

105

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

June 8, 1945

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by ALFRED HOLMAN, JR.

entitled THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE IN AMERICAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS;
AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE THEORIES OF LITERATURE IN-
STRUCTION SINCE 1900

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved by:

S. L. Eby
Carter V. Good
L. A. Pechstein

THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE
IN AMERICAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS; AN HISTORICAL STUDY
OF THE THEORIES OF LITERATURE INSTRUCTION SINCE 1900

A dissertation submitted to
The Graduate Faculty of the Teachers College
of the University of Cincinnati
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

1945

CINCINNATI
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

by

Alfred Holman, Jr.
A. B., Centre College, 1930
A. M., University of Cincinnati, 1932

UMI Number: DP15819

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform DP15819

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am deeply indebted to Professor S. L. Eby for his advice and friendly guidance throughout my work on this study. I also wish to thank Dean Louis A. Pechstein and the members of the graduate faculty of the Teachers College of the University of Cincinnati for their help and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
Nature of the Study.....	1
Need for the Study.....	1
Sources of the Data and the Special	
Terms of the Study.....	2
Method and Limits of the Study.....	3
Related Studies.....	5
II. THEORIES OF TEACHING LITERATURE BEFORE 1900	10
Aims.....	14
Differentiation.....	20
Suitability.....	21
The Teacher.....	22
Methods.....	24
Content.....	28
Summary.....	34
III. LITERATURE FOR ACADEMIC ACCOMPLISHMENT....	39
Aims.....	43
Negative statements about aims.....	45
College preparation and composition...	45
Appreciation.....	46
Taste.....	47
Vicarious experience and ideals.....	49
Moral aim.....	50
Accuracy in reading.....	51
Emotional release.....	52
Core of Required Materials for all	
Pupils.....	52
Differentiation.....	53
Grade level differences.....	54
Individual differences.....	55
Suitability.....	57
Training for adult life.....	57
College preparatory work for those	
not going to college.....	58
Meeting adolescent needs.....	58
Content.....	60
College entrance reading lists.....	60
Difficult classics.....	62
Modern literature.....	63
Time allotment.....	64
Chronology and sequence.....	64

Chapter		Page
III.	LITERATURE FOR ACADEMIC ACCOMPLISHMENT (continued)	
	Detailed contents.....	65
	History of literature.....	67
	Types.....	69
	Fiction.....	70
	Drama.....	71
	The essay.....	72
	The oration.....	72
	Methods.....	73
	A prescribed method.....	73
	The whole selection.....	74
	Rapid first reading.....	75
	Intensive study.....	75
	Techniques for intensive study.....	77
	Reading without drill.....	78
	Techniques for gaining interest.....	78
	Discussion.....	80
	Aids for teaching.....	81
	Oral reading.....	81
	Memorization.....	82
	Dramatization.....	83
	Visual aids.....	83
	Composition.....	84
	Outside reading.....	84
	Examinations.....	85
	Correlation.....	86
	The teacher.....	87
	Summary.....	88
IV.	LITERATURE FOR INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENT.....	94
	Aims.....	99
	Negative statements about aims.....	101
	Appreciation.....	101
	Enjoyment of reading.....	103
	Vicarious experience.....	104
	Familiarity with the classics.....	105
	Acquiring literary standards.....	106
	Skill in reading.....	106
	Various types of reading.....	108
	Moral aim.....	109
	Numerous aims.....	110
	Materials for all to Study.....	111
	Differentiation.....	112
	Courses other than college prepara- tory.....	114
	Differences in reading ability.....	115

Chapter		Page
IV.	LITERATURE FOR INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENT (continued)	
	Grouping and special work.....	116
	Junior high school.....	118
	Development of the pupil.....	119
	Suitability.....	120
	Responsibility for each pupil.....	120
	Recognition of the pupil as an in- dividual.....	121
	Providing for psychology needs.....	124
	Utilizing interesting material.....	124
	Providing for post-school needs....	125
	The Teacher.....	127
	Qualifications.....	128
	Training.....	130
	Advice on professional matters....	131
	Summary.....	132
V.	LITERATURE FOR INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENT - METHODS AND CONTENT.....	139
	Methods of Teaching.....	139
	Diversity of methods.....	140
	Intensive study.....	142
	Pupil opinion.....	143
	Literature as pleasure.....	145
	Socialization of the classroom.....	145
	Skill of reading.....	147
	Outside reading.....	148
	Book report.....	150
	Oral reading.....	151
	Memorization.....	152
	Assignment.....	153
	Examination.....	154
	Composition and literature.....	156
	Correlation.....	158
	Using aids in the teaching of literature.....	161
	Library.....	163
	Content.....	164
	Classics.....	165
	Contemporary literature.....	166
	Newspapers and magazines.....	169
	History of literature.....	170
	Set courses of study.....	171
	Content determined by interest of class and teacher.....	173
	Book lists.....	174
	Moving pictures as content.....	175
	Types.....	176

Chapter		Page
V.	LITERATURE FOR INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENT - METHODS AND CONTENT (continued)	
	Poetry.....	178
	The Novel.....	181
	Drama - Shakespeare.....	185
	The essay and the oration.....	188
	Summary.....	190
VI.	LITERATURE FOR ADJUSTMENT.....	197
	Aims.....	200
	Appreciation.....	201
	Reading as an aim.....	202
	Experience and adjustment.....	203
	Literary Materials for all Pupils to Study.....	204
	Differentiation.....	207
	Explaining differences.....	208
	Analyzing differences.....	209
	Providing for individual differ- ences.....	210
	Suitability.....	211
	Reading.....	213
	Remedial reading.....	217
	Individual reading.....	219
	Extensive reading.....	220
	Outside reading.....	220
	Book lists.....	221
	Book reports.....	222
	Content.....	223
	Choice of books.....	224
	Classics.....	225
	Teaching according to theme.....	227
	Teaching by types.....	229
	Newspapers and magazines.....	234
	Moving pictures and radio.....	237
	Methods.....	240
	Paraphrasing.....	241
	Reading aloud.....	242
	Memorization.....	242
	Units and projects.....	243
	Correlation.....	245
	Library.....	249
	Aids to literary experience.....	250
	Tests and appraisal.....	251
	Teacher.....	252
	Summary.....	255

Chapter		Page
VII.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	262
	The problem.....	262
	Subdivisions.....	262
	The periods.....	263
	Summary by periods.....	264
	Conflicting theories.....	266
	Aims in the teaching of literature	267
	The core of literary material re-	
	quired for all pupils.....	269
	Differentiation of objectives and	
	materials.....	270
	Suitability of the course in	
	literature.....	271
	Content and methods.....	272
	Philosophic bases.....	273
	Social and literary theories.....	275
	A Statement of the Writer's	
	Recommendations.....	276
	Problems for Future Investigations..	278
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	280

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

Nature of the Study

This is an historical study of the theories designed to aid the teachers of English in secondary schools, especially in that branch of their work referred to as literature, distinguished from written and oral composition. The study presents a brief summary of the background of the problem, examines the various and conflicting theories and indicