sociological perspective on culture, the dominant consciousness was unable to perceive any alternative to the monolithic articulation of cultural norms in the schools. The severe limitation of this perception

7. Dover Wilson's advocacy of the culture of the industrial classes (op. cit. 1921) looks forward to modern notions of cultural relevance which have seriously challenged the traditional monolithic middle-class conception of culture as a validation model for the educational system.
was that the majority of children's indigenous culture was totally ignored and thus the way in which different social groups have different but equally valid cultural experiences. Thus the total consciousness tended to actively ignore (by peremptory disapproval and dismissal) or passively accept (i.e. the majority of the working class) that folk or industrial culture had any educational relevance at all - particularly in the secondary school. (It is interesting to anticipate how this aspect of consciousness where there is both an explicit and an implicit belief in what is beneficial knowledge or trivial and only locally accepted 'not-knowledge' fits into a more abstract definition of consciousness as articulating the 'revealed truth' notion of paradigm theory. See Chapter 15).

(ii) Shifts in consciousness

Although the Board of Education's official pronouncements give little or no guidance on methodology, because of its predominant interest in the context of English teaching, the Board itself was exercised by the problem of examinations both controlling and shaping the consciousness and the nature of the institutionalisation of English teaching. Indeed one of the drawbacks of attempts to change the consciousness of the time lay in the control exercised over the legitimation process by the examination system. As the years were to prove any changes in the rationale articulated by changes in consciousness were precluded until that consciousness was sufficiently uniform and powerful (if not dominant) to press for changes in the examination system. This did not happen until relatively recently. (1960's)

The Board's relative flexibility is a crucial reflection of and contribution to the contemporary consciousness (we have seen, however, that its views were not always entirely representative of actual classroom
practice – e.g. Jessie Smith's report). This may be classified as follows:

(a) With reference to the problem of examinations, the Board had a genuine desire to retreat from complete authoritarianism towards both the teachers and examining Boards in respect of their syllabuses (we have already noted their diplomatic dilemma).

(b) A sensitivity to the curricular importance and even centrality of English (perhaps the 1921 Report came to be seen as occupying a somewhat extremist position – hence the measure of reaction).

(c) Genuine attempts to find more relevant and appealing curricula for children (always remembering that the Board's view of relevance was highly subjective and has been intimated as the product of a collective consciousness which had a monolithic view of culture).

(d) An increasingly scrupulous and meticulous consideration of all shades of relevant educational opinion (we have seen this in respect of the 1910 Circular and 1921 Report).

(e) A genuine, if not altogether successful attempt to achieve critical distance over Classics and Latin and exercising prudence over reconciling conflicting demand and opinion.

(f) Sensitivity to and support of the inspectorate who were given scope to use initiative and ability.

In some respects this relative liberalising of the Board's approach certainly up to 1921 (and even again in 1927) could be said to be in some respects a partial reflection of the counter-consciousness.
(iii) The Counter-consciousness

Before embarking on a review of the counter-consciousness it is necessary to emphasise that it has no communal visibility and can only be isolated in powerful, but scattered, individuals.

The first point to make about the counter-consciousness is that its essentially sociological nature distinguishes it from the dominant consciousness. This may be illustrated as follows:

(a) As we have seen perhaps the beginning of a social perspective in English teaching may be first located in the 1909 LCC Report (George Sampson's hand in this will be remembered, see chapter 4, pp. 75 - 84) but it is the 1921 Report which makes explicit reference to a sociologically-oriented rationale for English teaching. Because of his close association with and influence upon the 1921 Report, George Sampson's part in the counter-consciousness must be indicated. First it must be stressed that his views show that he believed that English could be used to humanise the mass of working people so that they should actively rather than passively conform in a process which aimed at reducing social cleavage. While it might be argued that this represents a shift in consciousness, rather than a genuine difference it is the implication of reducing social

8. It is very interesting to note that of the leaders of the counter-consciousness referred to in these chapters only H. Caldwell Cook received a conventional university education in English Studies (at Oxford) followed by a career in English teaching. Of the others, Margaret Macmillan was, of course, a pioneer of Health Education, deriving her ideas from the continent where she was educated; Sir Philip Hartog, having trained as a chemist, never taught English and spent most of his career in university administration, especially in India; whilst George Sampson having attended a teachers' training college later became an elementary school headmaster and eventually an LCC Schools' Inspector.
cleavage for the curriculum which suggests a change in the perception of the efficacy of English studies. In this respect it is the beginning of the realisation of the potential of English for creating a new rationale and subsequently new models of English teaching representing social as well as individual exploration of contexts.

b) However the 1921 Report also gave birth to a notion of integration powered by the centrality of English concept which although unable to gather contemporary curricular credence because of untimely comparison with the correlation argument did eventually grow into a viable force in the Comprehensive Movement after 1960.

c) Sampson's (and the 1921 Report's) concept of egalitarianism predicated on a notion of reducing social cleavage was limited because any contemporary view of social interaction retained a given pedagogic model and a monolithic view of cultural relevance (i.e. interaction would remain a teacher-initiated and controlled activity and thus the strong classification and Framing of the transmission/reproduction model would be preserved). Moreover to apply a notion of reducing social cleavage as a counter to social divisiveness without any radical plan for tackling the socio-economic causes of that divisiveness was bound to be ineffectual - especially given that the contemporary ethos was as unable as a later age to get to grips with the societal causes of the evils of inequality and disadvantage.

d) Perhaps another reason for the contemporary resistance to any discussion of a pragmatic follow-up to the 1921 Report would be that as English had been institutionalised hierarchically any common school (Sampson's ideal) would mean levelling down of the English curriculum.

e) The other major area of the counter-consciousness is that of creativity. Like the notion of reducing social cleavage this too had its contemporary
limitations. The aim of the model (in so far as it can be described as such at this time) was to extend not to breach the constraining parameters of the traditional pedagogy; thus although more initiative was given over to the child (pace Caldwell Cook) this was within less limited contexts. However the ultimate notion of a strongly classified subject content remained intact, together with implicitly strong framing. On the other hand because there is classroom evidence of his work, Caldwell Cook's pedagogic position points towards changes in frame because he does clearly advocate a measure of social interaction as a preliminary step to writing (thus anticipating a more up-to-date pedagogical sequence).

2) Having given some general outline of consciousness during the period it is now necessary to look first at a number of the curricular implications of that consciousness and second to examine their implications for 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing'. This may be dealt with in two dimensions: -

(i) The English Language and Literature curriculum.

(ii) The implications of the traditional transmission/reproduction model for Classification and Framing.

(1) The English Language and Literature Curriculum

One of the main conclusions of the foregoing discussion is that there was a relatively fixed consciousness throughout the period 1900 to 1930. The position of grammar and language illustrate this. J.H. Arnold writing in 1928 is still able to assert that grammar has a place in the training of the mind, thus demonstrating that the linguistically insensitive form of traditional grammar (by our reckoning) persists as a viable part of the English curriculum. The only modification made
during the period under review is that some concession is made to the incidental learning of grammar (more significant only in the elementary school). More precisely this may be categorised as a shift from

(i) contextual prescription to contextual derivation
(ii) formal to informal contexts for grammatical analysis

(i.e. from 'non-contexts' (i.e. exercises) to contexts created by pupils (under direction).

However for purposes of subsequent evaluation (i.e. as part of the correcting act of teaching) the prescriptive and proscriptive norms of the conventional grammar still obtained.

Grammar almost certainly survived more or less in its somewhat modified form because it was externally legitimated in English teaching by other subjects. Another reason for its survival (and one already mentioned) is that there was as yet no more exact description of language generally available.

Inspection of the Appendix at the end of the previous chapter revealed that there was little real change in the types of text studied for examinations between 1909 and 1923, although as we have suggested there are occasional indications that contemporary texts are coming in - e.g. the English Association's "Poems of Today" (1915). It will be remembered that this Appendix also revealed how the literature of the past still dominated the content of English syllabuses and thus helped to reinforce the notion of a given and received cultural corpus. This prevalence of retrospective texts (and the low priority placed on contemporary fiction) especially in secondary schools, because it promoted the

9. This seems to be an important 'truth' of 'normal' English and as such fits in with the theory of paradigm to be introduced later in the thesis. See chapter 15.
traditional ethic and the accepted underlying ideology which covertly supported a closed society, naturally rejected the modern novel, especially as contemporary writers appeared to be increasingly alienated from society. A more particular reason why novels were rejected, especially in secondary schools was that by comparison with more serious imaginative and non-fiction prose they were thought to provide inadequate models for writing.

(2) The Implications of the traditional transmission/reproduction model for Classification and Framing

One of the underlying objectives of the institutionalisation of English teaching is that the content of the subject should be independent; thus, in order to achieve this a measure of conciliation had to be shown towards other subjects. However the institutionalisation of English was inevitably similar to that of other subjects. This was so because teachers, educators and administrators were themselves the product of a collection. code curriculum. Thus, as we have seen, English was institutionalised into a similarly strong Classification and Frame where 'states of knowledge' took precedence over 'ways of knowing'.

In the traditional transmission/reproduction model the pedagogy is explicit, which is important for the sequencing of skills. However it cannot be changed until the assumptions in the teachers' and educators' consciousness is challenged and thus the nature of the transmitting act itself. As we have seen this requires sufficient change in consciousness in order to be effected. Such a change in consciousness results in new directions of awareness and perception. Such directions were only just being signposted in the period up to 1930. The 1921 Report represents the first indication that the notion of the dominance of the 'states of knowledge' concept will not remain unchallenged. Moreover the creative
'movement' had indicated that children should be given more opportunity to shape the means to 'ways of knowing'; and it is most significant that the shift from passive reception to active doing had implications for changes in the controlling power of relative strengths and weaknesses in both Classification and Framing.

3) Socio-political implications

The second group of implications relate to the schools curricula and to the wider socio-political significances.

(i) Implications for elementary and secondary schools

A number of features may be isolated:

(i) Very generally, by 1930 it was assumed that the secondary schools catered exclusively for the able and the whole nature of secondary schools (i.e. grammar and public) was to fit such able children intellectually and morally to undertake roles of responsibility and leadership in society.

(ii) The articulation of an elitist element in Arnold's transcendental model had meant that its institutionalisation in secondary schools had been intense and specific. This tended to widen the gap between elementary and secondary schools.

(iii) As the concept of the pursuit of individual excellence to a high and exclusive level of attainment had been progressively legitimated in English studies in secondary schools since 1902, this again brought about a discrepancy between the curricula content and objectives of elementary and secondary schools.

(iv) This discrepancy, it will be remembered, was noticed by Jessie Smith (Chapter 4, pp. 107 - 112). She suggests that in England
there is a "frank differentiation of education according to the ability and probable future of the pupil" (op.cit. p.288). Although it will be remembered that this was written in 1910, the position in 1930 suggests that elementary schools were thought of as producing literate, conforming and contented people whilst secondary schools were thought of as producing erudite, individualistic and 'spiritualised' people.

(2) Wider socio-political significances

(a) The 1921 Report

(i) The 1921 Report presents a shift in terms of notions about the control and nature of the exploration of arranged contexts for English teaching. In other words arranged contexts are now implicitly challenged.

(ii) The Report makes a contribution to the refining of a definition of egalitarianism for educational use i.e. this starts within the details of the curriculum and suggests that the imbalance of the traditional model is a species of inequality because that imbalance preserves educational exclusiveness. This was seen as a necessary curricular reappraisal, preceding a pedagogical reappraisal which in turn (i.e. as it relates to Framing) must precede any more radical and viable socio-political conception of egalitarianism.

(iii) The Report provides the first rationale for a sociotherapeutic model.

(b) The Liberal-Humanist ideology

(i) Although the underlying ideology with its acceptance of social hierarchies remains intact, the appearance of a
liberal-humanist ideology presents a challenge to the inequality which the underlying ideology articulates.

(ii) However the nature and the degree of the intensity of the challenge suggests that liberal humanism denies revolution whilst hoping for more social equalization in socio-economic if not necessarily socio-political terms. In other words liberal-humanists were concerned that the working-class should participate equally in education. In a sense this is the first concept of compensatory education. As has been suggested this position contains the liberal paradox i.e. the desire to humanize without advocating radical constitutional change.

(iii) Thus the liberal-humanist ideology was concerned with the content of education; it was not concerned with any evaluation of frame or discussion of changes in the hierarchical relationships between teacher and taught. Thus it did not challenge the social assumptions implicit in those relations.

A sociological summary of the three perspectives on the dominant consciousness and its attendant curricular and pedagogical implications. Counter characteristics will be indicated where relevant.

(1) A static system of values and orientations. A dynamic system is implicit — i.e. the 1921 Report.

(2) An externally created sensibility. An internally recreated sensibility i.e. implicit in the work of the 'creative advocates'.

(3) A limited range of experiential alternatives made available to the child. The 'creative advocates' point towards an increase in experiential alternatives made available to the child.
(4) Strong frames for both teacher and pupils.

(5) Highly explicit social positions for both teachers and pupils (an hierarchical model) where the former operate as expert performers and the latter as inexpert performers.

Thus the emphasis placed on individual intellectual and academic excellence reinforces hierarchical relationships in two dimensions:

(6) (i) In respect of teacher-pupil fixed role relationships (i.e. the teacher represents a desirable and necessary 'states of knowledge' model and possesses a technique for handling knowledge which the pupils must learn in order to succeed in terms of the teacher's evaluation of their efforts.

(ii) The knowledge corpus itself is implicitly an agent of control because it is presented as potentially attainable only as the result of a single strategy of learning or as a severely limited number of strategies (i.e. the characteristics of reproduction).

(7) Literature presented as a covert reinforcement of a process of socialisation already set in motion in order to render the world as immutably fixed and necessarily hierarchical.

So far we have been mainly concerned with showing how an implicit ideology articulated a dominant consciousness in English teaching.

However the notion of ideology which is employed in this thesis indicates
that it refers to an implicit or explicit cluster of beliefs, expectations and aspirations which underlie the practices of English teaching. Thus the growth of a counter-consciousness and the sociological summary above would suggest that the discussion is pointing towards a view of the institutionalisation of the teaching of English as an arena of ideological conflict. This will be seen to become increasingly explicit in the second and third parts of the thesis.

Note 1

A comment on English and the Institutionalisation of class-based pedagogies

Chapter 4 made several references to standards of teaching gleaned from contemporary sources. As has been suggested this part of the thesis seeks to indicate that the dominant consciousness of the period saw the improvement of such standards as crucial to the successful institutionalisation of English in the newly-created secondary schools. As the 1910 Circular indicates the Board of Education was anxious to improve the academic and pedagogical standards of teachers in such schools. However the socio-historical survey has indicated that there is a hierarchy of status among teachers and the pedagogy they transmit which is determined by the type of school in which they teach and which again, clearly, is a reflection of their socio-educational background.

The 'Ashridge' files have revealed that some of the Inspectors have uncompromising views about the quality of teachers in some of the secondary and elementary schools they visited. Appendix 1 to chapter 4 helps to explain something of the background of the Inspectors whose own socialisation would go some way in providing a standard by which consciously or unconsciously they would be judging the content and transmission of English.
Thus in the public schools a highly-educated teaching corps, recruited from the middle classes via Oxford and Cambridge taught a classics-based curriculum which absorbed a very broad definition of what constituted 'literature' (see Appendix 2 to Chapter 4 and the 1924 "Suggestions"). Here a high degree of language skills was transmitted, together with the cultural heritage of western civilisation derived almost exclusively from the classical tradition. This was the education intended for the socialisation of an élite.

The newly-formed grammar schools concentrated more specifically on English Studies, but such as were defined by people who themselves were the products of the public schools. Hence again all the evidence points to a broad-based definition of 'cultural-heritage' (with more emphasis, perhaps, on a specifically English curriculum - e.g. biography, travel, history, belles-lettres). Again a high degree of language skills was transmitted by university-trained specialists. This is the major area of the institutionalisation of English studies dealt with in this part of the thesis and illustrates how because of the background of the Inspectorate and members of the English Association especially a middle-class pedagogy penetrated the selective schools, intended primarily for the lower middle class.

However the real social cleavage pedagogy is illustrated by the English pedagogy institutionalised for the working-classes in the elementary schools. Here the teachers at this time (certainly up to 1910) were themselves mainly products of an elementary school education and training college. They transmitted a basic skills model together with the sort of morally-based, 'improving' literature discussed in chapters 2 and 3. Certainly they were not transmitting even the first years of the sort of 'cultural heritage' programme referred to in respect of public and grammar schools.
Thus it might be argued that the working-classes only had access to a basic skills model because their teachers were largely unable to give them much more.


Reference has already been made to the use of the "Journal of Education" as a legitimate and fairly representative means of finding out how some teachers felt about the content, transmission and institutionalisation of English at the turn of the century. However the major sources used in this socio-historical survey have been the references made to public and hitherto unpublished private material (largely the 'Ashridge' files). The published sources, i.e. the Circulars, Codes, Regulations, Suggestions and Reports of the Board of Education are clearly of crucial importance in mapping the development of official policies as they create and reflect consciousness about English teaching. These sources represent the factual progress of the institutionalisation of English in the schools.

However a major emphasis has been placed on the original 'Ashridge' material because of the light that it has thrown on the detail of the prevailing consciousness and the implicit value system it reflects. Thus because the Ashridge material is available, albeit inconsistently, in such detail, I felt justified in using it fairly extensively in order to present evidence of how official decisions were arrived at. Moreover these decisions also illuminate a wider perspective on the rate of absorption into the consciousness of English teachers of official policies and advice.

The 'Ashridge' material also demonstrates the apparent desire of the Board of Education to consult and the extent to which it consulted
representative bodies of teachers and other persons. In this respect the role of the English Association is given a new perspective and the ways in which its views on the content of English influenced the institutionalisation of English in the secondary schools.

Again, the documents available in the 'Ashridge' files reveal the care and precision with which Board of Education officials and Inspectors worked to improve standards of English within the assumptions of the prevailing dominant consciousness.
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CHAPTER 8

A 'BRIDGEHEAD' REVIEW OF THE PERIOD 1930 TO THE PRESENT DAY.

The purpose of this chapter is to link the description and analysis of the first 7 chapters to the present-day position in English teaching. As has already been stated, unfortunately the material available after about 1925 in the 'Ashridge' Files is minimal and in any case not really central to the discussion of this chapter. This chapter, then, represents a deliberately perfunctory and selective mapping of a number of features which show how the dominant consciousness became both modified and changed. In this sense the chapter is a 'bridgehead' projected from the traditional model of English teaching into the formation of consciousness which challenges the traditional model and seeks to present opposite models. This process is difficult to present in any regular historical form because of the uneven overlapping of the general outline of this chapter with a more detailed treatment in subsequent chapters - especially in the post-war period. Moreover it is felt that as there is a need to give a selective focus to the thesis, any blanket historical analysis would be inappropriate. In any case, as we have already indicated in the earlier chapters, this has recently been most adequately treated by Shayer who without arguing a thesis has provided us with a thorough description of developments in English methodology and examinations. Thus this chapter seeks to examine the impact of new developments in part of the consciousness-forming mechanism which articulates and shapes the classification and framing of English.

It is proposed to follow through developments in the period after 1930 in four dimensions:
(1) General developments in the 1930's.

(2) The emergence of the new criticism of I.A. Richards and F.R. Leavis.

(3) Changes in the institutional mechanism necessary for the transmission of the new consciousness (i.e. conditions necessary for paradigm change).

(4) The 'New Learning' and pointers towards the direction of its impact on English teaching (i.e. the work of the Schools Council)

(1) The 1930's started by showing the continuance of the dominant consciousness with its attendant shifts already described in the previous chapter. (See Shayer, op.cit, p.110 for a description of the steady flow of grammar and grammar-based text books). This can perhaps best be illustrated by reference to the continuity and sameness of the language and literature papers from 1920 to 1960. (See Shayer, op.cit. pp.112-117 passim for details). That the majority of grammar school teachers felt that the status quo was satisfactory might be demonstrated by the publication of "Memorandum on the Teaching of English" by the Association of Assistant Mistresses in 1932. Shayer describes (p.106) what is no more than a reissued blueprint for the traditional model and reminds us that the recommended texts had remained unchanged since 1910.

However the significant difference between the 1930's and the 1920's was that the counter-consciousness gradually began to gain ground. Five features may be selected to illustrate this difference:

(i) The report on the Primary School (Second Hadow Report) 1931

Briefly, the Report stressed the following factor:

(a) The enjoyment of literature.
(b) The fostering of creative imagination (a distinct from 'reproductive imagination'.)

(c) The importance of activity and experience rather than knowledge (This is a movement from 'states of knowledge' to 'ways of knowing'.)

It is clear that the antecedents to this Report may be found in the 1921 Report and represents a further move towards the institutionalisation of the liberal-humanist consciousness.


The significance of this publication is that

(a) it attempts to follow the 1921 Report advocating the centrality of English through literature and

(b) literature should act as an integrating force in the 'people's' schools. His twin objectives for the children in these schools (i.e. the non-grammar schools) is that appreciation and expression should be the core of the English curriculum. Pritchard's advocacy anticipate the sort of thinking which went into the drawing up of syllabuses in secondary modern schools after 1944 as well as a central tenet of the post-war consciousness.

(iii) The 1937 "Suggestions"

(Discussion of the Board's publication anticipates the official sanctioning of the impact of the new criticism which will be dealt with in the next section of this chapter). The main 'progressive' feature of the discussions were:

(a) An endorsement of the shift in consciousness which advocated the incidental teaching of grammar (It will be
remembered that this had been acknowledged in the 1927 "Suggestions").

(b) The acknowledgement of the importance of the social development of children (again one may see another influence of the 1921 report).

(c) The support of active forms of expression in English — e.g. the child improvising, writing his own verse.

In some ways one might regard the "Suggestions" as an endorsement of Leavis' emphasis on the social and moral value of literature providing a perspective in which to combat the influence of technology.

(iv) The growth of the social perspective

It will be remembered that the 1921 Report had called for the implementation of the reduction of social cleavage by the civilising influence of literature and respect for the individuality of the child. It had been hoped that the elementary schools would provide the opportunity for the objectives to be fully realised. During the 1930's the issue seemed to become increasingly urgent given the desire for more social, civic, and educational aspects to be addressed. This led to the development of an interest in 'citizenship' (A. J. Ayer surveys books published on this theme during the 1930's and 1940's, op.cit. pp.132-133). However one important text may be cited which is representative of the general significance of this new orientation — "Education for Social Change" by Ir. "Red Clark", published in 1940. This book not only sums up a contemporary belief in the efficacy of the elementary schools but also anticipates a socially-oriented rationale for English teaching in the post-war period. In many ways what Clark says are the positive features of the elementary school of the time indicates the considerable modification of consciousness
about it curriculum - a modification with the previous section of this thesis has signalled (e.g., the 1927 "Suggestions"). Clark's observations suggest that the elementary school has evolved a philosophy of education which reflects its purposes for the mass of the people - namely, the substitution of a more culturally-relevant curriculum based on liberal-humanist studies (i.e., the dilution of the 'cultural-heritage' model) and pupil-centred activities (i.e., the shift away from the subject-centred approach institutionalised in selective secondary schools). One is reminded of the views of Dover Wilson and George Sampson on the necessity of acknowledging that it is the duty of the elementary schools to reflect an indigenous rather than an imposed culture when Clark is critical of the fact that elementary schools in the past have always had their curricula imposed from above - "with a content of studies that suited the ruling interests" (p.30). His notion of their ultimate purpose being to induce "usefulness rather than culture" whilst incidentally indicating an imprecise awareness of the sociological meaning of that concept does point back to the stranglehold of the dominant socio-political consciousness on curricular models - not least, as we have seen, in English teaching. His criticism reinforces the point made in the previous chapters of this thesis that the notion of a people's culture had been almost totally ignored until well into the 20th Century. "Existing popular culture was wholly set aside as idle and trivial and the "utilizable skills" of reading, writing and arithmetic together with simple craftwork and much moral teaching (with a strong emphasis on the virtue of obedience) provided the staple" (p.3). Now he believes the elementary schools have reached a stage where they can become culturally independent institutions where relevant components of a 'popular' culture are legitimately replacing the elitist concept.
However, the idea that such schools and the secondary modern schools which loosely succeeded them might represent a more broad-based, contemporary and indigenously 'relevant' cultural transmission only served to polarise a kind of educational apartheid which has been a major battleground in English teaching since 1945).

(v) The growth of the 'creative' perspective.

The creative advocates of the 1930's found that they had to make their case against the dominant consciousness's conviction that too much concession to creative work lowered standards of expression and accuracy. However Shayer quotes evidence (op. cit. ch. 4 passim) to suggest that there was not only methodological resistance to this persistent belief but practical proof that children were continuing to write creatively and successfully. The obvious inspiration for this work was Caldwell Cook and although much of it was still literary and reproductive, as Shayer says (p. 122) "children's writing was now considered ... to be worthy of publication for its own sake." (The most famous anthology usually quoted for this period was "First Fruits" edited by Norman Morris in 1939). In 1943 D.A. Beacock published "Play Way English for Today" which suggested that Caldwell Cook's influence had prospered over the past 25 years. After that it is noticeable that the 1954 Language pamphlet issued by the Ministry of Education implicitly acknowledges his influence by stressing the close bond between language and the development of personality.

Perhaps more significant for the development of future consciousness was the publication in 1930 of Susan Isaacs' "Intellectual Growth in Young Children". Although mention of this book at this point in the chapter perhaps anticipates the impact of the 'New Learning' which is discussed later, the obvious relevance of her ideas to creativity may
legitimately be mentioned here. Based on a description of her work with children between two and ten, Susan Isaacs argues the importance of imaginative expression as a necessary part of the individual's intellectual and emotional growth. She sees this approach as a necessary and valid sort of psychoanalysis which takes us forward past Marjorie Houd and anticipate David Holbrook. Her work is important because it prepares us for a change in consciousness not only about the rationale of teaching in this context but consequently in notions of the framing necessary to accommodate a classroom articulation of this context.

(2) The Curricular implications of the new criticism

It would be an unnecessary duplication of a very well documented area if this thesis were to concentrate on a full analysis of the impact of I.A. Richards, F.R. Leavis, "Scrutiny", the post-scrutineers and Leavisite on English studies in the universities. Moreover Shayer (op.cit., ch.4, p.125-126) gives a satisfactory outline of the way in which the more intellectually and aesthetically demanding criticism of I.1. Richards began to have an effect on the method of English teaching primarily, of course, in the upper part of the secondary school. Leavis' contribution is important for two reasons:

(i) his effect on the further articulation of the cultural-heritage model
(ii) his advocacy of the role of literature in training, taste and sensibility in order to combat the worst effects of the outside world.

Apart from twenty years of "Scrutiny" (1932-1953) the publications relevant to the first influence are "Hass Civilisation and Minority Culture" (1930) and "Education and the University" (1973); and to the

1. The author hopes it will be made clear as the thesis proceeds how much the influence of Leavis has created growth points for shifts in consciousness among English teachers. It seems sufficient to mention in this chapter some of the basic relevant facts about the creation and location of his views.
second "Culture and Environment" (1933) written with Denys Thompson. ("English Literature in Our Time and the University" (1969) really deals with the connection between these two orientations, reiterating the responsibility for cultural regeneration being placed on the university. "The real university is a centre of consciousness and human responsibility for the civilised world" (op. cit., 1969, p. 3).) Denys Thompson also helped to promote the Richards-Leavis approach in schools with his "Reading and Discrimination" (1934).

Leavis' contribution to the further articulation of the 'cultural-heritage' model from the 1930's onwards may be summed up as follows:

(i) Although Leavis derived his literary parameters from Matthew Arnold, he adapts them to a philosophy of education which concentrates and exemplifies aspects of the 'cultural-heritage' model which have been accepted or rejected in the training of English teachers ever since. This philosophy of education crystallises and energises the whole concept of the centrality of English (i.e. Literature) in the curriculum. In this respect the somewhat flabby idealism of this aspect of the 1921 Report is given an uncompromising and for many English teachers an exciting redefinition and reshaping. His open advocacy of a culturally elitist conception of literature (and one which he spent the next decade refining - viz "The Great Tradition" 1948) challenged any growing notion of the validity of a 'popular culture' and helped to polarise consciousness in the post-war period as much as any other single influence in English teaching. The crucial quotation from "As Civilisation and Minority Culture" (see Appendix III of "Education and the University") is: "In any period it is upon a very small minority
that the discerning appreciation of art and literature depends: it is
only a few who are capable of unprompted, first-hand judgment."

(ii) Leavis himself was anxious that the schools should learn how
to teach genuine and sensitive reading and that teachers of
English should be nourished on the methods of Richards'
practical criticism in order to do this. Moreover, together
with fellow Scrutineer L.C. Knights he hoped that the
examination system would not get in the way (op.cit., 1943,
Appendix II 'How to teach Reading')

(iii) In this perspective Leavis is important in the development of
the consciousness of English teachers because he makes explicit
and coherent through insisting on a notion of missionising what
was always implicit in Arnold's transcendental ideal. Whereas
Arnold thought of a carefully selected, morally unimpeachable
type of literature as desirable for the moral and spiritual
growth of responsible leaders, Leavis believed that without
not only the content of literature but also a very stringently
articulated notion of responding to personal and social experi-
ence through literature, the quality of our civilisation would
inevitably deteriorate. (That there were socio-cultural forces

2. It is worth mentioning an article published by L.C. Knights in "Scrutiny"
in September 1933, 'Scrutiny on Examinations' in which, having
referred to the unfortunate effects of stereotyped and standardised
examination procedures being applied to literature, he calls for the
abolition of exams. It is worth noting that the growth in the number
of candidates Knights quotes as sitting for Certificate examinations
(1918: 22,673; 1924: 49,343; 1931: 66,909) is indicative of how the
teaching of English literature has been institutionalised at a price
most English teachers have expressed a bitter resentment at having to
pay. As we shall see the pressures brought to bear in this area led
to considerable modifications after 1960.
representing themselves uncompromisingly to Leavis is obvious). This profoundly-held conviction helps to put in context the second aspect of his influence.

Thus in 1933 "Culture and Environment" was published. In many ways this book may be regarded as a major component in the shaping of attitudes to English teaching. It certainly informs much of the early philosophy of "The Use of English" (edited by Denys Thompson from 1949 to 1969) and as representative of Leavis' influence on English teaching is tacitly given official approval in the 1937 "Suggestions" and the 1954 Pamphlet on Language. Because of the considerable volume of writing on English teaching growing directly from "Culture and Environment" it is worth examining its main points.

The introduction contains an analysis which, again, puts into sharper focus the more discursive points made in the 1921 Report about the need to recreate the spirit of a folk culture within the realities of contemporary industrial life. However whereas Dover Wilson thought in terms of making visible the indigenous culture of the industrial classes, Leavis and Thompson advocate more traditional values against which to assess a contemporary cultural environment. The main message of the book is that:

(i) "we are committed to more consciousness.... to train critical awareness of the cultural environment... is to train in discrimination and to imply positive standards" (p.5).

(ii) standards of the language need to be maintained as a means of preserving the quality of emotional life and the quality of living. Leavis and Thompson saw the disappearance of the pre-industrial organic community as a threat to the unity of the family and community. They quote from I.A. Richards'
"Practical Criticism" (1924) "As the family and community ... are dissolved, we are forced more and more to rely on language" (Leavis and Thompson, op.cit. 1933), p.81).

(iii) The language of advertising must be subjected to rigorous analysis - "a modern education worthy of the name must be largely an education against the environment" (Ibid p.106).

If Leavis and Thompson saw themselves as representative of the guardians of traditional values articulated by critical intellect, a fuller analysis of the weakening of those values through the debasement of language may be found in Q.D. Leavis' "Fiction and the Leading Public" (1934). Having sought to explain why there is a neglect of serious reading characterising an age which prefers more ephemeral and superficial literature, Q.D. Leavis reiterates the stance her husband took in "Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture". This is perhaps best illustrated by two quotations:

(i) "The new idiom is less adequate since it is incapable of flexibility, it has no fine rhythms to draw upon, and it is not serious (i.e. it has no room for expression of spontaneous personal feeling): it is not only formed to convey merely crude states of mind but it is destructive of any fineness." (Q.D. Leavis, op.cit. 1934, p.210).

(ii) "... it is of the gravest importance that what the twentieth century reads should modify and correct the influence of environment. It is only by acquiring access to good poetry, great drama, and the best novels, the forms of art that, since they achieve their effects through language, most readily improve the quality of living, that the atmosphere in which we live may be oxygenated". (Ibid, p.211).
Thus both F.R. and Q.D. Leavis, like the dominant consciousness of the previous period, do not regard a contemporary working-class culture as having any value or validity where it stems directly from a popular consciousness fashioned by the mass media and advertising. The implications of this for the professionalisation and consciousness of the English teacher have been profoundly significant. It is certainly partly responsible for the dilemma and role strain prevalent among English teachers since 1945 pointing up a discrepancy between adhering uncompromisingly to an internal conviction about literature and the integrity of language and compromising with the cultural realities, often mass produced, as the major determinant of the consciousness of the majority of children.

(3) **Changes in the Institutional mechanism**

This section of the chapter may be dealt with briefly and historically by reference (a) to the external administrative conditions necessary for the implementation of a new consciousness and (b) to the 'New Learning' which will be dealt with under (4) below.

(i) 1944 Education Act - implications for the school organisation of English: (a) The Act broadened the base of secondary education and crystallised the urgency of positive reaction to the social pressures on English teaching heralded in the 1930's.

(b) The Act instituted the secondary modern school, the successor to the elementary school, as the People's School. However its presence as an alternative means of secondary education meant that its pedagogy as well as its socio-cultural and socio-political purposes were more directly comparable with selective schools.
Thus (c) the tripartite system made notions of social class more explicit as it tended to widen the ‘educational gap’.

(ii) The raising of the school-leaving age to 15 in 1947 (This is part of the 'broadening' process).

(iii) The formation of the Schools Council in 1964 (see pp. 270 - 275 below for details of its work).


(vi) Changes in the examination system - the development of GCE from 1965.

(vii) The formation of new subject associations in English teaching - i.e. The London Association for the Teaching of English (1947); the 'Use of English' Groups, (1956-1965); The National Association for the Teaching of English (1963).

A major official publication on English teaching during this period was the Ministry of Education's Pamphlet No.26 on Language (1954) already mentioned in passing in this chapter.

The 1954 Pamphlet indicates that the Ministry of Education is both sensitive and receptive to post-war developments in English teaching. In the Preface the Ministry says that its aim is "to encourage teachers to look at other books which pursue the philosophic, linguistic and pedagogic aspects of language study" (p.V). In this sense it acts as a link between the new criticism and the 'new learning'. The Ministry's assessment of the new criticism can best be illustrated by reference to Chapter 10 where it sees any attempt to separate language from literature as "fraught with danger, not only to our national culture but also to
standards of linguistic achievement in schools" (p.133). It is critical of the advance of the study of the novel where it has edged out the "broad stream of English prose". The Ministry proffers that our heritage may be preserved only if children also study writers like Johnson, Burke, Mill, Ruskin, Acton, Trevelyn etc. In this respect what is said harks back to the spirit of the 1920's in the secondary schools. The Ministry's views on poetry show an approval of the growth of more contemporary and imaginative anthologising and acknowledges I.A. Richards' valuable pioneer work which "more than any other single influence ... has helped to change the spirit and method of the study of poetry in grammar schools .... and therefore indirectly in all schools" (p.145).

In Chapter 1 'Language Thought and Culture' the Pamphlet anticipates the influence of the 'new learning' by referring to recent work in linguistics and semantics. The chapter reviews the work of a number of seminal thinkers like Spearman, Sapir and Bloomfield and acknowledges the crucial relationship man has to society through his own sense of cultural reality. However that the Ministry is aware that little of the recent work is known to the layman and that few of its results have been incorporated into the practice of teachers is indicative of a future rather than an established trend in the forming of consciousness. Indeed on Page 49 is evidence that despite some of the indications of change in methodology and developments in the institutional mechanism necessary for change, the Ministry believes that very little has happened in English teaching since 1921 beyond a "slow general improvement". What is most significant is that the Ministry feels it necessary 33 years later to state that "no substantial and permanent progress is likely to take place until 'English', literature as well as language, is regarded by all in authority as the central expression of English life and culture and as the
central subject in the education of every English child of every age and every grade of intelligence." In some ways the 1954 Pamphlet is a re-affirmation of the aims of the 1921 Report, not least the renewed stress on the social importance of English (This at least had become increasingly visible in the intervening years). Again the message is that the reduction of social cleavage should be aimed for.

However it is also clear that between 1921 and 1954 there had been a shift in the content of English. For example:

(i) Whereas the 1921 Report had strongly advocated phonetics as the basis of speech work, the 1954 Pamphlet minimises its importance.

(ii) As we have indicated above the vague notions of 'appreciation' of literature to be found in the 1921 Report have been swept aside by the impact of the new criticism.

(iii) A more confidently stated view on grammar is also given - i.e. a minimum of grammar and basic competencies work preceding the more important business of writing (This is a widely held view today).

Moreover the 1954 Pamphlet is clearly an attempt to guide secondary modern teachers of English at a time when problems of motivation and learning were becoming increasingly obvious (It coincides with the Ministry's publication of the "Early Leaving Report" in 1954). That a form of the 'cultural-heritage' model is advocated as a 'civilised experience' is a natural reaction to the minimum of literary experience available to the pupils in many schools. This is made clear by the Ministry's obvious approval of the way that English was being taught in many grammar schools. (It was during this period that the teaching of English, as of many other subjects, was largely modelled on grammar
school syllabus and methodology). In this sense the Ministry was giving tacit approval to the further articulation of the hierarchical principle in the traditional model.

Ient’ n of the civilising influence of the literature of a literate minority on a semi-literate mass indicates a further articulation of the liberal-humanist consciousness. Although we have seen the socio-cultural and socio-political weakness of this particular view of 'reality', the Epilogue of the 1954 Pamphlet is a good example of the sense of moral commitment implicit in that view. The centrality argument is reiterated especially in the face of "any general decline in the power to deal with print" (p.162). In this respect the Pamphlet advocates a balance between technique and "interest". Technique relates to 'standards' in reading and writing upon which "a modern society depends for its health and strength ... no less than in technology". A balance of "oral, grammatical and literary aspects' is also advocated as "the key to successful practice" (p.163). This deliberate emphasis on balance (as opposed to compromise which is firmly rejected) is another aspect of the liberal-humanist consciousness. The representativeness of such thinking and its implications for a mixed appraisal of the Classification and Framing of English helps to locate an enduring rationale for modern English teaching.

(4) 'The New Learning'

In the next section of the thesis it is proposed to show how the contributions of psychology, sociology and linguistics helped to effect changes in consciousness among English teachers. At this stage it seems sufficient to list the names of the most significant people and the dates of their first relevant publications. It is interesting to note that a chronological order demonstrates a tremendous knowledge explosion taking
place since 1920. Further treatment will demonstrate the significance of this work to those areas of educational concern which are crucial to shaping the consciousness of English teachers.

- Sapir (1921)
- B. Levinowitz (1923)
- J. Piaget (1926 revised 1959)
- J. Firth (1935)
- F. Lewis (1936)
- C. Burt (1939)
- L.E. Osgood (1953)
- A.R. Luria (1955)
- B.L. Wharf (1956)
- B.F. Skinner (1957)
- N. Chomsky (1957)
- B. Bernstein (1958)
- L. Vygotsky (1962 translated in 1962)
- I. Halliday (1964)

A more detailed examination of the impact of the 'new learning' on educational theory in general and English teaching in particular suggests a number of interrelated factors are relevant:

(i) Motivation.

(ii) Educability.

(iii) Psychology of Language and Psycholinguistics.

(iv) Sociological Aspects.

(i) Motivation

The work of Lewis (1953), Burt (1945) and McClelland (1953) opened up the whole problem of why many working-class pupils were under-performing in the new secondary modern schools. This directed English teachers to look very critically at the suitability of the English curriculum, its classification patterns and the relevant pedagogy for this type of child.

(ii) Educability

The work of Nisbet (1953) focused attention on characteristics of the familial patterns and life style of the working class. Kohn (1959) and
Dougl (1964) after Davis (1948) all contributed to the analysis of the implications of this life style for learning.

(iii) Psychology of Language and Psycholinguistics

(a) In 1952 the American Social Science Research Council brought together three linguists and three psychologists for an interdisciplinary conference that led directly to the creation of psycholinguistics. At that time structural linguistics was in the ascendancy (Bloomfield and Fries). However this was attacked in the late 1950's and early 1960's under the leadership of Chomsky who stressed language acquisition as creative and generative. On the other hand more recently we have seen the direct influence of system structure linguistics with models derived from the Firthian heritage, producing the neo-Firthian "scale and category" grammar of Halliday. This work relates to "institutional linguistics", particularly the sociology of language. Thus, although Chomsky and Halliday have opposed views, their work presents a linguistic mapping which has been instrumental in changing teachers' consciousness about the nature of language and the teaching of language studies because their description of the structures and functions of language call into question the whole intellectual viability of conventional grammar.

(b) The work of people like Piaget, Vygotsky, Luria, Osgood and Bruner. Generally speaking they have shown how language acts as the most vital factor in the shaping of and focusing of thought. They have also concerned themselves with the problem of language acquisition, and cognitive development. Their novel notions of the stages of language development have
had tremendous implications for the reclassifying of the ways in which children make both spoken and written language. (Evidence of how this is being taken up in English teaching may be seen in the work sponsored by the Schools Council, mentioned below pp.270-275). This has also meant a reexamination of the teacher's role.

(iv) Sociological Aspects

(a) The socio-cultural / socio-anthropological perspective

The work of Sapir, Malinowski, Firth and Whorf. The revelation of the necessary link between speech and social structure; the notion of the real world being mediated by the language habits of the group; the notion of the relevance of a speech context which accords closely with the concept of appropriateness of the linguistic perspective.

(b) The sociolinguistic work of Bernstein.

Bernstein's work provides a relevant convergence of selected features of the 'new learning' in psycholinguistics and the linguistic aspects of social anthropology in order to show the crucial correlation between differential socialisation (i.e. sub-cultural modes) and the transmission of culture.

The impact of the 'new learning'

There is a convergence in curriculum theory of the impact of the 'new learning' and the institutionalisation of a more socially broad-based secondary education system briefly described above (p.237). Given the challenge to the traditional model, the dominant consciousness and established notions of relevance, precipitated in issues like motivation and
educability, the first clear message of the reorganisation of secondary education was that the system was loaded against the working class, who, by and large, despite 'equality of opportunity' were unable to enjoy a sponsored mobility via higher education. Two features emerge after 1950:

(i) Research into the effects of social class on educational opportunity.

(ii) Attempts to redress the clear imbalance.

(i) Although there is some evidence that the wastage of working-class ability was acknowledged in the mid 1930's, after 1950 there was a real focusing on the educational performance of large numbers of working-class children who seem to be working far below their potential ability. The problem of access to selective education is also given prominence. In this respect "Social Mobility" edited by D.V. Glass (1954) was a crucial text in raising the general enquiry which gave rise to Floud, Halsey and Martin's study "Social Class and Educational Opportunity" (1956). Significant texts further exploring the problem of differential access were J.W.B. Douglas' longitudinal studies "The Home and the School" (1964) and "All Our Future" (1969). These studies together with the Ministry of Education's "Early Leaving Report" (1954) paved the way for a consideration of working-class wastage in such official Reports as the Crowther Report (1959) and the Newsom Report (1963) which also highlighted the problems of linguistic disadvantage of the below-average child.

(ii) Although these publications identified and clarified the problem it was not until the formation of the Schools Council in 1964 that any large-scale research was undertaken to deal with the ways in which the 'new learning' and the findings of individual seminal
research might be applied systematically to the curriculum.

The work of the Schools' Council

As might be expected early projects sponsored by the Schools Council were concerned with helping "those children who are prevented by deficiencies in their personal background from benefiting fully from education" ("The First Three Years: 1964 - 1967", Schools Council, 1968). As English had a place of priority within this scheme an early publication (December 1965) entitled "Working Paper No. 3. A Programme for Research and Development in English Teaching" is worth examining in some detail. Moreover it is something of a predictive document as well as a description of the development of English teaching in recent years (It helps to predict some of the parameters of the modern consciousness). The Working Paper provides a good launching point for the mapping of the contemporary position because given the construction of this 'bridgehead' account one can go back to pick up the beginnings of models which both reflect and shape changes in consciousness.

A number of points in the document may be summarised as follows:

(i) The dissatisfaction with the contemporary examination structure.

This had persisted since 1920.

(ii) A close liaison was established with NATE who implemented a number of Schools Council projects.

(iii) The Schools Council predicated much of its work on the fact that the centrality argument was now widely accepted and linked it firmly to notions of personal and social 'growth'. In connection with this, referring to the evidence submitted to the Plowden Committee by NATE (1964), the Working Paper suggests that English transcends the limitations of subject barriers. Reference is also made on page 2
to the psychological awareness and technical knowledge that the English teacher must have; moreover "the relationship between teacher and pupil matters as much as expertise". This suggests the nature of the impact of the 'new learning' and indicates the characteristics of the consciousness about English teaching which is now forming.

(iv) Added to this more personalised notion of pedagogy and the lowering of the subject's boundaries (to be discussed later in the thesis) in the section on speech (pages 3/4) the Working Paper advocates improvised drama for both personal and social effectiveness. This suggests shifts in consciousness which have direct implications for changes in the Classification and Framing of English knowledges.

(v) The Working Paper suggests (p.6) that the problems confronting English teachers in the mid 1960's are:

(a) The established form of many examinations. 3
(b) Children's social background.
(c) The impact of the mass media.
(d) Schools' lack of suitable accommodation and equipment.

If we examine what the Schools Council advocates as necessary research into aspects of teaching the mother tongue we can see the effects of the new learning in respect of:

(a) the influence of linguistics and psychology.
(b) the cognitive and conative functions of language.
(c) the nature and apposite use of 'personal' and 'impersonal' writing.

---

3. The Schools Council was, of course, instrumental in the devising and evaluating of the CSE which began in the mid-1960's.
(d) the individual and social development of children through using language in different speech and writing contexts. (p.11).
(See ibid, p.11-16 for a full analysis of those aspects where the Schools Council believes "fundamental and preliminary research and other forms of investigation and discussion are needed").

The first part of the Working Paper deals with projects already started or projected (Appendix A, pp.23-28).

(i) Linguistics: (a) The Descriptive Register under Professor Quirk which sought to provide a description of the English of contemporary educated speakers (since 1950).
This clearly follows the basic intellectual principles of linguistic science and its significance here is that it could eventually provide a basis for "authoritative and objective teaching grammars and other handbooks". (p.24).

(b) In connection with producing satisfactory aural and oral tests for the new CSEExamining Boards, the work of Professor Peel at the University of Birmingham Department of Education.

(c) Professor Halliday's research project based on functional linguistics. This was set up principally to apply the results of research into English grammar, vocabulary and sound systems to the teaching of English as the mother tongue. This relates to the concept of appropriateness rather than correctness and again the approach is intellectually in the same area as Professor Quirk's work.

(ii) Sociolinguistics. Professor Bernstein's continuing work at the

---

4. In this connection it would be remiss to omit mention of P. Gurrey's "Teaching English Grammar" (1961) which was an authoritative early text advocating descriptions of the usage of English speech as a basis for grammar.
London Institute of Education researching into the sociological factors determining forms of language use.


Completed Projects relevant to English

(1) Italian - an independent evaluation (5 - 8), Professor F.W. Warburton and Miss Vera Southgate, 1966-1971, Manchester University.

(2) English for Immigrant Children (5 - 16+), June Derrick, 1966-71, Leeds University. This led to the publication of "Teaching English to Immigrants" (1967) and the production of teaching materials - SCOP - "An Introductory Course for Immigrant Children" (1969).

(3) The Teaching of English to West Indian children, J. Wight, 1967-70, Institute of Education, Birmingham University. This started with research into linguistics and social and emotional problems, then developed materials.


(5) Speaking and Listening: A study of what constitutes effective oral communication to find out how we should educate children towards easy, coherent and fully articulate methods of conversation, Dr A.J. Wilkinson, 1965-72, Birmingham University.

(6) An enquiry into the role of literature in the curriculum of primary
and secondary schools. Commissioned from NATE. (One feature of the new consciousness about English teaching is that it is prepared to examine the very means of its own raison d'être in relation to literature. This is a major distinguishing feature from the dominant consciousness of the traditional 'cultural-heritage' model).

(7) Children's Reading Habits (8-16). P. Whitehead, 1969-1972, Institute of Education, Sheffield University. This was particularly concerned with the relation between the amount and quality of children's reading and various environmental factors in school and home.

(8) A study of prose literature for 11 - 16 year olds - Gulbenkian / NATE 1967-72. These three projects (all located within the NATE ambience), together with Professor Britton's project, map a reasonably full picture of the child's response to creative language and his own use of it. It is interesting to note that the recognition of the influence of NATE by a powerful and well-endowed official body is indicative of NATE's power to help shape consciousness. (Professor Britton, Dr Wilkinson and F. Whitehead are all past Chairmen of the Association).


(11) Language Development in the Primary School, Mrs C. Rosen, 1969-1971, Goldsmith's College, University of London. (This led to the publication of "The Language of Primary School Children" in 1973).

(13) Pre-school Language Project (2 - 5), Dr J. Tough, 1971-72, Institute of Education, Leeds University.

(14) English in the Middle Years of Schooling, B. Newson, Collishtons College, University of London.

Projects in Progress

(1) Written language of 11 - 18 year olds, Miss N. Martin, Institute of Education, London University.

(2) Communication skills in early childhood, Dr J. Tough, Institute of Education, Leeds University.

(3) Extending Beginning Reading, Mrs Vera Southgate-Booth, Manchester University.

Projects having a bearing on English teaching


(2) Research and Development Project in Compensatory Education, N. Chazan and Dr P. Williams, 1967-72, Department of Education, University College, Swansea.

(3) The Effects of Environmental and Social Factors in Educational Attainment (Plowson follow-up), Professor F.W. Wrburton, 1966-69, Manchester University.

To sum up:

The 'Bridgehead' review suggests that there is a great deal outside English affecting the subject. Most significant are the general changes which began to affect the work of the primary schools from the 1930's
Towards the end, here the first major application of theories from psychology transformed the authoritarian models we had earlier discussed under notions of transmission/reproduction. The effects of the 1944 education act was to accelerate the push up of the application of those theories into the secondary schools where they have been resisted or accepted. This has also had the effect of sharpening ideological conflict especially over evaluation and notions of relevance.

However from 1930 until the mid 1950's there were continuing shifts rather than any real changes in the consciousness of English teachers, particularly in the secondary schools. Here certainly before 1960 the effect of the new criticism had been stronger than the theories derived from the social sciences. Particularly in selective schools there had been a change in the subject consciousness of English teachers, that is new insights into the nature of looking at and relating to literature and thus new insights into its place in the curriculum were afforded to English teachers. In turn this had led them to see themselves in a missionary role as champions of linguistic integrity. In this sense their traditional moral commitment had been redefined more strongly in terms of liberal-humanism rather than the 'spiritualised nationalism' of the earlier part of the century. Leavis' legitimation of the centrality of literature related it not only to the curriculum but to life.

On the other hand, given the changes in the institutional mechanism at the end of the second World War which established a measure of equality of opportunity, it was within liberal-humanism that a desire to encourage individuality and social opportunity was located. However this, together with a sensitivity to the power and strength of language for promoting cleavage rather than disunity, made many English teachers acutely aware of the anomalies and imbalances within the tripartite system. In this
way the liberal-humanists prepared the ground for the emergence of new
models of English teaching based on the therapeutic qualities of liter-
ature and the pursuit of truth and precision in language at all levels
of ability. Without this stage in the development of English teaching
more uncompromising notions of the suitability of certain types of
literature (the contemporary problem of 'relevance') and the explicit
and publicised recognition of the power of the word in the battle for
the control or the enlightenment of the child's consciousness would not
have come about. This state of affairs underlies much of what comes in
the next section of the thesis.
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PART TWO
So far we have been concerned with mapping a visible and largely dominant consciousness amongst English teachers which has revealed the major patterns of the institutionalisation and transmission of a relatively monolithic pedagogy. The implicit ideology has also been indicated. The strategy of delineation has been to follow a chronological description for the most part. However the 'Bridgehead' review chapter has suggested that any analysis after 1945 cannot follow traditional patterning exclusively because of the large number of factors influencing English teaching simultaneously.

Thus Part Two of the thesis will consist of

(1) A survey of the major orientations of a new consciousness through a content analysis of selected items from "The Use of English" (1949 - 1962) (Chapter 9).

(2) A discussion of the significance of the transatlantic dialogue (from the mid-sixties) (Chapter 10). It is hoped that the treatment of these two elements will prepare the ground for

(3) an analysis of a variety of approaches to the teaching of English. These will be called Models of English and will be dealt with in Chapter 11.

(4) Chapter 12 seeks to take up the notion of conflict within the models and attempts to subsume them as two competing rationales - 'initiation v. growth'.

(5) Chapter 13 relates to the notion of conflict in as much as it is an account of the nature and location of a more recent 'politicoising' of English teaching.
CHAPTER 9
"THE USE OF ENGLISH" AND THE NEW CONSCIOUSNESS

"The Use of English" has been chosen as a visible longitudinal indicator of how consciousness in English teaching reacted to the dimensions making for change outlined in Chapter 8 – particularly how a measure of integration between the new criticism and the implications of the 'new learning' came about as an adjustment to changes in institutional organisation after the 1944 Education Act. It is proposed to follow this process chronologically into the early 1960's after which time it is thought that other analytical processes are more revealing.

It is realised that the content analysis of "The Use of English" may be rather tedious for the reader. However it is believed that mapping the chronology of significant contributions which reflect or comment on institutional and intellectual changes actually points up the processes of the formation of consciousness. "The Use of English" appears to be particularly significant in showing the growing realisation amongst English teachers of the importance of encouraging personal and social exploration in the transmission of the subject. Moreover its own expanding concern during the 1950's for the institutionalisation of such a pedagogy at all levels makes the journal worth analysing. It should also be remembered that because of the publication's influence Use of English' groups were founded which were forerunners of a national association of English teachers. Finally I am persuaded to give "The use of English" such detailed chronological coverage because of the results of the empirical survey, details of which will be given in chapter 11.
However, reference to the Appendix at the end of the thesis (pp.531-532) reveals that of 11 'influences' on the way English teachers come to hold their views on the 'reality' of subject matter and transmission, key texts and journals are placed second. Where members of the survey sample do specify journals, "The Use of English" receives the most mentions as a formative influence.

**Volume 1 Autumn 1949 - Summer 1950**

"The Use of English" was first published in Autumn 1949 under the editorship of Denys Thompson. It had previously been called "English in Schools" and had been edited by Boris Ford. The new editorial board consisted of Boris Ford, David Hölbrook and Raymond O'Malley - all four were products of the Cambridge School of English. Denys Thompson's first editorial firmly asserted the centrality of English and committed "The Use of English" to fight for the preservation of a critical use of language to offset the worst effects of an ever-debilitating and corrupting environment, e.g. "English for us is more than a subject, its particular value (or 'use') is that it can create and heighten that critical attitude to our civilisation .... education must educate against the environment" (Autumn 1949, p.5). Thompson's overall view is clearly retrospectively informed by the objectives of Leavisism. However in the same first editorial he also indicates the disseminating function which he sees the quarterly periodical performing for teachers of English:

(i) A clearing house for text books.

(ii) Practical criticism.

---

1. The key texts are referred to in the Models chapter (Chapter 11) and in Chapter 15.
(iii) Notes on current examinations, including constructive suggestions for arranging syllabuses, and how to work for examinations without losing sight of the purpose of education.

(iv) Publication of children's writing.

An article by Boris Ford entitled 'The Reading Habit' also helps to fix the orientations of "The Use of English" in the Autumn 1949 issue. It is a criticism of sensational journalism and advertisements and makes the same sort of criticism so influentially expressed later by Richard Hoggart in "The Uses of Literacy" (1957). Having indicated that it is necessary to resist the exploitation of "facile emotion and stock response" Ford reiterates the cultural-heritage position. "We need to keep ourselves and above all our pupils in touch with the incisive emotional integrity of the words that make up our literary heritage" (p.14). The significant point is that the position taken up by Thompson and Ford is a measure of the tenacity of the missionising perspective of those teachers of English who believe in the central role of literature and as an offshoot of this the notion that worthwhile experience may be consummated in the 'word'. The idealism is manifest, as is also the beginning of an element within the consciousness of English teachers of the power of the 'word'. Although the contemporary concern was for the moral power of the word to combat an adverse environment, because of the same implicitly social perspective (the new consciousness articulates it explicitly), the logic of political implications must be recognised.

Frank Whitehead (at that time a Senior English Master in a Grammar School) also contributed an interesting article to the first issue. He takes Denys Thompson's line of argument when he says that the English
teacher should utilise the child's zest for acting, "at a time when there are so many factors in the cultural situation which militate against the full development of the individual's capacity for aesthetic appreciation" (p.23).

Another early, and continuing, concern of "The Use of English" is the vexed problem of exams. The first article on the subject, again in the opening issue, is by R. Pedley (also at that time Senior English Master in a Grammar School) who, writing on English in the proposed new G.C.E., attacks English teachers for being complacent and accepting the status quo (a feature we have noticed as characteristic of the profession in the early 1920's). He also attacks current ideas on composition and comprehension and declares that questions on grammar and vocabulary are redundant. His main concern however is that English Literature shall not suffer from standardised marking schemes. The whole intention of "The Use of English" acting as a pressure group is signalled in the call to action which comes at the end of the article. "Unless enough of us can convince authority of the evils of the present English papers, the GCE will for the mass of pupils remain as pernicious an impediment to intellectual and spiritual health as its predecessor" (p.39). R. Pedley also anticipates another commitment of "The Use of English's" mission when in reviewing two books on the press he agrees with Norman Angell that the press "sets up a progressive debasement of the public mind and judgment". (p.50).

Denys Thompson's second editorial (Winter 1949) also contrasts the environment of the school which provides standards against the worst effects of the out-of-school environment. Connected with this David Holbrook (then Assistant Editor at the Bureau of Current Affairs), criticises the Royal Commission on the Press's 1947-1949 Report for its
complacency and general acceptance of commercial values whilst an article by Nancy Martin signals much later orientations in English teaching when she reports on the setting of more satisfactory examination papers which took examples from contemporary writings. A.J. Jenkinson is also prophetic when in reviewing Geoffrey Trease's "Tales out of School" he hopes that writers of children's stories relevant to secondary modern schools will come forward who will not use "the conventions based on the more superficial prejudices of the middle classes" (p.101). At the same time one notices that M. Alderton Pink's "A Dictionary of Correct English" is recommended.

In these early issues of "The Use of English", Denys Thompson's editorial comment seemed to be explicitly designed to cater for grammar school teachers. Indeed in the third issue (Spring 1950) he specifically states that an account of English teaching which sees English literature as providing a living tradition and a sense of direction would be applicable to the Grammar School if not the Secondary Modern. During this first year of issues the Practical Criticism exercises were introduced and were obviously designed for the upper part of the grammar school. It was as if the editorial board were determined right from the start to provide a means of proliferating the sort of heightened consciousness which would establish the means of a determined counter attack on moral and linguistic corruption.

However it is also clear in these early issues that the principles of the 1921 Report have largely been shelved owing to their apparent

2. Raymond O'Malley reports in the Winter 1949 issue that 19 schools had replied to the practical criticism feature of the first issue, but that only one was a secondary modern school. In the Spring 1950 issue there were no replies from secondary modern schools.
irrelevance to grammar school English which has been given such a powerful raison d'être through the new criticism. Thus when in this issue Denys Thompson refers to the secondary modern school he is able to say that "principles need to be thought out". Clearly he does not see the secondary modern in any way similar to the grammar school for the purposes of teaching English and endorses A.L. Stone's suggestion that expression in the arts as a basis for tackling the difficulties of social relationships offers a point of departure for the modern school (p.116).

The third issue also shows a shift in pedagogical tactic to counter the debilitating contemporary culture, although the 'conviction of consciousness' remains intact. This is contained in a review by W.S. Spencer of "The Observant Reader" by F. Mosby and J.K. Thomas. Spencer says the book is too academic "it is doubtless deplorable that very few boys of 13 and 14 will ever read Jane Austen and 'the Brontës' or even Dickens and Scott, let alone Smollett and Addison, unless they are compelled (and any compulsion to do so is surely a grave mistake).

We know that most of their reading from choice (if they read at all) will be the type exemplified in the Biggles Books, Westerns and Leslie Charteris. The obvious policy is surely to base such exercises as these on writers a little less remote from their natural interests, without pandering to what is cheap and ephemeral. And how illuminating and really educative it would be to have some comparisons between good and bad, with appropriate exercises, so that they could see (for example) why Buchan is better than Biggles and C.S. Forester or Richard Hughes than Charteris" (p.158).

Denys Thompson's fourth editorial (Summer 1950) takes note of correspondents' concern about the implication of anti-environment studies. They believe that these could lead to negative and destructive attitudes
in pupils and submit that to pursue work on the mass media pushes English towards social studies and thus away from what they see as its central function with literature. (These reactions had been provoked by an article in the previous issue by Raymond Williams). However Thompson is anxious that the press and cinema do not deflect children from a literary heritage. His remarks also indicate that he sees that heritage as working positively to civilise and thus eventually help change society. It is thus that the 'cultural-heritage' model is further articulated in a dynamic perspective. It is possible that this is so because at least covertly that heritage and thus the social fabric which supports it is being threatened. This may have persuaded the defenders of the literary faith to take up a dynamic stance, whereas under the dominant older consciousness no such need for defence existed.

Given the views about literature as a carry-over from a traditional consciousness (albeit 'brought up to date') it is not surprising to find an article in the same early issue defending formal grammar. Entitled "Suggestions for a Grammar School Syllabus", the article, by Dorothy E. King (a Senior English teacher in a grammar school), comes down firmly on the side of correctness and advocates the necessity of concentrating on the end rather than the means. Inevitably that end is to train children to think so that they will be proof against the "insidious persuasiveness of advertising" (p.186).

Frank Whitehead, also in the same issue, takes to task the English Association's guide to English Literature for schools for its formidable list of essays and belles lettres, thus indicating again that the older consciousness prevails (not unnaturally in the English Association) and that a new consciousness is not assuming that one can merely fill children up with adult texts. The role of the facilitator is taking shape.
(Later on, in the 1960's, Frank Whitehead talks of the 'nudging' role of the English teacher.)

Volume II Autumn 1950 - Summer 1951

Denys Thompson's editorial to the Autumn issue shifts the focus of concern on to the problem of textbooks and anthologies. His suggestion that textbooks not only institutionalise aim and method but also prejudice, is indicative of the mounting criticism of the continuing publication of the transmission/reproduction textbook. As far as poetry anthologies are concerned Thompson alleges that the notion that all human experience is fit matter for poetry is not reflected and that in his opinion Auden and Garnett's "The Poets' Tongue" (1935 - often quoted as a prototype of the newer anthology) has had little influence. Moreover "in prose anthologies there has been little enterprise in a field still held by ideas about Style and Fine Writing" (p.3). An article in the same issue by G.G. Urwin (a Senior English Master in a grammar school) claims that the author, after a quick check of publishers' catalogues, found books like "Guy Mannering", "Henry Esmond" and "The Talisman" to be the most popular, "it is indeed strange ... that today the tastes of schoolboys should be dictated by the middle-class parlour readers of the 19th Century" (p.27). Perhaps the move towards the modern controversy centred on 'relevance' has begun - again indicating how the critical nature of the new consciousness, starting perhaps indirectly from the Leavisian position is producing a logic of change. It is also in this comparatively early issue that G.H. Bantock reviewing "Disagreements" by R.C. Churchill poses the question whether egalitarian democracy and a high state of culture are possible compatibilities.
Thus the logic of change is throwing up a dilemma which has caused an uneasy compromise and thus is one of the underlying reasons why consciousness mapping is so difficult after 1945.

In a sense Denys Thompson's editorial to the next issue (Winter 1950) touches on this problem. He underlines the lack of a deeper informing purpose and because of this his remarks may hold a clue to the apparent institutional persistence of traditional models of English teaching. His view suggests that a part of the contemporary consciousness may be derived retrospectively in as much as his repeated special pleading for the study of literature includes an argument which had in fact underpinned the whole institutionalisation of English before 1920 — namely that it should fill the void left by classics. He believed that the place of English in the curriculum was seriously challenged by Social Studies (This challenge had been implicit ever since the early 1930's and the heightening of social consciousness). In the same way that Leavis dismissed any comparison between English Literature and Chemistry, Thompson again stresses the supremacy of English, whilst "Social Studies is essentially a tool and cannot provide standards" (p.60). However he shows not only the sociological and cultural naiveté but also the lack of historical relativity so often shown by ideologically committed English teachers when he suggests that "the people who advocate them (Social Studies) miss the point that classical civilisation was approached and apprehended by the student through a study of its literature" (p.60).

The function of "The Use of English" as a place where practical

---

3. Part of the first articulation of the new consciousness, predicated on the generating power of Leavis' views and the new criticism, was to arrogate centrality and thus supremacy. Ever since the euphoric conviction of the 1921 Report it may be argued that this particular articulation of consciousness was possible in the context of the transcendental view of literature.
teaching experience may be aired is consistently well illustrated throughout the period under review. From the very early issues the practice of English teaching in a secondary modern school was given liberal coverage. Again in the Winter 1950 issue, William Walsh suggests that group composition is used as a substitute for individual verse composition "for those who are not capable of producing it. Even they shall not be denied up to their capacity" (p.63). R.B. Cook, writing in the same issue on 'Suggestions for a Secondary Modern Syllabus' tacitly accepts a 'low-culture' objective which at this stage seems to be equated with "developing a child's ability to express and satisfy personal or social needs within his environment." (p.75) The further articulation of that aim is of profound significance in the development of the new consciousness, not least making redundant the worst effects of the then visible stigma. It is also significant that another and associated change in consciousness is signalled in a review by E. Taylor of Charles Segal's "Backward Children in the Making" where the comment is made that the class teacher knows little about the families of his school children or their lives outside school.

However at this stage in the early 1950's "The Use of English" was zealously committed not only to the 'cultural-heritage' model but also the study of literature as the end to which all other means of English teaching should eventually aspire. Thus we find reference to contemporary "Scrutiny" contributions which had taken to task the 'play way' approach for "pandering to the immediate needs of the child whilst ignoring his ultimate needs" (p.223); moreover in the same issue we find "oral composition and drama are means and means only towards that development of basic skills and that introduction of the child to its cultural heritage which are especially the concern of the teacher of English" (p.224).
In the Autumn 1951 issue Denys Thompson makes explicit the moral missionising aspect of the 'cultural-heritage' model. "In an age when moral responsibility seems urgently necessary for survival, anyone who is made aware of literature as having such power must feel compelled to try to bring as many people as possible to be adequate readers" (p.3).

However it is the communal aspect of this missionising which is equally significant, because it is in this issue that the primary schools are specifically referred to as having a 'need', which was the concern of "The Use of English". An article by James Reeves on 'Poetry at the Primary Stage' is included. In the Spring 1952 issue Thompson suggests that there should be a closer liaison between primary and secondary schools and reports on a small one-day conference (16th November 1951) organised for primary schools and attended by 12 Primary School heads and assistant teachers together with 6 University and Training College specialists. Apart from discussing the problems of adopting progressive teaching methods with large classes, the conference was also exercised by the problem of standards. Again one might argue that this extension of the interest and influence of "The Use of English" is an extension of the notion of an English teaching community. Moreover the concept of changes as opposed to deterioration in standards was also discussed (perhaps the pluralism which characterises much of contemporary English teaching is indicated here). However there was complete agreement on the preservation of values contained in literature which is indicative of a consensus in an area not yet affected by notions of cultural relevance.

In respect of 'community' it is also in this issue that we find articles by Raymond Williams on 'Literature in Adult Education' and a forceful plea on behalf of the day-release student by F.E. Foden who is clearly motivated.
by Dover Wilson's "Humanism in the Day Continuation School" (1921).

In the Summer 1952 issue there is an important article by Frank Whitehead, 'English Through Exercises' which again refers to "a steady stream of textbooks whose bulk is largely filled out by heterogeneous and unsystematic 'exercises'" (p.215). He indicates that they exist because of the necessary connection between the institutionalisation of English teaching and examinations and because they appear to offer something definite in the face of many teachers' fears about losing a sense of structure. Although at this stage Whitehead's view is based on the notion that the teaching of English is ameliorative (and perhaps ultimately transcendant) his awareness of the reality of children's needs very positively signals the 'growth' rationale. Clearly this also indicates a sense of commitment which has emerged as an ideological consensus in the early years of "The Use of English". In the same issue this sense of commitment and its implications is the crux of Muriel E. Jenkins' article 'Values and the Fence' where she suggests that it is impossible for the teacher of English to be uncommitted religiously and politically.

Volume IV Autumn 1952 — Summer 1953

In the first issue Denys Thompson indicates that the primary school dialogue is progressing — if somewhat modestly. An article by W. Worthy, a Junior School Headteacher, entitled 'English in the Junior School' is included. The notion of encouraging personal expression with an exciting and stimulating environment would clearly be approved by Denys Thompson who hoped that the dialogue with the primary school would inject a new methodology into the secondary school. The psycho-therapeutic model derived from developmental psychology was beginning to
impinge on the consciousness of secondary teachers. However that consciousness remains dominated by an examination system which is regularly criticised in "The Use of English". For example in the Winter 1952 issue P.E. Marshall comments on the Examining Board's choice of texts. "With Wales ... as an honourable exception ... criticism is mainly of the Authorities' cautious, safety-first policy, their unwillingness to get away from academically safe choices" (p.86). He suggests that there should be a selection of modern choices. This issue also contains two contributions presenting a total view of English teaching. Such descriptions have become increasingly prevalent and are indicative of the growing uncertainty about the parameters of the subject. However G.H. Bantock's contribution is significant because it still underpins a lot of people's thinking about English teaching. Basically Bantock posits a notion of duality, making a distinction between 'practical communication' and 'subtle states of being'. He recommends texts like "The Mill on the Floss" and "Jane Eyre" as studies of human relationships. This notion is also taken up by Harold Stephenson in 'Chaucer Explored', in the same issue, although he stresses the social motive of a group's mutual interest in literature. Thus the central human need of belonging is catered for and Stephenson sees this as a major function of the secondary modern.

The Spring issue of 1953 is significant because Denys Thompson announces that the publication is extending its range of interest to the U.S.A. Here perhaps the transatlantic dialogue starting in the mid-1960's is first signalled (It is interesting to note that Boris Ford, David Holbrook, Frank Whitehead as well as Denys Thompson himself all had a part to play in the beginning of that dialogue).

Indeed the Summer 1953 is also important as an indication of the
shaping of future consciousness in English teaching in that it contains
the first major article by David Holbrook, "The Point of Making Things
Up - Composition Work in a Modern School". His later highly explicit
description of maturity is here given an early airing. His rationale
is clearly derived from the Leavisian articulation of the 'cultural-
heritage' model and a very high premium is placed on sensibility and
feeling. Children should be given "a high degree of emotional
education" (p.194) - "our aim should be to help produce maturity of
sensibility" (p.195). However the significance of the article is that
it not only gives credence to personal feeling but points up the social
perspective on language which is logically implicit in any exploration
of feeling. "The interaction of thought and feeling and our attitudes
to experience will involve both ideas about behaviour, and a knowledge
of other people's experience - a sympathy with some and an antipathy to
others .... through language we experience other people's attitudes and
situations and, more important, their valuations of these" (p.195).
Here we are able to point to an early signalling of the rationale which
subsumes the 'personal-expression' model because it has sufficient theor-
etical power to do this for those developmental notions which, whilst
separate for the purposes of describing 'models' logically develop the
rationale.

Finally it is worth mentioning that in a 'Stocktaking' article
surveying English courses G.H. Franey makes it clear that the Reproductive
Model still flourishes when he reports that books like R. Ridout's
"English Today" series are characteristic of the English teacher's stock-
in-trade. Such a series, it will be remembered, fragmented English
teaching into composition, comprehension, précis, punctuation, poetry,
use of figurative language, general knowledge and 'clear thinking'.
It is a curious characteristic of the consciousness of English teachers that throughout the period under discussion there is a regular call for a return to upholding 'standards'. One might argue that this periodic obsession is indicative of the insecurity English teachers have always felt in trying to reconcile the conflicting claims of freedom and authority (often institutionalised) in language use. It is perhaps another manifestation of the liberal-humanist paradox; or again it might be indicative of the extent to which the 'new learning' has or has not penetrated that consciousness. In any case it probably reflects only a partial view of the reality of the situation. Thus we find A.A. Evans (Deputy Director of the Leeds Institute of Education) in an article on 'Grammar, Language and Style' in the Autumn 1953 issue pointing to two issues of "The Times Educational Supplement" (January 23rd and February 2nd, 1953) in which "well-known teachers of English publicly announced that they would return to grammar". His summary of the history of the teaching of grammar is comprehensive, indicating that increasingly since the 1920's there has been no consistent practice. Whilst believing that grammar holds its own in the grammar schools he says the position in the secondary moderns is chaotic. His advocacy of a 'return' to grammar however is based on a theory which the 'new learning' has thoroughly discredited (i.e. mainly the 'transfer fallacies')

The primary school syllabus is also given space in this issue with an article by a Primary School Headteacher, J.S. Nicholson. His belief that divisions between Literature, Grammar and Spoken English are for artificial convenience indicates a practice which has had profound repercussions for the organisation of English Studies in the lower part of the

secondary school and for a weakening of Classification towards a more integrated conception of English Studies. It is also interesting that Nicholson clearly derives his thinking from George Sampson from whose book he quotes.

In the Winter 1953 issue A.A. Evans elaborates the views introduced in the previous issue. His main argument is that "there has been an unwise disassociation between grammatical and critical analysis in the study of text and the training of appreciation" (p.80). Once again one detects a sort of struggle to achieve a balance between style and content, a compromise. Perhaps one might argue that this notion of balance is crucial to liberal-humanism. (It is the opposing notion to 'paradox') and thus vitally important in the professional socialisation of the majority of English teachers. It certainly makes a contribution to 'model' descriptions of English teaching.

In a sense, an article in the same issue by C.S. Shorter on 'Drama in the Secondary Modern School' points up another aspect of what is coming to be seen as something of a dilemma by English teachers as the 'new learning' derived from psychology and sociology begins to impinge upon consciousness. He is discussing the relative function of formal drama and psycho-drama. The first he clearly sees as within the 'cultural-heritage' tradition whilst the latter he sees as a sort of sublimation of anarchic elements within children in order to achieve social conformity. He wonders whether psychodrama is either adequate or practicable.

The Spring 1954 issue is an important one. First there is a notice about a new 4 Year Course "Illustrated English" where photographs form the starting point of each lesson. Now, although the actual photographs used (e.g. of train-spotting, aeroplanes, ships, roundabouts etc.) are
different from the social emphases to be found in later 'thematic' books
the idea of using non-verbal material as starting points has obviously
been born. Moreover there is also an article by Arthur Harvey, Head
of the English Department at Walworth School, London, on 'English in a
Modern Secondary School' which in a sense is prophetic. First, it
echoes Holbrook and secondly indicates that Walworth School was perhaps
the first large inner-city school to see the need of emphasising the
social significance of English teaching. It is also significant that
members of the English Department have been influential in the develop-
ment of consciousness in English teaching.5

The basis of Arthur Harvey's argument is that English teaching rests
on friendly cooperation between pupils and teachers. On p.152 he says
"the awareness they (the pupils) acquire of their own and others'
emotional moods and problems helps them towards self-control and a
tolerant sympathy for self-control, or lack of it, in those they meet.
They begin to realise how their writing can release and help to solve
some of their conflicts and problems; they begin to see that many
difficulties they thought peculiar to themselves have been experienced
by many others, that a sense of guilt is a common human experience, and
that to be just in their dealings with others demands an imaginative
effort similar to the one they must make in their reading if they are to

5. After Arthur Harvey there have been John Dixon, Leslie Stratta,
Simon Clements, Harold Rosen and Alex Mcleod. Dixon, Stratta and
Clements of course combined to produce "Reflections" in 1963 thus
beginning the 'source book revolution'; also John Dixon is Chairman
of the English Committee of the Schools Council and author of
"Growth through English" whilst Leslie Stratta is the current editor
of the NATE journal "English in Education". Harold Rosen and Alex
Mcleod are, of course, members of the English Department at the London
Institute of Education.
appreciate it fully". This is a very early statement about English as a social means of ameliorating intention and action. It is by no means a bland advocacy of an undifferentiated notion of reducing social cleavage (differences and difficulties are indicated). Most importantly for the development of a new consciousness about English teaching it implies that most of today's problems are socially derived. Moreover given the 'personal-expression' orientations of Holbrook and the sociological perspective of the Walworth English Department and given the great impact of these two approaches and their obvious points of contact in the concept of 'growth' (as yet undifferentiated) perhaps it is not too much to claim that here in the pages of "The Use of English" the major feature of the new consciousness is beginning to take shape. As we shall see in Chapter 12 this feature is articulated into a super-ordinating rationale.

Perhaps the other significant feature of this issue is the announcement of the formation in Leicester of the first 'Use of English' group. David Holbrook was to be secretary and it was the intention of the group to divide their attention between discussing literary and classroom matters.

In the Summer 1954 issue Denys Thompson keeps up the attack on the proliferation of intensive courses in comprehension which flood the market and are used quite unsuitably with lower forms in grammar schools. Raymond O'Malley's review of Vicar Bell's "On Learning the English Tongue" points up the role of literature in any concept of 'growth'. He suggests an individual growing into literature and then a growing by means of it, which process binds the teacher and child together "in that affinity which comes whenever a work of art is enjoyed in company" (p.274).
Perhaps the most significant contribution to the Autumn 1954 issue is an article by Elizabeth Richardson, 'Therapy and Aesthetics in School Drama' which is a reply to C.S. Shorter's article (Winter 1953 see p. 297 above). Her main contention is that there is no clear line of demarcation between the aesthetic value and the therapeutic values of classroom drama. She says that many of the activities mentioned by Shorter are sociodramatic which might be taken to incorporate psycho-drama (p.28) (As in writing and non-dramatic talk, the sphere of drama and role-playing seems to be moving towards a centrally visible rationale).

On p.31 she talks of dual development (nb. this had been implicit in the recent writings of Holbrook and Harvey) "On the one hand the child learns through acting as he learns in day-to-day situations in his home and his school to ... accept himself as an individual. But growing up also involves accepting other people and adjusting oneself to meet the stress and strain of a constantly changing environment. When a child projects himself into a dramatic role he is exploring his own personality; when he assumes a role which is foreign to his own nature he is exploring the social environment in which he lives."

In the Winter 1954 issue one notices that the link between examinations, literature and moral worth are kept before the reader - again by contributors like O'Malley and Holbrook. R.B. Kennedy writing on C. Brooks' and R.P. Warren's "Fundamentals of Good Writing" again keeps up the grammar debate by calling for the abolition of grammar teaching. In his view there is a "primacy of meaning" in which "Reading and Writing, composition and appreciation" may then come to be regarded, correctly, as different aspects of the same things and attainment of skills in them largely a matter of instinct and response to example" (p.145). This is
a further example of the 'incidental' view of 'skills' teaching and one which clearly regards them as implicit within English as a unity rather than explicit to English as split into language and literature (functions). However the mixed consciousness about English teaching which prevailed may be illustrated by the Spring 1955 issue giving space to a notice about the publication of M. Alderton Pink's "An Outline of English Grammar". As far as the 'communal' consciousness of the traditional model is concerned perhaps it is significant to note that this book was written and published on behalf of the English Association.

Volume VII  Autumn 1955 - Summer 1956

The Autumn 1955 publication was the 25th issue of the periodical. In spite of providing a forum for practising English teachers to exchange views, Denys Thompson does not think that the state of affairs outlined in the first issue has improved. An important article by Eric James follows on 'Liberal Education in a Technical Age'. Again the views of Dover Wilson seem implicit in a point of view which firmly equates the idea of a subject being taught with "a proper regard for its social relations and with a humanising influence" (p.6). This point is indirectly taken up by J.H. Walsh who in writing about the function of the class reader in 'Day-to-day Practice in the Teaching of English' suggests that it is "to act as an interpreting link between the child and the world around him" (p.11). It is in a social perspective that Christopher Gillie writing on the teaching of "The Tempest" states that "there is nothing at all of the day dream about "The Tempest", it is firmly engrafted in the reality of life" (p.37); moreover Frank Whitehead in reviewing F. Gurrey's "The Teaching of Written English" and referring to the principles underlying composition says "childrens
writing ... needs to arise out of and be closely related to the experiences in their own lives that really matter to them" (p.57). Perhaps even by the mid-1950's the rationale of the modern consciousness is being formulated.

Denys Thompson's editorial in the winter 1955 issue takes the form of a review of the Ministry of Education's 1954 pamphlet on Language (see chapter 8). He is critical of their view that a knowledge of the structure of sentences is useful at a certain stage in learning to write but agrees with the Ministry's view that the inclusion of essayists in English syllabuses encourages false notions of style. He is clearly gratified that the Ministry is as much against comprehension manuals as he himself is. More space is also given to views on the viability of group work in drama - this time for backward boys - in an article by E.W. Hildick who claimed that it encouraged cooperation within the group. Indeed A. Rintoul, a grammar school master, contributing to the 'Useful Lessons' series also advocates group work in interviewing and role-playing work. Thus the notion of social interaction is further explored.

In the next issue, Summer 1956, J.F. Watts, contributing an article on 'Original Writing in the C Stream - a Method of using a tape-recorder' also advocates the efficacy of role-playing methods leading to writing and stresses the cooperative effort of a group in producing a written record.

Once again the grammar issue is given an airing - this time by Hunter Diack of Nottingham University. His article entitled 'A Re-examination of Grammar' begins by asserting that research shows that the teaching of grammar is a waste of time. He then goes on to outline the three main reactions to those research findings (p.257):
(1) There is a considerable body of opinion, particularly in the grammar schools and universities, in favour of bringing grammar back into the schools more or less as it was before. Diack mentions the sponsoring of Alderton Pink's "Grammar" by the English Association.

(2) More progressive opinion, those who want to see English taught creatively in the schools have campaigned against the teaching of grammar in the belief that all the grammar any pupil is likely to need will be picked up incidentally.

(3) An attempt by writers to produce brighter textbooks (e.g. "Grammar Made Gay"). The author's own view is that grammar is the very process of thinking and that there should be a new course in which the first part would deal with the relationship between words and things. This article is another example of one of the major polarisations of the new consciousness.

Volume VIII Autumn 1956 - Summer 1957

In the Autumn issue Denys Thompson returns to the 'centrality' argument, this time suggesting that the teacher of English is in a much stronger position than his colleagues in focusing children's attention on their surroundings - i.e., in training the eye. In a way this sort of belief (which is perhaps in one sense implicitly arrogant) is a further articulation of the school institutionalisation of the new criticism as well as preparing the ground for the impact of Holbrook and the later more socially-oriented radicalism of Raymond Williams and Fred Inglis. It is clear also that this constant dialogue about the effects of Urbia and Suburbia on children points up personal and social significances.

The organic folk culture has been destroyed but through verbal and visual
literateness acting as 'organic substitutes' not only may a refined sensibility be preserved and transmitted but it will be seen to be superior to mechanistic values. This aspect seems to be taken up by T.R. Barnes in 'Drama and Values' included in the Winter 1956 issue. Having dismissed the argument that drama is only a therapeutic pastime, Barnes says it is also an art and in "matters of art we cannot avoid the problem of values" (p.81). He goes on to claim that "folk-sources - songs and ballads, medieval drama and Shakespeare ought to be the basis of dramatic work in schools". These represent the child's country's cultural traditions and are "the only standards he can get hold of by which to measure his debased subtopian surroundings" (p.83). In the same issue Richard Hoggart's article on 'Changes in Popular Reading' attacks that species of modern literature which embraces superficial and ephemeral standards in sex, crime and the supernatural.

In the Spring 1957 issue Hoggart contributes a second article on this theme and indirectly introduces the theme of relevance - very much a controversial subject in the new consciousness. His view is that there is an increased trivialisation in publications for the majority which are not "truly concrete and personal". In a sense this dilemma motivates the whole creative and sociological movement within the new consciousness. It relates to the different emphases English teachers have placed on facing up to the increased complexities in the evident truth that "social ills thrive on basic literacy". It is these different emphases that have concerned English teachers in the search for a rationale.

Volume IX Autumn 1957 - Summer 1958

The Autumn 1957 issue is important first for an article on 'English
Teaching and Modern Linguistics by Frank Whitehead. His view at this time seems to accept the behaviourist approach but what he says anticipates some of the major areas of relevance to the way in which linguistics has begun to alter the 'reality' construction of English teachers "taken-for-granted" knowledge about language. This stems first perhaps from 'context of situation' and from the notion of register. Whitehead's article also signals the massive increase in attention paid to the spoken word during the 1960's and his distinction between grammatical and linguistic analyses of language the concepts of correctness and appropriateness.

R. Pedley keeps the examination controversy firmly in front of readers in an article entitled 'Comprehension: A wrong approach'. His views once again show how English examinations still operate as perhaps the most powerful form of institutionalisation - this time he is able to refer to 10 different manuals in comprehension because it is included in 'O' level examinations. His concern is that "the comprehension manual will completely oust from the classroom 'real' reading - at least of prose". (p.18) Denys Thompson's editorial in the Spring 1958 issue complements this point of view - namely that the educational publishers tend to prolong the status quo. As he had continually stated, he believed English would be healthier if there were far fewer textbooks (The new consciousness has in fact attempted to institutionalise this view).

6. The recently published Ministry of Education pamphlet on Language (1954) had specifically warned against Comprehension manuals, preferring the material to be drawn from reading books - and even then the passages should not be too short or followed by "fidgety and superficial questions" (op.cit.p.137). It is interesting to compare the impact of this Report on Schools with earlier Board of Education attempts (see chapter 6) to persuade schools to organise their syllabuses more flexibly than the dictates of the Examining Boards seemed to allow.
This issue also contains an important article on 'Free Writing' by M.K. Paffard of Keele University. His view puts another slant on the 'anti-admass' position constantly argued by many contributors to "The Use of English" over the years. "If one can begin at school to build up a realisation of the intimate connection between the personality of the individual and the language he uses, together with some awareness of the emotive power of words ... one is laying invaluable foundations at once for the critical appreciation of literature and for the sort of resistance to propaganda in all its more or less insidious forms which any adequate English teaching today must attempt" (p.115). As he also argues that free writing should be varied with more formal types of composition one may infer that within Paffard's article are the elements which have become recognised as contributing to a central 'compromise' position in English teaching.

The Spring 1958 issue is distinguished by a long article on 'The Place of English Literature in a Liberal Education' by L.C. Knights. This article not only reaffirms "The Use of English" stance on the defence of linguistic standards (with quotations from Ezra Pound's 'Has Literature a function in the state?') but also seeks to vindicate the centrality of English studies in terms of Leavis' views on the sociology of literature. Knights seeks to show the connection between literature and contemporary problems, "particularly political and social problems" (he cites Milton, Dryden, Swift, Blake and Wordsworth). Like so many contributors before him he is particularly anxious that the "encroachment of a newspaper consciousness made up of a few stereotypes" (p.165) is resisted. However Knights, perhaps sensing a danger in this particular articulation of the new consciousness, warns against a "sombre missionising zeal" and literature as a "panacea for the world's ills". (p.165)
Volume X  Autumn 1958 - Summer 1959

Raymond O' Malley contributes an important review of Dora Pym's "Free Writing" to the Autumn 1958 issue. He makes an explicit link between free writing and the reduction of social cleavage, mentioning the virtues of tact, candour and deference "that can emerge between child and child, child and teacher, where such free communication can take place" (p.53). He compares 'free writing' favourably with more formal modes of writing. "And I have to think of the kinds of make-shift and second handedness and falsity and the failures of mutual respect that often seem to be intrinsic with the teaching and practice of more disciplined forms of writing" (p.53). This view has significance for changes in the nature of social relationships within the classroom and points towards a completely different teaching style (weaker framing) emerging in many English classrooms in the 1960's partly as a result of what may be called 'the creative-writing revolution'.

When the creative-writing model is looked at in some detail we shall see how it was institutionalised largely because it offered a pedagogical alternative to English teachers seeking for ways to teach disadvantaged and less able children. In the Winter 1958 issue R.J. Harris, writing on "The Organisation of English in the Secondary Modern School" is also bearing such children in mind when he indicates that children might be encouraged to use their senses through more stimulating source-based materials than the currently available poor quality course books.

In the Summer issue Edmund Blishen continues the debate on secondary modern schools' English - always a problem exercising English teachers. His view may be summarised as another attempt to vindicate the notion that English for the majority must be linguistically relevant and encourage the reduction of social cleavage, e.g. "we have got to be
interested in his (the child's) own tongue, and not exile it from the classroom" (p.220). "I'm not sure that we shall not have to confess that the two tongues (of educated English and the vernacular) must learn from each other" (p.224). A review by Ian Michael of C.C. Fries "The Structure of English" raises interesting points about the ways in which the whole linguistic perspective has come to impinge upon English teachers' consciousness. Michael makes a distinction between accurate description of the functions of language which is the business of linguistics, and the control of expression and interpretation which, he suggests, is rather more the business of English teaching. This particular view may point up the more modern doubts about the legitimacy of linguistics for English teachers in that the notion of control implies an evaluative stance (be it literary, moral or socio-political) which many English teachers believe to be necessary and desirable. This issue also announces the formation of a London-based 'Use of English' group. However the group acknowledges that it does not want to go over the same ground as the London Association for the Teaching of English (LATE), hoping rather to confine itself to discussing the relationship between English teaching and the "cultural environment" in which it takes place. It must be pointed out, however, that its brief is very much central to the official "Use of English" view on the overall purpose of English teaching, specifically stated on this occasion to be to see "what effect the training of taste and sensibility by English teachers have against the multitudinous counter-influences, films, newspapers, advertising - indeed the whole world outside the classroom." (p.264) As LATE objectives were to look at cultural environment perhaps less uncompromisingly (and certainly more from the point of view of the cultural reality of the inner-city child) one might see counter-orientations which
eventually pointed up aspects of contending consciousnesses. Indeed this has been a characteristic of English teaching since the 1950's.

Volume XI Autumn 1959 - Summer 1960

Denys Thompson uses the Autumn issue to review the first 10 years of "The Use of English". He reports that the circulation of the periodical has steadily grown since 1951 after the Bureau of Current Affairs was wound up. He reiterates "The Use of English's" main concern to assert the special contribution of English literature to education and to discuss methods of teaching it. He again attacks the text-book situation saying that it is "impossible and unnecessary to review all text books published because some of them are rehashes and have small justification for existence" (p.4). He also condemns the pragmatic approach to English which he says has increased in secondary modern schools. "It is even doubtful whether whatever skill is thus acquired is best gained by ad hoc instruction; it is better attained as a by-product of studying real books and of the child's own writing about what he is interested in. He also criticises examinations for encouraging drills' teaching in the '0' level year. R.O'Malley's article in the same issue acts as a follow-up: He too reaffirms "The Use of English's" moral stance against the "materialistic, opportunist and cynical" appeal through words. (The moral battle for the child's consciousness is pointed up).

In the Winter 1959 issue R.J. Harris' criticism of the multiplication of rival English courses is by implication a good indication of how progressive elements within the new consciousness might very well view what remains of the transmission/reproduction model as perpetuated by these courses - e.g. irrelevant material, fragmentation, false analogy, grammatical dragons and chimeras, uncertainty of audience (a feature of
the transmission/reproduction model was its monolithic view about
children's needs and capacities). Professor W. Walsh's articles, however,
in the Spring and Summer 1960 issues on 'The Place of Literature in the
Training of Teachers' are a clear indication that the elitist aspects of
Leavis' original view is still held by influential people. Walsh's view
is quite uncompromising. "We have to resurrect and realise the concep-
tion of a learned class as an essential element in a civilised society"
(Spring 1960, p.150). His view that "the direction of remedial effort
must be from top down" would seem to go counter to the main elements of
the new consciousness in respect of the education of the less able. To
the sociotherapeutically-oriented English teacher such beliefs would
appear at best to perpetuate unfortunate class differences, at worst to
be deliberately and viciously divisive. This would seem to be a long
way from Arnold's hope for society despite Walsh's view that Arnold's
guidance to standards are all important. On the other hand Geoffrey
Wagner writing in the Summer issue makes a plea for the habits of
discipline. Indeed he accuses "The Use of English" of "happily under-
mining education with its encouragement of unchecked opinion in the
classroom" (p.252). He refers to essays on "how to make English easier,
more palatable, less grammatical, i.e. work" (p.253). Although such
an opinion would not suggest a very careful reading of the first 40
issues, it does indicate perhaps that the authoritarian consciousness is
likely to be exerting a powerful limiting effect on the articulation of
the new consciousness.

In the Spring 1960 issue there is more argument against the teaching
of formal grammar. In an article 'Grammar: Dry Bones', D.M. Skews
asserts a view which had divided English teachers - namely that there is
no connection between grammar and improved writing. However it was the
sort of grammar that they had been professionalised with and into that was being rejected, namely traditional prescriptive and proscriptive grammar not the necessity for an appreciation of the structures and patterns of language. Skews quotes Vallins and the AAM Conference in 1958 to support his views.

Volume XII Autumn 1960 - Summer 1961

Perhaps the only significant contribution to the Autumn issue from our point of view is Ian Michael's review of J. Hubert Jagger's "A Handbook of English Grammar" which because it appears to be an early attempt at a compromise between traditional grammar and the "unsettled views of contemporary linguistics" makes the book vulnerable. Again one might conjecture that this revealed the real need of the Schools Council's Linguistics Programme begun in 1964 - in order to realign linguistics and the teaching of English so that early prejudices might be overcome.

A controversial problem of the early 1960's was undoubtedly the introduction of 'Use of English' examination papers for Science Sixth Formers at the instigation of the universities. "The Use of English" editorials and articles roundly condemned the new examination because it was not firmly established in literature. Indeed in the Spring 1961 issue Denys Thompson himself launched into a general attack on the whole examination system and accused the universities of having a "near-irresponsible attitude over the years towards the English language" (p.220). His main concern again is the institutional effect of examinations. In this respect he quotes G. Bruce, Secretary to the London University Examinations Council. "At present we sell about £15,000 worth of past GCE papers each year and the amount of working through these must be enormous and stultifying". Thompson believes that this stultifying
effect is to promote more general illiteracy and accuses the universities of being responsible for not getting what they want. "The remedy is to restore literature to its place in the teaching of English" (p.221). Brian Jackson writing in the Spring 1961 issue also contributes to the debate in 'The Strange Case of the Sleeping Senate'. He too criticises the universities for attempting to redress the balance after edging out a compulsory Latin paper by substituting "a more sophisticated English Language paper". (p.182).

The Summer 1961 issue contains an important contribution to the dawning consciousness about the link between personal and social experience where P. Creber and G. Summerfield also link personal insight leading to social insight with a moral purpose. Their scheme of work for the development of the imagination moves from actions, scenes and objects to persons (self and then others). All of this they suggest leads to a development of empathy.

Volume XIII  Autumn 1961 - Summer 1962

In the Winter 1961 issue Marie Peel in an article 'Imagining What They Know' reports that at a March conference of teachers of English in Direct Grant Schools no one questioned the validity or proposed form of the Oxford and Cambridge 'Use of English' papers. For them this meant something to work towards with more VI Form time made available to do it. This could very well be described as an almost classical example of an institutionalisation pattern – and one which characterised the earlier institutionalisation of English up to 1920.

In the Spring issue the examination argument is taken up yet again – this time in respect of English and the Beloe Report (Secondary School Examinations other than the GCE). Parts of the Report are quoted and
we can present these as representative of the new consciousness as it had developed by the early 1960's.

(1) Some examinations were criticised for their narrow and stultifying effects on teaching - "encouraging stereotyped responses at the expense of imagination and directness".

(2) The new methods of English teaching which are developing present special difficulties for examining English in the normal way.

(3) Written parts of the examination might be tested subjectively.

(4) 'Grammar', vocabulary exercises and other linguistic snippets should be discouraged.

(5) The subjects for continuous writing should aim to allow candidates to write from experience, interest and conviction.

(6) Questions should test the quality of a child's response and not be "mere pegs on which to hang tests of vocabulary, figurative usage and the like" (p.195).

As it appears that sufficient of the later developments in English teaching had been signalled and projected by 1962, it was decided that after 1962 items selected from "The Use of English" for discussion should relate directly to the implications of the 'Models' and the formation of the 'growth' rationales.

Conclusions: Analysis of "The Use of English", 1949-1962 reveals the following factors:

(1) Despite the earlier views of the editorial board (which were modified in order to meet the challenge of the secondary modern syllabus) there appears to be a growing consensus expressed by
contributors about the necessity of making the English classroom a place for personal (individualised) expression and social (cooperative) expression. (The strong egalitarian implications are beginning to have repercussions in the consciousness of English teaching). This is a classification factor which points towards new classificatory models to add to the 'cultural-heritage' model.

(2) Because of this change in perspective the traditional transmission/reproduction model has been considerably but probably unevenly weakened, although by no means discredited in the consciousness of many English teachers, especially as at this time linguistics appeared as yet unable to provide an alternative language model which English teachers accepted as viable. However this visible weakening has meant implications for the boundary-maintenance mechanism between the hitherto insulated parts of the English curriculum. This is a framing factor and points towards the emergence of a new framing model for English teaching. It also relates to the original hypothesis about the relationship between pedagogic content and context outlined in chapter 1.

(3) This weakening is due to the attack of a consciousness predicated increasingly on the 'new learning' and faced with the institutional necessity of adjusting traditional modes of teaching to meet the implications of the 1944 Education Act. The examination system, the main institutional legitimator and traditional grammar, the main transmission legitimator of those traditional modes have been particularly singled out for criticism. It is significant that the Schools Council made two of its early objectives changes in the
examination system (leading to CSE/CEE) and the development of a 'linguistics-based' model.

(4) The 'cultural-heritage' model appears to have held its own and without compromising its own rationale has helped to point up the necessity of seeking a new type of 'community relationship' originally morally and aesthetically oriented. (The political orientation, however, is implicit in "The Use of English's" stress on the moral power of the word). This would appear to imply that a portion of the creation of the attitudes conducive to the articulation of that consciousness are derived from Leavis. This may help to begin to explain an apparent inconsistency in a very powerful socialisation pattern in English teaching wherein some English teachers professionalised in the Richards/Leavis 'School' appear to have been in the van of a more egalitarian movement (e.g. Douglas Barnes, Anthony Adams, Esmor Jones, Anthony Burgess). This perhaps helps us to see that when the elitist aspect is pared away (and it is often a Leavisite rather than a Leavisian encrustation) we are left with Leavis' major emphasis that what was needed was an increase of consciousness in order to live more satisfactorily. Thus implicit in this was the notion of a reduction in social cleavage being achieved through literature. However this is the point of departure for further articulation of the new consciousness along the lines of cultural relevance for the working-class child.
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B. Other References


A Introduction

If one examines the reasons for the dialogue between British and North American teachers of English one sees how those aspects of English teaching which were so concerning "The Use of English" editorial were contributing to the need for such a dialogue. In the NATE office files at Huddersfield there is a document prepared by James R. Squire\(^1\) from which it is possible to abstract a number of reasons for that need coming to a head as it did in the mid-1960's. Six points may be made:

1. The Schools Council's new examination proposals needed to be tested against American experience.

2. Both countries were beginning to be affected by the problem of disadvantaged children (in a sense this had been reflected in "The Use of English's" concern for fruitful explorations of the secondary modern syllabus.)

3. The fact that the USA had had more success with older students whilst the UK had had more success with younger children pointed to the need for exchange.

4. In the USA University departments had been persuaded to help in defining curricular objectives and methodology whilst in the UK,

---

1. In 1966 James R. Squire prepared a grant-seeking document entitled 'Proposal for an International Seminar on Teaching and Learning of English' which also anticipated the questions to be discussed at the Dartmouth Seminar in Summer 1966.
at least since the foundation of the Schools Council school-teachers' initiation had been enlisted. It seemed that in this dimension both countries could benefit from the other's experience.

(5) Perhaps because of these different orientations the USA had concentrated on producing materials and structures into which to fit them whilst the UK had concentrated on the needs of the child. Thus, again it was felt that the two systems had much to offer each other on a complementary basis. Because of this:

(6) Perhaps both set of teachers felt acutely that fundamental questions about "the nature of English as a school subject, its principles, limits and proper orderings" had not begun to be answered (p.6). That is there was no rationale, no basic philosophy. We shall see later on how making this notion urgently explicit through the transatlantic dialogue led to the attempted formulation of a rationale.

Thus in November 1965 the first collective exchange of information and opinion between British and North American teachers of English took place at Boston, Massachusetts. In many ways this was of profound significance for the process by which British teachers were to come to focus on the fundamental issues of rationale and curriculum content. Up to that time there had been no real dialogue between teachers from the respective countries - only intermittent individual exchange. However there is evidence to suggest a growing interest in the American experience in the 1950's. For example about a dozen articles had appeared in "The Use of English" on the teaching of English in the USA - although about half of these were concerned with the universities - a significant factor as later collective exchange was to reveal. Moreover
the introduction to "A Common Purpose" (edited by James R. Squire and published in 1966 as the Report on the Boston Conference) suggests that for several years contacts and professional relationships had signalled such a conference as the one at Boston. It is also clear that the formation of NATE in 1963 located a visible body of English teachers with an audible national voice. After affiliation with their American equivalent, the NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English), it was only a matter of time before the two associations came together.²

As it was the first major meeting was, not unnaturally, more heavily representative of North American (particularly U.S.) participants, so that out of a total of 43 Conference members only 9 came from Britain. Despite Squire's point above (number 3 on page 321 above) only 4 members of the total conference were practising school teachers of English (2 in the British party).³ This factor suggests a weakness in the notion of communal visibility - especially in this country where practising teachers in First and Middle schools are generally underrepresented in

2. There was always a danger of course that teachers on both sides of the Atlantic, convinced of the comprehensiveness and viability of their own particular pedagogy (and the dangers are implicit in points 3, 4 and 5) would take up entrenched positions.

3. The British party consisted of Denys Thompson (Editor of "The Use of English" and Vice-chairman of NATE); Frank Whitehead (Senior Lecturer, Institute of Education, Chairman of NATE and on the editorial board of "The Use of English"); G.C. Allen (Staff Inspector for English at the D.E.S. and instrumental in the founding of NATE); R. Hoggart (Director of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham University); Esmor Jones (Secretary of NATE and Head of an English Department in a Secondary Modern school); Sybil Marshall (Lecturer in Primary Education, Institute of Education); W.T. Sponge (Assistant Secretary of NATE and Head of an English Department in a Secondary Modern School); Professor R. Quirk (Professor of English Language, University College, London); A. Wilkinson (Lecturer in Education, Institute of Education).
the professional subject associations. In the U.S.A. NCTE provides a structure for the different groups to be represented; however as George Allen has recently pointed out (see 'English Past, Present and Future' in "New Movements in the Study and Teaching of English", edited by Nicholas Bagnall, Temple Smith, 1973, pp. 30–47) the influences for change had traditionally emerged at the top and worked downwards.

James R. Squire's "A Common Purpose" seems to be much concerned with contributors exchanging information about respective practice and seeking areas of agreement which, as Applebee has suggested (Bagnall, op.cit. pp. 51–62) perhaps obscured the real differences in practice and outlook which existed between the two countries. In all, under various headings, 28 papers read at the Conference together with a summary of 8 discussions are reproduced in Squire's book. It seems relevant to comment on a few of the papers.

1. 'Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in Britain' – Denys Thompson

Denys Thompson seems to point to the contradiction which illustrates another aspect of the liberal-humanist paradox – namely that all teaching (but especially English in its 'central' role) creates a tension between humanistic and occupational aims. (This goes right back to Sampson's notion of educating against one's occupation and points up how the liberal-humanist paradox informs the necessary implications of the growth rationale.) Obviously this evaluative stance reflects the well-known "Use of English" position that sees English as the major protagonist in the battle of words. Again this relates to the crystallising 'growth' rationale implicit in "The Use of English" and signalled in the notion of growing in resistance to "the invasion of personality that are features of our mass civilisation" (p.8).
(2) 'The Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in the USA': Albert Marckwardt (Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton University)

It is worth mentioning Marckwardt's paper because it gives a different perspective to Thompson's paper. Marckwardt believes that the end of education is to improve individual communication "in order to preserve our social heritage" (p.13). He points up principles of social cooperation through language.

(3) 'Literature Teaching in English Schools': George Allen

In a way George Allen's paper synthesises the views expressed in Thompson's and Marckwardt's papers, although he represents a central tenet of the mid-1960's consciousness when he says that culture is best transmitted through the language of literature, especially of great literature. As we shall see in the next chapter and in chapter 13 the crucial question now for many teachers is 'whose culture are we transmitting?'

(4) 'Teaching Oral and Written English in Non-Selective Secondary Schools - W.S. Sponge

Sponge's article is important because it gives a perspective on how the new examination sponsored by the Schools Council (CSE) is actually institutionalising notions of personal involvement and cooperation. This is of considerable significance in the articulation of the new consciousness about the necessity of weaker framing,

(a) in order to cope with the institutional requirements of the new examination structure and

(b) because of this as a necessary pedagogical basis for the emergence of any superordinating rationale.
Spouge’s quotation from NATE’s 1964 survey illustrate this well:

(i) The best texts will be those where the discussion is relaxed and friendly.

(ii) Informal prepared talks followed by question and discussion give a pupil authority and status.

(iii) Conversation between pupil and teacher is welcome as much for its encouragement of friendly relationships as for its effectiveness as a natural test of spoken English.

(5) ‘The Scope of English Studies in British Universities’ : R. Hoggart

Hoggart’s contribution puts Denys Thompson’s views into sharper focus. He points out the dangers of looking at literature from the personal, critical, professional and scholarly perspectives in piecemeal fashion. He advocates making the connection between literature’s communicative uniqueness and its qualitative engagement with experience. In a sense, perhaps, he is suggesting that any partial view of literature can only be insufficient because its lines for connection will have reduced options - akin to the insulation of subject matter into ‘states of knowledge’. The concept of connection implies making inroads into consciousness which makes for change both in the theory and practice of teaching. Again this sort of thinking is part of the deep structure of the ‘growth’ rationale.

It must be pointed out that in no way were these views representative of all shades of opinion within English teaching. The Cambridge English school was strongly represented and the language element was not referred to by the British contingent.
B The Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth, 1966

In the Summer of 1966 a much larger British contingent took part in a month-long seminar with 28 US and 1 Canadian representatives. The British party consisted of 20 participants and 2 consultants (Basil Bernstein and Sybil Marshall; there were in all 21 consultants—psychologists, philosophers, administrators, sociologists, secondary school teachers.)

Of the British contingent 15 were from university or college of education, 2 from schools, 1 from the DES and David Holbrook and Denys Thompson; of the American contingent of 29, 20 were university professors, none were practising schoolteachers. This in itself is a measure of the domination of English in the schools by the universities.

The British Contingent

1. David Abercorombie, Head of Phonetics Department, Edinburgh University.
3. George Cameron Allen, Professor of Education, University of Sussex, formerly Staff Inspector in English at the Ministry of Education. Read Classics and English at Oxford. Instrumental in foundation of NATE.
5. James Nimmo Britton, Reader in Education and Head of the English Department, University of London Institute of Education. Later
Professor of Education at Goldsmith's College, University of London, Chairman of NATE 1970 - 1972, joint author of "Language, the Learner and the School" and "Language and Learning" (1970). Read English at London.

6. John Dixon, Senior Lecturer in English, Bretton Hall College of Education, Author of 'Growth Through English'. Read English at Oxford. Prominent member of NATE.


8. Denis W. Harding, Professor of Psychology, University of London. Major contributor to "Scrutiny", influenced James Britton's theoretical position in "Language and Learning" (Participant and Spectator) Read English at Cambridge.

9. Barbara Hardy, Professor of English Language and Literature and Head of the Department, Royal Holloway College, University of London.

10. David Holbrook, author, major architect of 'creative writing revolution' of the early 1960's, editorial board of "The Use of English". Read English at Cambridge.

11. Esmor A. R. Jones, Honorary Secretary of NATE and Head of English Department, Ashmead School, Reading. Read English at Cambridge.

12. Evan Glyn Lewis, HM Staff Inspector, Department of Education and Science, later Senior Research Fellow, Swansea University.


15. Mrs Connie Rosen, Lecturer in Education, Goldsmith College, University of London. Prominent member of LATE.
16. Harold Rosen, Lecturer in Education and the Teaching of English, University of London Institute of Education. Prominent member of LATE. Joint author of "Language, the Learner and the School".
17. John M. Sinclair, Professor of Modern English Language, University of Birmingham.
18. Mrs Barbara M.H. Strang, Professor of English Language and General Linguistics, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

1) Characteristics of the British Contingent

Although the British contingent included linguists, thus reflecting the impact of the significance of aspects of the new learning on the new consciousness, chief interest for our purposes centres on locating a coherent 'community' within the group. From the above data the following characteristics and factors emerge:

(1) There is a meshing of consciousness about English teaching generated by a common core of professionalisation and later professional commitment e.g. 8 members of the group had come under the influence of P.R. Leavis at Cambridge. All of those 8 were intimately associated
with either NATE and/or "The Use of English" in an executive and therefore a policy-influencing capacity.

(2) An articulation of later consciousness can be traced to this 'community' acting as individual members or jointly e.g. the publication of "Language and Learning" and the highly influential "Language, the Learner and the School". Within this group also is the generating force of a language policy across the curriculum.

(3) The centrality of literature model is well represented as well as its existentialist articulation. Historically the connection between the generative and regenerative qualities of literature which we have seen argued in "The Use of English" is here represented in a 'community' which strongly believed in creative personal and social revelation as crucial to the educative process. In other words the 'growth' rationale has strong communal visibility as far as this powerful and influential contingent is concerned.

(4) Suggesting that this group is powerful and influential seems to connect status, authority and power within the profession with a creative minority who operate outside the classroom for the most part. It is interesting to note that whilst most of the group (i.e. the group socialised through literature) clearly taught in school (a few as head of department) it is only since they left school teaching that they have been able to bring pressure to bear to promote the institutionalisation of the new consciousness. This observation would seem to modify Squire's point on page 321 above (point 4).

The Dartmouth Conference was thought of as a crisis meeting. Indeed Squire's 'Proposal' had suggested that there were five major areas of concern which should be discussed. These were:
(1) What is English? 
This would be the search for a rationale which it was now clear the new consciousness had come to see as urgently needed in order to cope with a complex range of phenomena. In his outlines Squire signals the 'growth' rationale when he says "through English we communicate with and understand other people, come to terms with the world around us" (op.cit. 1966 (b) p.14). In other words the rationale will have to be abstracted from a combination of linguistic, psychological and sociological factors humanised by literature - the very point of view we have seen becoming increasingly explicit as we studied the contents of "The Use of English". Once again 'ways of knowing' are being pointed up.

(2) What is Continuity?
The rationale, it appears, must have order without a constraining and thus excluding structure. Part of the crisis in the new consciousness was that it increasingly had felt unable "to identify the principles which ought to provide English teaching with an ordered and sequential framework" (p.15). Squire points to other subjects like Mathematics for instance, having an inner logic. The seminar should try to seek English's 'inner logic' (Perhaps the subsequent work of J. Moffett and his effect on the work of the Writing Research Unit at the London Institute of Education is a significant result of the dialogue beginning to heighten consciousness.)

(3) One Road or Many?
Notions of the pacing of knowledge, maturation and differential teaching styles underly this particular aspect. Squire was concerned that children of different abilities were taught by appropriate methods. It also throws up the whole question of pluralism which is obviously implicit in the concept of Models of English teaching.
(4) Knowledge and Proficiency in English

This aspect relates to the teaching of competencies ('states of knowledge') a component which had never quite been reconciled by practice especially as one moved away from the centre of the new consciousness (non-specialist 'community' consciousness is relevant here.)

(5) Standards and Attitudes

This is closely related to (4) and the notion of correctness being replaced by appropriateness. Perhaps unwittingly Squire puts his finger on another reason for the persistence of the notion "rendered untenable by half a century of research" when he says that it is "satisfying to some teachers because of its pedagogical simplicity". Although many British teachers would disagree with Squire that "the concept of standard must emerge" they would agree that "the teacher needs an understanding of the strength and nature of dialect variation he encounters in the children in his classes" (p.20).

The seminar itself consisted of a month in which major papers were delivered and the contingents broke up into study groups and working parties. Plenary sessions explored 'community' similarities and differences. Two studies were commissioned - one by John Dixon, "Growth Through English", was intended for professional consumption and will be dealt with later in chapter 12; the other "The Uses of English" by Herbert Muller intended for the general public will be analysed here as part of the process of delineation and as a more seminar-centred and revealing publication than Dixon's book.

The Uses of English - Herbert Muller

It appears from Muller's opening remarks (under the title 'What is English?') that members of the seminar did not expect or even hope to come
to complete agreement. Indeed Muller isolates a fundamental dichotomy in consciousness – the claims of a language-based approach against a literature-based approach. Because of this split in consciousness caused by the 'English explosion' (as outlined by the 'Bridgehead' review chapter) Muller reiterates Squire's call for a search for a philosophy.

The different experiences of American and British teachers of English articulates the fundamental problem which we have seen as the regulator of change and inertia in English teaching – namely the opposition between authoritarian and progressive ideologies. Perhaps what was sought at Dartmouth was not the impossible compromise between pedagogies articulated by these two ideologies but a synthesis which would, as Squire had intimated, respect the inner logic of the two positions and make a developmental connection between them. Because it had been 'revealed', this inner logic would act as an automatic regulator on consciousness. The differential rate of evolution of the two teaching systems complicated the issue. On the one hand, but under different cultural conditions, the Americans had preceded the British through the experience of child-centred education and had found much of it unsatisfactory. They had found that the inherent democratisation of education which that process necessitates had put societally-determined standards of excellence at risk. These views were being partly replicated in England where increasingly (and the process was accelerated in the late 1960's with the Black Paper controversy) the old dominant consciousness was being resurrected in order to inject some stringency into the production of speech and writing. However in England it was not so much that 'excellence' was being denied but rather that it could no longer be defined in terms of the pedagogy of the traditional consciousness, especially in the
technique of working in language which had helped to define that consciousness. Thus perhaps the seminar rejected the notion of 'What is English?' and replaced it with 'What should an English teacher do?' (This change itself underwent further modification after Dartmouth).

In other words the notion of a static, passive body of knowledge (the idea of reproduction) was being challenged by the notion of a volatile active process of helping children to perceive connections between phenomena, themselves and other people (the idea of production). The first may be accommodated by linear and sequenced revelation (the old models' predetermined means to a predetermined end); the second may be accommodated only by a network revelation which has profound significance for the pacing and transmission of 'ways of knowing'.

The dilemma was given sharper focus when the direction of discussion seemed to centre on reconciling the demands of society and the needs of the child. American policies had clearly attempted through well-publicised and supported national projects to find a compromise solution where the needs of the child are fulfilled on society's terms. On the other hand the British policies had tended increasingly within the new consciousness to foster the needs of the child against the demands of society. However the demonstrable variations in practice and the relative heterogeneity of the total educational consciousness (professional and lay) suggested that despite the restrictive nature of the associated pedagogy many people were uneasy about preparing children against the expectations of society.

The main advocacy which emerges from Muller's book is that English teachers have an obligation to reduce social cleavage. Having recognised the cultural and pedagogical confrontations both within the respective societies and between the two sets of representatives, Muller
begins his argument for this principle from a traditionally American 
egalitarian point of view, "The English teacher could .. help to over-
come division between kinds of human beings". (p.27). However for Muller
human beings come in different kinds and that any rationale for the
teaching of English should recognise those differences, not only in
uniqueness but in endowment. This notion of egalitarianism and its
democratic institutionalisation in schools caused G. Summerfield to
rephrase one of the seminar's 'shaping' questions, 'One way or many?'
to 'one way and many'. In a sense this represents movement from the
notion of confrontation which has been increasingly explicit in our
educational system especially with more and more attention being paid
to the 'disadvantaged'. This movement was reflected in "The Use of
English" which began with a conflict model and although not surrendering
its belief in the centrality of literature and the need to train critical,
consumer-resisting awareness (i.e. against indiscriminate consumption of
'the word') moved to a cooperative model as its editorial board recog-
nised the need for this as a means of making secondary modern teaching
viable. This was then a consensus of concern arising from a heightening
of consciousness among English teachers about the necessity for and the
nature of their commitment. Now this sense of concern and commitment —
which had triggered the Dartmouth seminar — can also contain a loyalty
to more formal modes of teaching, the conviction being that the teacher
is committed to the future communicative efficiency according to the
expectations of society and thus its system of status allocation and
rewards.

4. The new consciousness has in one segment rejected this system of
extrinsic rewards and is seeking either to radicalise the educational
system in order to achieve a more equitable distribution of extrinsic
rewards or de-politicise it in order to achieve intrinsic rewards for
those not motivated or 'hothouse grown' to strive for extrinsic
rewards. This development will be dealt with in Chapter 13.
This particular aspect is also implicit in the remarks of Glyn Lewis who in a liberal-humanist context pointed out that society has its claims on the child - its nature and needs must be considered. "It properly seeks to inculcate its values, secure his loyalty and promote national unity to which the study of language and literature can contribute much". (p.34). Glyn Lewis also advocated that the child needed society's cultural heritage yet he sought "to maintain a principle of balance in the personal development of youngsters between their varying needs as individuals and their common needs as members of a society" (p.35).

However Muller himself gave the aspect of national unity a lower priority because the national articulation of democracy leads to a sort of consumer tyranny or the politics of conformity and mediocrity. Thus the more traditional notion of literature as a means of promoting national unity is put below the notion that "it is more clearly helpful in the development of personality and the respect for quality." (p.35).

In his chapter on the development of the child Muller relates to Squire's original question 'What is Continuity?' He suggests that the major dichotomy between American and British thinking is that the Americans believe that the principle of order lies in the subject matter or objective principles of knowledge, whilst the British believe that the principle of order is to be found in the psychological development of the child.

Both groups of delegates agreed that a principle of continuity existed. This is important because it means that two 'communities' of English teachers agreed on the existence of an organising principle. What this pointed up was that the principle needed to fuse knowing and feeling along the natural growth lines of the child. Muller makes two important references:
(1) to Alfred Whitehead's "The Rhythm of Education" (Muller, op.cit. p.45) Here Whitehead suggested three main stages of growth:
(a) of romance or first apprehension - the subject matter is novel.
(b) of precision - secondary education.
(c) of generalisation - marking entrance into manhood.

The growth in complexity of discourse accompanies these stages, which represent a movement towards the handling of abstractions. However the notion of accumulation rather than hierarchy must be emphasised so that linear sequences of teaching do not make false distinctions between the significances of elements in the process of revelation. In this way a 'states of knowledge' objective will be resisted and the equality of different ways of knowing (equal that is along the continuum of growth) promoted. The network spread is clearly implicit.

(2) Muller's second reference (on p.46) is to J. Moffett's "Towards a Model of Continuity". Muller rejects Moffett's model building because he believes that whilst it may be applicable to social science it is not going to help to map the ever-increasing complexity of discourse which natural development presupposes. However it must be pointed out that as a means of making complex phenomena more visible whilst accepting its lack of absolute discreteness, model making itself can be a useful mapping device. Moffett's work will be discussed later.

On page 49 Muller gives us a clear picture of the communal visibility of the new consciousness as he saw it.

The British Consciousness (translated into the concepts of this thesis.)

(i) In some ways a combative consciousness - 'states of knowledge' about language and literature rejected. In other words principles,
'knowledge' and forms not admitted.

(ii) Thus notions of 'instruction' were rejected in favour of 'guidance'.

(iii) An emphasis on the incidental mode of teaching language. "Explicit teaching about language should have a low priority" (p.70).

The American Consciousness wanted more teaching of subject matter and thus an understanding of form and principles - although the Seminar agreed unanimously that there should never be a uniform syllabus or fixed programme.

As far as the problem of 'good English' was concerned the Seminar displayed mixed feelings about the subject of linguistics. Certainly the linguists' final report's remark that teachers do not have enough understanding of language was to set in motion increased activity in exploring ways in which language relates to learning and how the researches of linguists may best be adapted for classroom use. The seminar was acutely aware that in the absence of such revelations being thoroughly absorbed by the total teaching community the dichotomy within consciousness and its disabling influence on the effectiveness of a 'progressive consensus' within the new consciousness would persist. Thus the older, once dominant consciousness persisted with normative notions about language, whilst the newer consciousness sought to institutionalise descriptive notions.

Muller referred to Miriam Wilt's statement: "The child has vocabulary; he has experiences; he has grammar; and he has his culture." (Muller, op.cit., p.62). The traditional model, it seems, could contend for consciousness with the first three factors, but a new model and thus a new consciousness started from the fourth - and it was the impossibility of avoiding the implications of the child's culture which was just beginning to impinge on the more perceptive elements of the new consciousness and
which has precipitated the 'political' controversy in the last few years. Muller's reference to the British contingent's thinking that standard English amounted to a bourgeois standard puts the British position into sharper focus. Clearly Muller's position is less uncompromising and more expedient. He believes in the notion of reducing social cleavage and the child internalising society's needs as his own - reflecting the need for Americans to promote the ideal of social unity to preserve democracy - which is a strong American socio-political tradition.

"Democratic idealism itself calls for the teaching of it to all children as an essential means to sharing in the heritage of their society and the opportunities for realising their potentialities, bettering themselves both intellectually and socially" (p.63).

In his chapter on the uses of literature Muller quotes Denys Thompson's humanistic view on language tinged with the notion of English as a substitute for religion (the transcendental view again.) There was thus an expected consensus that children needed the experience of literature. Indeed Britton expressed the view that literature is experience. A quotation from Frank Whitehead's "The Disappearing Dais" was included to point up the consensus. "All children whatever their ultimate role in life is to be, need experience of literature .... if their personalities are to expand and flower into a capacity for fulness of living". (Muller, op.cit. p.79). However the literature study group specifically questioned the Leavis view that "our cultural heritage required the teaching of certain writers" (p.79). The British tended to see literature as a medium for perspectives on the child's expanding perception of the world. In this way it would allow parallel experience; it could be therapeutic and challenging; it could act as an instrument for personal evolution or change. Some sort of compromise solution seems to have
been reached whereby for adolescents for whom at least it was thought "reading materials should always be chosen for their literary values, rather than their possible bearing on psychological problems" (p.81). However on page 84 Muller notes the duality of the study group - on the one hand reading must be meaningful to children but on the other must also heighten consciousness. Muller himself opts for the 'cultural-heritage' approach, "Given the wide range and rich variety of our literary tradition, I would stress both the possibility and the need of selecting some great works of the past that students can find meaningful and enjoyable". (p.84). He refers to a statement made by the literature study group which concluded "without contact with his literary heritage, can an American really be an American, or an Englishman an Englishman?" (p.89). However the study group dropped the suggestion that a literary education had to include certain writers. Glyn Lewis repeated his views believing that we are what we are because of a cultural heritage. If one ignores literature as a record of man's accumulative experience one cannot claim that it provides an education in values (passim p.89).

As far as speech is concerned perhaps the basic difference between the US and the UK is the difference between formal and informal involvement. In the USA there is a concentration on debate, public speaking and speech programmes, whilst in the UK instead of concentration on communication skills there is more concern for the role of speech (i.e. as 'talk') in the personal and social development of children.

As a corollary to this Muller points up the ethical obligation to speak and write responsibly. Thus he thinks English teachers should aim to eradicate abuses of language. Here, of course, he aligned himself with Thompson and Holbrook. This is the moral position which as we have seen was a strong feature of the new consciousness. Muller also
obviously represents the American consciousness in his desire to develop the historical perspective especially, as we have intimated, as a means of internalising the obligations and relations of the individual and a democratic society. This is very similar to the organic perspective of Leavis and Thompson which perhaps explains the defence of a cultural-heritage position (in the US democratic sense rather than a British elitist sense). At any rate both perspectives identified a common enemy in the threat to the individual from the pressures to conformity in mass education. This perhaps also helps to explain why the Americans proposed rhetoric as the centre of transmission if a "philosophy" of English teaching was to emerge (p.106) for it is in rhetoric that the importance of thinking would be brought to bear on the individual consciousness giving it a critical perspective in order to resist the limitations and abuses of the manipulative uses of language. Perhaps an aspect of the new consciousness in England is to deny historical reality, except perhaps in an ideologically determinist sense, and perhaps because of this Muller is covertly critical of some of the British contingent for stripping a work of literature of all its extra-literary significance in the false belief that literature as an artefact has no relevance to the reality of its temporal shaping. It is almost as if one can abstract the aesthetic and the stylistic as pure universals, untouched by time and created by men who were not of their time.

Frank Whitehead's remarks on literature are significant because they point to an internal dichotomy in English teaching in England:

(1) There are those people who would agree with him that a thematic organisation of literature as a means of man revealing more of himself to his fellow men "leads our attention away from the unique work of literature" (Muller, op.cit., p.85).
(2) There are those who would vindicate literature precisely because it acts as a means of individual and social revelation pointing up an engagement with the quintessence of literature. The first is the 'form and meaning', the stylistic, the aesthetic, the 'pure' approach to literature; the second shifts the centre of engagement away from the quintessence of literature making literature a component in an act of revelation in which its essentially aesthetic and literary value is made irrelevant.

There were many differences of opinion expressed at Dartmouth, but perhaps the most significant for our purposes was the different conceptions of social relevance revealed. Muller believes that there was agreement that children need to be developed as human beings and that this process means making skills subordinate to human values. However Muller thinks that the British could be charged with slighting the legitimate claims of society and refers to John Dewey's notion that individuality can only be fully developed in and through community. Perhaps, however, Muller has misinterpreted the British contingents' view of society. It is not society as a community which is slighted but society as a technocracy. Muller's final point comes back to the problematic nature of contemporary English teaching, thus showing that he has realised that one cannot close one's consciousness against the implications of the challenge of "economics and efficiency" and of "military and commercial interests" (p.176). Thus the book ends with reference to a statement made by Denys Thompson which perfectly polarises the confrontation between liberal-humanism and societal expectations.

"Can they conscientiously prepare their pupils to take the kind of place offered by the society they see? Is it not likely that as people are better fitted to earn a living, the less likely they are to be developed
human beings" (p.186). Muller comments "English as the seminar proposed it be taught would be more liberal and humane than English as it is taught in most schools, but it would also be riskier, possibly unsettling, certainly less likely to turn out students well adjusted to a highly commercialised society devoted to efficiency and affluence" (p.187).

C After Dartmouth - The Squire and Applebee Report

Writing in "New English - New Imperatives", (Ed.Henry B. Maloney, 1971), Albert H. Marckwardt gives a useful delineation of the aftermath of Dartmouth. Perhaps the most significant development from the British point of view, however, was the Squire and Applebee Report (1967/68) and James Moffett's "Teaching the Universe of Discourse" (1968) (I am deliberately ignoring the increased communal activity culminating in the International Conference at York in 1971 which will be mentioned briefly later.)

The Squire and Applebee Report consists of the findings and observations of a party of 10 Americans visiting 42 Secondary Schools in England, Scotland and Wales in 1967. These schools, described as pace-setting institutions and specially selected by a panel of British advisers purported to represent the best British practice. Of the 31 English schools visited, NATE members were strongly in evidence among Heads of Department. A number of these can be said to be influential either through their institutional or published works' status. (e.g.

Anthony Adams, A.W. Rowe, W.S. Spouse, B.A. Phytyian, J. Hunter, Ian Davie, Michael Marland, Alex Mcleod). Those consulted to recommend schools included George Allen, James Britton, Esmor Jones, Denys Thompson, Frank Whitehead, Glyn Lewis, David Holbrook, Harold Rosen, Douglas Barnes and Anthony Adams - all Dartmouth participants; so in a sense the notion of 'community' could very well be extended to include the English Staffs of the 31 chosen schools. Their practice although probably not representative of overall British consciousness describes the generative force of the new consciousness.

The early chapters point up the American belief that British society has become more broad-based and democratic since 1940 and that a philosophy of reform is attempting to come to terms with the implications of those changes. Thus in terms of English they are able to observe a shift in emphasis from structure ('is') to values ('for'), from critical reproduction to creative production, "it emphasises values more than subject matter, values like imagination, sensibility, engagement, humanism" or again "involvement in the creative act seems to be the primary goal ... there is little of the American concern that the student know a lot about the material he works with or that he be able to respond in technically correct ways. Feeling and doing, not knowing, are the critical concerns" (p.55).

Squire and Applebee's remarks obviously relate to the beginning of a politicised element within English teaching when they note that (especially among some leaders and younger inner-city teachers) "British teachers are concerned with the social consequences of education: hence the attempt to make schools less selective and more democratic" (p.57).

Although Squire and Applebee are clearly impressed by the quality of teachers and Heads of Department in the selected schools they also point
out what in their opinion are the weaknesses of English programmes. They place "lack of sequence and organisation in English curriculum" at the top of their list (See Table 3, op.cit., p.64). In their opinion this leads to discontinuity and amongst non-specialist teachers a heavy reliance on what we have called transmission/reproduction techniques in this thesis. Such teachers often "relied completely on text books, or slavishly followed the form of the school syllabus" (p.65). They blame "scheduling" (i.e. rigid timetabling) for this "so that the flow of instruction from class to class is broken and erratic" (p.67). This again has been instrumental in articulating the new consciousness to support integrated and 'language across the curriculum' policies.

Squire and Applebee also point to another type of discontinuity between the work of junior and senior forms. The "free wheeling of practices observed in the lower forms" is replaced by "the restraining influences of exams in the upper forms". (p.41)

Having completed their initial and general survey, on page 84 Squire and Applebee present a Rating of Schools on Selected Characteristics. 16 selected characteristics are isolated: Methods; Materials (Variety); Discussion (Student Response and Teacher Leadership); Literature (Emphasis on Ideas in Text); Library (Accessible and well stocked); Intellectual Climate; Composition (frequent and varied); Program (Coordination of Language, Literature, Composition, Appropriate Sequence and Proportion); Reading (Effective Program); Supervising (Effective Department Chairman); Administration (Support of Program and New Ideas); Teachers (Quality); Curriculum (Program for Terminals, Reflects Changing conditions). The following inferences may be drawn from the Rating:
(i) More teacher leadership in discussion than pupil response. It is noticeable that the American observers thought this to be 'excellent' although the exact nature of the quality is not indicated.

(ii) More emphasis on ideas in the text than American teachers gave.

(iii) More varied composition than American teachers provided.

(iv) More sensitive awareness of the relationship between the curriculum and social change than observed among American teachers.

(v) Heads of Department were generally effective and teachers of a high quality.

(vi) Successful intra-subject integration.

(vii) In the schools visited, the English departments were well supported by the school administration.

On the other hand the observers noted

(i) a mediocre 'intellectual climate' by comparison with American classrooms. Indeed the observers went further than this in the study noting an "absence of concern with the cognitive" ... "few would maintain that many of the programs stretched the intellectual powers of the pupils" (p.115).

(ii) that American teachers used more varied methods of teaching and that students responded better in discussion (Both of these factors Squire and Applebee suggest are partially a reflection of stress on the skills of thinking in better American classrooms).

Andrew Wilkinson, writing in "English in Education" (Vol.3, No.3, Autumn 1969, pp.122-128) on the Squire and Applebee Report has this important point to make: "In the stress on the culture of the feelings the intellect is being neglected... 'to learn to live ...' is fair enough, but if we are to define it further it surely must be done in terms of
heart and head. The present stress on sensibility is of course quite understandable - arising for instance from a reaction to the arid mental exercises of the past, or (more significantly) from the search for common experiences and approaches in teaching (unstreaming etc.) in a democratic climate ... we need to think as well as feel. The exercise of reason in human affairs is not so evident that we can cheerfully neglect means of developing it" (p.124). This reflection, at least, suggests that the implications of Squire and Applebee's Report for the articulation of the new consciousness may suggest that a notion of synthesis is part of English's inner logic.

Squire and Applebee provide a most illuminating analysis of the Heads of Department of the schools visited. This may be summarised as follows:

(i) 30 out of 31 read English at a university, Cambridge being the most frequently mentioned. Thus some indication of the penetration of Leavis' influence into the schools is well illustrated by this survey. The Report also notices that many of the Heads of Department completed their professional training at the London Institute of Education. Squire and Applebee make a later reference to the pedagogical effects of this 'communal orientation' which is worth quoting in full: "The forces that most influence the selection of literary works in today's British schools emanate from the criticism of P.R. Leavis, whose deep concern with literature, education and society transformed a whole generation of Cambridge graduates into ardent educational reformers." (p.130).

(ii) The Heads of Department have an average age of between 30 and 35.

(iii) 60% have First or Second Class Honours Degrees.

(iv) Slightly more than half have contributed articles to professional
journals; several have edited literature books or contributed to a language and composition series; a number have written reviews of professional books; two have published their own poetry; one is a novelist; four have edited texts of familiar literary works; a number have contributed critical articles.

(v) Departmental meetings are democratic and informal and clearly important for the generation of local 'communal' consciousness rather than routine administrative matters. This is perhaps the most significant point to emerge in assessing the grass roots location and dissemination of consciousness. This seems to be particularly applicable in comprehensive schools where non-graduate generalists from colleges of education are likely to be especially affected by the outlook and convictions of a Head of Department.

It is in the chapter reviewing the teaching of literature that perhaps not unexpectedly the 'growth' rationale predicated on developmental theory is revealed. The 'philosophy' of the schools visited appears to be existentialist; one notices from the evidence presented that the historical sense is played down. (This had been signalled at Dartmouth.) This aspect of the new consciousness is a deliberate attempt to make redundant through cultural production the reliance on cultural reproduction and its historical relativity. "The aim of English study is to learn to live without fear", said one gifted teacher .. To 'live and feel' through literature means to respond to the ideas and emotions elicited at the moment, not to prepare for future goals. Literature is not studied as a form of art or as a document in human history, it is for the here and now, an exploration of the human condition, a way of strengthening awareness and sensitivity" (p.116) .... British teachers ... largely ignore historical and cultural associations
and aggressively disavow the importance of transmitting a cultural heritage. (p.118).

Thus Squire and Applebee suggest that as British teachers of English are more concerned with the development of personal sensitivity to experience than with the teaching of any outside subject matter they are strongly influenced by Susanne Langer, Piaget and Vygotsky. As this process is perpetually open-ended, much of the classroom practice that they saw impressed on the American observers that British teachers of English are not particularly interested in closure or summary "to build toward a concept or generalisation with which young people can tie together the various ramifications of discussion ...Lacking this conviction of the importance of process, some American observers saw such talk as 'little more than directed play' " (p.135). In this sense the search for 'ways of knowing' is a perpetual celebration of means.

In the chapter on the teaching of writing Squire and Applebee stress the British concern for ensuring that all writing fits in with and contributes to the important pattern of the growing sensitivity of the individual. They were struck by the lack of a body of skills to be taught, by the absence of a core of rhetorical principles and that the subject "composition" became the process of the experience of writing. All of this fits into what rather loosely has been called the 'creative-writing' model which has suffered from some reaction in recent years. Thus we should be careful not to suggest that the teachers in the 31 English schools are necessarily representative of all aspects of the new consciousness. A cursory glance at the history of the teaching of writing will reveal that there is always an atavistic element within consciousness in respect of the teaching of competencies - not so much that the inner logic of clarity and effectiveness is evaded, but rather that
there is an ambivalent attitude to "discrete lessons focused on isolated sets of skills" (p.159). Indeed one might argue because of its internal volatility and external permeability the new consciousness has a high potential for reaction; not so the older consciousness which as we have seen was able to retain its dominance because of the stability and impermeability of its supportive systems - curricular and socio-political.

However Squire and Applebee take care to demonstrate that formal conventions are not neglected in the best of schools, merely introduced differently and dependent upon the pupil's creative response - the 'incidental' model again. However this incidental, or indirect method of teaching language competencies contrasts with the more direct American method. In British practice the context of situation sustains learning with 'teaching' contributing to the process as an enablement device. The teacher does not interfere in the act of production, but he contributes to the means of production. Thus the American observers saw a pedagogy predicated on weak framing. In terms of contrasting with the pedagogical style of the old consciousness, the practice in the selected schools is representative of the new consciousness in its 'pure' form as it existed a few years ago.

That there have been changes in consciousness since 1967 is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that Squire and Applebee saw that linguistics was still regarded as "a foreign discipline". The 'incidental' model of grammar referred to traditional or conventional grammar and it was this type of grammar which informed the mechanics of the language to be used. This point of view would almost certainly be reflected by a majority of English teachers at the time precisely because it had a compelling logic of the sort of balanced pedagogy fashioned by liberal-humanism. However by 1967 it is unlikely that even a majority of English teachers would
have completely rejected course books in favour of 'source books'.
Perhaps indirectly Squire and Applebee seem to blame the essentially unsequential and thematic nature of these books for the lack of a long range view of language among British teachers of English. Indeed one of the accompanying observers accused English teachers in this country of knowing "precious little about learning theory and language learning" (p.221).

In the chapter on oral language Squire and Applebee suggest that the Newsom Report was in some way instrumental in opening up consciousness about the need to provide varied oral activities. The two quotations they use from the Newsom Report (1963) indicate that it is the twin objectives of personal development and social competence which had impressed them as articulating the practice they had observed. Reference is also made to James Britton's remarks about classroom discussion which are an attempt to justify what perhaps had been seen to be lacking a clear educational purpose. "It is in such discussions that children exchange experiences and in doing so with the incentive of sharing them they interpret and give shape to those experiences and help each other to shape them ... A great deal of our low level thinking coming out into words in discussion is cleared away and the essential central points are verified" (J.N. Britton "Speech in the School" in NATE Bulletin II, Summer 1965). This is important because the development of Britton's

6. A most useful survey of Secondary English Course/Source Books (1960-1970) undertaken by a group of teachers in South West England was published in 1971 under the auspices of the University of Exeter Institute of Education. A major conclusion of this survey is that although the older structured course books were still being published, the 'source' books were gaining ground in publishers' lists. The survey also indicates how the different types of book not only help to locate but also institutionalise consciousness. The check list of points of disapproval drawn up by the group is an excellent description of the transmission/reproduction model predicated on a 'states of knowledge' pedagogy whilst the check list of points of approval suggests a link between 'way of knowing' and the 'growth' rationale.
ideas (see "Language and Learning" (1970) has given English teachers an operational model based on a synthesis of aspects of the new learning which takes into account the need to go to the language produced in order to find out underlying principles. However it is only within the articulation of the new consciousness that a pedagogy has evolved allowing such language to be produced by equating it with the notion of 'learning to live'.

Squire and Applebee on the whole were much impressed with the quality of the English teaching they saw. However they point to a considerable amount of chaos and muddle in English classrooms, especially among those non-specialists to be found on the staffs of modern and comprehensive schools. It is interesting to reflect that in its initial drive towards full institutionalisation English teaching was most zealous about the need for specialists and or enthusiasts (an English Association point of view it will be remembered). However this was for the selective schools where, according to Squire and Applebee, conditions of recruitment remain the same. Perhaps it would be true to say that the driving force in the institutionalisation of the new consciousness (in schools like the 31 visited) has been the highly competent specialist 'inner group' so far described whose creative and intellectual grasp is sufficient to meet the complex and conflicting demands of the new pedagogy. (John Dixon has remarked that in order to flourish the New English requires very able teachers). On the other hand non-specialists in literature or language would find it doubly difficult to grasp and implement programmes in language/literature without sensing an overall structure or seeing continuity.7 This has profound implications for the organisation of

departmental consciousness as well as for the institutional power of published materials.

A most pertinent comment contained in the Squire and Applebee Report relates to the youthfulness of the English teaching profession. Whilst few teachers seen were more than 40 years old, most were in their late twenties which means that the majority were not teaching before 1955. As Squire and Applebee correctly point out, and as this study also attempted to show in Chapter 8, the majority of changes making for the contemporary milieu occurred after 1955 - especially in the contexts of psychology, sociology and democratisation (e.g. the growth of the Comprehensive school and the work of the Schools Council). The Report also notes a real desire for in-service education and the way in which organisations like LATE and NATE have been developed to provide a forum for heightening of consciousness. This in itself is of great significance to the delineation of communal visibility. Indeed Squire and Applebee report that 41% of the teachers in the selected schools were members of NATE (This of course would be well above the national average of about 4% if one takes a total English teaching force of about 100,000 and samples at random). Another highly significant statistic is that 65% of the teachers responding subscribed to "The Use of English" whilst another 40% took the NATE Bulletin (later "English in Education"). All of this gives a 'community focus' to the new consciousness.

In the Summary and Final Observations chapter, Squire and Applebee suggest eight hypotheses in which to restate some of the major observations. These are as follows:
Hypothesis 1 "A de-emphasis on teaching formal "subject matter" or "content" in English classes in the UK as compared with practice in American schools" (i.e. a concern for means not ends) (p.320).

Hypothesis 2 "A greater concern in Britain with student response to literature and a corresponding lessening of concern with the planned study of great works and great authors" (p.322) (i.e. a concern for personal production in a contemporary context).

Hypothesis 3 "A greater emphasis in the UK on the creative uses of language" (p.323) (This permeates the whole teaching programmes of the selected schools, has implications for reclassifying content and framing - i.e. points up the 'negotiations' model to be described in the next chapter.)

Hypothesis 4 "A greater stress in the UK on the teaching of expository writing in all content areas rather than in the English classroom alone" (p.324) (The beginning of a moving out from the traditional areas of the English curriculum; boundaries have been lowered and a new version of the 'centrality' conviction is informing a 'language policy across the curriculum'.)

Hypothesis 5 "Comparatively little attention in Britain to formal instruction in rhetoric and in the English language (including grammatical analysis)" (p.325) (Although this may be true of the creative minority here represented in the selected schools, other evidence from the Report concerning the use of course books, especially by non-specialists, suggests that the traditional transmission/
reproduction model is more prevalent either in direct or indirect form than the new consciousness would admit.

**Hypothesis 6**

"Greater emphasis in British schools on the teaching of speech and oral English" (p. 326) (a major feature of the new consciousness, very much related to a growing conviction derived from linguistics that speech contexts are limitless and thus not amenable to prescriptive control.)

**Hypothesis 7**

"Less communication in Britain than in the USA between high school teachers and scholars in university and college departments of English, with corresponding differences in pre-service and continuing education of teachers of English" (p. 327) (With the development of NATE this would seem to be less true.) However it is important to note that a career pattern noted earlier by Squire and Applebee has caused many classroom teachers with a deep personal commitment to social reform to find their way into higher education where they have more institutional status, power and particularly opportunity to devise and implement institutional strategies in the schools. Thus the patterns of professionalisation of these pace setting individuals is crucial. We have already isolated a major power nexus within NATE, "The Use of English", The Cambridge English School (F.R. Leavis and I.A. Richards) and the London Institute of Education.

**Hypothesis 8**

"Greater reliance in Britain on the use of external examinations to control the quality of offerings; correspondingly less emphasis on prescribed courses of study and textbook adoptions for this purpose" (p. 328). This relates to the
discontinuity in school experience of English for children seeking external qualifications and suggests a limitation of the real institutional power of the new consciousness in as much as English courses for public examination show considerable changes in transmission (in other words there is a shift back to stronger classification and framing).

In their conclusions Squire and Applebee believe that there must be a reasonable balance "between process and content, between thinking and feeling" (p.332). It is apparent that many British teachers of English embrace feeling at the expense of knowing as a kind of reaction against the older dominant consciousness. Thus the new consciousness has a potential for rejection and so in some ways is a zealot consciousness especially as its drive for institutional recognition is often powered by a radical ideology. However the dynamic diametric process of fierce rejection and strong advocacy may subvert the synthesising power of liberal-humanism which could in the end be the new consciousness's major articulating strength.

D The Work of James Moffett

Herbert Muller (op.cit. 1968, p.109-110) reports on a paper delivered by James Moffett at the Dartmouth Conference. Entitled "Towards a Model of Continuity" the paper is the first stage of perhaps the only serious attempt so far to synthesise the essentially strongly classified pedagogy of American teaching of English with the weaker classification and framing patterns of British practice. Later Moffett wrote "Teaching the Universe of Discourse" (1968) in which he suggested that what English as a school subject had always lacked was some ultimate context
or sub-structure (p.3). Moffett's synthesis consists in recognising that English is a symbol system by which we think and talk about other things; thus it is not about itself but "we cannot free data from the symbols into which they have been abstracted, the message from the code" (p.8). Having indicated that English is "all discourse in our native language" (i.e., everything thought, spoken or written) Moffett suggests structuring the English curriculum according to the relation of speaker, listener and subject. The student would move from one kind of discourse to the next in a sequence which permitted him to learn encoding and decoding procedures (i.e., the American concern for style, logic, semantics, rhetoric, literary form meshed with the act of creating language as a means of individuation and revelation). As Moffett puts it, "the structure of the subject must be meshed with the structure of the student" (p.12). His is a model of structural development along the natural growth lines of the subject (these are assumed) which articulates with the natural growth lines of the child (these are psychologically demonstrable).

Moffett acknowledges that the growth of speech in children is very sketchily mapped. However he proposes stages of growth in the structuring of discourse along growth lines apparently answering the inner logic of his original premise that "growth is toward internal complexity and external relationship" (p.29). This would fit in with the 'growth' rationale crystallising within the new British consciousness as well as imposing the rigour of ordering which is central to the consciousness of American pedagogy. Thus basing his thesis on Piaget's subsuming concept that a dimension of growth is decreasing egocentrism, Moffett posits that "the primary dimension of growth seems to be a movement from the center of the self outward" (p.59). In this way he can propose a linear structure
which moves from description to abstraction. The notion of audience appears to be a regulator and clearly a clue to the development of thought and speech in children — moving from intrapersonal communication, through close or distant interpersonal communication among familiar groups to impersonal communication. Thus one can plot the different discourses locked into this process — from the personal and reflective, through conversation and correspondence to publication.

On page 211 Moffett says that his purpose is to bring the teaching of discourse more into line with the goals attached to thinking, speaking, listening and writing. He sees these as basic to all uses of language and suggests that aside from art, music and P.E. there is really only one 'subject' and that is discourse itself. This fits in with the notion of language across the curriculum which, as we have intimated, has been a recent articulation within the new consciousness and which has had communal visibility under the auspices of LATE. For Moffett the organising principle of any notion of integration would be based on the central process of human symbolisation. His final comments, with the notion of sequence and structure implicit, would very much fit in with the new British consciousness. "The most important things children of today will need to know when they are adults are how experience is abstracted, communicated and utilised, whether the data are occurring phenomena of nature and society or private truths of the heart." (p. 212)

It is perhaps difficult to estimate how far Moffett's scheme is a redistribution of the old transmission triad. The significance of the new consciousness in this respect is that it is a redistribution of the importance we attach to notions about the authority of the subject (traditionally nearly always the created and transmittable word), the
speaker (traditionally nearly always the teacher) and the listener 
(traditionally nearly always the pupil). Perhaps Moffett's implicit 
notion of audience suggests an awareness that when there is a shift in 
'authority' from the teacher to the situation (of a recreating pupil) 
the natural growth lines of discourse will reveal themselves. However 
Moffett is sometimes a little confusing in that he never makes it 
absolutely clear that the "practising of skills" on "actual raw 
materials and audiences" should or should not be attempted in increas-
ingly complex contexts. Perhaps part of the new consciousness in 
English teaching is to view with a certain suspicion the notion of a 
'communication maturation' taking place in a sequenced and orderly 
fashion. Because of this uncertainty there is then some danger in 
attempting to write about the English curriculum making tacit assumptions 
about layers or stages of revelation and competence; which is why we 
need to treat L.E.W. Smith's "Towards a New English Curriculum" (1972) 
with some care. Indeed that publication would be rejected by those 
elements of the new consciousness who wished to see the emphasis shifted 
to the child as developing in a community.8 Probably of more ultimate 
significance will be the use that the Writing Research Project at the 
London Institute of Education has made of the implications for analysis 
of types of discourse.

J. Squire's address to the International Conference at York, 1971

Perhaps the latest and certainly the most authoritative contribution 
to the significance of the heightening of consciousness set in motion at

---

8. Moffett himself makes implicit rather than explicit points on this 
issue. He refers to G.H. Mead's article on 'Self' in "On Social 
Psychology: Selected Papers" ed. Anselm Strauss, Univ.Chicago 
Dartmouth was J. Squire's keynote address at the International Conference on Teaching and Learning English held at the University of York in July 1971 [See "English in Education", Vol.6, No.1, Spring 1972] Entitled "Freedom and Constraint – the Scylla and Charybdis of Language Learning" Squire's reported paper suggests a clear consensus on 'big' ideas did emerge from Dartmouth. These may be summarised as follows:

1) A concern for responsiveness, expressiveness and involvement in learning.

2) Belief that the experience of literature is of deep and lasting value, not a knowledge of heritage measured by title, genre or history.

3) Recognition that oral language actively used forms the foundation for curriculum building.

4) A commitment to heterogeneous grouping and social interchange as a necessity for sound programmes in language learning.

5) A recognition of the importance of linguistic and language training for teachers.

6) A concern with the danger that external testing would establish normative benchmarks that standardise learning and inhibit true individualisation.

However Squire suggests that since 1967 there has been the development of a species of counter-consciousness which is retrospective and reactionary and characterised by elements recognisable as belonging biologically to the articulation of the older dominant consciousness previously described. Perhaps this is an indication of 'backlash' or over-compensation at work upon the liberal-humanist consciousness. Squire asserts that "the Black papers .. offer a further challenge to the new freedom ... A lack of attention to disciplined studies – indeed to disciplined minds of any kind – seems to be one concern of these critics". Squire also reminds
us of the Black paper argument over falling standards brought about by comprehensive education, the importance of the great tradition, the decay in the quality of teachers and teaching. (p.10). He suggests that it is the classic dialectic between freedom and anarchy. For Squire freedom and restraint are the Scylla and Charybdis of the current educational dialogue. The forces of freedom we would identify as the dynamic driving impetus of the new consciousness (the 'growth' rationale is postulated); the forces of constraint we would identify with a counter-consciousness committed to quality control, the cultural heritage and basic competencies. The concept of the school as a place where "socially acceptable learnings" take place. The perpetual transmission of a recreating culture is axiomatic. This societal conception of 'growth' demands to be institutionalised; for English teachers this represents the dilemma of reconciling a dualism. Squire's thoughts towards a solution are offered as five principles. The first represents an integrated and individually activist view of growth wherein a taxonomic perspective is rejected. It is clearly activated by a 'negotiations' model. Thus we might argue that any new programme in English must acknowledge that man is a negotiator by instinct - introspectively, with his peers, with institutions and with processes. This has profound implications for the framing and thus the pacing of the 'transmission function'. Thus ideally the school is a time-demanding and time-creating institution for the child.

Squire's second principle links learning by being with learning by becoming - a basic notion of James Britton wherein children reconstruct experience through language. However the articulating pedagogy must create a relatively permissive atmosphere for such learning to take place. Squire's advocacy of autonomy rather than absolute freedom perhaps suggests a liberal-humanist check on radical excess and the reproof to reactionaries.
In addition to the first two principles, the other three also suggest that Squire's views point towards synthesis - indeed the liberal consciousness (which he clearly displays) is committed to a faith in the natural power of synthesis. As we shall see in the next section it is the only area where solution is thought possible or permissible given the continuation of the school as a democratic institution rather than a repressive or anarchic institution. Whereas the liberal-humanist consciousness admits the possibility of indirect teaching (in the sense of creating facilities for learning with the children and for the children) and thus by implication the desirability of some direct teaching, its very institutionalisation and control over the socialisation and professionalisation of English teachers militates against moving regressively into "disciplined" pedagogy or 'progressively' into de-schooling. In other words if we examine Squire's fourth and fifth principles (4. "Ways of satisfying the individual needs of learners require continued experimentation with alternate patterns and approaches" and 5. "An educational system must both reflect and influence the society which it serves, and in a rapidly changing society education must be prepared for radical changes") we may see again that individual rates of learning are given high priority. However the school must be left responsible for devising ways of accommodating the curricular pacing and sensitivities of individual teachers. The liberal-humanist consciousness celebrates its own quintessence by acknowledging that "The school as an institution exists not only to 'acculturate' the individual and pass along the accumulated experiences of the human race, a position clearly supportive of the forces of restraint and not easily disavowed. The school also exists to provide interaction between students and teachers from many social and economic classes and the surrounding environment. Such interaction is central
to the educative process and from such interaction both students, schools and the environment will change" (p.16). Thus the school is seen as an agency which institutionalises the potential for change by admitting the inner logic of innovation within a reconstituted triad. It is noticeable that the new triad is dependent upon the permeability of the school and thus the teaching act to the outside world.

To sum up: The dialogue between American and British teachers of English is still effectively less than 10 years old. However as far as the new consciousness in this country is concerned it has not only helped to locate the professional and institutional driving force of that consciousness but also more than any other communal activity helped to sharpen the focus on the real nature and curricular implications of English studies in schools. A new and authoritative collective voice has been heard and a process has been set in motion of providing dimension and direction which has vastly contributed to the heightening of consciousness of the English teaching communities in both countries.

9. It will have been noticed that the transatlantic dialogue did not appear to raise the issue of the dialect of negroes or other ethnic minorities in the United States. Indeed in the evidence available there is little or no reference to deprived groups in American society as a characteristic of the dialogue. However there are signs that since 1971 the work of Labor has begun to impinge upon the consciousness of British teachers of English - especially those concerned with teaching in urban schools. A useful introductory article to the whole notion of the child's basic competence in language production in terms of work undertaken on both sides of the Atlantic is 'Saying it without sentences: the role of grammatical abbreviation in the speech of young children' by Maureen M. Shields in "English in Education", Vol.6, No.3, Winter 1972, pp.82-96.
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CHAPTER 11
THE MODELS OF ENGLISH.

Introduction.

Although we should bear in mind Muller's strictures on model-making being applied to English studies, this particular classificatory construct has been chosen in order to make visible the characteristic elements of the new consciousness, suggesting theoretically where 'communities' might be located within a pedagogical framework. As Bernstein's Classification and Framing construct allows permutations to be made between curriculum content and teaching style it is proposed to adapt and extend this in order to sum up the institutional, transmission and ideological implications of the models as well as identifying and making predictions about cohering and durable parts of the new consciousness.

Thus the strength of constructing models appears to be that they allow areas of cohering pedagogy to be made visible, although it is accepted that each model in itself is neither discrete nor possesses the final articulating power of the new consciousness. But within these areas of cohering pedagogy a rationale may be located; thus constructing models helps sharpen the focus on the areas of emergence of a super-ordinating rationale.

It is proposed to demonstrate the models by pointing up their characteristic elements with reference to the influence of one or two key texts or persons in each case.

As we have seen certain elements of the older dominant consciousness in operational existence before 1945 have persisted. Predicated on a transmission/reproduction model (i.e. the teaching of explicit skills
through comprehension and vocabulary exercises and the sequences of prescriptive grammar) the older consciousness has prevailed both pedagogically and, through literary-critical strategies, ideologically. Thus these elements have shown durability and even adaptability during the onset of the new consciousness - perhaps more particularly in selective schools. Evidence of adaptability may be shown by reference to the 'cultural-heritage' model¹ where two positions may now be identified - described briefly as a compromising and an uncompromising position. The compromising position has evolved as the generative force of the ideology of that creative minority of Leavis-inspired teachers identified in previous chapters. It shows adaptability in terms of making literature the central area of engagement and aligning it with the moral, critical, aesthetic and social development of the child whilst eschewing the claims of the 'canon' view of literature. This position has a high potential for democratic institutionalisation (i.e. into all types of school).

On the other hand the uncompromising position suggests that the 'canon' must be preserved and it is the duty of academically excellent schools to act as conservationist institutions for all those capable of benefiting from their modus operandi. This view has a low potential for democratic institutionalisation and, more significantly, a greater chance of being thought to be the repository of high status knowledge among certain legitimating groups in society (e.g. the universities).

¹. Because it is felt that the 'cultural-heritage' model has been sufficiently delineated in the thesis, an analytical observation only is made here.
A. The Models of the New Consciousness

1) The 'Personal-Expression' Model (usually referred to as 'creative-writing')

The 'personal-expression' model has always been central to the imaginative articulation of the English psyche - and as such its moral and spiritual qualities tend to promote an ideological stance amongst those whose socialisation and professionalisation has been one of increasing conviction about an engagement with life through the arts. Historically the 'personal-expression' model is itself an excellent example of how there has been seen to be an increasing need to cope with the impact of technology and its threat to organic modes of life, freedom and moral integrity. In this sense it may be related pedagogically at the level of personal revelation to accepting the centrality of literature as originally posted by Leavis and later given a wider institutional relevance by Thompson, "The Use of English" and of course most effectively by David Holbrook. Thus given the mechanistic nature of much of the pedagogy of the earlier part of the century it is not surprising that the 'personal-expression' model should be the first indication of a counter-consciousness. However as we have seen a combination of new sociological and psychological theories together with institutional changes in the schools have not only redefined the institutional map but also affected concepts of English teaching. Thus the 'personal-expression' model now challenges for a dominant place itself within the new consciousness.

Shayer (op.cit., p.148) reminds us that "it is no coincidence that Holbrook's introductory remarks to "English for Maturity" on the secondary modern school are almost identical to George Sampson's remarks in "English
for the English" on the elementary schools. Holbrook is really initiating the second major battle in the same war; the junior schools have been won, now the campaign must be carried into the newly-created secondary sector where the bulk of the nation's eleven-to fifteen-year-olds are desperately in need of assistance" ... "Like Sampson, Holbrook is convinced that the failure up to now to find a new education at the 11-plus level fitted to the needs of society to understand what a civilised, humane (and imaginatively creative) life should be." (p.149)

Setting aside for a moment the urgent institutional need for the 'personal-expression' model, that the model has historical continuity both retrospectively and prospectively is well illustrated by Marjorie Hourd in her seminal book "Education of the Poetic Spirit" (1949). Retrospectively we are able to see the development of a line of consciousness starting with Wordsworth and later Arnold both of whom might be said to have helped articulate the essential morality of a poetic engagement with life in and through poetry (the creative and the creative-critical act); continuing in Susan Isaacs who showed the tremendous potential for creativity of young children to Marjorie Hourd herself who gives a powerful theoretical shaping and rationale thus increasing the institutionalising potential of the 'personal-expression' model. Her book may be said to be important for the emergence of the 'growth' rationale in two respects:

(1) It embraces notions of continued personal integration and growth or reintegration through an applied form of psychotherapy (i.e. the notion of coming to terms with personal problems, relationships or the effects of environment.)

(2) Having established the individuality of the child Marjorie Hourd believed that the child should then move out into group work.
Her avowed aim, building on the work of Susan Isaacs, and anticipating Holbrook was to liberate the artist in the child (This is clearly the theory behind the classroom practice observed in the 'pacesetting' schools of Squire and Applebee's survey).

The psychotherapeutic element is particularly emphasised in Marjorie Hourd's view that "Drama has a double psychological function. It acts on a release of phantasy and also as a means of grasping reality". (op.cit.p.63). The whole emphasis on the improvised drama of the past 10 years is signalled by "the aim is not to produce a perfect play so much as to give these adolescents scope for a wider interpretation of their own personalities within the media." (p.64). Unlike some of the later practical applications of this theory Marjorie Hourd makes it quite clear that despite the notions of liberating the creative element within children, "structure is not to be thrown away." (p.140)

The prospective nature of Marjorie Hourd's articulation of the 'personal—expression' model is most practically and profoundly illustrated in the impact made by David Holbrook on English studies. It is perhaps sufficient in this context to say that Holbrook's "English for Maturity" (1961, revised edition, 1967) and "English for the Rejected" (1964) represent respectively a theoretical position and an exemplar for practice. 2 In these books Holbrook seemed to be applying the notions of developmental psychology (i.e. the child has indigenous growth lines

---

2. The 'personal-expression' model has been articulated and initially institutionalised through two types of text (1) the 'prototype' and (2) 'the reproduction of the model'. Examples of the first include "Free Writing" by Dora Pym (1956); "The Use of Imagination" by William Walsh (1959); "The Excitement of Writing", by Alec Clegg (1964). Examples of the second include "Iron, Honey, Gold" edited by David Holbrook (1961); "Creative Writing for Juniors" by Barry Maybury (1967) and "An Approach to Creative Writing in the Primary School" by S.M. Lane and M. Kemp (1967).
which enable cultural production in artistic terms). They were particularly significant for those teachers in the early 1960's who were struggling to cope with the increasingly visible (and damaging) conflict between school and out-of-school culture for the majority of children. Indeed that period might very well be described as the nadir of English teaching in the Secondary Modern school which seemed to have institution-alised the labelling of the majority of the country's children as inferior. However "English for Maturity" seemed to have dramatically redefined the opportunity and the uniqueness of teaching English in such schools (This helps to explain why this particular model had such operational significance in the increased comprehensivation of schools after 1960). It appeared that in this book and in the later inspirational account of his own practice that Holbrook had devised teaching strategies which enabled his pupils (the disadvantaged, the underachieving, the apparently rejected) to achieve some sort of personal cohesiveness in the face of a disabling and stultifying social environment. Many teachers saw in detail a way to help children to come to terms with the colour and the chaos, the drama and the uniqueness, the life and the death of their own living with themselves as uniquely able to act as a facilitating and sympathetic 'audience'. (Although this model has not penetrated selective schools with anything like the same force it has become visible throughout the English teaching profession ).

Thus 10 years ago Holbrook's psychotherapeutic model seemed to satisfy the liberal-humanist conscience of many English teachers still suffering from latent cultural shock. Indeed it made explicit the

organic approach to learning always implicit in the liberal-humanist consciousness and perhaps this is the unique feature which gives it pedagogical visibility as a model of English teaching. In a sense, also, Holbrook's version of the model may be said to be a new version of transcendentalism. What the cultural-heritage had done morally and spiritually through literature for the more academically able and socially privileged child, Holbrook hoped his model (which used literature to celebrate feeling), would do for the disadvantaged. In this sense the 'personal-expression' model is very close to the philosophical position of those teachers advocating the centrality of literature. Indeed Holbrook's link with this group and their tacit approval of his position has been demonstrated in the chapter on "The Use of English". However because the model was originally intended for non-academic children it is essentially a non-intellectual model (Squire and Applebee's encounter with the centre of the 'personal-expression' model suggests something more firmly anti-intellectual - which because of a more sociologically-oriented appreciation of the school's normalising of cultural differences is an indication of the socio-political articulation of the model over the past 10 years.)

In an article in the "New Left Review" entitled 'Education: Programmes and Men' (1965) Quinton Hoare is critical of Holbrook's ideas. Having praised the generative as well as regenerative powers of Holbrook's model, Hoare says that the whole Romantic tradition of individual self-realisation "has failed to transcend its opposite escapist character and has failed to do more than salvage a minority from being broken by the system. "The ever-present danger for this whole school of thought is that it can so easily be absorbed and used as a palliative where the system breaks down, thus becoming complicit with the very
education it purports to challenge." (p.48) However perhaps in the early 1960's Holbrook and the teachers who followed him were more concerned with healing than challenging the education system.

Perhaps the major weakness of Holbrook's model and example (apart from the fact that not all English teachers are charismatic) is that it was not located in any theory of language. Certainly, in Moffett's terms, it acknowledged the 'psychologic of the child' but in no way did it suggest any appreciation of the logic of language. It is surely not logical to ignore the nature of discourse when attempting to facilitate writing. As James Britton has so cogently and so functionally demonstrated transactional language (which does not really exist as an objective within the personal expression model) is just as viable and normal a means of formulating consciousness (perhaps more so socially) as expressive or poetic uses of language.\footnote{Britton provides an operational description of language into which various types of discourse (and the whole process of transactional, expressive and poetic is seen as a continuum) may be fitted and regrouped according to the nature and function of the language operation of the individual or group. Moreover because Holbrook's model was not located within a visible and explicit theory of language it led to the sort of ad hoc excitements so favoured by those authors of texts for schools seeking to promote writing response through variegated and exciting stimulus. Here the model has not only been over-produced in publications but has in effect taken on a prescriptive characteristic, institutionalising and locking in a pedagogy which reduces the options on language experience and exploration.}

4. As it is not my purpose here to elaborate on Britton's model - merely to show basic contrasts, see his "Language and Learning" (Penguin, 1970).
for children. Thus as precedence has been given to 'creative writing' in many English classrooms other kinds of writing have been grouped together and crudely labelled 'impersonal'. These kinds of writing (as the London Institute of Education Writing Research Unit's project is demonstrating) clearly represent limited and stereotyped personal and social situations wherein the major purpose it seems is to show familiarity with explicit competencies. Such an artificial and functionally incorrect dichotomy leads to a highly insulated, perpetually institutionalised and unnaturally segmented pedagogy. So it might be said that because the 'creative-writing' model deliberately neglected explicit competencies as inhibiting and relegated them to other and 'less important' kinds of writing, its adherents neglected to develop a theory of language. In recent years, however, there has been something of a reaction to free expression precisely because it did not eventually seem to point to a coherent language theory (and it is in this context that because for perhaps a majority of English teachers the old transmission/reproduction model has been discredited in its traditional form these teachers are now looking to the articulation of linguistics to provide a new language theory in which all kinds of discourse might be located.)

Three sociological observations need to be made: first, as an attempt to liberate the artistic process within children making their experience the core of the curriculum, the model represents the weakest Classification and Framing positions (see Figure 1). Second, although cultural claims are made explicit within the model (i.e. the viability of the child's personal production in terms of his own biography and uniqueness) and the pedagogy is culturally radical, the wider sociopolitical aspects remain implicit. However the inner logic of personal
growth (which concept incorporates the model) points to a naturally following social context for that growth to be articulated (Marjorie Hord had recognised this natural corollary). Thus in this sense the 'personal-expression' model seems to have the potential for developing a sociological and even a sociotherapeutic correlation. However it must be remembered that Holbrook himself would deny purely sociological objectives as therapeutic because he believes them to substitute a mechanical realism which offends human spirituality.5

Finally, in his contribution to "Knowledge and Control" (Edited M.F.D. Young, 1972) G. Esland suggests that English teachers have rejected social Darwinism by attempting to legitimate psychotherapeutically derived knowledge i.e. it is a working-class knowledge, a knowledge of low status where knowledge of self is given precedence over knowledge of things. Thus perhaps the model represents a classical articulation of 'ways of knowing' against 'states of knowledge'.

2) The 'Sociological' Model

As has been suggested and illustrated more than once in this thesis an exploration and evaluation of personal experience brings the child into contact with how other people shape and contribute to that experience (i.e. the 'personal-expression' model often means helping children to come to terms with other people). More specifically the nature of the relationship with other people involves examining social grouping e.g. the family, peer groups, the community; it also involves an appraisal of concepts like authority, deviance, social control and associated social

5. David Holbrook made this point in private correspondence with the author (1973) (See also "English in Australia, Now": 1973).
problems (e.g. violence, sex, old age, welfare) which are accessible within the social consciousness of children. Thus as the social component is basic to a common consciousness, reference to it in the classroom means that the cultural materials are familiar and therefore likely to meet with approval. In other words they act as a legitimation for reclassifying the English curriculum in terms of cultural relevance for the majority of children.  

Basically, then, it might be argued that the model arises because there has been a heightening of consciousness amongst teachers generally about working-class lifestyle and language. (the sociological and socio linguistic impact of the 'new learning'). This has led to recognition of the urgent institutional need of accepting the legitimacy of accepting a working-class cultural perspective. This in turn has led to some sort of reaction to what is seen as an alien and reproductive middle-class culture (the so-called 'high culture') so that many teachers have sought to replace it with notions of (1) making the working class child's personal milieu and biography relevant and (2) making relevant the social milieu and thus the group experience of the working-class child. Thus there has been an attempt to institutionalise the individual and social aesthetic of the working-class.

In this respect the model points up Bantock's observation that social relevance is going to produce the most powerful incentive for children. This notion of relevance is crucial to an understanding of the model and

6. It is for this reason that the notion of 'low culture' was first thought of. However such a term, besides being derogatory, is irrelevant to the Classification/Framing Model.

7. See "Education in an Industrial Society" by G.H. Bantock (1963).
usually the centre of any controversy about its viability. However those teachers who subscribe to this model believe that much of the older pedagogy and the particular 'states of knowledge' it had attempted to inculcate were irrelevant. Thus, as Squire and Applebee pointed out such teachers discarded non-contemporary literature. Indeed there had been within this model a shift in the whole mechanism of selectivity—hence the 'invasion' of the English classroom by other media than literature. As Leslie Straita observes in an unpublished paper "English: A sociological Approach?" English teachers have recognised that important statements about the human condition are being made through a variety of media" (p.2). Despite some English teachers' misgivings, however, part of the irrelevance of the 'cultural-heritage' model for children in non-selective schools has been countered in as much as this model has the potential at least of focusing on what great literature, particularly from the 20th Century, has to say that is relevant to the human and social conditions of our time rather than automatically accept that it is profound and humanising. In this sense, then, it might be argued that the model has given the notion of the relevance of literature a useful perspective.

8. See "Teaching Fiction in Schools" by Sydney Bolt and Roger Gard (1970) and "Literature as Exploration" by Louise Rosenblatt (1970) for a discussion of different perspectives on the problem. English teachers are divided about choosing literature for its immediate or more universal relevance. Shayer points up what is probably a majority view among English teachers "There is a very real danger .. of concocting a 'relevance' fallacy at the expense of real literature work. The trouble with the 'modern' and the 'relevant' is that it dates so quickly .. what children surely need to day more than anything else (their society being what it is) is a sense of permanence and continuity, of the valuable which remains valuable whatever the vicissitudes of popular taste or journalistic fashion" (op.cit. 173/174).
We have seen how important textbooks are to the institutionalisation of English teaching (i.e. the effects of repeatedly printed or duplicated course books on consciousness-maintenance has been indicated). Key texts were indicated as articulating the 'personal-expression' model; similarly we may discern prototype publications in the articulation of the 'sociological' model. The best known, of course, is "Reflections" (1963) by Simon Clements, John Dixon and Leslie Stratta. Stratta reports (in the unpublished paper mentioned above) that "Reflections" came about because the English Department at Walworth School felt that their pupils had not really had the opportunity in school "to consider coolly and systematically important human issues, and that they were leaving ill-equipped to face aspects of the life they would meet in the adult world" (p.6). The book was divided into themes which focused on topics such as family relationships, the community, the mass media, social problems and deviance. Now although the authors' objectives were as much socio-political as social in it one finds the first stage in the lowering of boundaries between school knowledge (i.e. literary texts and teacher-controlled questioning) and out-of-school knowledge. As has been suggested above this points up a demystifying of 'knowledge' in order to facilitate a pedagogy suitable for the mass of people.

In as much as the 'personal-expression' model operated therapeutically the 'sociological' model appears to have a sociotherapeutic function. Thus the two models make a composite pedagogy.

The sociotherapeutic function can be said to have three dimensions:

9. The objective dimension of the model is being signalled - what Holbrook would term social realism.
1) A dimension which grows out of the psychotherapeutic function and which preserves its primacy, although in a group setting. Thus although operating technically within the 'sociological' model some English teachers feel that personal experience is primary and that the sociotherapeutic function is for the benefit of individuals as members of groups, the groupings merely being the best way of administering the 'therapy'. (i.e. sharing personal problems).10

2) A dimension which seeks to establish group cohesion. In a sense this is a healing function (administering moral egalitarianism) either at the level of rationalisation about limitations or exultation about uniqueness. Much of the new pedagogy of the working class (which the classification of the wider range of materials coming into the English classroom in recent years would indicate) operates initially in this dimension.

3) A dimension which seeks to establish group solidarity. This dimension is logically implicit in the previous dimension in as much as it points up the implications of presenting creative writing and social studies as a working-class pedagogy (the 'sociological' model of English teaching has an obvious overlap with Social Studies). Following the logic carefully it seems that those implications are that the achievement of group solidarity suggests a post-therapeutic articulation of the model. In this respect the socio-political aspect of teaching within this model becomes explicit. It is an ideological dimension both morally and politically in as much as it signals the teacher's commitment to the battle for consciousness

10. In "Language and Learning" (1970) James Britton reminds us that it is through gossip that things need to be said to other people in order for some personal evaluation and therefore possible solutions to be arrived at.
against political manipulation (especially those authoritarian forces of social control, perhaps first encountered in the school and its legitimating structures.)

Any assessment of the 'sociological' model must take into account the problems attaching to it. First, one of the dangers feared by many English teachers committed to the 'growth' rationale is that personal experience will be sacrificed in the interests of an objective treatment of materials - i.e. using all texts merely as social documents, thus stressing reportage and factual prose at the expense of imaginative literature. In other words critics of the model believe that subjective elements need to be injected into the model in order for social empathy to play its vital part in the formulation of group consciousness. Thus the literary and expressive production of a common culture must be allowed to operate - some argue centrally - within the model. This would seem to be the position argued by Michael Marland in his contributions to "New Movements in the Study and Teaching of English" (pp.139-147) "The 'response' tradition ... looks to passages that involve pupils with themes and experiences that concerns them ... by learning how to respond to what (they) can genuinely, personally and fully take now ... these criteria normally lead to recent, or at least 20th Century writing. It is extremely difficult to develop a personal response if too many words have to be explained, if the general idiom is strange, and if the settings have few points of recognition" (p.141). Thus he suggests studying texts like "Kes" by Barry Hines, "Billy Liar" by Keith Waterhouse, "Steptoe and Son" edited by David Grant and editions of "Z cars".

A second problem attaching to the model is whether it is subversive of English Studies. Whilst its moral and egalitarian purpose is explicit
some English teachers believe that it seeks a compromising alliance with Social Studies. Perhaps they see Social Studies as a diluted form of sociology for schools which they believe to be an objective classificatory activity which does not take into account the uniqueness and individuality of the personal engagement of man with society, especially through literature. In this sense perhaps it is feared that a dominating sociological perspective might attenuate the 'growth' rationale because such a rationale depends on taking evaluative stances.

Although it appears that this model too does not appear historically to be based in any theory of language, it is now becoming clear that the model can accommodate and be accommodated by the linguists' efforts to adapt linguistic perspectives for classroom use. That they are doing so in a social perspective is signalled by M.A.K. Halliday in "Language in a Social Perspective" (Educational Review, Vol.23, June 1971, pp.165-188) where he states "a significant fact about the behaviour of human beings in relation to their social environment is that a large part of it is linguistic behaviour. The study of social man presupposes the study of language and social man" (p.165). In terms of this observation it appears that an articulation of the model could very well be in a socio-linguistic dimension.

The 'Negotiations' Model

As has already been intimated the 'Negotiations' model is the pedagogical activator of the 'personal-expression' model and, particularly, the 'sociological' model. It contains the dynamic relationship between modes of classification and framing. In this respect the 'negotiations' model is essentially a framing model.

In "Growth Through English" (1967) John Dixon recognised that for the
'growth' rationale to be fully articulated discussion methods have to be developed to their full potential "with their emphasis on interplay of ideas, dialectical exchange, shared experience, group learning and understanding" (op.cit. p.112). However it is to the work of Douglas Barnes that we must turn in order to find a coherent statement of the 'Negotiations' model. Such methods as Dixon itemises above would in Barnes' exploration of the invasion of external social reality (with its media, its artefacts and its low status knowledge) lead to a lowering of boundaries between the knowledge of the subject and the knowledge of life (the characteristic of the 'sociological' model). Barnes believes that with the lowering of boundaries children have logically been brought more actively into the making of knowledge "partly celebrating the knowledge they have already by being human beings and also seeing the classroom as a place where their knowledge can be expressed and developed and made more subtle. This has meant making children more active and therefore giving them more power, both over the knowledge that is negotiated in the classroom and over classroom relationships, so that the teacher's responsibility is directed towards the quality of the interaction through which knowledge is negotiated".11

Barnes first gave articulation to what I am here calling a 'Negotiations' model in "Classroom Contexts for Language and Learning" (Educational Review, Vol.23, June 1971, pp.236-244).12 Here he proposes the concepts of teacher Domination and teacher Valuation as containing the dialectic tension of a 'negotiations' model. The teacher's conception of his role in relation to these two concepts determines his personal


12. See also "Language in the Classroom" by D. Barnes (1973) Open University, for a full discussion of the Transmission - Interpretation dimension.
legitimation of what passes as established knowledge. If the teacher dominates classroom interaction, controlling subject matter and all forms of interaction then only the established knowledge (states of knowledge) of their specialism will be allowed as a consciousness-generating force; in this context a low value is put upon pupil participation. On the other hand if the teacher values the pupils' contribution, then changes in the behaviour of pupils need to be anticipated because instead of transmitting a received body of established knowledge the teacher is inviting the pupils to negotiate personal and group ways of producing 'knowledge', their own construct of relevance (i.e. stressing ways of knowing). As Barnes says we need to take into account the pupils' experience as a member of social groups outside school, especially in the home. This makes the link with the 'sociological' model explicit.

Barnes also points out that "involving pupils in new roles and relationships will alter the pupil's perception of the options at his disposal" (Op.cit., 1971, p.237). Again it will be seen how the teacher's pursuit of redefining his own concept of relevance is crucial to the articulation of this model and thus for the formulation of the new consciousness whose operational mode this has become (James Britton's operational model can itself only function within the 'Negotiations' model - i.e. negotiating with personal experience - 'expressive' and 'poetic' or negotiating with experience (personal or social) more objectively - 'transactional').

In the sociotherapeutic dimensions of the 'sociological' model, the 'Negotiations' model operates most typically in validating the perspective the child brings to the classroom. However its importance is that it activates the high potential for social change within the 'sociological' model (i.e. growth towards, revelation and social metamorphosis). It is
perhaps because of its high potential for change that consideration of the model points up the difficulty attaching to any hope of a permanent orthodoxy emerging for English teachers. Indeed in its articulation of communal intercours it seems to relate to a process of permanent social change. In this respect the model has been the means by which a political consciousness has been generated amongst those English teachers committed ideologically to formulating a competing working-class pedagogy. This in turn has serious implications for changes in the social composition and organisation as well as the curricular organisation of the school—particularly patterns of authority in legitimating 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing'.

The 'Linguistics-based' Model

In the criticisms made of the 'personal expression' model it was suggested that the more recent reaction against unlimited 'free writing' by many English teachers was largely because the model tended to ignore teaching the conventions of language. At best it accommodated the 'incidental' approach to teaching publicly-accepted language competencies derived from a traditional prescriptive grammar. Equally there has also been a reaction against the 'sociological' model largely because its attempted institutionalisation, especially through source books, has been seen to present piecemeal rather than theory-based approaches to English teaching. Inspection of these texts reveals that there is very little sense of developmental structure—and although this is no problem for the resourceful and inspirational teacher it induces a feeling of frus-

13. Consideration of this model will be based on a discussion of the implications for the English curriculum of the "Language in Use" materials.
tration, insecurity and possibly alienation amongst the large number of average - and especially non-specialist - teachers.

However, as we have seen, there has also been a resistance to the acceptance of a linguistic perspective. Four reasons may be isolated:

(i) The impact of the 'new learning' in linguistics has been less sharp than the impact of psychology and sociology whose findings appear more obviously relevant to the curricular problems facing English teaching.

(ii) Doughty has reminded us\(^{14}\) that many teachers have met a particular form of the structural analysis of the grammar of English, an analysis which would not be acceptable to contemporary linguists because it does little more than list the surface patterns of the grammar in what is ultimately a not very illuminating fashion.

(iii) The constraints of popular consciousness about language. What the general public 'know' instinctively competency in English to mean, and how therefore they expect these competencies to be taught affects to a certain degree the rate of absorption of the new consciousness about language among English teachers. Thus the consciousness of English teachers may very well be enmeshed in a popular consciousness produced in generations of people by the old transmission/reproduction model and prescriptive notions of 'correct' English. Doughty suggests\(^{15}\) that this consciousness is always one or two generations behind. However he was sensitive to the fact that


\(^{15}\) Ibid, p.60.
although the popular consciousness usually equated the function of language with conveying information this would have to be taken into account in order for a 'linguistics-based' model to find first 'community' legitimation and then institutional legitimation among English teachers.

(iv) English teachers have resisted linguistics because they have seen that the theory of transfer of competencies through the learning of a Latin-based grammar has been discredited. This relates to a suspicion of the structures of linguistics.

John Dixon also reminds us of the suspicion of English teachers that linguistics is a new and superior English grammar; thus, he says "despite different intentions in the past of those producing materials, teachers who have already invested a good deal in the traditional grammar may simply switch to a new body of knowledge without giving a thought to the process whereby such knowledge could ever come to be in use" (op.cit. p.75).

The 'Language in Use' project which was an early Schools Council undertaking may be said to derive its theory from the work of M.A.K. Halliday whose important article "Relevant Models of Language" (Educational Review, Vol.22, No.1, November 1969-1970, pp.26-37) presents 7 models of language all of which are represented operationally i.e. as viable, socially-based contexts suitable for classroom use. Moreover Halliday's point that the child's awareness of language cannot be isolated from his awareness of language function seems the beginning of the crucially important attempt to integrate notions of competence and consciousness within a practical structure which would allow them to act reflexively and as a means of orderly personal and social revelation. Thus this is the first visible attempt to inject a theory of language
into the hitherto uncoordinated practice of making language.

After a series of theory raising publications the "Language in Use" materials were finally produced under the direction of Peter Doughty, together with John Pearce and Geoffrey Thornton. As Doughty reminds us in his 1971 article "one of the major tasks for the team was to develop a coherent view of the nature and function of language. The very title 'Language in Use' reveals the emphasis that was urged" (p.70).

The materials themselves are presented as individual units each providing an outline for a sequence of lessons. Three broad divisions are made (1) the nature and function of language.

(2) its place in the lives of individuals.

(3) its role in making human society possible.

These are subdivided into 10 themes each concerned with one major aspect of language in use.

In a sense what the "Language in Use" materials are attempting is to give an ordered perspective to the 'personal-expression' and 'socio-logical' models. In the 1971 article it is clear that Doughty sees the contemporary use of these models in the same ways as Squire and Applebee observed when he says "another problem arises from the exaggerated attention now paid to the individual lesson or group of lessons at the expense of long-term programmes of work" (p.70).


Thus the 'linguistics-based' model made visible in "Language in Use" seems to offer a flexible but orderly structure in which the two main models described previously can operate. Two features may be distinguished:

(i) a new theory of scientifically-derived descriptions of language to replace the old unscientific prescriptive model and to put over a viable practice for teaching and learning how to operate successfully in all types of discourse.

(ii) a compendium of practical situations which allow for personal and social exploration of meaningful contexts predicated on the concept of appropriateness.

Thus because it appears to offer an organisation rather than a rigid structuring of language activities the model has tried to find a solution for the vulnerability of the teacher working within the 'growth' models and therefore necessarily committed to the opportunism and the insecurity of constantly negotiating his pedagogy. Thus for a number of teachers it holds a promise of a long-term strategy rather than the reality of short-term tactics. Although such teachers are committed to the 'growth' rationale they find teaching to its precepts very difficult.

Although we have seen that resistance to the influence of linguistics on English teaching usually took the form of misgivings about the discipline providing new prescriptions about language, the attack mounted on the "Language in Use" materials (English in Education, Vol.5, No.2 Summer 1971, pp.74-84) by Fred Inglis points up much more deep-seated fears of that segment of the new consciousness committed to the centrality of literature. In characteristic 'radical robust' style Inglis picks on the limited coverage given to experience through literature (20 out of 110 units) in the materials. Thus the notion of literature as one
register among many is attacked. For Inglis the materials suggest that language has become technique and that the goals of planned management (ends rather than means) have somehow incongruously and distortingly been applied to the development of awareness and humanity. "The rectilinear pattern of flow-diagrams does not answer the multifoliate shape of human intentions" (p.77). Inglis is clearly annoyed at Doughty's view that Holbrook's model "ignores the nature and function of technical varieties of English, that is, the working languages of a complex industrial society" (Quoted on p.76).

In a sense because of the particular direction of his criticism and his obvious reference to the concept and jargon of planned management Inglis is perhaps suggesting that "Language in Use" is at fault because it does not appear to take up the critically evaluative stance of the ant-environmentalists' consciousness of the new criticism. Perhaps he is also critical of the materials as the product of the way in which capitalist society has spawned a dependent psychology and sociology in order to make public and therefore amenable the psychical and social complexities of a mechanistic culture constraining organic instincts. For Inglis "Language in Use" represents a perspective which is potentially non-humanising and whose materials give no indication of how language carries values. In this sense he appears to be criticising the model's lack of potential for change, it is not a regenerative model (which the Holbrook model is held to be). Thus its key omission is a moral perspective. Generally then in his moral critique of the model Inglis appears to be saying that a theory of language must take into account the linguistic reality that whatever else language is and does it is also a value-signalling symbolic system. This view has a high potential for extending liberal-humanism into a more visible radical ideology which is precisely Inglis' own
position (see "The Englishness of English Teaching" (1969)).

Inglis also attacks the model on the grounds that he believes that it is emptied of history (it will be remembered that this point has been argued in this thesis as a feature of the new consciousness.) "The uses of literacy are a product of our history, and to ignore the changes in that history is to commit a mortal error. It is to ransack the past for our present purposes. But the omission is consistent. A demoralised language is by definition a-temporal, because time coded the language with its values" (p.81).

Perhaps Inglis' attack shows that one of the fundamental areas of potential conflict within the new consciousness is the rival claims of language-based theory and literature-based theory. For those teachers who assume the latter literature is the most intense message sender, the most significant code carrier of all communication. However its relevance for the mass of children still has to be redefined; for the exponents of literature the experience of this 'word' is unique, is central, and contains the most profound revelations about the human condition. As Raymond O'Malley has remarked, "Poetry exists to change people"18. Thus the literature-based model articulated from the Leavisian position is perpetually dynamic. One might say that Inglis believed Doughty's model to be static precisely because it does not celebrate and provide contexts for the metamorphosis of the individual and society. As far as he is concerned the "disinherited liberalism" of Doughty's model is too weak (and this criticism extends to James Britton's "Language and Learning"). What is needed is a theory of language which

eschews the objective, linear and essentially classificatory urge of
the 'new learning' and which acknowledges a theory of culture which con-
sistently radicalises itself as "living politics" (p.84).

Doughty replied to Inglis' paper in the Spring 1972 issue of "English
in Education" in an article entitled 'Pupils also use language to live:
a defence of a linguistic approach to language study in the classroom',
(pp.18-28). His approach echoes Geoffrey Summerfield's 'one road and
many' plea at the Dartmouth Conference when he points to his own advocacy
of the 'growth' rationale arguing as it were for a sort of loose federal
structure in order to accommodate pluralist views. The sequences of
emphases suggest the line of articulation of the new consciousness which
I have attempted to show in this thesis: "one centres attention upon the
education of moral sensibility, and regards its chief instrument as the
best literature of the language; the second emphasises the role of the
English teacher in developing the imagination, and looks to the written
exploration of personal experience as its chief means; and the third stresses
the English teacher's role in developing adequately a pupil's resources
for handling social relationships" (p.19, quoted from his own 1968
paper) ... "what I wanted to see was a BOTH/AND model". He accuses
Inglis of reconstituting this into an EITHER/OR confrontation between
language and literature. In fact it is a question of sequence. For
Inglis value is subjective and primary; for Doughty value is derived
objectively and primarily in order to find an appropriate subjective use.
However linking the "Language in Use" materials to the 'growth' rationale
centred in literature and personal expression would clearly point up an
evaluative stance. This is signalled on page 21 of the 1972 paper when
Doughty says "The units in "Language in Use" set out a large number of
local and limited enquiries into very many aspects of day-to-day use so
that the cumulative effect of the enquiry is not at all social and limited, but pervasive and extensive in altering pupils' views of the part language plays in their lives". Thus on page 23 he builds a very careful argument to show how the 'linguistics-based' model acknowledges a 'growth' rationale, e.g. "Through his ability to acquire the patterns of a natural language, an individual acquires the ability to construct for himself a version of reality and interpret it consistently to his own satisfaction" (personal 'growth'); "participation in social networks or groups, depends upon his ability to share the way in which the members of the group use language to relate to each other and to give a discernible identity to the group" (social 'growth') (My underlinings - to suggest implications for 'growth'). In this sense the 'linguistics-based' model is potentially a subsuming model for the new consciousness.

Doughty takes particular pains to answer Inglis' criticism of the possible effects of the objectivity of a 'linguistics-based' model. His argument is based on the notion of linguistics' concern for the creation and maintenance of cultural values, the wider sociological definition of culture (derived from Tylor) clearly including the values transmitted through literature. He also ties in the theories of George Kelly and Berger and Luckmann to a growth of consciousness acknowledging individuality and sociality (Such a 'growth' must therefore take into account the significance of literature).

However perhaps the argument between Inglis and Doughty is revealing something more fundamental, even a crisis in consciousness. Perhaps the 'rhetoric of disaffection' which appears to perturb Doughty (the liberal) more than it does Inglis (the radical) is in fact a post-liberal phase of consciousness now affecting some English teachers and central to the articulation of radical interpretations of
Two further points need to be made about the model's potential for institutionalisation. First, although the 'linguistics-based' model is a young model it is likely to gain maturity through increasing in institutional visibility as it permeates the new consciousness. It is likely to appeal because it offers an alternative road to the linguistic organisation of relevant experiences and the learning of the competencies of socio-economic survival.

On the other hand we must not forget that the notion of competence itself may not exactly operate as a substitute for the traditional 'states of knowledge' prescriptions about language. Eventually too much may be asked of the pupil's ability to infer the symbols and conventions of the message code "the essential element in competence in the individual's ability to read the situation in which he finds himself and deduce from the clues that it provides (my underlining) what language is appropriate" (Doughty, op.cit. 1971, p.71). This may not be explicit enough for teacher or pupil.

The 'Synthesis/Compromise' Model

Taking the profession as a whole perhaps it is true to say that most English teachers prefer to teach to a model which allows a wide range of options among the other models to be adopted. Although some teachers operate in a piecemeal or freelance way moving in and out of the models,

19. In an article entitled 'Language in Use - Another Viewpoint' ("English in Education", Vol.7, No.1, Spring 1973, pp.58-72) Don Salter in a perceptive account of the argument says that not only does his own experience of using the materials prove Inglis to be wrong, but that Inglis' embattled arguments point up a form of prescription and authoritarianism.
such practice is neither a synthesis nor perhaps a compromise but perhaps unsystematic eclecticism. Thus for practice to qualify as a synthesis of model positions one has to seek visible orientations among combinations of models which in terms of classification and framing seem to incorporate different degrees of strength and weakness. The most frequent combination appears to be in terms of classification, a compromise between intramural states of knowledge to be achieved and extra-mural states of knowledge to be recognised. Perhaps a more exact way of indicating this process of compromise is to suggest that the model recontextualises the notion of 'states of knowledge' (Strong Classification) because of the 'negotiations' principle (Weak Framing). The notion of 'skills' is reconfigured because of a pedagogy based on weak framing. Thus in terms of framing there is a measure of teacher initiation so that the pattern emerges typically as a differentiated strong classification and a weakening of frame with neither strong nor weak positions being discretely visible in either classification or framing. A characteristic feature of the model is the use of literature (the 'cultural-heritage' model may operate here) in the classification and encouragement of a wide range of discourse (controlled by the 'incidental' approach to language teaching derived from traditional notions of grammar). However to warrant the name of synthesis the model must acknowledge the viability of creative expression and oral work. Because of this the teacher's role is likely to make for weaker rather than stronger framing.

Because of its eclectic nature the model is very difficult to describe with any exactness. In a sense it is a continuum model and individual teachers can take up different positions within it; they can favour certain Classificatory or Framing options which reflect the strength of the influence of the other models. In this respect the model is highly
permeable but probably accommodates the practice of the majority of English teachers. The different balanced options within its generous latitude would obviously appeal to a consciousness socialised into viewing life as the achievement of balancing instrumental and expressive objectives. This model is temperamentally suitable to a general liberal-humanism which seeks a symmetrical interpretation of life.

A good example of a position taken up in this model is Sydney Bolt's "The Right Response" (1967) which seeks to oppose Denys Thompson's view of educating against the environment. His comment indicates the sense of expediency found within this model when he suggests that the teacher who tries to teach against the environment will eventually fail. As far as Bolt is concerned a level of competency must first be established before the teacher moves into looking at 'relevant' literature e.g. Bolt suggests that the teacher has a special responsibility for communicating necessary social discourse skills - letter writing (strong Classification and Framing) before going on to read Bill Naughton's "Late Night on Watling Street" where there are changes implied in Classification and Framing. Thus perhaps a feature of this model is the teacher's control over different intensities of Classification and Framing. Some might argue that this is artificial as the teacher is ultimately in control. This would be true of the other models in a much looser sense - at the moment of introduction and initiation, but not necessarily in articulation.

It would appear also that the synthesis model may in one perspective be a deliberate attempt to avoid taking up an embattled position. In this sense the concept of rightness in Bolt's book is meant to indicate that it does not indicate one way as right but that it is 'right' to introduce and facilitate more and more processes of subjective and objective revelation. So in this sense Bolt rejects the strong classifi-
cation inherent in the 'comprehension' approach (central to the transmission/reproduction model). Indeed a feature of the synthesis model is that the mechanical elements of language teaching are likely not to be chosen whilst the necessity of formal competencies is considered as important.

We have already seen in the chapter on the transatlantic dialogue that Herbert Muller favoured a compromise between 'discipline' and 'freedom' i.e. a Classification/Framing position which would allow structural stability and pedagogical negotiation. "The Americans were upholding the traditional British ideal of intellectual discipline, the British were clamouring for the individual freedom that Americans have always prized in theory; but at bottom all wanted both discipline and freedom - the best of both worlds" (op.cit. p.13). This was also the substance of Moffett's and Squire's contribution to the debate and in a sense is implicit in the 'linguistics-based' model. (See Doughty, op.cit., 1971, p.69).

Perhaps the most influential text published20 in recent years which fits most naturally in this model, wherein lies its appeal, is Frank Whitehead's "The Disappearing Dais". A number of factors illustrating this can be isolated:

1) The book is firmly located left of centre in the model; literature is presented as central to the personal 'growth' ideal with the teacher's role that of facilitator.

2) The classification of the English curriculum is based on literature as the articulation of the powerful Cambridge-dominated group previously described. This is an evaluative stance which acknowledges literature as "uniquely valuable organisation of experience" (p.15).

20. See also "Sense and Sensitivity" by J.W.P. Creber (1965) as an influential example of this model.
(3) Whitehead believes that "developmental growth is a continuous process which necessarily follows an orderly sequence". (p.17).

(4) He does not regret more popular but less literary books coming into schools (the compromise position of the 'cultural-heritage' model, of which this book is largely representative).

(5) The book is located firmly in the professional ambience associated with "The Use of English" (Whitehead was editor when he wrote the book). Thus it does not compromise over attacking the disabling elements of the environment, and in this respect perhaps stands firmly against the culturally repetitive stance of the 'sociological' model as Whitehead sees it. In its advocacy of the belief that English teachers should help to make up the deficiencies of environment, again the book would seem to emanate from the compromise position of the 'cultural-heritage' model. In this respect Whitehead tries to apply I.A. Richards ideas at the level of the pupil.

(6) Perhaps the appeal of the book lies in its restraint and balance. For example although Whitehead stresses the need to use poetry he warns the English teacher of the necessity of finding "ways of showing that it has its relevance to the real world and to their own problems and concerns in living in it" (p.120).

(7) The appeal of the book to the new consciousness is probably contained in his view that means rather than ends are important e.g. "it is not the acting proficiency, but the process of getting there that is educationally valuable" (p.135).

(8) However the book is likely to appeal to moderate opinion where Whitehead suggests (p.174) that rather too much is being claimed for creativity. Children are not capable of producing poetry of the same quality as T.S. Eliot. He also criticises 'free writing' as being no
more than a short term expedient. However he does not discount the
notion that writing can have a therapeutic effect and quotes Freud's
postulation that the process of working through is an essential part
of psychoanalytic procedure.

(9) Perhaps his real synthesis position, and one which argues the
liberal-humanist 'balance' is that the source of Whitehead's con-
sciousness about English studies is contained in the statement "Most
typically, however, the English critical tradition has combined the
mimetic with the pragmatic" (p.170).

(10) As far as language study is concerned, Whitehead supports the concept
of appropriateness; however a compromise position is indicated when
he says "we know that if we deviate markedly from the customary norms,
we shall be judged either eccentric or uneducated. In the written
language .. certain aspects of correctness need to be mastered by all
children because they are indispensable ancillaries to ease communica-
tion in the modern world" (p.211). Whitehead advocates the learning
of a competency when the pupil needs it, can see the benefit of it
and will make it his own. As Whitehead's approach is to maintain the
openness of all options it is apposite that his chapter on linguistics
anticipates the "Language in Use" approach.

This open mindedness and willingness to be flexible clearly leads
Whitehead to accept that "the inner logic of English teaching itself seems
likely to increasingly opt for a breaking-down of the barriers which have
grown up between English and other subjects - and between English and life"
(p.258). However he warns of the dangers of English losing some of its
indispensable intrinsic qualities and a separate identity. This would
seem to argue for a strengthening of Classification whilst implying a
weakening of frame which view probably holds the centre of the English-
teaching profession.
The Relevance of some empirical data to the models

In order to make the models more meaningful it seems appropriate at this point to refer to the empirical work which has been undertaken in order to find support for some of the descriptions advanced in this part of the thesis.

The empirical work was divided into two activities. The first was concerned with interviewing about 40 people whom I designated as 'leaders' of English teaching. Although some reference is made to the transcriptions of a few of those interviews (particularly in this chapter and Chapter 13), where the material seemed appropriate, the major analysis of this activity is being reserved for a later, follow-up study. This will be signalled more clearly at the end of the thesis.

On the other hand the second activity has a major bearing on some of the analysis presented in this thesis. This concerns a questionnaire on the personal details, background and professional training and views of a sample of English teachers and lecturers (also some administrators and advisers). This sample was chosen systematically from the membership lists of NATE and the English Association. For NATE 968 members were sampled (1 in every 2) from 6 major sub-sections of the membership, whilst the same form of sampling was applied in order to obtain 389 English Association members from the three sections of membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number sampled</th>
<th>Returns</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATE</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Questionnaire consisted of 13 closed questions (these were related to personal details and professional training) and 4 open-ended questions,
Nos. 14-17. It is the replies to these final 4 questions which are of relevance to the thesis as it is presented. Question 14's relevance is dealt with in relation to Chapter 15 (see also Appendix at the end of the thesis). Here we are concerned with Questions 15, 16 and 17 which are as follows:

Question 15: "What for you have been the THREE most important changes in English teaching in the past ten years or so? If you can, please list these in order of priority. If you find this difficult, please indicate."

It was hoped that this question would shed some light on more recent changes in English teaching, whilst at the same time indicating something about the 'reality' construction of English teachers and the formation of consciousness. (see Figure 2).

Question 16: "What directions do you think English teaching will take in the next five years? If you can, please list these in order of priority. If you find this difficult, please indicate."

This question was asking for a prediction of how the English teachers sampled saw the trends indicated in their answers to Question 15 being confirmed, reversed or modified. This would also have some predictive significance for the formation and retention of consciousness (see Figure 3).

Question 17: "What directions would you personally like to see English take in the next five years?"

This question was asking the sample what they hoped might happen which would probably have some significance for the direction of competing ideologies and the transmission modes they supported. (see Figure 4).

In order to make a classification of replies it was decided to apply Bernstein's Classification and Framing thesis. However two factors
became apparent during the analysis of the replies:

(1) that in Questions 15 and 16, the sample had normally found it very difficult to list their views in order of priority. Accordingly, this distinction was abandoned.

(2) that using the Strong/Weak Classification/Frame as a basic descriptive device did not allow a sensitive enough classification of the complicated and often very full replies returned by many members. This suggested that the number of categories be increased in order to differentiate among replies. Thus the 4 positions in Bernstein's Classification/Frame model was increased to 8. (See Figure 1). These are subsumed under headings of 'Models of the older consciousness' and 'Models of the new consciousness' and can be described as follows:

- 2 Strong Classification positions (1 and 2 on the octant) SC1 and SC2
- 2 Weak Classification positions (3 and 4 on the octant) WC1 and WC2
- 2 Strong Framing positions (1 and 2 on the octant) SF1 and SF2
- 2 Weak Framing positions (3 and 4 on the octant) WF3 and WF4

The replies themselves suggested that most English teachers saw some sort of distinction between language and literature. Usually separate statements were made about each. This meant that the classification positions were relatively easy to differentiate.

However the framing positions were less easy to distinguish in this way because the replies indicated that transmission was not always differentiated from content in the mind of the individual teacher. Thus the connections between WC2 and WF4 and SC2 and SF3 and 4 showed that framing positions were a function of classification positions.

The eight Classification and Framing positions may be described as follows:
Before explaining how replies were allocated to each of the above 8 positions it is necessary to remember that

(1) Question 15 refers to what the sample thought had happened in English teaching (This is a descriptive question).

(2) Question 16 refers to what the sample thought would happen in English teaching.

(3) Question 17 refers to what the sample wanted to happen in English teaching. (Questions 16 and 17 ask for predictions about the future of English teaching as the sample views the 'reality' of that future).

**Strong Classification (1)**: Replies which were allocated to this category indicated the place of explicit language 'skills'. A return to some sort of formal language work involving the teaching of grammar, vocabulary, style and the conventions of the language was indicated.

**Strong Classification (2)**: Replies which were allocated to this category indicated an exclusive, narrow-based literature content based on 'approved' texts mainly from the cultural heritage.

**Strong Framing (3)**: Replies which were allocated to this category indicated that they were a function of SC2. The canon of literature and the culture it was reproducing was to be effected by explicitly segmented and highly specialised techniques of looking at literature and the requirements of an examination system with explicit evaluative processes.

**Strong Framing (4)**: Replies which were allocated to this category
indicated the transmission of the culture of the book through placing a premium on writing. A strong emphasis was placed on writing as an initiation into an intellectual activity with special conventions. Thus language is learnt largely through writing, the material for which maintains a high boundary against other materials and pedagogy. These were arguments for the purity of English as a means of maintaining moral and aesthetic standards, which necessarily imply a strong framing.

**Weak Classification 1**

Replies which were allocated to this category indicated the place of what most people called 'creative writing' (i.e. the 'personal-expression' model). This was accompanied by an indication of either no grammar or only a very small amount; no or very little formal language work, including a low priority being placed on the conventions of the language.

**Weak Classification 2**

Replies which were allocated to this category indicated a permeable and broad-based literature content. These replies indicated a low boundary between literary and non-literary materials (e.g. films, tapes, artefacts, unscripted drama as viable alternatives to the study of literature). Literature itself was seen as one of many forms in which language could be expressed. Replies indicated more tolerance of contemporary 'texts' (e.g. scripted books from popular Television Series, working-class fiction). This category also came about because a number of replies clearly approved of English as part of creative arts' or integrated studies' programmes, although it must be recorded that many people saw English (both language and literature) as central to such combinations of studies.

**Weak Framing 3**

Replies which were allocated to this category indicated that they were a
function of WC2. They saw the pedagogic function of literature and non-literary materials as a means of personal and social exploration, as a stimulus for improvisation and oral work. In this respect replies indicated a negotiated pedagogy between the teacher and the child. Replies indicated that examinations should either disappear or be made to have far less effect.

Weak Framing 4

Replies which were allocated to this category indicated that they too were a function of WC2. This category represents the main pedagogic impact of the new consciousness in as much as it is the growth in oral work which has allowed a negotiated pedagogy to develop. Replies indicated a great variety of oral work, particularly improvisation and discussion, the first as a means of exploring cultural materials imaginatively, the second as a means of exploring personal and social issues more objectively.

It must be pointed out however that 62 returns out of 435 were unable to be allocated under any of the 8 positions for Questions 15, 16 and 17.

Explanation of Figures 1 - 6

The eight sections of the Classification - Frame octant are indicated by a box in the centre of each Figure containing numbers relating to the two Strong Classification and two Strong Framing positions and the two Weak Classification and two Weak Framing positions. All of the strong positions relate to the models of the older consciousness (later Paradigm A in Figure 6, Chapter 15), whilst all of the weak positions relate to the models of the new consciousness (later Paradigm B in Figure 6, Chapter 15). This may be indicated diagrammatically:
In Figures 2 to 5 the coded returns of NATE members (001-319) and English Association members (320-435) are plotted within the eight positions in a numerical sequence of allocation.
Summary description of replies received to Questions 15, 16 and 17 with the location of the 7 models of English teaching.

### CLARIFICATION

**STRONG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLICIT LANGUAGE COMPETENCIES</th>
<th>IMPLICIT LANGUAGE COMPETENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>('Explicit Skills' Model)</td>
<td>('Personal-Expression' Model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychotherapeutic Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITERATURE CONTENT</th>
<th>BROAD-BASED LITERATURE CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(IMPERMEABLE)</td>
<td>(PERMEABLE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE</th>
<th>SYNTHESIS/COMPROMISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEAK**

1 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS OF THE OLDER</th>
<th>MODELS OF THE NEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 3

**CONSCIOUSNESS**

(Paradigm A - See Figure 6)

4 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITERARY CRITICISM</th>
<th>LITERATURE AS EXPLORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN-ENDED, CONTEXT FREE,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS EXAM-ORIENTED PEDAGOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synthesis/Compromise Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDOMINANTLY WRITTEN STRATEGIES</th>
<th>PREDOMINANTLY ORAL STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>('Transmission/Reproduction Model referred to in Chapters 1-7 of the thesis)</td>
<td>('Negotiations' Model)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CULTURAL REPRODUCTION (LOW CHANGE POTENTIAL)

FRAME
Figure 2

Classification Frame Analysis of Replies to Question 15

000 Hate
000 English Association

Models of the Older Consciousness (Paradigm A)
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Hierarchical classification tree with categories and numerical values.
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Frame Analysis of Incidence of Ambivalence in Replies to Questions 16 and 17

000 Hate (Question 16)
000 Hate (Question 17)

Models of the Older
Consciousness (Paradigm A)
000 Eng. Assoc. (Qu. 16)
000 Eng. Assoc. (Qu. 17)

Models of the New
Consciousness (Paradigm B)
000 Eng. Assoc. (Qu. 16)
000 Eng. Assoc. (Qu. 17)

Strong
Weak

Classifications

- FRAME ANALYSIS
OF INCIDENCE OF
AMBIVALENCE IN
REPLIES TO
QUESTIONS 16
AND 17

000 HATE (QUESTION 16)
000 HATE (QUESTION 17)
Commentary

Figure 2 (Replies to Question 15)

This figure refers to the plotting of replies concerned with a retrospective assessment of changes in English teaching over the past 10 or so years. It indicates a view of the 'reality' of those changes as seen by a representative sample of English teachers. However comparison between this retrospective view and the views indicated in Figures 3 and 4 suggest that there are considerable discrepancies between a collective view and individual practice. This seems to be particularly true of a comparison between Figures 2 and 4. Nevertheless the Figure shows remarkable unanimity and as such goes some way to indicating the relative institutionalisation of the new consciousness.

Figure 3 (Replies to Question 16)

This figure refers to the plotting of replies concerned with the sample's views about the directions of English teaching in the near future. It will be noticed that the pattern of uniformity shown in Figure 2 (WC 1+2 and WF 3+4) is considerably modified. There is a marked movement into SC1 although some of those replies which are plotted in this position show ambivalence about the nature of a stronger linguistic classification and are reluctant to abandon a 'personal-expression' model. On the other hand this movement shows a genuine desire for some sort of structuring in the area of language competence. However the movement into SC2 and SF1 and 2 although in evidence is much less marked. This suggests that the majority of the sample believes that a more open-ended classification of literary materials and a negotiated pedagogy will persist provided some way can be found to transmit language skills without
resorting to the transmission/reproduction pedagogy which the models of the new consciousness have attacked and largely discredited. There are no proportional differences between the replies of the NATE sample compared to the English Association sample.

Figure 4 (Replies to Question 17)

This figure, which shows further evidence of movement into SC and SF positions, indicates some sort of balance, although we must again be careful to note the distinction for subjective assessments of the place and nature of language and literature respectively. The movement from WC1 to SC1 is more pronounced which suggests a real desire on behalf of a majority of the sample for a return to some sort of formal language teaching. However, as in Figure 3, the high incidence of ambivalence indicates that the nature of the return is problematic. In fact the detail of the replies suggests a recontextualising or a reconfiguration of the teaching of language competencies in order to accommodate not only new descriptions of language but also new modes of transmission. This would indicate that the majority of the sample would be in favour of a strong but recontextualised classification of language activated by a 'negotiated' form of transmission (i.e. WF3 and 4).

However there is other evidence to modify the predictive power of such a conclusion. There is a suggestion contained in the replies to this question that English teachers might have to face the desire of some of their number to entrench on an uncompromising view of literature. This is indicated by the movement into SC2, but particularly into SF3. Here there is a marked proportional difference between the location of replies from the English Association compared to those from NATE (37/16 v. 49/319). This seems to be indicative of the English Association sample's stronger
desire for the preservation of a pedagogy suited to the reproduction of the cultural heritage, and would help to locate them more firmly as supporters of the models of the older consciousness.

4. **Figure 5** Incidence of Ambivalence in Figures 3 and 4

Ambivalence is taken to describe those replies which indicate a real dilemma facing many teachers about abandoning formal language teaching (something which has clearly nagged at the conscience of many teachers over recent years). Of course ambivalence works the other way too. Replies often indicated that teachers were anxious not to lose the freedom and reward they had found in working in the 'personal-expression' model. Other replies noted the incongruity of trying to work within an 'explicit skills' and a 'personal-expression' model.

Thus the dilemma is plotted mainly as SC1 v WC1, although there is some evidence of ambivalence in the framing segments. It is the dilemma which in other ways has pointed towards the search for compromise positions indicated earlier in this chapter. In a sense it reflects a contemporary version of the liberal-humanist paradox noted earlier in the thesis. It is also a good example of the way in which attitudes towards problems of the transmission of language skills (especially the teaching of grammar) reflect a liberal-humanist ideology - i.e. a desire for structure without the constraints of authoritarian views on the nature and teaching of language. Finally, it should be noted that it is likely that ambivalence will increase the more a subjective response is called for.

21. In Figure 2 there was only one return, NATE 121, whose replies suggested ambivalence about methods of teaching literature.
Summary

1. The major movements from Figure 2 to 4 seem to be:
   (a) an increasing belief in a recontextualising of a form of structured language teaching. This indicates a reaction against 'creative writing'. There is some evidence that the way seems clearer for the institutionalisation of a 'linguistics-based' model.
   (b) on the whole a desire to relax stringent definitions of 'suitable' literature and its 'relevance' in favour of a curriculum which is highly permeable to a wider, more broad-based definition of literature. This depends on the imaginative experience and the place of literature being seen as central in any form of integration.

2. On the other hand there is also evidence in Figure 4 to suggest that some teachers are looking towards a stronger framing especially as a crucial means of transmitting the cultural heritage.

3. Oral English holds a strong position in the consciousness of English teachers; it is clearly basic to the 'negotiations' pedagogy of the new consciousness and is certainly basic to a working-class pedagogy.

4. The major differences between replies from the English Association and NATE indicate little or no English Association ambivalence in Figure 3, and proportionately much less than NATE in Figure 4 (SC1 v. WC1).
   Although there is proportionately more ambivalence in the S v. W Framing positions, generally speaking the sample of English Association members are more homogeneous in their views than the sample NATE members, as evidenced by these returns. A possible reason for this is that the largely selective school experience of members of the English Association had reinforced the more closed models of the older consciousness.

5. Although the selected empirical evidence is thought to throw some light on the 'communal' orientations of movements in consciousness, it must be
stressed that only part of the analysis has been presented here - i.e. that part which helps to locate and describe the models and from which some tentative predictions may be advanced. In Chapter 15 it is hoped to integrate these descriptions with paradigm theory; however the rest of the analysis of the data relating to Questions 15, 16 and 17 of the sample questionnaire is reserved for the post-thesis empirical study.

**Conclusions**

1. The models' classification of English is a means of drawing attention to orientations within highly complex phenomena rather than in any way suggesting a definitive construct.

2. There are three main groupings of models:

   (i) 'Explicit Language skills' + 'Cultural-Heritage' models:
   
   This is the survival of the older consciousness which suggests the continuation of an authoritarian consensus within the total English-teaching consciousness. These models form what may be called the 'initiation' rationale.

   (ii) 'Personal-Expression' + 'Sociological' + 'Negotiations' models:
   
   These three form what may be called the 'growth' rationale.

   (iii) 'Linguistics-based' + 'Synthesis/Compromise' models.
   
   This represents a moderately progressive and adaptive consensus and ideologically fits into the new consciousness.

5. This is not altogether a tidy grouping because as has been suggested the 'linguistics-based' model has some of the same objectives as the 'growth' models as well as the synthesis model. For the 'growth' rationale it could provide an organising focus; for the synthesis model a much looked-for alternative to the prescriptive grammar which informs the 'incidental' base of that model.
In a sense the synthesis model (which is the most elusive to delineate) is a liberal-humanist articulation of the old traditional models (explicit skills 'incidental' approach; cultural heritage compromise position which still holds to the centrality of literature). However, that articulation has taken place under the impact of the new consciousness. Thus because the synthesis model represents a moving towards the more 'progressive' models it may be described as moderately progressive. Indeed Frank Whitehead's 'The Disappearing Dais' which it has been suggested epitomises the synthesis model embraces the concept of 'growth' inherent in the 'progressive' models.

As it has been suggested earlier that within the models a superordinating rationale might become visible, perhaps it is clear that from an examination of the models an analysis of the concepts of 'initiation' and 'growth' is necessary.
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CHAPTER 12

THE INITIATION/GROWTH RATIONALES

The previous chapters in this section of the thesis have indicated that within the models of the new consciousness a subsuming concept of 'growth' may be located. Discussion of these models has revealed that the visibility of the concept is strong enough for it to be recognised as a superordinating rationale for the new consciousness. However, although some indication of the nature of 'personal' and 'social growth' has already been given within the parameters of the new consciousness because it is related to the notion of acculturation any discussion of the concept will also have to deal with its retrospective implications for the older consciousness.

It is also necessary at this stage to discuss the significance of John Dixon's "Growth Through English" which, it will be remembered was a direct outcome of the Dartmouth Conference and which sought to show how the transatlantic dialogue had begun to point towards the concept of 'growth' as a new 'model' for English teaching to supersede the 'skills' and 'cultural heritage' models.1

Dixon's intention is to try to discover a collective intuition about English teaching and in terms of the delineation of the models given above he acknowledges that the 'creativity' (i.e. 'personal-expression') model has clarified the objectives of English teaching. Moreover his remarks

1. Dixon's historical analysis is oversimplified and undifferentiated. He assumes that a 'skills' model preceded a 'cultural-heritage' model when in actual fact it complemented it at all levels. Both were transmission/reproductive models.
in the preface anticipate the 'Negotiations' model i.e. the importance of acknowledging the language resources brought by the child to the school. However Dixon makes no distinction between notions of personal creativity and the development of social awareness and sensitivity which it will be remembered were seen as a continuous and synonymous process ('network') in the previous discussion of the 'personal—expression' and 'sociological' models (The emergence of this composite notion was first mapped in Chapter 9 on the significance of "The Use of English"). Yet even so it does appear that Dixon believes all 'revelation' is ultimately personal - e.g. "The fact is that in sharing experiences with others man is using language to make that experience real to himself". (p.6).

In effect Dixon's 'personal growth' model operates between two poles. At one end "deeper levels of the self are realised and composed; at the other language takes us out to encounter and bring to explicit order the external world" (p.28). Thus a continuous and synonymous progression, a 'growing' is indicated which is implicit in everything Dixon says. It represents a movement towards the management of complexity; talk is the foundation which increases in complexity ramifying into all types of discourse. However Dixon's more specific notions of how the 'personal growth' model is articulated in the English curriculum are shown in his views on the relative balance between literature and life. He clearly believes that looking at life through fictions is not enough, "one can also look at people and situations direct". (p.54). Thus he strongly advocates creative drama (very much central to what we have called a 'Negotiations' model) and quotes Barnes' views on the sociotherapeutic as well as progressively revealing value of drama for adolescents deprived of a wide range of social experiences.
John Dixon's concept of 'growth' draws attention to expressive perspectives. It relates to Raymond Williams' notion of acculturation as the tending of natural growth. Within the 'growth' models and hopefully within a 'linguistics-based' model many English teachers are seeking the inner logic, the key to the 'network' building process (i.e. 'ways of knowing) as revealed in language.

If we review the nature of the relationship articulated by the older and new consciousness with the cultural significance of the school we are able to distinguish a fairly clear dichotomy between two diametrically opposed positions. These suggest a historical dimension as well as institutional, transmission and ideological differences between the older and new consciousness and the models they support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'INITIATION'</th>
<th>'GROWTH'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MECHANISTIC PERSPECTIVES</td>
<td>ORGANIC PERSPECTIVES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reproduced objective culture
   (The models of the older consciousness and their implicit values).
   Produced subjective culture
   (The models of the progressive consensus - i.e. largely a working-class pedagogy).

2. Inflexible social conformity
   (Transmission/reproduction model)
   Transmission flows from teacher to child.
   Flexible social conformity
   ('Negotiations' expressive)
   Transmission is negotiated between teacher and child.

3. Vocational (process of socio-economic allocation instituted early in school career. Pacin
   Non-Vocational (This is not a straightforward polarisation because socio-economic allocation is instituted
Tacitly accepts ideology of differential access to consciousness (selection, streaming, evaluation).

Order potentially highly integrative in terms of its institutionalisation and transmission; tends to preclude organic perspective.

. Explicit bureaucratic organisation and control.

. Monolithic and explicit evaluation (tends to be primarily Mode 1).

. Maintains status quo of the school as an agency of social conservation (i.e. 'cultural-heritage' model in 'uncompromising' position).

. Tacitly accepts ideology of differential access to consciousness (selection, streaming, evaluation).

Later in school career. However time is given so that 'growth' models may operate.

Order potentially integrative in terms of the 'psychologic' of the child, but only so in terms of institutionalisation and transmission if supportive authority system is conducive. Divisive and subversive in terms of mechanistic perspective.

Implicit bureaucratic organisation (i.e. in a comprehensive school committed to implementing working-class pedagogy) but therapeutic control.

Diversified evaluation (mixed modes with Mode 3 favoured by the new consciousness).

Subversive of status quo of the school as an agency of social conservation (Potential challenge through the 'sociological' model). Supportive of school as an agency for social and economic diversity.

Explicitly rejects differential access to consciousness based on selection and institutionalised through streaming and externally controlled evaluation.
Accepts strong relationship between 'knowledge' and occupation.

'Knowledge' is revealed and reproduced through formally controlled induction into 'states of knowledge' by a linear process. 'Initiation' rituals are externally superimposed for internalisation as the 'reality' of 'education'.

Attenuates relationship between 'knowledge' and occupation.

'Knowledge' is discovered and produced through informal induction into 'ways of knowing' by a network process which activates a progression leading to a deeper realisation of self and the external world. "Growth" is based on the maturing of indigenous 'growth universals'.

---

**General Positioning of Models in relation to 'Initiation' and 'growth' rationales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Initiation'</th>
<th>'growth'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Personal-Expression'</td>
<td>'Synthesis/compromise' → (Direction of rationale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sociological'</td>
<td>(LIBERAL-HUMANIST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Negotiations'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RADICAL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Linguistics-based'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cultural-Heritage'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Explicit skills'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CONSERVATIVE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy explicit.</td>
<td>Pedagogy implicit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As species of socialisation the two rationales are convenient rather than entirely satisfactory descriptions of the two conflicting orientations. They represent another way of looking at the contemporary controversy in English teaching which centres on the internalisation of the needs of the child and the perpetuation of society's power structure. Whereas it was once possible to say that within the models of the older consciousness the two 'needs' intersected in the school, within the new consciousness the logic and the morality of that intersection has been questioned.

In Hoare's terms the 'conservative' position (i.e. conservation of cultural norms of hierarchies and a self-reproducing mechanism) would be challenged by a 'radical' position which sought to 'produce' cultural experience through a mechanism for extending and transforming cultural reality so that it was always relevant to the logic of 'growth universals'. However the position is complicated in as much as 'growth universals' in terms of producing personal 'conscientization' and the radical awareness associated with that concept\(^2\) are mediated through the differentiated cultural consciousness of the class structure. This would obviously perpetuate differently-oriented pedagogies. Ideally of course the liberal-humanist position represents a compromise, although from the radical point of view by definition it must represent a compromised conservative position. (As much is admitted within the liberal-humanist consciousness). Historically the liberal-humanist 'synthesis/compromise' model has viewed egalitarianism as a normative means of achieving critical conformity without accepting the radical logic that true egalitarianism

---

2. 'Conscientization' is Paulo Freire's term for a critical consciousness which sees social political and economic anomalies in stratified societies. This term becomes more significant in Chapter 13.
cannot come about unless there is tension and conflict. This would be to achieve what Freire calls 'the practice of freedom' wherein men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world" ("Pedagogy of the Oppressed", Paulo Freire, quoted from p. 14 of the Foreword by Richard Shaul, Penguin, 1972).

In Radical terms the 'production' of culture would seek to change what Hoare calls the "organisational modalities of the school system" (op.cit. p.46) because they are inflexible, encourage 'wastage' through selection, restrict mobility and deny equality of education. The 'sociological' model, especially in its sociotherapeutic dimensions is very close to a socialist ideal which attempts to develop human need in terms of a 'growth' rationale's conception of relevant cultural production and as Raymond Williams says "keep the learning process going for as long as possible in every life" ("The Long Revolution", p.147).

It will be seen that the notion of developing human need in the terms outlined above is a different matter from "people processing" which implies a standardising of both process and product. Indeed Bernstein has said (op.cit. 1971) that it is a trivialisation of socialisation to think of the school merely as a "people-processing" institution. However the notion can be related to the two rationales in as much as the 'initiation' rationale might be said to operate a highly visible form of social control; highly visible that is in terms of the purity in design of the 'processing' plant. In this respect a selective school is most nearly like a total institution where teachers have strong educational identities

3. Here the word has been underlined to relate to the radicalisation of the indigenous ability (i.e. 'growth universals') to extend consciousness.
and pupil identity is fixed by streaming and reinforced by examination expectation and performance. Thus the social hierarchies are explicit and the sequencing of learning is explicit; the child is initiated into successive degrees of socialisation before achieving an ultimate stature which in 'processing' terms is largely predetermined. The child's range of options for connecting revelations (i.e., beyond the requirements of his becoming a microcosm of cultural reproduction) are limited and he has little or no chance to 'negotiate' the sequence of their presentation.

On the other hand the 'organic' concept of growth which has articulated the new consciousness in English teaching is very sensitive to the child's demonstration of his own needs. What the child will ultimately need is known neither to himself nor the teacher because the articulation of 'growth universals' is as diverse as the physical manifestation of biological properties in each human being. In the 'mechanistic' concept the teacher has a standardised measure of the finished, manufactured product.

Whereas in the 'initiation' rationale social control seems to be visible, in the 'growth' rationale it is invisible because there is less concentration, especially in many primary and large secondary schools, on deliberate initiation into an ultimately explicable knowledge corpus and thus identities have a lower potential for being stereotyped in respect of being able to reproduce the knowledge corpus. The advocates of this concept of 'growth' would claim that it induced more individuality in children. However there are 'political' implications for both pupil and teacher. On the one hand some children so induced may feel alienated beyond the norms of local community groupings; indeed there may be a conflict situation in the school where other forces are at work.
to articulate the 'initiation' rationale. On the other hand the teacher may too feel alienated because of this second reason.

Another way of showing the crucial difference between the two rationales is to look at them in terms of 'revelation'. By revelation is meant species of discernible increase in understanding, perception, abstraction or creative communication. This notion of revelation could be produced to a greater or lesser degree and in terms of its own raison d'être by either rationale. Measuring this would help to determine the degree of control of the child's consciousness. At each successive stage of internalised revelation (i.e. acquiring knowledge or demonstrating creative production) there would be a development to satisfy the objectives of the rationale. In the initiation rationale there would be a convergence on 'pure' educational identities; in the 'growth' rationale on 'impure' educational identities. The degree of 'purity' is determined by institutional approval or disapproval taking the curricular organisation of a Collection Code as the institutional norm. However it is likely to be true that neither educational identity can be entirely insulated from its opposite. As has been intimated the two rationales are likely to be linked as a continuum.

Thus perhaps it is true to say that the 'growth' rationale - implying a whole new pedagogy - is best accommodated in an Integrated Codes curriculum. However the new pedagogy has implications for the socio-economic significance of the school. Whereas the 'initiation' rationale articulates the concept of the school as an alloc tor and agency for social conservation and adaptation within the status quo, the 'growth' rationale has a potential for articulating the concept of the school as an agency for social change (especially where within this concept of 'growth' an increase in political consciousness is envisaged). Thus transmission
(i.e. the input dimension determining the nature of revelation) is crucial. Each perspective of the school's ultimate societal function implies different concepts of what counts as knowledge, how it is to be processed, evaluated and paced. The new pedagogy in English teaching seems to increase the potential of conflict between the two perspectives. Perhaps some of the compromise formula and strategies adopted by English teachers as a result of the social pressures of children and the profession to question the values of traditional, strongly classified and framed knowledge suggest a measure of expediency which it will be seen in the next chapter is one reaction to the political challenge.

The bi-polarised analysis implicit within the two rationales underlines that English teaching is at the centre of cultural confrontation. Perhaps it is true that the average English teacher's personal identity has made it more conducive for him to explore experiential and existential contexts and thus fashion his professional identity. In his professional socialisation an already developed sensibility (fostered by literature) has added to it a social dimension which perhaps represents a consciousness conducive to encouraging individuality and humanity. In other words he feels a heightened commitment to the social dimension.

To sum up:

(i) 'Initiation' rationale. This subsumes the traditional transmission/reproduction models (including the 'uncompromising' position of the cultural - heritage model). It articulates an ideology of the logical necessity of thinking of the school as an agency of social conservation - largely to preserve the status quo of the superstructure of society. This rationale allows hierarchical organisations and institutions to survive because the child has been initiated
into accepting and internalising this state of affairs as normal. Thus the child has been socialised to accept and/or compete.

(ii) Growth rationale. This may include the necessity of acknowledging a place for or the inevitability of the controlling effects of mechanistic perspectives. However this rationale shifts the emphasis from acceptance and competition towards self-revelation and participation, (the therapeutic base of a working-class pedagogy is discernible). It permutates consciousness and as such prepares children either for creative adaptation or non-conformity. Thus it provides, ostensibly, a mechanism for coping with change. Because the notion of a permanent hierarchy of either social organisation, values or knowledge is constantly challenged this rationale eventually focuses on a critique of society. Therefore it has a high 'politicising' potential. In this sense it is essentially a radical concept.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CHAPTER 13

THE POLITICISING OF ENGLISH TEACHING

It will be remembered that the second of the two original hypotheses proposed in the introductory chapter to the thesis suggested that if the pedagogical assumptions which have supported the teaching of a subject are challenged then the implications for subsequent organisation and content are increasingly overtly political. So far we have seen that the models of the new consciousness because they indicate a weakening of both Classification and Frame and an attempt to institutionalise the 'growth' rationale have mounted a massive attack on the models of the older consciousness. Moreover we have also seen that these models, especially the linked 'sociological' and 'negotiations' models, generated a high potential for the politicising of English teachers and their pupils. Thus it is the nature and the particular location of the political implications of these models among English teachers which is the subject of this chapter.

First, it is important to note that the political potential of the models of the new consciousness may be linked to a general increase in the potential of politicised positions emerging within those parts of the teaching profession ideologically committed to the sort of pedagogy pointed up by the 'growth' rationale. In other words many English teachers have achieved solidarity with other teachers in a notion of integration which is as much ideological/cultural as it is administrative/ pedagogical. This is the ideological thrust of the expressive, working-class pedagogy. As we have seen this is basically a 'ways of knowing' pedagogy made suitable to accommodate the institutional and transmission
implications of broadening the base of secondary education (especially through comprehensivization). This contains the politicised view that a 'state of knowledge' pedagogy is irrelevant, manipulative and oppressive. As we have seen both the institutionalisation and the ideology have been effected by articulations of the 'new learning' demonstrating in the literature and research that the concept of the equality of opportunity operates selectively because of socially mediated differential access to forms of approved consciousness. The single most significant factor so far analysed is social class.

Second, in order to show how within the new consciousness of English teaching a politicised perspective has emerged a number of factors need to be isolated. Initially perhaps we need to be aware of the impact of a socialist engendered consciousness. It is perhaps wisest to treat the notion of the 'New Left' with great caution in whatever context the term is used. As far as English teaching is concerned there is no such self-styled 'community' within the "New Left Review" ambience. However that publication is relevant in as much as it helped engender and focus a socialist consciousness during the 1960's which has had repercussions for the construction of the 'reality' of the politicised consciousness within English teaching. For example it is in the fact of publication

1. i.e. 'approved' in terms of being able to achieve 'states of knowledge' in accordance with the objectives of the 'initiation' rationale. This has nothing to do with the intrinsic quality of either socially-derived consciousness - forming mechanisms (e.g. specific familial and peer group socialisation patterns) or the conceptual/aesthetic power of that consciousness itself. An articulation of politicised consciousness urges two positions:
   (i) that the uniqueness is institutionalised in its own terms,
   (ii) that its indigenous properties of socialisation are capable of creating language of an elaborated nature.
and the nature of the argument within the publication of an article by David Holbrook that we are able to see the editorial support of a position which (1) seeks to resist the worst effects of a corrupting and debilitating environment and (2) asserts that children are equal in terms of the needs of sensibility ("New Left Review", No.11, Sept.-Oct. 1961 pp.24-29).

What Holbrook argues for is, of course, in accord with the whole creative/expressive movement which as we have seen becomes institutionally increasingly an attempt to provide a non-intellectual alternative pedagogy for working-class children. His initial advocacy is moral - i.e. that the enhancement of sensibility (consciousness about ... and for dealing with the phenomena which determine the quality of life) is the key to education. However he takes up a political stance in as much as he castigates the grammar school system and calls for a completely fresh perspective for the secondary modern school. Inherent in his remarks is the notion that the heritage of literature is part of the business of living to capacity in a modern society. His language is characteristically transcendental which contrasts with an article published 9 years later in December 1970 by Hans Magnus Enzensberger. Whereas Holbrook's 'political' position was morally biased in favour of resisting the worst effects of modern society (this deriving from the Leavis/Thompson/"Use of English" consciousness) Enzensberger's position is more overtly political in as much as he suggests that the "New Left of the 1960's has reduced the development of the media to a single concept - that of manipulation" (p.17). In other words the 'anti-admass' position described in Chapter 9 tended to focus on the problems of consumption of the media, whilst the "New Left Review" position tended to draw attention to the political nature of the control of the production of the media. Enzensberger's summary of repressive and emancipatory uses of the media points
up a classic bi-polar model which almost exactly mirrors the points of contrast between the older and new consciousness as described in this thesis. However perhaps the most crucial part of Enzensberger's article is that which discusses the significance of books, for it is this aspect of 'manipulation' which has impinged itself most forcibly on to the politicised consciousness of the new English teaching. Enzensberger is clearly referring to a knowledge corpus based on transmitting a received literature of a traditional and monolithic view of cultural reality and validity when he suggests that "intimidation through the written word has remained a widespread and class-specific phenomenon even in advanced industrial societies" (p.32). His remarks underline the fact that the techniques of, the methods of transmission of the models of the older consciousness because they were so heavily dependent on the act of writing reinforced an important part of authoritarian socialisation by the school ('good writing' as a kind of breaking in.) Enzensberger's description of the differences between speech and writing again reflect the differences between the pedagogical assumptions (i.e. degrees of framing) underlying the models of the older and new consciousness. "The formalisation of written language permits and encourages the repression of opposition. In speech, unresolved contradictions betray themselves by pauses, hesitations, slips of the tongue, repetitions, anacoluthons, quite apart from phrasing, mimicry, gesticulation, pace and volume. The aesthetic of written literature scorns such involuntary factors as 'mistakes'. It demands, explicitly or implicitly, the smoothing out of contradictions, rationalisation, regularisation of the spoken form irrespective of content. Even as a child, the writer is urged to hide his unsolved problems behind a protective screen of correctness" (p.32). Enzensberger is suggesting that
in a sense deliberately chosen pedagogies reflect the political position of those who control them. This view is based on the notion of the school as an agency of social conformity. It is clear that he believes that such a notion is bound to be challenged should the pedagogic options be increased. To do so would be to allow explicitness (this we have seen is a central feature of the 'negotiations' model) and thus inevitably to recognise the profound implications such an increase in options would have for pacing a 'ways of knowing' pedagogy.

A second factor which subsumes the notion of becoming aware of manipulation is that of conscientisation. This is a particularly useful concept, first used by Paulo Freire in "The Pedagogy of the Oppressed". Here we should remind ourselves that conscientisation refers to learning to perceive political, social and economic contradictions and "to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (p.12). As far as politically-aware English teachers are concerned this type of consciousness represents a shift from an awareness of moral to political anomalies; a shift from a morally manipulative society to a politically manipulative society - including the 'society' of educational institutions. In fact the articulation of the new consciousness may be predicted as developing in this dimension - i.e. within a socio-political dimension. The significance of Freire's concept is that it is the conscientisation of the oppressors (i.e. the manipulators) which is crucial. Thus in terms of English teaching the politicising of consciousness means that a number of English teachers have become aware that their duty to their pupils goes beyond responsibility to building consumer resistance but also, as has been said, resistance to any oppressive and manipulative means of production. This is a more fundamentalist position which has to be embraced or deliberately avoided as the logic is quite clear. Once
the teacher adopts the pedagogic strategies necessary to implement the 'growth' rationale he finds that he needs to take up a position in relation to questioning the cultural means of production. Again a continuum is in evidence as we move from an 'initiation' to a 'growth' rationale, from conserving to radicalising positions.

Conservative → Liberal/Humanist → Radical

No potential → Some potential → Strong

for conscientisation for conscientisation conscientisation

It is the logical implication of the strategies of the new consciousness which focuses the radicalising of English teaching as it enters that phase of the continuum. This makes a distinction between the degree of the potential for radicalising within other phases because the process of conscientisation is not sufficiently far advanced in shaping the 'reality construction' of English teaching operating strategies in the liberal-humanist phase of the continuum. However it is a radical function to proselytise. This points up a difference in operational strategy between those teachers who view teaching as a subversive activity and those who see it as a reformist activity. In the first case there is a fundamentalist challenge made to the whole educational status quo; in the second the challenge is to make the present system more equitable. The first is logical to the totally conscientised and uncompromising consciousness of the radicals; the second to the partially conscientised and compromising consciousness of the liberal humanist.

It is now necessary to try to trace the movement from liberal-humanism which is an implicitly politicised position to radicalism which is an explicitly politicised position within English teaching. Historically liberal-humanism has found its voice and its consciousness in
asserting the individuality of the child against the impersonality of the subject. At first, as we have seen, this meant the fostering of making independent judgments about using language and evaluating literature. Going right back to I.A. Richards, part of the critique was to challenge and not to accept current critical ideology and practice. The new criticism tended to institutionalise a kind of critical conformity. However although this implies critical distance on specious and manipulative uses of language conscientisation takes place only when the manipulative nature of the generative forces of that language production is recognised. The liberal-humanist commitment is to a moral struggle which derives from Leavis who is rejected by many radicals. To many radicals the moral critique is superficial; what is needed, they believe, is a more radical critique of a socio-economic system which sets out to exploit people in a far greater number of contexts than is indicated in the Leavisian position, in our context, linguistic subjugation. Fred Inglis suggests 2 that the liberal-humanist stress on fostering individualism has been at the expense of recognising that the public life of the individual has been encroached on by the world which has reduced the significance of that individualism. However that notion of individualism may also be seen to relate to a view of social mobility which impinges on attitudes towards the 'growth' rationale.

In this respect we have seen that changes in the consciousness of teachers partly articulated by attempts to democratic education institutionally have pointed to the dilemma inherent in any attempts to formulate a working-class pedagogy. We have also seen that the models of the new consciousness in English teaching (the 'growth' rationale) have been consistently dedicated to raising children's consciousness. It has almost

exclusively been applied to the 'less able' it being assumed that the 'more able' do not need a consciousness-raisin programme in the same way. However it is the changes in the programme which help to distinguish the liberal-humanist from the radical position. The notion of compensation is implicit in the former but it is predicated on a middle-class view of cultural reality and a sociologically naive view of occupational opportunity. Until recent years, perhaps, most English teachers wittingly encouraged their pupils to aspire to upward social mobility (clearly, a majority still do so); but this took place before (a) an awareness of 'growth' and (b) the implications for conscientisation as a result of that awareness. Since the increasing institutionalisation of the 'growth' models of the newer consciousness many English teachers, especially in densely populated urban areas, have seen a discrepancy between what children ought to be able to expect and what in fact industrial society has planned for them. The fact that their limited expectation was socially mediated gave a political dimension to an already strongly established moral consciousness. This heightening of consciousness is the process of radicalising.

It is now proposed to show first the theoretical problems attaching to this radicalising and second briefly to try to trace the articulation of the radical movement in English teaching where it shows any sort of 'communal' visibility.

 Whereas we can at least point to an articulating theory for liberal humanism in English teaching deriving originally from a reformulation of literary criticism with its implications for heightening social consciousness within indigenously British definitions of egalitarianism, i.e. non-revolutionary, it is much more difficult to find an appropriately
logically radical theory in English teaching. As has been suggested although the 'growth' rationale has some power for generating egalitarian theories the cultural norms are still implicitly those of a society which sees liberal-humanism as its best achievement. Not only is there no tradition of political revolution in this country but equally there has never been a revolutionary culture. Left wing writers are typically uncompromising on this point. Gramsci pointed out that without a revolutionary culture there will be no revolutionary theory which Lenin himself had seen as crucial to the success of any revolutionary movement.

Writing on 'Components of the National Culture' (in "Student Power: Problems, Diagnosis, Action", Penguin, 1969) Perry Anderson points up the uncompromising notion of the challenge which, again, represents the necessary shift in consciousness in order to generate explicit radicalisation. "A political science capable of guiding the working-class movement to final victory\(^3\) will only be born within a general intellectual matrix which challenges bourgeois ideology in every sector of thought and represents a decisive, hegemonic alternative to the cultural status quo" (p.215). Indeed it would appear that the 'politicising' of some English teachers may very well be part of the reaction to a change in the political climate reflecting a resurgence of various forms of Marxist thought which arose in the late 1960's in different parts of the world, particularly in Europe and the Americas. In this period underlying class

---

3. This in itself is stylistically uncompromising; the language is untypical of writing within the British egalitarian tradition which articulates at best intellectually a kind of critical conformity and social equality of opportunity for upward social mobility. However we shall see later on in this chapter how the styletics of the 'politicised' English teacher moves towards this type of expression of the radical consciousness (e.g. articles by Paul Clarke and Harold Rosen).
assumptions about the institutionalisation and transmission of knowledge have been made explicit. In this country whilst objectively working-class culture may be indigenously valid, it is clearly subordinate. Perhaps in order to derive an explicit, systematic and coherent ideology English teachers need to be aware of an historical mapping process which sets cultural traditions in institutional and transmission perspectives. The 'growth' rationale operating out of the models of the new consciousness clearly has consciousness-raising power in making ideology explicit, but if it is not seen in an historical context then its generative power is largely spent. In other words as Fred Inglis asserts English teachers need to raise their level of consciousness such that they recognise their political reality and that English does have political bearings. Thus the radicalising of English teaching would necessitate English teachers building reflexively into their own constructs of reality the notion of an explicitly committed ideology which they see in total rather than partial contexts. It is this concept of 'partial' contexts which perhaps characterises the movement towards politicisation which has so far taken place in English teaching.

In the same way that 50 years ago it was difficult to locate the creativity counter-consciousness minority in English teaching it is somewhat difficult to locate the radicals in English teaching, partly because of the lack of an explicitly stated and communally approved ideological theory. From their actions and publications one may infer radical socialism but that would assume that concept to be rather less than dynamic; and it is the problematic nature of their social role which concerns radicalised English teachers. Clearly they may be found in many different institutions, but it is likely that any communal visibility will be located in cohering groups in urban areas.
However one 'historical' movement may be traced from 1963. This movement is representative of an increasingly visible phenomenon in secondary teaching which demonstrates teacher conscientisation (in the specifically political sense defined above) as part of a wider concern for finding a formula for the 'pragmatics of survival'⁴ - not only in terms of devising viable classroom strategies but also in retaining a sense of identity true to the implications of heightened consciousness. It is this articulated identity which many English teachers feel is threatened by the authority and boundary-maintenance subjects of the wider school system i.e. especially in role designation and legitimation.

When NATE was founded in 1963 it was born as the child of a liberal-humanist consciousness fashioned, as we have seen by a morally-committed, critically-aware group of largely Cambridge English School/London Institute inspired teachers with "The Use of English" as their powerful and influential voice. NATE was concerned with the centrality of literature and resistance to the more stultifying effects of examinations. However, as has been suggested in this thesis, the establishment of the models of the new consciousness shifted the centre of concern to devising a pedagogy which would take into account the cultural present of the average and the 'less able' child. Thus we have seen that the nucleus of this shift was the implementation of the 'growth' models. We have also seen that the implications of the activating 'negotiations' model

---

⁴ This is a phrase coined by Robin Chambers, Head of English at Hackney Downs School (See Commission Seven: 'A Matrix of Concerns' in English Education, Vol.7, No.2, Summer 197) pp.33-38. It is clearly representative of how many radicalised English teachers, very sensitive to the social aspects of teaching, are concerned for the survival not only of the urban child's sense of orientation and the means of cultural production but also the English teacher's survival within what radicalised teachers see as a relatively hostile authoritarian structure representative of external manipulative hierarchies.
has been crucial to the latest NATE advocacy of a 'language policy across the curriculum'. This clearly has profound significance for the way in which the school can adapt to the weakening of Classification and Frame. In Freire's terms it certainly has implications for the notion of moving flexibly between teaching and learning roles - a pragmatic consequence of conscientisation.

The first indication that some English teachers were becoming conscientised in the ways indicated was in 1971 at the International Conference on the Teaching of English held at York University and organised by NATE and NOTE. In one of the daily Newsletters issued at the Conference three young radical teachers Myra Barrs, Bernard Bryan and Peter Griffiths asked 'What Are We doing Here?' They clearly believed that NATE had raised consciousness sufficiently amongst its active supporters so that certain central beliefs about English teaching had communal visibility. It is interesting to see that the list of those central beliefs which they proposed encapsulate major features of the models of the new consciousness and the 'growth' rationale as indicated in this thesis. Moreover the list has strong political implications. The central beliefs as the three teachers saw them were:

1. the crucial importance of individual development and the role that language plays in it.
2. the rejection of a content-centred curriculum.
3. the emphasis on autonomous and non-competitive learning situations as prerequisites for growth.
4. non-authoritarianism.

However that the three saw the implications of the weakening of frame which the classroom institutionalisation of those beliefs pointed to is in their view that small groups and individual activity must be
accommodated if there was to be a "democratization of the content and structure of the English class'. They then went on to make the first overtly political statement heard at a NATE conference. "What we now need to ask is whether these aims can be accomplished in undemocratic and authoritarian structures, where the aims and assumptions of other teachers and of the institution as a whole are not always in sympathy with these objectives and practices. Moreover were it possible to envisage a single school or college which was able to achieve such aims, the institution concerned would constitute a challenge to the present socio-economic system. In other words, English can make small local gains, and English teachers can achieve a certain measure of personal gratification from them, without impinging in any way on the society which produces the inequalities which the English teacher is trying to abolish. We should therefore like to ask...... Should a body of English teachers like NATE be prepared to draw specific social and political conclusions from its present position of commitment?"

In a tape-recorded interview with the author (1973), Peter Griffiths said that what they were trying to do was to suggest to the NATE hierarchy that it was time for NATE and other organizations to make clear their attitudes on certain things and express more of an orthodoxy - a move NATE has always been reluctant to attempt, but obviously vitally important for the growth of radical consciousness. Thus it appears that the three contributors to the Newsletter were representative of a number of younger teachers who had become somewhat disenchanted with a pedagogy derived solely from liberal-humanism. They were particularly critical of the NATE hierarchy and at York in 1971 were disappointed at the nature of James Squire's key speech which as we have seen was in its advocacy of a synthesis between freedom and authority an articulation of liberal-humanism. (See Chapter 10, pp. 359 - 363 above).
As far as the statements in the Newsletter are concerned it is clear that the three teachers were obeying the logic within the 'growth' rationale which, as we have seen, inevitably points up the misfit between the models of the new consciousness and the authoritarian structures of the school. However it appears that for many English teachers there is a barrier to a further articulation of consciousness because to obey the implicit logic inevitably makes one committed to a course of revolutionary action which clashes with those powerful forces of professionalisation making for authoritarianism and conservatism which, as Peter Griffiths suggests, is simply part of being a teacher in our particular kind of society.

The reaction of NATE appears to have been a partial generational polarising which had some immediate repercussions. However the chance of a really significant cohering of communal politicising was dissipated a few months after the York Conference. This seems to be indicative of the true ideological position of the majority of NATE members and almost certainly a fairly accurate predictor of trends to be found in the post-thesis empirical study.

Thus an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Association was held at the University of Birmingham on 26 February 1972. This represents the only serious attempt to radicalise NATE by means of a direct confrontation and voting on specific issues couched in specifically political terms. A briefing paper was prepared by Pat D'Arcy. Ostensibly the meeting appears to have been called to look at the strengths and weaknesses of the organisation, given the changes in English teaching over the previous few years. However Pat D'Arcy suggested that "the wider social implications into which their convictions as teachers of 'English' had led them" needed to be recognised. (This is clearly a result of conscientisation
having been 'negotiated' as a means of heightened consciousness brought about by operating within the 'growth' models of the new consciousness). Pat D'Arcy's briefing paper itself follows up one of the logical implications of the 'growth' rationale (she locates it as an ideological commitment to "the social implications of a child-centred philosophy") when she intimates the deschooling position. The briefing paper makes the link with the 1971 International Conference and the Birmingham meeting. At the former Pat D'Arcy observes "... there was undoubtedly by the Friday afternoon teatime session a strong sense that NATE should at the very least be ready to give backing to English teachers who now found themselves in difficulties under the present system because they were being prevented from operating along child-centred lines ... Most of us agreed at the final open meeting that official NATE backing should speedily and readily be offered to English teachers in any situation where these kinds of difficulty arose. We were agreed that although we were not in a position to offer any financial aid to teachers at odds with their schools or LEA's the very least that we could do would be to offer them the Association's support for any kind of teaching which placed the interests of the children first and if necessary the status quo second" (see Note 1). Thus at Birmingham a number of proposals were made in order to restructure NATE. About 80 people were present, they were divided into seven groups. For our purposes in this chapter two groups are relevant. It is perhaps significant that although they referred specifically to political issues they were not particularly

5. Perhaps NATE toyed briefly with this notion in the politically-oriented Commission 4 of the April 1972 Conference at York when Peter McGuire was invited to talk of his experiences with London 'skinhead' boys.
The two groups supported the following proposals:

1. NATE needs to be a pressure group in relation to social forces (13 members).

2. NATE should give support to teachers at risk (6 members).

The first group reported that they had considered contact with the unions, ways of reviving branches, and the publication of leaflets prepared by ad hoc working parties, but they had framed no resolutions.

The second group had three resolutions adopted:

i. NATE should set up a working party to liaise with all the teachers' unions to discuss and exchange ideas about the way in which teachers and children are treated in schools, with particular reference to language relationships and structure. (many abstentions)

ii. NATE should set up a study group inviting all those responsible for the training of teachers across the curriculum to discuss the particular needs of the student teacher. (many abstentions)

iii. NATE should seriously consider meeting the needs of young teachers by inviting them to set up a young rank and file group to give opportunities for discussion of common problems and promote dialogue within the Association" (34 for, 10 against).

Although the second and third resolutions do not at first appear to be particularly relevant they are an indication of a certain politicising of consciousness amongst those younger teachers facing a variety of

---

6. In a tape-recorded interview with the author (1972) Bill Spouge (then Secretary of NATE) pointed out that the original Trust Deeds of NATE forbade any action whereby NATE could support teachers who found themselves in conflict with their school or authority over teaching content or process. He also said that in his opinion the majority of the people who attended the Birmingham EGM did so in order to preserve NATE as they knew it.
problemas urban schools. There has been no official attempt to set up a young rank and file group within NATE although it is becoming increasingly clear that the initial driving force towards politicisation has been able to regroup its energies at the very productive grassroots level of the London Association for the Teaching of English (LATE) to which, in any case, many of the politically active minority of English teachers belong. Since the Birmingham meeting in early 1972 two developments are worth noting.

First, at the NATE Conference, also at Birmingham, in April 1973 as a direct result of the York 1971 and Birmingham 1972 impetus an attempt was made by a group of LATE members to found a new commission (Commission 7). It was much sharper in its focusing than the concerns which had come before the 1972 EGM in as much as it attempted to find a subsuming notion for problems of classroom survival for the conscientised. It was a serious fundamentalist attempt to bring to some fruition the consciousness-raising of the original Commission 7 at York 1971 (which had been a direct result of the Newsletter), the implications of advocating a 'language policy across the curriculum' and the 'English in a Social Context' Commission 4 at York in 1972. The commission is described by Robin Chambers in 'Commission Seven: A Matrix of Concerns' (already referred to on p. 442).

However perhaps this has been made more significant by the repercussions of three full Saturday conferences organised by LATE in the Autumn term of 1972 under the general title of 'Teaching London Kids'. The 300 - 400 teachers who attended those conferences are perhaps the best example of a visible politicised group to be found in English
teaching today. The nature of that politicisation formulated by those meetings has been expressed in the publications which the conferences generated.

Two publications may be referred to which indicate the nature and the scope of the politicised stance of this new and powerful LATE commitment. The first is 'Teaching London Kids' (LATE, 1973) and the second is 'Language and Class' edited by Harold Rosen and published in February 1974. Two articles in the first publication seem to be particularly significant. Paul Clarke writes on 'Language, Politics and Education'. Immediately we are able to see the links which the earlier part of this chapter suggested existed between the politicising of English and the 'growth' rationale "The conditions that foster language growth are by their very nature anti-authoritarian" (p.1). This is a more explicit way of making the link than in the York 1971 NATE Newsletter and suggests again a sharpening of the focus and growth of communal concern since 1971. The whole tone of Clarke's article reflects the concern about manipulation and the influence on the generation of consciousness of those who control the means of media production. It is clear that language used to manipulate "to instruct, inform and perhaps intimidate" concentrates power in what Clarke calls "top-down authoritarian systems". On the other hand Clarke acknowledges

7. The influence of LATE is of significance in locating a strong communal radical element within English teaching. It is also necessary to remember LATE's connection with the English Department at the London Institute of Education which is certainly the largest and most powerful centre for the professionalisation of English teachers in the country.

the inevitable diffusion of power when language is used for discussion (i.e. 'negotiations'). English teachers have lowered the boundaries between a finite number of approved contexts and an almost limitless number of contexts - a whole new legitimation process has been set in progress. As Clarke says "the impulse to exploit the endless resources of language tends towards the dissolution and replacement of mental structures inculcated by official power" (p.1).

The other article is by Harold Rosen and is entitled 'Their Language and Ours'. It is an interesting contribution because Rosen cites the spirit of the 1921 Report which unequivocally condemned "the evil habits of speech contracted in home and street" (op.cit. p.59) as still obtaining when most people think about the speech of working-class children. Thus Rosen's species of politicising is to champion the qualities of working-class speech on its own terms. In this respect he rejects the liberal-humanist reforming zeal to change the language habits of working-class children to fit middle-class speech models. He is in fact saying more pointedly that it is not relevant to process our teaching with this assumption about differences in performance as a premise for strategy. For Rosen working-class children are not so much deprived as exploited and he sees his task as bolstering their self-respect and indigenous verbal power, contextually located within the biography of the individual child so that the working-class shall recognise and reject exploitation. Hence his advocacy of cockney as a fully-fledged language and thus he takes teachers to task for passing on the speech neuroses of the middle-class. For Rosen there is a dangerous logic yet one which leads to the inevitable conflict which the politicised teacher feels it his duty to risk. In this he denies the doctrine of social mobility (which denial we have seen is a central tenet of the fully politicised consciousness and is certainly basic to Freire's
Rosen suggests that the strengths of working-class speech should be the starting point. In this he returns to a central notion of the politicised consciousness that the written word and its means of production have to be treated with great caution. He suggests that our education system institutionalises an imbalance between reading and writing on the one hand and talk on the other. Rosen believes that this puts the working-class at a disadvantage and blames the 'culture of the book'. For him this is the central area of conflict where the battle for the child's consciousness takes place. "The history of the book culture shows it to be the closely-guarded preserve of an elite caste. So in spite of the vast educative potential of books, they also bear the marks of their history. They tend to be very conservative products, very ritualistic in their complex format and they tend to hold one class of readers at bay while inviting another." (p.4). This point is also taken up in Harold Rosen's editorial to "Language and Class" where having admitted that the producing group of teachers share socialist political convictions also asserts that they have a "powerful conviction that working-class language was being misrepresented and that the misrepresentation was being used for reactionary ends, merely as a means of subjugation". In respect of the strengths of working-class language Harold Rosen believes that by and large the rich oral tradition of England has been omitted from the school curriculum. We are familiar with the fact that indigenous local communities do have such strong oral traditions as part of their own cultural heritage. Harold Rosen clearly believes that in order to give a sense of personal and community identity, this heritage must be of prior concern to the teacher.

Two points arising out of this seem to warrant further discussion.
in order to fix the parameters of the politicised consciousness even more firmly. First it will have been noticed that the radicalised teacher accepts a notion of conflict; second that the conflict between notions of consumption and production derive from the cultural heritage debate.

The dilemma facing every teacher is, as Harold Rosen points out, the conflict between the demands of society as a superordinate entity and the ideals of a 'growth' rationale for English teaching which perhaps radicals feel is more desirable. In this sort of environment these ideals of 'growth' could become mature. On the other hand because it is unlikely in this dimension of very slow social change that there will ever be any dramatic reorientation in the superordinate demands of society, the English teacher has the means of giving his pupils a way of controlling the worst psychic, aesthetic and moral effects of that society through developing their critical faculty. It is because of recent concerted resistance to the demands of society for allocation and a docile labour force that some English teachers have promoted the development of their pupils' critical faculties as a reflection of their own radical socialism. However there are two problems here. First radical Socialists committed to doctrinaire progressivism cannot ignore the future of their pupils who will be living in a manipulative society which will give them a living only on its own terms. Second, within English teaching there has been a tendency for another wing of the progressive movement to try to ignore this factor (what Harold Rosen calls a "nice comfortable warm little area of English teaching in which you

9. This section of the chapter derives from the author's evaluation of a tape-recorded interview with Harold Rosen in December 1972.
shut your eyes as to what's going to happen to these kids after sch ol"). Harold Rosen referred to the c se of Christopher Searle whose pupils although they were pleased about contributing to "Stepney Words" were worried about the indifference of the outside world they were imminently to enter. Criticising those teachers who believe that their only brief is to encourage children to be creative and original, Harold Rosen thinks that one of the major weaknesses of the New English is that it advocates too much undirected and uncommitted talk. As has already been su gested, he seems to be advocating a sort of defensive dialogue for working-class children. In a way it is insufficient to build up intensive personal relationships in a friendship group (he cites Countesthorpe College) because later on this experience can be seen to be irrelevant and unreal- istic. Thus the 'defensive dialogue' is a sort of insurance against manipulation and exploitation. Behind all of this there seems to be a whole pedagogy which would stress cultural relevance and the development of a linguistic competence to resist manipulation. The generation of a sense of personal worth and social heritage is a means of resisting the worst exigencies of an alien system of manipulation. Thus the politi- cised English teacher is committed to building up a resistance in working-class children and here the school is the most immediate representative of manipulation, authoritarianism and allocation. Harold Rosen thinks that the clash between such a monolithic structure and young teachers especially, is inevitable. At each stage - the classroom, the school and the society - the child is vulnerable. He has no real autonomy unless he enjoys it in every community. Presumably there is a correla- tion (perhaps negative) between the extent to which the English teacher devises strategies to promote that autonomy and the extent of his commitment to the superordinate demands of society.
Thus, Harold Rosen claims, the need for and the consequences of conflict are entering more and more into the discussion of English teachers. The raising of political consciousness has meant that for more, especially younger, teachers there has been a profound and startling revelation of anomaly in an authoritarian system which often seems to act against the wishes of the majority of teachers. Now clearly at first sight one might argue that this sort of political consideration should have nothing to do with the curriculum. However the models of the new consciousness because they involve children in a socio-psychological critique and exploration of personal and social relationships inevitably align teachers more and more with children. In a sense very often a social relationship transcends the pedagogic or certainly what most other teachers and relevant 'publics' (e.g. administrators and parents) consider as a relevant pedagogic relationship. This causes a situation which very often must look almost intolerably paradoxical to the child. On the one hand he is subject to a certain social distance in which 'states of knowledge' are made available to him; on the other, in many English classes, the social distance is considerably reduced and he is initiated into 'ways of knowing'. But the source and strength of the conflict is not only significant for the child but perhaps more so for the teacher who has to operate in a differential supportive structure (e.g. Department v. School). Thus, for example, the English teacher may not only feel isolated but be isolated. This is probably one reason why there is a movement in the profession to break out from a position which as long as it can be identified under the flag of the English Department can focus alienation, hostility, isolation and deliberate frustration. Hence the notion of 'language across the curriculum' which if integrated and implemented as an exercise by teachers to reduce conflict might
partially help to de-politicise English teaching. It is here of course that many English teachers organised within the models of the older consciousness (especially in respect of strong classification) might very well resist what to them would be a direct threat to their professional subject identity. This is an institutional-political rather than a socio-political position and again helps to point (i) the shift towards a polarisation of political opinion in English teaching and (ii) how that polarisation has come about only through the democratisation of teachers.

As has been indicated, within the concept of resistance to manipulation and the effects of the culture of the book is a rejection of the cultural-heritage position. However the implications of that position are worth discussing here because they are basic to the whole problem of relevance which is of great significance in the politicisation debate.

Thus the objection of those who oppose cultural heritage, as we have seen, is made on the grounds of relevance rejecting not merely types of text but also the culture of the book which they see as essentially a reproductive culture to be consumed by pupils. However for Harold Rosen what is traditionally represented by the term is a very narrow view of the richness of our past. It simply is not relevant to the cultural heritage of the majority of children. Thus part of the commitment of the politicised teacher of English is to persuade schools to give the cultural heritage of the working class prestige and a place in the curriculum. This then is one sector of a contemporary drive for a par-

10. In a sense Rosen's desire to tap the creative organic roots of industrial society (put down despite a mechanistic standardisation of life-style) is similar to Leavis and Thompson's desire for a return to what they believed to be the traditional moral virtues of an organic folk culture. This appears to be a strong feature of the contemporary politicised position.
ticular type of institutionalisation and as such is a natural articula-
tion of the 'sociological' model. On the other hand teachers of a more
conservative and even liberal-humanist disposition feel uneasy about
rejecting established literature. The anxiety comes over their inability
to accept those 'great works' approved by Leavis as any other but part
of the 'high' culture. Many of them are only too aware of the
inaccessibility of such works and the associated consciousness to the
majority of children. Perhaps, however, many of them are looking at
literature as if it can only be looked at like this. All great liter-
ature is ultimately independent of its critics and as such is potentially
accessible to everybody. No great literature is totally relevant to
everybody but sufficient is relevant to transcend conventional definitions
of cultural heritage. In many ways it is quite possible to put this type
of egalitarian construct on literature, but it is essentially a liberal-
humanist construct because it implicitly believes the consciousness-
forming and raising characteristics of that literature to be morally and
aesthetically transferable. No socio-political critique of the
fundamental assumptions behind the production, transmission and con-
sumption of that literature is attempted precisely because literary
criticism has no part in questioning those assumptions. This again
points up an implicit and therefore unspected political position
vis-à-vis the materials of English teaching.

Harold Rosen's suggestion that it might be possible for every child
to be introduced to certain works of literature to which they respond
powerfully indicates that the notion of 'canon' or 'high culture' or an
erroneously connoted 'cultural heritage' might be avoided. In this
way the 'boundaries' of the canon are crossed and the concept made
irrelevant. On the other hand it might also be true to say that
because 'high culture' exists 'out there' as it were for every child it is as manipulative to divert children from access to it as it is to exclude them from access to it.

Indeed the political implications of this seem to be taken up by John White in two articles published in "New Society" (2nd May 1968 and 6th March 1969). In the first article entitled 'Instruction in Obedience' White is critical of the Schools Council's support of types of "inquiry" curricula contained in "Society and the Young School Leaver" (1968). He says "it would not be at all fanciful to see the major aim of the new curriculum as getting the ordinary child to accept his lot in life as inevitable, and try to make the best of things" (p.638). He believes that the new curriculum is clearly intended for the less-able child and sees the danger of changing the content most dramatically illustrated in English. He points to the abler child studying English literature in its own right, who in so doing is being initiated into a form of aesthetic experience. On the other hand if the less-able child does only social projects White asks what guarantee there is of his ever being able to appreciate literature aesthetically. His final point is to exhort the Schools Council to turn away from the illusory radicalness of the Humanities Programme and think about what techniques can be worked out to help the less-able to learn the same things as the more-able pupils learn more readily.

In the second article, 'The Curriculum Mongers', White says that if the radical objective of an equalisation of status is to be achieved then logically everyone should be acquainted with the higher culture. He says that it is not rational to assume that because more children have to do jobs that are intellectually undemanding then they should only be taught the things which make them efficient consumers and law-abiding citizens
as well (p.359). In this respect the objectives of liberal-humanism would seem to accord with those of radicalism. In fact it seems to be central to the concept of compromise which in turn is central to the synthesis model. In a sense however White's implicit definition of radicalism is not one which would be accepted by the majority of politicised English teachers precisely because it does not question the supportive socio-political structures of the culture of the book. Thus they would see his conception of ends (i.e. equalisation of status) as being much nearer to the liberal-humanist version of egalitarianism within the parameters of critical conformity.

John White's mention of the Schools Council points to an important aspect, already indicated in Chapter 8, wherein English teachers have attempted to implement the institutional articulation of the new consciousness. He accused the Schools Council of attempting to institutionalise a different pedagogy for the working class leaving them at a disadvantage. Indeed in 'Knowledge & Control: Introduction (Ed.M.F.D.Young, 1972) Michael Young underlines this when he says that most of the research sponsored by the Schools Council is for the purposes of discovering suitable programmes for the less able. These concentrate on those kinds of knowledge which are not associated with rewards, prestige and power in our society - i.e. the psycho and sociotherapeutic 'knowledge' is mainly for adjustment to disadvantage. (p.39).

On the other hand one might argue with G. Caston writing on 'The Schools Council in Context' (J.of Curr.Studies, Col.3, No.1, May 1971, pp.50-64), that there has been deliberate resort to democracy in recent years. He says there has been "an attempt to secure the commitment of teachers by involving them decisively at every stage of the innovation programme" (p.55). As far as many English teachers were concerned the
implementation of CSE signalled a major success in democratising both
the institutionalisation and transmission of English and certainly
helped towards the legitimisation of part of a working-class pedagogy.

In order to begin summing up it is necessary to suggest that two
components relative to the politicisation of the teaching of English may
be isolated:

(1) that which relates to the actual or potential confrontation
between English teachers and supportive authoritative structures

(2) that which relates to the dispute over relevance and the battle
for the child's consciousness in terms of the production and
consumption of cultural materials.

So far we have indicated that an uncompromising sense of commitment to
the necessity of conflict and an ideological stance is necessary for the
politicised teacher. He is committed to a revolutionary procuring of
equalisation, even working-class pedagogical dominance. For the truly
politicised teacher nothing less will do. On the other hand as far as
perhaps the liberal-humanist majority of English teachers are concerned
there has always been a resistance to taking ideological stances, mainly
because they appear to involve forms of extremism and eventually embracing
attitudes and courses of action which to those teachers seem to go beyond
what is legitimately 'English'. Thus certain recent institutional
strategies would indicate that a type of political expediency operating
out of liberal-humanism is in evidence. This may be described as the
de-politicising of English teaching. A number of factors may be isolated.

First John White's articles indicate one form of adjustment and Marion
Edman arguing along the same lines in 'Suggested Methods for Realising
asserts that "We are convinced that the best means of controlling the
colossus of modern technology is to ground children in the best ideals and spiritual values of our culture" (p.17). Because t's argument redefines the nature of the battle for the child's consciousness in moral and aesthetic rather than political terms (and as such in a sense is a repetition of the 'anti-admass' critique) such an advocacy is a species of de-politicising.

Second one might also argue that to negotiate areas of integration with language as the crucial synthesising factor is changing the institutional nature of English so that its embattled, departmentally isolated position is made less visible is also a species of de-politicising.

Thirdly, mention has been made of deschooling in this chapter. Pat D'Arcy referred to it in her briefing paper for the Birmingham ECM. She suggested that teachers "had come to feel powerfully that the social implications of such a child-centred philosophy was leading the teacher further and further away from schooling as we had always known it towards fresh possibilities for learning" (p.1). In other words there seems to be a link between the implementation of a working class pedagogy and a deschooling position. This shows the contrast between the politicised and de-politicised positions well. On the one hand the politically-committed teacher's drive to demystify 'the word' is articulated by a strategy which believes in a redistribution or an extension of power as a correlate with literacy. On the other hand that English teaching which concentrates on a working-class culture and thus vindicates its legitimacy by simultaneously concentrating on a process of personal and social reintegration is practising a sort of depoliticised compensatory programme. Although as Michael Young suggests such strategies make no bid for power it is as if power which leads to dominance is seen as irrelevant. Thus one logical outcome of this would be the de-
institutionalisation of English not into an integrated matrix but as part of the thrust into a deschooled position which is an articulation of the contemporary counter culture (see F. Musgrove "Patterns of Power and Authority in English Education" (1971) chapter 10).

To sum up: We have seen that the politicising of English teaching represents a shift from advocating moral resistance to the potential corruptibility of certain manipulative and debasing uses of language to a political resistance to the actual exclusiveness not only of the 'word' itself but of the means of its production. Thus scrutiny has been shifted on to the motives of the producers of 'the word' and its institutionalised reproduction in the schools. It has been realised that herein power is located, a subjugating as well as a corrupting power. Thus the role of the English teacher has been seen to devise strategies to cope with this new realisation. This is a species of conscientisation.

Thus some English teachers - the truly politicised - are seeking a solution through political confrontation i.e. challenging the whole authoritarian supportive structure as it ramifies into society; others however are advocating extending the notion of 'negotiation' in pressing for a 'language policy across the curriculum'. Perhaps there is a danger of the first being entirely identified with a militant, activist radical Left and the second being entirely identified with a compromising liberal centre. Thus perhaps if there is to be pluralism it will crystallise in this dimension rather than an entirely intellectual dimension.

Finally just as the liberal-humanism of the 1921 Report and its support of egalitarianism (i.e. equalising within the status quo)
represented a coherent if limited exposition of the contemporary counter-consciousness, so the radicalising of English teaching in the last few years represents a new counter-consciousness. This is a historical movement which it is hoped paradigm theory will accommodate.

Note 1. It is difficult to talk categorically of the status quo because it is now under scrutiny. However we can look to the publication of the Black Papers as an expression of a seemingly timely rearticulation of what looks more like the traditional status quo than anything else. In this sense the authors of the Black Papers were prompted to write a defence of what in the broadest sense many English teachers would recognise as the authoritarian supportive system. Thus the Black Paper debate is ostensibly about standards, differential intelligence, cultural heritage and the minutiae of educational practice. However it is also a political manifestation. Many English teachers themselves have rejected the extremes of 'progressivism' and have increasingly sought to inject some sort of direction into personal exploration through language by looking at the functions and role of language as they occur - and this involves facilitating a variety of discourse. Perhaps many English teachers would oppose the Black Papers - not because they disagree with the whole case but the part relating to discipline, literacy, intelligence and egalitarianism. Most English teachers would agree that they should be concerned with competent literacy, that they should try to make available great works of art and literature (if in a different timescale); that children should be stretched to give of their best. However it is a question of how much more they do which relates directly to the notion of the differential control of consciousness. This is
where the political aspect is located; this is where the ideology of the radical English teacher would stand against that of the authors of the Black Papers.
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PART THREE
INTRODUCTION

The thesis has now reached a stage where the major changes in the institutionalisation, transmission and supportive ideologies of English teaching have been mapped in some detail. In addition some analysis of ways of classifying these changes has been suggested in terms of a delineation of models of English within the older and new consciousness. An attempt has also been made to see these models in relation to 'initiation'/'growth' rationales.

The third and final part of the thesis proposes to move towards a more viable and sensitive theoretical focus. This movement reflects the author's search for such a theoretical focus moving through bi-polar analysis to paradigm theory. In this sense it should be seen as a developmental process reflecting stages of theory refining. However it must be pointed out that the more powerful paradigm theory still remains problematic in its application to English teaching.
CHAPTER 14

THE APPLICATION OF A BI-POLAR ANALYSIS TO INTERPRET CHANGES IN
ENGLISH TEACHING: A SECOND THEORETICAL PROBE.

It will be remembered that in the first chapter of the thesis the author proposed to explore the basic distinctions between 'states of knowledge' and 'ways of knowing' using as a foundation some of the ideas contained in Bernstein's paper on the Classification and Framing of knowledge. The socio-historical chapters were in fact informed by the theoretical principles contained in that paper and a selective mapping was presented. However in order to refine the process of theorising it is now proposed to look at the descriptive principles behind the major changes in consciousness to see if a more powerful subsuming construct can be generated.

So far we have been able to suggest how the models of English teaching differ and to what extent they are likely to be taken up by English teachers. This description was mainly concerned with contrasts in Classification and Frame and the ways in which the models relate to those contrasts (Figure 1). It has also been suggested that the models form three major groups which can be subsumed under the two opposed positions indicated by the 'initiation' and 'growth' rationales.

Since the evidence presented in the previous chapter suggests that these two rationales are diametrically opposed, the second theoretical probe proposes to examine how far a bi-polar analysis can generate meaningful, more generalised descriptions of changes in English teaching. Certainly the contrast between the models of the older and new consciousness indicates a polarising of ideology and mode of transmission. Thus
if we look at the material so far presented in these terms we are able to point up a process which shows a tracking away from the original polar orientation towards a diametrically opposed position.

Pole A  The elder consciousness → its models → 'initiation' rationale

Pole B  The new consciousness → its models → 'growth' rationale

This concept has logic in as much as the notion of change can be described in terms of available differences and does in fact accord with the two basic descriptive aspects of Bernstein's Classification and Frame paper selected for use in this thesis (i.e. Strong v. Weak Classification and Framing; 'states of knowledge' v. 'ways of knowing').

If we bear in mind the detail of the various summarising sections of the thesis (Chapter 7, pp. 230-245, Chapters 11 and 12) in which these available differences were presented in a more systematic form, especially in the 'Initiation'/-'Growth' rationales chapter, then the bi-polar analysis is put into sharper focus. However in addition it is proposed to show how the analysis may be applied generally and very selectively to the material in other ways. This illustration is deliberately selective and limited because it is felt that the logic of bi-polar analysis can quickly be applied to the contrastive summaries already presented in the thesis without extensive comment. The first context concerns Classification and Framing where the differences among the models have already been indicated. However it is here proposed briefly to apply bi-polar analysis in order to look at those differences historically across the material of the thesis.

Thus we can argue that changes in English teaching, where they can be located, show a movement from a static system of values and orienta-
tions towards a dynamic, ongoing almost amorphous condition. On the one hand there is initiation into explicit notions of hierarchies in terms of what is to be learnt and how it is to be learnt; on the other the child is induced to take part in a process of negotiation in order to determine what is to be learnt and how it is to be learnt. In the 'initiation' polar position an open-ended range of alternatives (i.e. in the pacing, sequencing and evaluating of knowledge) are just not made available to the child. In the 'growth' polar position a vast range of experiences are not only available to the child but are accepted as such by both pupils and teachers. In both positions the rationales have to be internalised in order to make viable their associated pedagogies.

To illustrate this in a little more detail it is useful to remind ourselves in the first instance of the part played by the English Association. It will be remembered that a major component of the older consciousness was the promotion of individual excellence to which the grammar and public school-dominated English Association committed itself during its early years. Given the necessary transmission and ideological implications of such an objective in order to institutionalise a pedagogy promoting individual excellence, the English Association was instrumental in implementing a drive to establish a new identity and status for English teaching. This involved encouraging a strong objectively classified English pedagogy held together by strong framing. We have also seen that as a point of diametric contrast with the later more expressive and subjective pedagogy of the new consciousness, the older consciousness had no knowledge of and no deep concern for wider psychological and sociological issues. However if we apply bi-polar analysis the implications of strong framing may be mapped.
We have seen that an implication of teacher control is that social positions within the classroom are highly explicit (i.e. strongly hierarchical and not interpersonal). This represents a strong framing. However, as the thesis has proposed, when frames are weakened the nature of all social relationships in a classroom is changed because the pedagogic operations based on a high degree of teacher control are no longer possible (we have seen how this notion is at the heart of the 'Negotiations' model). The major change is in what is held as implicit and explicit between teacher and pupils. Thus as was argued in the first theoretical probe at the beginning of the thesis a linear concept is replaced by a network concept.

We can follow up this change historically in terms of the 'explicit skills' model. Here, as we have seen, the traditional approach to the teaching of communication skills was to make individual performance as competent as possible - again the mechanics of objective excellence (i.e. clarity, cogency and comprehension). Here strong frames for the teacher acting as an expert performer were appropriate to the pupil starting as an inexpert performer. A set of more or less prescribed standards or procedures also contributed to the strength of the frame. Thus the pedagogic context was clearly appropriate for the processing of such explicit, circumscribable skills. Any way in which these skills were communicated in an indirect or implicit manner was peripheral or incidental because the strong framing necessarily precluded the possibility of the skill being acquired in this way. Conversely (i.e. applying bipolar analysis to the observable implications) when frames are weakened one might argue that it is virtually impossible for explicit skills alone to be acquired (indeed these too may not be acquired). This is so because the weakening of frames inevitably and logically leads to more
diverse pedagogic approaches based not on notions of teacher initiation and control but on shared initiation and control.

Thus where frames are weakened, the teacher is not so much concerned with a pupil's objective excellence but by acting as a guide to pupils who are seeking self-knowledge and subjectively exploring appropriate contexts (the 'growth' rationale) he is helping them to acquire it.

We can return to the historical evidence to show movement from the original polar position (Pole A) in terms of literature teaching. We have suggested earlier in the thesis that by 1920 the English Association seemed to represent a more liberal approach to English teaching (given the institutional connotation of the liberal-humanist concept which the thesis has sought to analyse). Apart from suggesting that the teacher should be less authoritarian the English Association advocated that the main pedagogic criterion should be a feeling for literature. In order to show the tracking away from the original bi-polar position, it might be true to say that the English Association's desire to lay more stress on the aesthetic side of teaching literature is the beginning of the movement from objective to subjective strategies in English teaching with the implications for 'sharing' becoming less implicit. (The 1921 Report's concept of individuality and liberal-humanism builds on this).

Thus the 'polar change' is a movement from the objective to the subjective which leads to a socio-aesthetic dimension in as much as feeling is recontextualised mainly through a personal and a social sharing of a writer's experience, especially in the novel. In this context the change in sensibility is subject to bi-polar analysis. Thus we can see

1. It could perhaps be said that it was not until the novel became accepted in the English classroom that this sort of shift in pedagogic sensibility became possible.
literature not only as a reinforcement of 'what is' but also, for the individual, of 'what is becoming' — in the sense of an emergent, albeit differential control of experience. This contrast has profound significance for the notions of relevance and cultural production articulated by the models of the new consciousness (see the previous chapter on the 'politicised' consciousness).

It is possible to illustrate the contrastive state outlined above in a little more detail by further historical reference. Thus when the English Association laid stress on enjoyment, the set books which it recommended (see Appendix 2 to Chapter 4) tended to present literature as a covert reinforcement of a process of socialisation already set in motion in order to render the world as immutably fixed and necessarily hierarchical (see Summary review, Chapter 7). This accounts for the original polar position showing a prevalence of retrospective texts — especially in history, biography and belles-lettres — and also a low priority being placed on contemporary fiction, especially the novel, at a time when many writers were becoming increasingly alienated from society. However movement away from the original polar position shows that increasingly the whole of life (individual and social) is the true context of English teaching. In this sense we can suggest that this is the contrast between a static and a dynamic organisational principle for the transmission of English. Thus no longer is literature necessarily and exclusively seen as a covert elaboration or reinforcement of an élite culture.

Another way of analysing a constituent of the original polar position (and here a transmission/reproduction model is suggested) is to propose a tracking away from an hierarchical orientation towards a personal orientation as a mode of classroom organisation. The original emphasis
placed on intellectual or personal academic excellence reinforces hierarchical relationships in two dimensions:

(1) in respect of teacher-pupil fixed role relationships (i.e. the teacher represents a model and possesses a technique of approaching the model which the pupils must learn to manage in order to succeed).

(2) the knowledge corpus ('states of knowledge') itself is implicitly an agent of control because it is presented as potentially attainable either as the result of a single strategy or a severely limited number of strategies.

However other than hierarchical relationships cannot be obtained and what is worth knowing or is expedient to know in a 'personal-expression' model cannot be achieved unless the teacher-pupil role-relationship is dynamic and the hierarchy is less explicit. The teacher and pupils are explorers of a delimited area of experience from which knowledge may be abstracted. Therefore it is a relationship with a learning process which the children have to learn to manage in order to find out what is worth knowing for themselves. This becomes a matter of internal, personal conviction rather than external positional constraint. This points up the bi-polar analysis.

However the bi-polar analysis, at whatever level of generality it is applied does not account for intermediate positions, nor does it direct attention to mixed orientations which are often truer reflections of how 'reality' is constructed. Thus it has no mechanism for accounting for the ways in which the 'synthesis/compromise' model is described or to what extent it is likely to influence English teachers. It certainly does not account for the ambivalence over the formal teaching of 'skills' which the empirical data has revealed.
Moreover by using bi-polar analysis one is seeking to explain the effects of social change as if there was a steady, uniform movement from one orientation to its polar opposite. In this respect this type of analysis is not powerful enough to account for the real sequence of change. It does not help us to say very much about the formative or articulating stages of an orientation and thus tends to be retrospective in its descriptive power. Thus the analysis does not allow for overlapping (i.e. emergent counter-consciousness) or pluralism (competing or differential consciousness) to show up very clearly; nor can it track uneven or reactionary development. This is particularly important when trying to map the movement of change; it is incorrect to assume an even, 'forward' movement as entirely descriptive of development in English teaching. In other words the real nature of change cannot be accounted for by taking soundings in the historical flow of time. Thus a bi-polar analysis tends to follow the essentially uni-dimensional progress of time too closely for really significant detail about change to show up.

To sum up: A bi-polar analysis is a useful preliminary mapping technique; it sharpens the focus on contrastive elements, but in no way really explains them either substantively or historically. Thus although the analysis is productive at a level of static generality it does not describe the two diametrically opposed positions sensitively or rigorously enough, nor can we derive from it predictions about further change.

A bi-polar analysis is fairly sensitive in picking up the operational differences in transmission between the two forms of consciousness and shows up some differences in supportive ideology, but does not show up
the socio-historical factor of institutionalisation. As far as ideologi-
gical considerations are concerned the movement from strong framing to
weak framing polarised positions (i.e. transmission factors) reflected
a movement where an implicit, covert, static ideology is replaced by an
explicit, overt, dynamic ideology. This helps to accommodate one fairly
consistent linear development in English teaching from conservation,
through liberal humanism to radicalism.

I have included some discussion of bi-polar analysis because it was
implicit in the whole mapping process's contrastive design. However
continued inspection of the application of the theory soon revealed its
basic inadequacies. Thus the next chapter of the thesis attempts to
show how paradigm theory might provide a new more rigorous schema and
yet one which could also accommodate the virtues of all the contrastive
notions so far advanced in the thesis.
CHAPTER 15
PARADIGM THEORY AND ITS RELEVANCE TO ENGLISH TEACHING

A Introduction

It is proposed to start the discussion of the application of paradigm theory to English teaching by adding to the detail of Figure 1 (see Chapter 11) an initial view of paradigm as it might be related to English teaching. Thus Figure 6 (over page) shows that the eight positions of strong and weak classification and framing may be subsumed under a notion of two opposed paradigms, A and B. These represent the models of the elder and new consciousness respectively. A third paradigm, C, representing the synthesis/compromise model has also been added, whilst the general location of the emergent 'politicising' paradigm is indicated.

The three major paradigms, A, B and C may be said to form three separate arenas within the total arena of the ideologies, transmission and institutionalisation of English. Thus Figure 6 gives us some indication of how the attitudes of groups of English teachers correspond to paradigm positions. These arenas are centres of discourse which compete for the control of consciousness amongst teachers. In this way the notion of conflict which has been implicit in the contrastive principles employed in this thesis may now be made explicit. Thus it is hoped that Figure 5 will provide a referential focus for the discussion of paradigm theory and the later attempts to substantiate its application to English teaching.

B The Basic Elements of Kuhn's Paradigm Theory

This chapter, then, is an attempt to explore ways in which the
FIGURE 6  Superimposition of Paradigm positions on Figure 7
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theories of Thomas S. Kuhn might be applied to the curriculum in general and knowledge systems associated with English teaching in particular. It is hoped to show how Kuhn's paradigm theory provides a framework for considering the major transmission and ideological polarities which can be said to characterise the institutionalisation of English teaching in the past 70 years. In this way it is also hoped to show how paradigm theory incorporates the bi-polar analysis, in a sense building on it. This sharpening of the theoretical focus is part of the process of how the thesis has developed.

It must be pointed out that paradigm theory as Kuhn discusses it is concerned with how scientific knowledge is created. However in this thesis we are concerned with how knowledge is transmitted and institutionalised. This is an important preliminary distinction to make because it clearly determines the extent to which we can apply the details of the theory to English teaching. Moreover Kuhn's paradigm theory is essentially applicable to a very different professional community with a very different view of the reality of what they do. This is the difference between pure science and the technology of teaching.

The first step will be to define paradigm as Kuhn sees it with some detail of the ways in which paradigms are articulated in scientific communities. It is hoped to isolate the fundamental concepts of the theory as markers in a description of the application of the theory to English teaching. Finally some sort of a critique of the theory will


2. See Appendix at the end of this chapter for some discussion of 'community'.
Kuhn begins his theory by suggesting that 'normal' science means "research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements... that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time as supplying the foundation for its further practice" (op. cit., p.10). He says that these achievements are recounted in textbooks (e.g. Ptolemy's "Almagest", Newton's "Principia"). These works "define the legitimate problems and methods of a research field for succeeding generations of practitioners" (p.10). He suggests that the achievement of the legitimators is signalled by the extent to which they are successful in solving problems in conflict with competing modes of scientific activity. Thus "paradigms gain their status because they are more successful in their competition in solving a few problems the group of practitioners has come to recognise as acute" (p.23).

The student is socialised into a paradigm so that he can become a member of a particular scientific community where he will share a commitment to the "same rules and standards for scientific practice" (p.11).

The period of competition which preludes the establishment of a new paradigm Kuhn describes as the pre-paradigm stage. After the triumph of one of the pre-paradigm schools, Kuhn suggests that the defeated paradigm disappears "once and for all" (p.17).

On page 23 of his essay Kuhn distinguishes two senses of paradigm. He says "In grammar amo, amas, amat is a paradigm because it displays the pattern to be used in conjugating a large number of Latin verbs... In this standard application the paradigm functions by permitting the replication of examples any one of which could in principle serve to replace it. In a science on the other hand, a paradigm is rarely an object for replication. Instead... it is an object for further
articulation and specification under new and more stringent conditions."
Thus, having tested this notion against a number of historical develop-
ments in science, Kuhn is able to define paradigm as ".... the source of
methods, problem field and standards of solution accepted by any mature
scientific community at any given time" (p.102). The notion of time is
important because the application of paradigm to the passage of scientific
time suggests that the universally recognised scientific achievement
provides model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners
for a time. Thus in terms of the history of science paradigms refer
essentially to a series of transitory truths. This sense of 'permanent
impermanence' is helpful when trying to apply these notions to the
development of English teaching because it points to a uniformity of
practice which has the intense historical necessity to change as more
knowledge about the way children learn, institutions work and pedagogy
is transmitted becomes available. The philosophical correlation of
these new 'knowledges' (derived mainly from psychology, sociology and
linguistics) suggests the growth of a new paradigm. Here the notion of
an emergent paradigm is especially useful because, as Kuhn's definition
suggests, the shift from one paradigm to its challenger is entirely
dependent upon uniformity and consensus.

In Science, according to Kuhn, the paradigm operates as the basis
for research which scientists hope will add to the scope and precision
with which the paradigm can be applied. Moreover the paradigm provides
the scientific community with a criterion for choosing problems that
"while the paradigm is taken for granted, can be assumed to have
solutions" (p.37). Kuhn next introduces the idea of 'rule'. This
refers to the "sorts of restriction which bound the admissible solutions
to theoretical problems" (p.39). He says there are rules "to which all
the practitioners of a scientific speciality adhere at a given time" (p.42). For Kuhn although rules derive from paradigm, paradigm can guide research even in the absence of rules.

In Chapter VI of his essay ('Anomaly and the Emergence of Scientific Discoveries') Kuhn suggests that 'normal science' (as a puzzle-solving activity) is cumulative so much so that it inevitably leads to the invention of radical new theories of science. This is a process of "discovery" or "novelties of fact" and then "inventions" or "novelties of theory" (p.52). For Kuhn the distinction between fact and theory is artificial - they are linked episodes "with a regularly recurrent structure" (p.52). For Kuhn also "discovery commences with the awareness of anomaly", i.e. with the recognition that "nature has somehow violated the paradigm-induced expectations that govern 'normal science' " (p.53).

Kuhn links the notion of anomaly with the onset of paradigm change. However he indicates that the professionalisation associated with a paradigm underpinning 'normal' science leads "to an immense restriction of the scientist's vision and a considerable resistance to paradigm change" (p.65). The anomaly has to "penetrate existing knowledge to the core" (p.65) before there is a paradigm change. Kuhn locates such change in scientific discovery which reflects a destructive - constructive sequence. He characterises persistent anomaly and the paradigm change which it precipitates as representing a state of crisis. In terms of the scientific community there is "pronounced professional insecurity....... As one might expect, that insecurity is generated by the persistent failure of the puzzles of 'normal' science to come out as they should. Failure of existing rules is the prelude to a search for new ones" (p.68).

Within this context of crisis Kuhn suggests that scientists do not necessarily renounce the paradigm that has led them into crisis. To do
this would be to see an anomaly as a 'counter-instance' which, Kuhn suggests, is not going to be accommodated by the existing paradigm. In other words there would be a community readiness to reject simultaneously an older paradigm in favour of a newer paradigm. This in itself requires a "reconstruction of the field from new fundamentals, a reconstruction that changes some of the field's most elementary theoretical generalisations as well as many of its paradigm methods and applications" (p.85). Kuhn talks of a period of transition which, when completed, will reveal that "the scientific profession has changed its view of the field, its methods and its goals" (p.85). For Kuhn this is a switch of gestalt. This whole process is what Kuhn defines as a 'scientific revolution'. Kuhn's description of the characteristics of that 'revolution', as far as the scientific communities are concerned seems to parallel much of what has been going on in English teaching over the past 10 years. "The proliferation of competing articulations, the willingness to try anything\(^3\), the expression of explicit discontent the recourse to philosophy and to debate over fundamentals, all these are symptoms of transition" (p.91).

C The Application of Paradigm Theory to English Teaching

So far in this thesis we have been able only to note changes in English teaching retrospectively. There are no 'rules' in Kuhn's sense governing either the English or the wider curriculum. Thus it is difficult to impose tests of historicity whereby we might track changes in the 'rules'. If we were able to do this it is possible that we should also be able to say much more precise things about changes in

---

\(^3\) The 'growth' rationale demonstrates this.
pedagogic organisation and theoretical delineation of resources or materials (i.e. what is or is not included in any lesson or teaching situation based on those principles).

Although Kuhn does not make a very clear distinction between qualitative and quantitative dimensions in science, he appears to suggest that the qualitative dimension refers to the underlying theory of 'normal' science (i.e. paradigm) whilst the quantitative dimension refers to the laws which emerge through paradigm articulation. Such a distinction is just not substantively applicable to the curriculum, although some sort of theoretical paralleling is possible. In this respect it seems important to try to distinguish a quantitative and a qualitative dimension to the curriculum. The quantitative dimension might be said to refer to the establishment of the curriculum and the universal acceptance of its necessity as a way in which knowledge should be selected and organised for transmission in schools. The qualitative dimension might be said to refer to the successful relationships between that knowledge and the individuals and society served by the curriculum. One might argue that the curriculum becomes more quantitatively 'mature' the more its constituent parts (whether described as a Collection, or an Integrated Code) reflect what is deemed a necessary part of what a society thinks is worthwhile knowledge. On the other hand one might also say that a curriculum becomes more qualitatively 'mature' when its underlying theory appears able to cope with anomalies.

At the present time it is very difficult to argue for the quantitative maturity of the wider curriculum. However as far as English is concerned we might suppose that the pedagogic 'revolution' in the contents and strategies contained in the models of the new consciousness is a sure sign of qualitative maturity. But that 'revolutionary' context is
almost totally derived from 'discoveries' in other fields. In other words it underpins Paradigm B which has attracted practitioners through taking up progressively theories from social science allied to notions of a less explicitly hierarchical way of 'negotiating' the organisation and transmission of knowledge. This points up a 'revolution' in sensibility. Perhaps it is true to say that this notion could only be made explicit within the context of paradigm theory.4

Thus setting the goal of paradigm formulation as a theoretical ideal may help the historian to make some assumptions especially about transmission. On Page 8 however Kuhn raises the question of whether historical study can possibly effect conceptual transformation. He is suggesting that the notion of pure description would not generate a theory. Clearly the process involves interpretative, normative, logical and epistemological criteria. In terms of theory and practice we might consider Kuhn's twin notions of "the context of discovery" and "the context of justification. In the first we should be seeking to isolate thought sequences which reveal, connect and explore — a difficult abstraction and coordination operation, especially empirically. In the second we should seek to isolate procedural practices which were vocational, pragmatic and organisational. Thus a pedagogical paradigm based on the "context of justification" may be easier to abstract than a paradigm based on the "context of discovery". Whatever is done, however, Kuhn's warnings must not be ignored. "History suggests that the road to a firm research consensus is extraordinarily arduous" (p.15). On Page 16 he

4. However, given English's growing social perspective, we must not forget Kuhn's assertion that social science for example may not have acquired an overall paradigm. This is another reason why we should be conscious of the limitations of transferring the theory from science.
also says "only very occasionally ... do facts collected with little guidance from pre-established theory speak with sufficient clarity to permit the emergence of a first paradigm". Thus in order to begin to apply paradigm theory to the assumed theoretical orientations within English teaching it was necessary to go to the relevant communities to test whether those assumptions might be justified. Hence the survey questionnaire stressed criteria which could be located within accessible sociological data (i.e. influences and assessments of pragmatic factors. In this way theoretical positioning on the Classification and Framing octant could be locked on to a model of competing paradigms (i.e. Figure 6 above).

Thus given a preliminary analysis of the sort of English articulated by the older consciousness we may venture a paradigm description (Paradigm A.) Perhaps such a description would hold good for a large part of the curriculum both historically and at the present time. As we have already intimated this may be socio-historically interpreted in notions of the 'initiation' rationale. Conversely we may point to the characteristics of the 'growth' rationale to suggest a more recent and competing paradigm position (Paradigm B). However this suggests a notion of reformation as well as revolution; it might be inferred that English teaching has moved in toto into a new mode of transmission. But this is clearly not the case because this sort of historical periodisation clearly distorts any description of what has actually happened.5

---

5. The term 'periodisation' is probably the creation of Arthur Marwick. Writing in "The Nature of History" (Macmillan, 1970) Marwick suggests that although 'periodisation' is essential to the historian, use of the term tends to lead to undue stress on the breaks between one historical period and another (e.g. Middle Ages/Renaissance) (p.169 passim).
Thus it is important to try to determine whether a body of belief about English teaching is implicit in the welter of pedagogical 'facts'. So far we have seen that these beliefs can be mapped systematically and an indigenous principle abstracted to explain changes in those beliefs (the 'initiation' / 'growth' rationales). In which case, as Kuhn remarks, more than mere facts are at hand. Thus we have to try to determine contrasting metaphysics and try to make explicit and systematic the psychological, sociological, linguistic and literary 'belief' of many 'visible' personal classroom practices. One limitation which standard empirical techniques cannot overcome is that we can only begin to guess at the greater multitude of 'invisible', personal classroom practices. This in turn raises the problem of divergences referred to in Kuhn's thesis. Perhaps only by using paradigm may we test whether these divergences are likely to disappear. As Kuhn says on page 17 of his essay "their disappearance is usually caused by the triumph of one of the pre-paradigm schools, which because of its own characteristic beliefs and preconceptions, emphasised only some special part of the sizable and inchoate pool of information". However he stresses that a paradigm cannot explain all the facts with which it can be confronted.

Earlier in the chapter we noted that according to Kuhn's conception of paradigm change there can be no return to a previously discarded paradigm. However the synthesis/compromise model of English teaching indicates some sort of revision of a pedagogy which the models of the new consciousness have rejected. But what is being retained is being transformed because it is being affected by elements within the new consciousness. In a sense the synthesis/compromise model (which is basic to Paradigm C) is an aspect of the continuing sense of crisis which the earlier anomalies in Paradigm A brought about. Paradigm B was, of course,
an attempt to resolve those anomalies. Thus adapting Kuhn's analysis of crisis (op.cit., Chapter VII) already referred to earlier in the chapter we might say that under the impact of theories derived from social science and the subsequent increase in awareness among English teachers of conflict between supportive ideologies and modes of transmission, the English curriculum has undergone a period of profound insecurity, particularly in recent years. Thus Paradigm C and the emergence of the 'politicising' paradigm is an attempt to find new 'rules' for the English curriculum to replace the inefficient old ones.

At this stage, however, it seems appropriate to mount some sort of critique of the paradigm theory. A number of limitations have already been indicated in its application to English teaching; more need to be discussed.

First, Kuhn's notions of attempting to display the historical integrity of a science in its own time (e.g. Galileo's views are not discussed in terms of their relationship to modern science but rather in terms of his contemporaries) cannot really be satisfactorily applied to English teaching. Because of those differences in the nature of the knowledge to be transmitted already referred to earlier in the chapter and the different objectives of a scientific community as compared to an English teaching community there is a fundamental difference in the histories of the two activities. This fundamental difference is also reflected in the nature of any application of paradigm to the English teaching curriculum. This can be illustrated by referring to one of the basic reasons for the shift from Paradigm A to Paradigm B by large numbers of teachers in the past 15 to 20 years.

We have seen in effect that among other reasons attempts to teach English by what one might call quasi-scientific principles, that is by
attempting to teach according to unquestioned assumptions about the 
efficacy of vocabulary exercises and the nature of language failed 
because of what amounted to a superficial theory of language. This 
became especially urgent under the impact of the newly available know-
ledge in linguistics, psychology and sociology. In Kuhn's sense of the 
word, anomalies in Paradigm A were revealed. It is clear that Paradigm 
A was unable to accommodate the conceptual advances in the 'new' social 
sciences.

That this type of teaching persists, especially in selective schools, 
shows how the institutional realities of the school predicated on 
notions of social conservation and socio-economic allocation refracted 
and to some extent resisted conceptual advances in the 'new' sciences 
and thus any paradigm founded on them. As has been suggested this 
appears to point up a fundamental confrontation between two paradigms 
 deriving from the 'initiation' and 'growth' rationales. In science 
such a situation could not exist because a different conceptual time-
 scale operates. As one paradigm is refuted and its anomalies are recon-
ciled another paradigm becomes the organising concept for whole sections 
of if not always the full scientific community. In other words the 
establishment of a scientific paradigm correlates highly with its 
'communal visibility'. On the other hand the history of the development 
of English teaching indicates that there has always been a time lag 
 between 'novel' or creative practice and widely accepted institutional 
approval. This was, of course, illustrated in the first part of the 
thesis where a counter-consciousness was seen to represent the beginnings 
of a movement away from the original paradigm position. This seems to 
argue for the notion that schools reflect rather than actively shape 
social change. However very recent attitudes prevalent amongst an
active and creative minority of English teachers working in urban comprehensive schools suggests that the time lag is likely to be shortened. This inevitably leads to a shift in notions of change from accretion to revolution - which in a sense is a crucial difference between Paradigm C and the emergent 'politicising' paradigm. It is in the revolutionary dimension that any new paradigm would be most like Kuhn's definition for science, although, because paradigm is essentially a descriptive device, the theory could not be used to predict the actual process of paradigm synthesis (as suggested in this thesis, with the notion that synthesis means reformulation). In addition it would be very difficult to predict the further articulation of such paradigms in their problem-solving phases. 6 (We can conjecture that the 'linguistics-based' model, embedded in a pedagogy of 'negotiation' may be a possible outcome. The empirical data fixes the direction of this a little more firmly.)

Another problem involves the incorporation into a paradigm of a consciousness largely fashioned by aesthetic and intellectual response to literature. Whereas it has been suggested that it is likely that the 'linguistics-based' model will be linked with the 'synthesis/compromise' model (see Chapter 11) some teachers may resist this seeing it as a threat to the centrality of literary experience and the values they believe that experience to express. In this respect the initially published claim of linguistics to subsume the registers of literature may eventually make it less attractive to those teachers moving independently out of the

6. However we are able to draw some 'community' parallels. Thus in many ways the English Association had a problem-solving period after its inception - i.e. the curricular establishment and extension of English. Equally NATE fulfilled problem-solving commitments in its early years. This helps to point up Kuhn's notion of the interdependence of paradigm theory and community.
uncompromising 'cultural-heritage' position. However much we may assume a growth in popularity of what we have abstracted as Paradigm C, we should not forget that in Kuhn's terms any notion of a mixed paradigm is inadmissible.

If we go on to consider the relation of paradigm to the curriculum, it is no more than wishful thinking to say that a 'normal' curriculum would develop in the same way that well-attested scientific methodology and 'progress' have produced 'normal' science. Thus it is difficult to talk of 'normal' English teaching. (The seven models proposed earlier would preclude this.) Furthermore notions of normality tend to be

7. If we examine the 'uncompromising' position within the 'cultural-heritage' model we can suggest that it goes right back to Matthew Arnold's notion of 'the best'. In the earlier part of the thesis we associated this position with a view of a canon of literature exclusive to certain people who possess a basic intellectual equipment, often socially induced, to sustain successive rarefied stages of initiation into the profundities of the canon. This involves the development of an esoteric vocabulary and a refinement of concepts - and this was a basic pattern of professionalisation reinforced through highly selective education and professional study. It could be argued that this concept of professionalisation is a component of Paradigm A, with a strong communal belief about the transcendental power of literature. Thus any impetus towards changing it was seen not only as a threat to professional identity, but also to personal identity. However it might be argued that the very rigidity of this position prepared the way for it to be seen as an anomaly, following the impact of the 'new learning' and changes in institutionalisation. (The sociological aspects of anomaly relating to 'relevance' are particularly important). Thus the secondary modern school (the non-selective school) showed the way towards the necessity for change; and it was the broadening of the base of non-selective education which pointed up the anomaly. Even so, as we have seen in the development of the 'synthesis/compromise' model, certain characteristics of the 'cultural-heritage' model have not been abandoned. There has been some retraction but not destruction; where retraction however is most marked is in the emergent 'politcising' paradigm.
polarised which makes it impossible eventually to talk of the English teaching community as opposed to profession. Only NATE is a visible English teaching community, although of course many members of the English Association also teach. Thus only in NATE may it be assumed that there would be any sort of consensus about 'normality' - and the Association's resistance to notions of an orthodoxy of English teaching would militate against that.

We have already referred to Kuhn's explanation of how paradigms occur in science, especially in respect of an original synthesis being produced to attract practitioners away from older schools. In this respect there is a parallel in the emergence of Paradigm B (i.e. the new consciousness). Although there is no synthesis made within English teaching itself, educationalists have selected from the social sciences those theories which can be used to legitimate and create principles for a new practice (see Chapter 8). As has been stressed these principles relate to modes of transmission of English. This point preserves the essential difference between Kuhn's notion of a paradigm as it is applied to science and any attempt to apply it to English teaching. There has been a recontextualising of theories not initially concerned with education.

However, given the retention of the models of the older consciousness, if we assume that by the early 1960's there was some polarisation of competing modes of English teaching we could say that in this context NATE came into being for two reasons. First, as we have indicated, to try to formulate strategies for solving problems facing English teachers. Thus it was found that the practice of the traditional 'paradigm' did not work for a majority of children in non-selective schools. Thus in terms

8. This is in the area of a personal reconstruction of reality - i.e. a change in consciousness which suggests that because one's personal practice is not suitable for the children one is teaching, one needs to look for new methods.
of transmission the older 'paradigm' was no longer able to offer solutions to problems created by changes in institution. Second, there was at least implicit agreement among groups of English teachers (i.e. 'Use of English' Groups and those teachers working within "The Use of English" ambience) that it seemed necessary to gain community consensus in order to institutionalise new modes of transmission. More briefly it was a public recognition on the part of English teachers of the articulation of children's personal and social 'needs' which led to the formation of NATE in the same way that it was the subject's institutional 'need' which had led to the formation of the English Association in 1907. Subsequent articulation and problem-solving has been concerned with the institutionalisation of community objectives derived from an increasing knowledge about how children learn. We saw in Chapter 13 how this process has increased the visibility of an emergent 'politicising' 'paradigm'.

Thus, without NATE acting as a communal coordinator, it is doubtful whether a new 'paradigm' could have emerged, especially as the institutionalisation of that 'paradigm' as a viable working-class pedagogy has been effected in English by NATE working in close conjunction with the Schools Council.

Although it may be argued that it is possible to apply the concept of paradigm as it relates to the notion of a professional community, because the views and activities of NATE are not universally accepted by the wider specialist and non-specialist English teaching profession (as opposed to community) then this must be taken as a limitation on trying to apply the concept of paradigm to English teaching. Thus the transference remains problematic and despite arguments presented in this chapter, objections must be raised to any wholesale take-over of the theory.
In respect of the assumed power of paradigm as a refined mapping technique it is important to point out that Kuhn does not make it very clear in his essay how paradigms are refuted and new paradigms put in their places as a historical movement. Indeed one feels that Kuhn has some difficulty and only partial success in overcoming the historiographical problems of showing the movement from pre- into post-paradigm states of knowledge. Some further discussion of this and its relationship to Kuhn's definitions of paradigm seems appropriate at this stage.

Kuhn first published his essay in 1962 and his ideas have been subsequently criticised by, among others, Margaret Masterman in 'The Nature of a Paradigm' in "Growth of Knowledge" and Dudley Shapere in 'The Structure of Scientific Revolutions' in "Philosophical Review", LXIII (1964) pp.383-94. In the 1970 edition Kuhn included a postscript which attempted to answer the criticism of the theory. Here, on page 175, he goes beyond the definitions of paradigm which we referred to in our earlier discussion of the basic characteristics of the theory. He now distinguishes two different uses of the term. He says "In much of the book 'paradigm' is used in two different senses (1) entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques etc. shared by members of a given community and (2) one sort of element in that constellation, concrete puzzle solutions which employed as models or examples, can replace explicit rules as a basis for the solution of the remaining puzzles of 'normal' science". Perhaps the confusion arises because Kuhn's discrete category 'paradigm' is applied unsoundly (1) in an historiographical way and (2) is not differentiated into its philosophical and pragmatic aspects. The theory itself has been put into a linear straight jacket, i.e. movement from formulation, through articulation (Kuhn's post-paradigm stage) to the onset of its destruction.
However Kuhn's distinction serves us well because it helps to show the difficulty of tracking the continuity of the stages in the growth and decay of a paradigm. Moreover it does make us sensitive to points of development and changes in English teaching. For example it helps us to see how the 'initiation'/'growth' rationales are underlying ideological beliefs about the 'needs' of children (This would accord with Kuhn's first use of the term 'paradigm'). Thus if we accept that paradigms go through stages of assertion, growth, maturity and decay if not destruction and that changes in English teaching may be looked at in this framework, then the application of the theory may help us to show how institutionalisation is essentially the result of competing ideologies held by 'communities' of English teachers and expressed through the transmission of the subject.

The problem of periodisation was referred to above. Although it was suggested that periodisation has much historiographical convenience it is dangerous to periodise when describing the sorts of changes in English teaching we have been concerned with in this thesis. This is certainly one reason why the second half of the thesis is not presented entirely as historical sequence. Thus as we have seen although new ideas in English teaching inevitably lead to revaluation of older theory, for many the older theory continues to inform practice. Moreover English teachers reassess their practices and beliefs at different rates and in different institutions. This is partly because of the dissemination of the models. This is also affected by how far what the school wants correlates with what an English department sees as worthy of transmission. Unlike the growing articulation of a new scientific paradigm, changes in the practice of individual teachers is not necessarily communal. However as many individual teachers have changed their practice, there is a
growing 'communal' visibility. If we look at this in terms of Paradigms A and B the empirical data suggests that the English Association reflects the models of the older consciousness, whilst NATE reflects the models of the new consciousness. In this context NATE's real significance lies in its efforts to institutionalise conviction about English teaching arising from personal and collective changes in practice.

Because it is not made very clear in Kuhn's essay how paradigms are refuted and in order to accommodate notions of active and reactive change relevant to English teaching, some sort of modification of Kuhn's theory seems necessary.

Thus it is proposed that we think in terms of a three-dimensional concept of paradigm which it is hoped will accommodate changes in English teaching rather better than the periodisation inherent in Kuhn's concept. However, given the evidence so far presented in this thesis, it is possible to suggest that Kuhn's basic notion of refutation is applicable to English teaching. This seems to have a wider sociological implication if one sees English teaching paradigms as having a potential for volatility. This is realised in pedagogical practice which tends to reflect states of crisis in society. Thus when society becomes more aware of its own cleavages there is more explicit ideological confrontation.

9. This will of course be analysed in the post-thesis study.

10. The effects of such personal changes are usually a painful realignment of identity for most people, as a result of ideological realignment. As was suggested in Chapter 13 this can lead to alienation where the institution cannot or will not accommodate personal changes of this sort. We have seen how this can lead to a conflict situation in schools which the empirical data suggests may be as much a generational factor as anything else. Whilst such changes are less likely for older teachers (i.e. over 35), younger teachers are perhaps more sensitive to anomalies in on-going theory and practice.
As we have seen this accelerates changes in the mode of transmission of 'knowledge' as well as the 'knowledge' itself and causes conflict over how it should be institutionalised. In this way teaching is far more influenced by changes in the wider society than science. This in a sense reflects the difference between an homogeneous scientific community and heterogeneous English teaching communities.

Thus the modification and application of Kuhn's thesis rests on the recognition that although there are essential differences between the two communities, the data available for the communal identity and practice of NATE and the English Association suggests that a notion of paradigm, albeit different, can be applied. The modification of Kuhn's theory is an attempt to account for that difference. However it is important that we should locate any such modification of the theory within what may be abstracted from Kuhn as a three-stage model:

1. the progress of 'normal' practice, derived from 'normal' science, that is the articulation of the mature paradigm
2. the decay of the paradigm
3. the emergence of a new paradigm.

It is therefore proposed that a model of paradigm is used for English teaching which consists of

- a supportive dimension (Kuhn, stage 1)
- a destructive dimension (Kuhn, stage 2)
- an emergent dimension (Kuhn, stage 3).

It is hoped that this three-dimensional model of paradigm will be relevant to the fact that elements of a no longer dominant paradigm can be returned to by individual teachers should a new paradigm's potential for solving problems be called into question. A vindication for applying this notion is in the empirical evidence which we have suggested reflects a desire by part of the sample for a return to some
sort of formal language teaching. This also points up the problem that teachers often tend to measure the output of children in terms of the older paradigm. The present crisis over evaluation suggests one of the major battlefields of competing ideologies and their respective paradigms.

Thus by differentiating three dimensions in any notion of paradigm, if it is to have any real mapping or theory refining power within English teaching, we are suggesting that these dimensions may exist at the same time within different 'communities' or at different times within the same 'communities' in greater or lesser strength. This helps us to plot the relative positions of the paradigm based on the models of the older consciousness (Paradigm A) and the paradigm based on the models of the new consciousness (Paradigm B). In this way we can limit the obvious intellectual weakness of the notion of a cumulative process being a necessary part of paradigm change. It helps us to make sense of the tensions and conflict within developments in English teaching at a descriptive level as well as under stricter analysis. By suggesting three conceptual dimensions it is possible to talk about relative changes in paradigm. This helps to accommodate the temporal problem of co-existing and competing paradigms. This illustrates the localised influence of any attempt to apply an undifferentiated notion of paradigm to educational theory and practice in as much as there are other influences on a 'community' which affect paradigm. It would also seem to be better than asserting that the transition from one paradigm to another may only be achieved by an extension or articulation of the old paradigm. This is certainly not true in the way that Paradigm B rejects Paradigm A. Moreover it also helps to locate the 'synthesis/compromise' model which we have seen is at the root of Paradigm C. However Kuhn makes a useful point about a transition period. He says (p.84) "During the transition
period there will be a large but never complete overlap between the problems that can be solved by the old and by the new paradigm. But there will also be a decisive difference in the modes of solution. When the transition is complete, the profession will have changed its view of the field, its methods and its goals". This clearly means that a considerable period of time elapses "between the first consciousness of breakdown and the emergence of a new paradigm". This appears to have been the case in the change from the dominant older consciousness, to the emergence of the new consciousness. The contribution of the new learning in the social sciences and institutional changes after 1944 to the new paradigm will be appreciated in this context.

If we assume that "paradigm assertion" is possible as a means of mapping changes in the institutionalisation, transmission and ideologies of English, it would appear that a similar mapping of other areas of the curriculum ought to be possible. Paradigms in all three dimensions are implicit in educational politics (e.g. problems concerned with comprehensivitation). However there are attendant difficulties which cannot be ignored. When teachers and educationalists realise that a paradigm is not solving problems of transmission this leads to a complete reassessment of how subjects should be taught and their place in the wider organisation of the school. However there is a source of resistance to paradigm change in the Classification and Framing of English which suggests a distinction between a subject paradigm and its institutional setting. Thus any changes in the practice of English may involve organisational changes in the school in order to account for the discrepancies between the organisational structures of schools and changes in the practice of the knowledge to be transmitted. However this would suppose ideological similarity whereas there is evidence to suggest that the
'subject' and its institutional setting often operate in different ideological dimensions, thus causing the sort of tension discussed in Chapter 13. This has especial significance for the notion of 'community' when applied to English teachers because a lack of coherence between the subject paradigm and its institutional setting weakens the teachers' power as problem-solving 'communities'. Rather it reduces them to problem-processing 'communities'. The solution is only possible in successful institutional practice which cannot be established in Paradigm B unless teachers are involved in evaluating modes of transmission. (The work of the Schools Council is, of course, crucial in this area.)

Thus because the 'subject' paradigm often may not articulate (in Kuhn's sense) without organisational compromise, as far as English is concerned this may account for the timescale of approval for personal writing (i.e. the 'personal-expression' model). The further up the secondary school system the child progresses the more his 'needs' are made to fit in with the real purpose of the institution—i.e. as an agency of cultural and social conservation and socio-economic allocation. Such is the strength of the institutional setting that the senior school child usually internalises this 'need'. In terms of the transmission of English there is a shift in the mode of transmission and its evaluation from the subjective to the objective.

On the other hand under the auspices of Paradigm B we can see attempts to integrate subjects which will clearly alter the nature and direction of that shift. As far as English is concerned this reflects the attempts to formulate and implement a language policy for the whole curriculum as well as an integration of the 'personal-expression' and 'sociological' models in Creative Arts and Humanities' programmes.

However the empirical data has suggested that such developments might
well be resisted by subject-oriented teachers (compare Figures 2, 3 and 4). This is perhaps a good example of resistance to paradigm change. There is also some 'community' resistance (both within and outside English teaching) to the emergent 'politicising' paradigm especially in the persistence of Paradigm A and, as has been suggested, the growth of the 'synthesis/compromise' model. This seems to relate to the strategy of expediency referred to in chapter 13. It was also intimated in Chapter 13 that individual teachers and indirectly pupils might become estranged from a school and for that reason behave more and more aggressively within it. This would seem to make some sense of Kuhn's assertion on page 93 of his essay that the choice between competing paradigms proves to be a choice between incompatible modes of community life. This may very well be the battleground for any struggle between not only 'conservatism' but liberal-humanism and radicalism entrenched within particular 'communities'. Indeed evidence cited in chapter 13 suggests this could very well be the contemporary position among groups competing for power within NATE.

A significant factor which suggests how fruitful it is to try to relate paradigm theory to English teaching is in trying to see how far there is a textbook tradition in English teaching. In Science Kuhn asserts such a tradition is very important in underpinning the emergence of paradigm. However it must be pointed out that there is obviously no comparison in significance between texts like Newton's "Principia" and texts legitimising the transmission and practice of English teaching. Again it points up the basic difference between the creation and the transmission of knowledge. However if we accept the notion of a textbook tradition in English, given this essential difference from Science, we are able to see the key texts already referred to in the thesis in a
more meaningful light. Thus in the chapters on "The Use of English" and the models of English teaching selective reference to this 'tradition' has helped to point up practice and therefore orientation. It will be remembered that all the models of English teaching can be associated with crucial texts which 'produce' the model. In this context for example "Reflections" was a key text in 'fixing' changes both retrospectively in terms of a new theoretical orientation implicit in the new consciousness and prospectively in terms of the structure of future 'textbooks'. Similarly Holbrook's books had tremendous implications for prospective 'post-change', 'revolutionary' text book trends.

Evidence from the empirical data may be used to illustrate the efficacy of suggesting a textbook 'tradition' in English teaching.

Thus in answer to the question asking the NATE/EA sample to indicate the most important influences on the views they held about English teaching, the following information was returned:

1. Out of 11 'influences' isolated from the data, the influence of key texts and journals (usually "The Use of English") was placed second. (See Appendix at end of thesis.)

2. If one isolates those key texts from a list of people and books suggested by the sample as having most influence on the views they hold about English teaching, the following list of books occurs in descending order of incidence. 11

- "English for Maturity" - David Holbrook
- "English for the Rejected" - David Holbrook
- "The Exploring Word" - David Holbrook

11. The post-thesis study will include an analysis of the basic characteristics of the sample in order to show how the significance of this list varies with age and institution.
These books both innovate and legitimate the models of the new consciousness. They create an arena of discourse which holds the ground for Paradigm B. Most of them were written as a challenge to the arena of discourse legitimated by the sorts of texts underpinning Paradigm A (These have been very well documented by Shayer and Mullins, whilst this thesis has included selective reference to them in the earlier socio-historical chapters). Although there are of course a number of other books mentioned, the above list is sufficient to point up the kind of 'text book tradition' relevant to English teaching. They are certainly representative of all the seven models of English teaching proposed in Chapter 11, (with the exception of the 'explicit skills' model in its original articulation).

As has been intimated the relationship of a 'textbook' derived
tradition to the notion of an English teaching community is much more complicated than in Science. However, as in Science, textbooks occasionally (rather than invariably) preserve the historical importance of what Kuhn calls its 'community heroes'. However unlike many famous scientists of the past, the English teaching legitimators (rather than heroes!) are not merely of historical importance in the development of a particular approach, their influence can still be felt in current pedagogy. In this respect their positions in colleges and especially Departments and Institutes of Education enables them to transmit the paradigm to large numbers of teachers.

The final section of this initial discussion of the relevance of paradigm theory concerns the problem of research design and execution. It will be remembered that Kuhn defined 'counterinstance' as the stage when scientists realise that the paradigm underpinning 'normal' science can no longer cope with anomalies. Thus it only comes into existence when the theory is challenged. However it would appear from what we have already said about the essential differences between science and the curriculum that we cannot apply Kuhn's assertion on page 79 that "to reject one paradigm without simultaneously substituting another is to reject science itself". Thus we must be careful to acknowledge that what constitutes a counterinstance in Paradigm A might be normal practice in Paradigm B (see the contrasts in Figure 6). At least the theory of counterinstances appears to reflect on the whole

12. Historical legitimators who have actively shaped pedagogy of English teaching would include people like Matthew Arnold, Caldwell Cook and George Sampson. The results of the Questionnaire reveal that contemporary legitimators include David Holbrook, P.R. Leavis, Frank Whitehead, James Britton, P. Creber, Denys Thompson and Nancy Martin.
concept of research and suggests that an examination of counterinstances might be usefully applied in order to try to predict their effects in supporting a paradigm. (Again inspection of the differences between Figures 3 and 4 throws some light on this). Retrospectively, examination of the occurrence of the counter-consciousness isolated in the first part of the thesis fits in here. Moreover examination of the 'politicising' paradigm as a counterinstance may help us to make surer predictions about its effects.

It is now necessary to sum up the connection between paradigm theory and English teaching and present it as a superordinate descriptive concept.
It is proposed to make some contrastive analysis of Paradigms A and B. It will then be necessary to give a description of Paradigm C and some detail of the emergent 'politicising' paradigm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARADIGM A</strong></th>
<th><strong>PARADIGM B</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6) 'community' has a high regard for professional mystique.</td>
<td>The articulation of the models of the new consciousness have brought the 'community' into contact with the profane world - very much reduced notion of professional mystique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Its history, scope and structural relevance has a high visibility.</td>
<td>Its history, scope and structural relevance is more pedagogically diffuse; therefore there is much less visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Representative English Departments have strong, objectively generated identities located in the 'subject' (particularly in the literature of the 'cultural-heritage' model).</td>
<td>Representative English Departments have strong, subjectively generated curricular identities located in the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Strong traditional Classification of subject content and parameters. (high boundary-maintenance)</td>
<td>Reclassification of subject content and parameters. (low boundary-maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Objective praxis.</td>
<td>Subjective praxis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARADIGM A</td>
<td>PARADIGM B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Celebrates education as individual.</td>
<td>Celebrates education as social in its origins and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Writing is seen as a perpetually private and mostly reproductive act. (In this sense it points up a separatist pedagogy)</td>
<td>Writing is often seen as a social system - i.e. motivation is often achieved through &quot;background of discussion and shared experience&quot; (J. Britton, op.cit., 1970, p.45) (In this sense it points up an integrative pedagogy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Covertly political (implicit ideology)</td>
<td>Overtly political (explicit ideology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Children are given parameters of 'reality' to form consciousness.</td>
<td>Children are induced to construct their own 'reality' to form consciousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Institutionalises examinations based on 'explicit skills'/ 'cultural-heritage' models.</td>
<td>Institutionalises examinations based on 'personal-expression' and 'sociological' models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Explicit grammar, explicit sequencing rules for the transmission of knowledge - clear criteria for evaluation.</td>
<td>Implicit grammar, sequencing rules and criteria for evaluation open to discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARADIGM C.

The empirical evidence (derived from Figures 3 and 4) suggests that Paradigm C may be representative of a reaction building up among a liberal-humanist element uneasy about the apparent 'dilution of standards' and unacceptable notions about 'relevance'. This is so because perhaps most teachers have been socialised into strong classification and framing and often feel guilty about giving up the practice associated with this view of the contents and transmission of the curriculum. This then would indicate that in 'communal' terms Paradigm B is showing certain anomalies in that it is not always coming up with the 'right' answers in order to solve problems of dealing with the acquiring of language 'skills' and a professional view of 'reality' based on literary knowledge. This would give some vindication for including the 'linguistics-based' model in this 'paradigm'. Thus the movement from in particular the 'personal expression' model to a 'linguistics-based' model may ultimately be crucial in any movement from Paradigm B to C. Certainly it would appear to be a reflection of the search for a new language-based source of 'discipline' which also pointed up a movement towards political expediency which it was suggested in Chapter 11 was the 'ideology' behind the model.

The beliefs and practices of those subscribing to Paradigm C also points up the fact that a paradigm, wherever applied, cannot entirely disregard some of the procedural achievements of the previous paradigm. This helps to explain a new 'communal' move (beyond English teachers alone) to reinstate Paradigm A - that is to reconstruct it in terms of the three-dimensional notion proposed earlier. Thus one might say that Paradigm C represents the new concern among many English teachers to find a philosophy for English teaching. Given the strong liberal-humanist
element in the profession it is likely that some sort of synthesis will be desired. Thus we find Derrick Sharp, for example, contributing an article to "The Use of English" (Winter 1971) entitled 'Structure - a Plea for Synthesis', pp.120-126. His conclusion is significant in the context of Paradigm C. On page 125 he says "What we need above all is sound linguistic knowledge on which might be built a graded series of language experiences in which literature would figure largely but not exclusively". Implicit in Paradigm C is the 'communal' consensus that many teachers find it difficult to rationalise about Paradigm B pedagogy and feel that its total rejection of Paradigm A pedagogy is a distortion.

An article by Roland Harris in "The Use of English" (Winter 1966) is also clearly prompted by a sense of 'crisis' (in Kuhn's sense) facing the English teacher. Entitled 'The Education of the Teacher of English', pp.114-121, the article has a significant sub-title 'An enquiry into the need for a study of the role and status of the English teacher as seen by himself, by his colleagues in other disciplines, by parents and by pupils.' In the article Harris defines the role of the English teacher as one which extends "an appreciation of the intrinsic values of the materials to be taught and a knowledge of the nature of children" by suggesting that today he is also expected to combine "parental functions and the skills and interest of the social worker" (p.115). He suggests that this has led to uncertainty in the teacher of English, especially as in his opinion the "field of the subject has become vague and indefinite" (p.116). He goes on to outline how this is so citing the following factors:

(1) The lack of knowledge among a majority of English teachers of any new formulations of the structure of language.

(2) Loss of precision in examination procedure.
(3) Wider variations in accepted usage.
(4) The inaccessibility of the experience of literature to certain pupils.

He concludes that what is needed is a careful examination of the conditions and requirements for a fruitful acceptance of a role that is diffuse with specialist status and authority (my underlining). From this it would seem that Paradigm C because it tends to be a movement which keeps it more within the ambience of Paradigm B than Paradigm A (especially in terms of the full ideological and institutional implications of the older consciousness) may be a reflection of that attempt to meet the requirements of a diffuse role. However Harris is careful to point out that this should be done without sacrificing the lessons learnt in "a long and respectable reliance on the experience of literature as a means of inculcating linguistic skills and values and of securing the involvement of the child in experience of value" (p.117).

The Emergent 'Politicising' 'Paradigm'

It is felt that a full separate description of this 'paradigm' (which would be a 'pre-paradigm' in Kuhn's schemata) need not be attempted here for two reasons:

(1) Chapter 11, which dealt with the politicising of English teaching did so with special reference to 'communities' (e.g. NATE and LATE).

(2) The pedagogy of the emergent paradigm operates within Paradigm B, except in a very special ideological sense.

However it is important to note that where Paradigm B operates as a 'subject' paradigm within an institution which largely supports more Paradigm A oriented subjects, the 'politicising' paradigm is likely to emerge to entrench against the chief characteristics of the threat that
the institutional setting offers the subject paradigm. There are of course other ideological and institutional reasons for the 'politicising' of English teaching which would assert the paradigm. As has been suggested above these have been isolated in Chapter 13.

Thus because the emergent paradigm is still in a constructive phase, and that it is itself a specific articulation of the general 'ground' of Paradigm B, any comparison that can be made with the other paradigms can only be done so in terms of a limited number of variables.

Summary/Review

Part 1 of the thesis (Chapters 1 - 7) shows the emergence of Paradigm A as the dominant paradigm. However we can now say that the counter-consciousness evident at that time represents, in Kuhn's terms, the pre-paradigm stage of the new consciousness. This becomes Paradigm B. Moreover the modification of Kuhn's theory into a three-dimensional model for paradigm helps to recontextualise changes in English teaching in terms of what is being taken on modifying established practice. Thus John White's views (referred to in Chapter 13) may be interpreted as supportive of a cultural-heritage position serving to resist the total destruction of Paradigm A. In effect he is making a plea for the survival of the paradigm's legitimating theory.

We may also assume that Paradigm A as it is expressed in the models of the older consciousness is more homogeneous in its institutionalisation and 'communal' influence than Paradigm B. Thus the beliefs, practices and criteria of evaluation are more explicitly defined than those of Paradigm B. A Paradigm A English Department in a school could be said to have a strong, objectively generated 'subject' identity (transmission/reproduction). A strong paradigm-sustaining 'textbook' tradition also exists.
Paradigm A began to show that its practices could not cope with the implication of 'discoveries' in psychology and sociology being applied to education. This was particularly true of the problems facing the majority of children after the broadening of the base of secondary education in 1944. Thus, on the one hand the materials of the older models were seen to be culturally less relevant and unworkable for the majority of children. Paradigm A was also weakened by 'discoveries' in the nature of language and its personal and social significance. Here was the onset of the new consciousness.

To illustrate this, it will be remembered that in Chapter 10 (The Transatlantic Dialogue) reference was made to Moffett's schema as a redistribution of members of the triad consisting of speaker-listener-subject. In Paradigm A the locus of authority is in the teacher-subject, whereas in Paradigm B it is in the child/teacher. In Paradigm A here the 'subject' refers to a closed knowledge code and corpus impermeable to 'everyday knowledge'. In Paradigm B, however, both code and corpus are far more open (indeed 'corpus' is very much attenuated) and 'everyday knowledge' is central to the operating of the models of the new consciousness (see Chapter 11 and the description of the 'sociological' model).

Thus one might say that the movement from Paradigm A to Paradigm B is a process of divestiture. By this is meant that teachers have increasingly abandoned the notion of knowledge only being available when the child has been initiated into reproductive ways of acquiring it. However we have suggested that in Kuhn's terms Paradigm A has not entirely lost its 'normalcy' in 'communal' consciousness, a factor which the survey data confirms. In a sense this relates to Esland's distinction between a subject and a perspectives paradigm (op.cit.1972), although for purposes
of the kind of analysis pursued in this thesis the two are obviously inter-
dependent. We have been concerned with the institutionalisation, trans-
mission and ideology of perspectives on the 'subject' of English teaching. 
But we must remember that the teacher is usually socialised into a notion 
of subject first. Thus within the consciousness of the English teaching 
profession the objective quality of Paradigm A which characterises the 
way it normally operates in selective secondary schools is overlaid by 
Paradigm B which tends to be adopted as the 'normal' means of transmission 
by teachers trying to adjust to the institutional realities of teaching 
children in non-selective schools. However the growth of Paradigm C 
suggests that the desire for synthesis and compromise is a reflection of 
how certain objective factors (e.g. 'standards' in language attainment) 
still operate within the total consciousness-forming mechanisms of 
English teaching.

Finally it seems possible to say that a comparison of the details of 
Paradigms A and B indicate that Kuhn's thesis helps us to make more 
explicit the conflicting ideologies underlying different modes of trans-
mission of English. Although by no means all of Kuhn's paradigm theory 
is relevant to changes in English teaching it is sufficiently productive 
in sharpening the theoretical focus on those changes to make comparative 
analysis worthwhile.
Appendix

The relevance of W.O. Hagstrom's "The Scientific Community"
to the notion of English teaching 'communities'

This Appendix attempts to explore ways in which some of the ideas of Warren O. Hagstrom contained in "The Scientific Community" (1965) have relevance for a description of English teaching 'communities'. Hagstrom's analysis has been chosen because it arises naturally out of the earlier discussion of comparisons between science and English teaching generated by Kuhn's paradigm theory. Inspection of Hagstrom's work suggests that a number of factors have a bearing on that description.

(1) Research

Hagstrom based his description of a scientific community on the influence of scientific colleagues on the conduct of one another's research. He believed that an autonomous group of colleagues is the most important social influence on research. In turn such a group defines what ought to be areas of research and thus determines consensus about theory based on research. Hagstrom's conclusion is that decisions such as these involve the central goals and values of the scientific community. In this way Hagstrom presents research as a crucial activity in establishing the visibility of the scientific community. He says he is not concerned with scientists' personalities, their non-scientific backgrounds, their politics or the consequences of their work for non-scientists. Obviously the two factors defining Hagstrom's notion of community here would not help in defining the sort of English teaching 'community' indicated in this thesis. Clearly research affects only a tiny fraction of that 'community' and thus every other 'communal' action,
at whatever level, is more visible, permeable and externalised. One might argue that NATE has begun a research tradition of sorts. Various areas of the curriculum causing concern or producing special interest among English teachers have brought together members of the Association who have eventually published some kind of report on the topic. (We have already seen NATE's concern for and interest in examinations, primary education and 'language across the curriculum'). Although none of the work can be said to have employed the rigorous research techniques of science, it has clearly signalled NATE's goals and values. In the English Association there is also no 'research' tradition in Hagstrom's sense. However, like NATE, the Association's goals and values have been signalled by the production of leaflets, pamphlets and the Year's Work in English Studies. It is interesting to note that since the early 1920's there have been considerably fewer pamphlets devoted to the teaching of English. It will be remembered that this is a reflection of the successful institutionalisation of English as a major examinable subject at secondary level by 1920.

(2) Social Control

Hagstrom indicates that the major regulator of social control in a scientific community is an individual's desire to obtain recognition from colleagues. However this is of much less importance among English teachers because they are accountable to a number of other 'publics', children being the most significant. Clearly social control is not exercised in an exchange system as outlined by Hagstrom.¹

¹. "The prolonged and intensive socialisation scientists experience is reinforced and complemented by their practice of the exchange of information for recognition" (Hagstrom, op.cit., p.21).
teachers may or may not desire recognition. What is visible of their ethic, either in its conservative or radical dimension, suggests that 'recognition' is more complex and may have much to do with a sense of satisfaction derived from some sort of conviction that their ideology is fulfilling them as they believe that their pupils are benefitting from the strategies they are employing. However it does seem to be true that in English there is some kind of an élite group. If we associate such a group with the hierarchy of NATE it is interesting to note that since 1963 the social composition of that élite has hardly changed. But at the present time the view which it legitimates is being challenged by younger groups of teachers whose social composition is different. In this sense changes in paradigm are proportional to changes in the social composition of élites. However whereas such élites may be said to be active legitimators, the vast majority of English teachers subscribing to different perspectives of the new consciousness are the medium through which Paradigm B is institutionalised at the local or 'grassroots' level. This level, the departmental level, acts as a powerful form of social control and becomes a very important arena for competing paradigms.

At the local level, if the English teacher has genuine 'negotiated' contact with children, he is likely to be sensitive about his pupils' feelings towards him; this would certainly be true of teachers affected by the new consciousness. However this may be less true within the older consciousness where the nature of the transmission of knowledge is hierarchical. Thus a pedagogy produced by a Collection Code assumes an hierarchical relationship between an initiator and the initiated. However a pedagogy which is based on 'negotiation' assumes that the learner's perspective is one of participation. In fact differences may
arise here precisely because the form of social control is different—thus implicit in 'negotiation' is a notion of the equal validity of the child's perspective. This would seem to point up a fundamental epistemic difference between 'communities' of English teaching, (e.g. NATE v. E.A.)

(3) Orthodoxy

Implicit in Hagstrom's delineation of a scientific community is the view that it is committed to specific norms and values. This would certainly fit in with Kuhn's idea of a paradigm making for a uniformity of practice. However a feature of the history of NATE is its public disavowal of orthodoxy. This is particularly important when one is trying to map changes in English teaching and underlines the difficulties and dangers of locking into paradigm theory assumptions about uniform belief and practice. This would be especially true of Paradigms B and C wherein the main ideological weight of NATE may be found. On the other hand one is likely to find more orthodoxy associated with Paradigm A which seems to reflect the ideology of the English Association.
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FINAL DISCUSSION AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

It will be remembered that the thesis began with an attempt to find a viable theoretical orientation in order to point the major direction of the study - that is ways in which changes in consciousness underpinning the institutionalisation, ideologies and transmission of English might be mapped. In an initial theoretical probe the two main descriptive features of Bernstein's Classification and Framing paper were examined and were found to have sufficient generative power to establish guidelines for a preliminary mapping. This suggested a detailed socio-historical survey which allowed contrasts to be made between a dominant consciousness based on a transmission/reproduction model and a growing counter-consciousness. This survey closely followed the chronology of the extant files available for inspection in the Ashridge Repository up to about 1930. A linking chapter outlining more general intellectual and institutional changes followed providing a 'bridgehead' into the post war years.

The second part of the thesis sought to map the contemporary position as well as attempting to apply theoretical constructs in terms of model building and the subsuming initiation/growth rationales. This part was concluded with an analysis of the politicising of English teaching.

The final part of the thesis was concerned with discussing ways in which paradigm theory might generate an overarching description of the major contrasting changes in English teaching both historically and at the present time. In this respect the study is a history of the ways in which contrary directions have been taken up with some indication of why they have been taken up.
Thus there are two major orientations in the thesis - socio-historical and theoretical the first informing and shaping the second, which serves, reflexively, to interpret the first at increasing levels of generality. It was felt that the historical orientation was necessary because it enabled the author to show through the chronology of the selected material how consciousness was formed and articulated in modes of transmission both officially and more individually.

Although the Ashridge files were inconsistent in what they contained, and unfortunately sometimes omitted the sort of information which would have proved most significant (e.g. the preliminary discussions to the formulation of the 1921 Report) they were able to throw considerable light on the details of decision making. This in turn reflected an implicit ideology which helped to put the official policy of the Board of Education into much sharper focus.

The decision to use the contemporary educational press in the socio-historical section of the thesis, in addition to the more obviously available 'method' literature was prompted by the belief that opinions expressed were likely to be less cautious than those of official policy and probably a truer reflection of the 'realities' of English teaching as individuals saw them (Jessie Smith's article referred to in Chapter 4 is significant in this context). The subsequent empirical survey proffered some confirmation of this in as much as it seems most likely that "The Use of English" has been very influential in the formation of many features of the present-day consciousness. Thus if one takes the publications referred to in Chapter 8 as 'historical' one can actually trace how "The Use of English" both created and reflected opinions about English teaching.

More generally the socio-historical account has enabled us to see
how the models of the older consciousness, exclusively designed for middle-class children in selective schools, in no way took into account a working-class consciousness. This was demonstrated objectively in terms of explicit skills and subjectively in terms of cultural heritage. In direct contrast to this the new consciousness developed as a more sensitive index of the significance of pupils' lives. This helps us to show the basic conflict in historical terms.

As far as the theoretical orientation is concerned the later part of the thesis especially has been an attempt to find ways in which the flux and detail of the changes in English teaching might be subsumed under notions of increasing general descriptive power. Figure 7 in Chapter 15 is an attempt to show the stages of this search for more powerful superordinating descriptions. Building on the basic dichotomy between competing consciousnesses revealed historically, the theoretical orientation reached a final superordinating stage in the application of paradigm theory to English teaching. This was principally designated as two major arenas, Paradigm A and B which represented the main ideological conflict and thus differences in views about transmission and institutionalisation which characterise a historical and contemporary mapping of English teaching. However two further arenas of conflicting consciousness were isolated - Paradigm C and the emergent 'politicising' paradigm. The first was isolated partly through the socio-historical survey and the appropriate models it suggested, and partly as a result of the initial analysis of the survey material. Thus Figures 3, and 4, and 5 in Chapter 11 show the incidence of ambivalence which, it has been suggested, serves as some evidence for Paradigm C. The second was isolated as the author became aware of the increasing visibility of radical elements within English teaching, especially in connection with
the recent activities of LATE and its relationship with NATE.

Thus these two newer arenas suggest a new dichotomy, a recontextualised polarisation. On the one hand Paradigm C indicates some sort of compromise in order to accommodate some of the subjective praxis of a working-class pedagogy recontextualised within weaker framing, whilst on the other hand the emergent 'politically' paradigm uncompromisingly rejects a middle-class pedagogy. This newer polarisation indicates that while there is less crucial conflict in transmission, the ideological confrontation between liberal-humanism (Paradigm C) and radicalism (the emergent 'politically' paradigm) is likely to be quite marked. Chapter 13 has already indicated this.

If we accept the notion that the paradigm arenas are characterised by conflicting discourse about English teaching we are able to see this in the wider context of conflict between ideologies about how society should be organised and about what its institutions should reflect. As B. Hollingworth reminds us¹ this is the sort of perspective an English teacher ought to be concerned with in response to the confrontation between 'open' and 'closed' interpretations of society. In this respect the author believes that this thesis represents a preliminary step in that direction.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

These recommendations arise out of the author's awareness of the limitations of the thesis. One such limitation is that it tends to focus rather narrowly on changes in English teaching without taking into account

parallel and simultaneous developments in other parts of the curriculum. Moreover only a brief mention has been made of major organisational changes in the schools. However it is felt that the socio-historical and theoretical methods adopted to show changes in English teaching could be replicated to map the development of other parts of the curriculum. Certainly those areas which have a natural expressive affinity with English, such as Music and Art, might very well be amenable to such a treatment. Although it is likely that the histories of the teaching of these subjects are somewhat different from English, especially in their institutionalisation, perhaps it would be true to say that in recent times teachers of these subjects have been affected by similar ideological and transmission factors.

Another limitation of this thesis is that it has not been able to go far enough to show the full implication of the use of sociological constructs. Although the techniques used in this thesis have isolated a number of areas where consciousness is formed, the areas themselves need a full sociological treatment in order for their real significance to be brought out. Thus we need to know more about:

1) how English Departments in schools contribute to the formation of consciousness, i.e. how experience actually works. This suggests a case-study approach. Analysis of results returned to Question 14 of the Survey Questionnaire (See Appendix, pp.531-532) suggests that work-based experience is the single most important factor in the formation of consciousness.

2) the socialisation and professionalisation of English and other teachers. Thus the recruitment criteria of the various institutes, departments and colleges of education need to be analysed. Again this would suggest a comparative case-study
approach. Such a survey might provide a clue as to how competing
arenas are formed as well as how legitimating discourse about English
and other teaching is treated.

3) the notion of 'community' - whether and for how long the idea of
an 'English teaching community' can hold good; how the regrouping
of 'communities' in integrated programmes affects ideology and
commitment to different modes of transmission. This would be at
the level of school-based communities. In terms of a wider notion
of community (i.e. NATE) it would be most interesting to find out
how far and in what detail Teachers' and Language Centres are
likely to provide new foci for communal activity. Again the ideolo-
gical implications for changes in transmission and institutionalisa-
tion (especially of examinations) could be studied.

Although Shayer and Mullins have provided excellent descriptive
accounts of the sorts of texts used historically in English classrooms
we need to know more about the part played by publishing and the history
of the major legitimating texts used in schools.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1) Two major forms of contrasting consciousness among English teachers
have been isolated and described. These tend to be associated with
selective and non-selective schools respectively. In this way the
thesis makes some contribution to a differential analysis of middle-
class and working-class pedagogies. In this respect the thesis has
been a critical examination of one of the ways in which the cultural
control of the class structure is transmitted and institutionalised.

2) Bernstein's Classification and Frame paper is sufficiently seminal
to guide both historical and theoretical research in English teaching and thus would appear to be worth applying to other areas of the curriculum.

3) English teaching is a very sensitive reflection of the fact that education is historically and socially created. This has implications for the way in which English teachers should view the 'reality' of their subject.

4) The 1921 Report has been shown to be the pivot in the development of English teaching. It is hoped that this thesis has gone some way to revive its crucial importance.

5) The 'Ashridge' files which have not been used before have given us a new perspective on the official Board of Education policies in the earlier part of the century which has been lacking in previous accounts. They would also be useful material in any subsequent mapping of other parts of the curriculum.

6) Chapter 10 suggests that the British and American perspectives on English teaching have been influenced by the transatlantic dialogue. This may have increasing significance for those ways in which British and American societies face similar problems.

7) 7 models of English teaching have been described which reflect the areas of major difference and conflict between the competing ideologies of the two consciousnesses. A synthesis/compromise position as well as an emergent 'politicising' position within English teaching has also been isolated.
8) By increasing the level of generality (consciousness—models rationales—paradigm theory) it is possible to sharpen the theoretical focus on changes in English teaching.

9) In this respect, however, the thesis has demonstrated some of the difficulties and dangers of trying to apply models and constructs in a cross-disciplinary way. We have to be careful not to reify them or suggest that they are refined descriptive devices. They throw light on rather than offer definitive analysis on changes in English teaching.

10) With reference to the first hypothesis (Chapter 1) the exploration of notions of consciousness and community suggest that English teachers construct ideologically a notion of the reality of the subject which determines how they perceive that it should be transmitted and institutionalised. This kind of perception of reality has informed the major movements of the subject over the past 70 years.

11) In this respect the data from the empirical survey selected for presentation in this thesis enables us to say something about what teachers believe and hope is going to happen in the future in English teaching. Comparison of Figure 4 with Figure 3 suggests that what they hope will happen over the next few years (Figure 4) shows a certain difference from what they believe will happen (Figure 3).

12) Paradigm theory helps to put the whole movement of the thesis into a theoretical perspective which suggests competing arenas of
This has also helped to show how the methodology of teaching English has been profoundly affected by increasingly explicit and polarised ideologies. This was the substance of the second hypothesis (see Chapter 1) which Chapter 13 explored.

Although it is likely that Paradigms A and B will continue to compete for the major ground in English teaching, it is also likely that Paradigm C will gain supporters among English teachers because of its liberal–humanist ideology; whilst at the same time it is also likely that the emergent 'politicising' paradigm will increase the tension making for conflict.

The thesis has gone some way in exploring a notion of 'communities' and 'communal visibility' in English teaching, deriving some analogies from science (Kuhn and Hagstrom). It has also indicated something of the part played by the English Association and NATE, although a much fuller and more thorough history of these two associations needs to be undertaken.

The thesis submits that liberal–humanism is the central ideological position of English teaching - i.e. it is committed to a reduction of social cleavage and the centrality of literature. In other words the majority of English teachers are in favour of a strong classification somehow based on literary experience to be transmitted in a weakened frame. Examination of the work and influence of the major legitimators of English Studies indicate a movement in this direction, but one which holds more or less to the central liberal–humanist position.
POSTSCRIPT - ONGOING RESEARCH

During the period of the study it has been felt necessary to undertake a major piece of empirical work in order to substantiate the nature and directions of changes in English teaching as they were affecting teachers at the present time. As has already been mentioned in Chapter 11 this was conducted as two separate activities, involving obtaining information from selected 'leaders' of English teaching and a sampled selection of the membership of NATE and the English Association. Although some of the results of those two activities have been considered necessary to include in the thesis as it stands, it is felt that the large amount of material collected can only be properly treated in a further piece of work. Thus although the thesis has raised questions to which some kind of answers have been indicated, much more needs to be shown of the crucial variables which determine how English teachers come to hold and practice their beliefs both individually and communally.

In fact 25 variables drawn from Questions 1 - 12 of the survey questionnaire have been programmed on a computer for significance and it is the analysis of this data which forms an important part of the follow-up study. In this respect the empirical study explores further the contemporary alignments of NATE and English Association members.

In the follow-up study it is also hoped to show how the 'leaders', or legitimators, themselves contribute to the competing arenas of discourse; how they line up in ideological conflict and how they too come to hold their beliefs. Because the emphasis is likely to be more specifically sociological than has ultimately been the case with this thesis, it is hoped that the follow-up study will help in establishing sociological profiles of English teachers. Furthermore whilst it is
hoped that the thesis has isolated the arenas of discourse and suggested something of the effects of their supportive ideologies on the transmission and institutionalisation of English, it is also hoped that the follow-up study will go some way further in locating the nature of cooperation and conflict in a more sensitive and revealing way.
APPENDIX : Ranked categories of influences on views held by survey sample.

This Appendix abstracts the relevant data from the replies to Question 14 of the survey questionnaire. A fuller treatment including the breakdown of sub-group replies within both the NATE and English Association samples will be presented in the post-thesis study.

Question 14: What have been the most important influences on the views you hold about English teaching? If you can please list these in order of priority. If you find this difficult, please indicate.

Again, as with replies to Questions 15, 16 and 17 it was found easier to discount any attempts to place influences in order. In any case many replies clearly found this difficult. Instead an incidence count was taken so that categories of influence became clear as the replies were dealt with. Finally 11 categories of influence were isolated from the data. These were:

1. School based experience ['work', 'children', 'pupils'].
2. Own schooling and education - both positive and negative.
3. Colleagues - e.g. same school or as members of local teachers' committees - i.e. CSE.
4. Professional ambience - discretion to use here or under.
5. Courses and conferences.
7. People - if clearly stated or implied, not just their writings e.g. as specific tutors, teachers or colleagues.
8. Professional association - NATE/EA where named, in order to point a particular orientation within professional ambience.
(9) Institutions - as distinct from (5) and where named e.g. London Institute of Education. Also this category could distinguish a long in-service course as distinct from a short, often highly-specialised in-service course which would come under (5) above.

(10) Background - home and parents.

(11) Professional content - literature, linguistics etc.
### TABLE 8(a) Incidence of 1-11 Category returns NATE and EA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATE</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH ASSOC.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8(b) Rank order of category, NATE and EA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Categories in rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG. ASSOC.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATE + E.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Assistant Mistresses</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantock, G.H.</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, D.</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre, Myra, Bryan B. and Griffiths, P.</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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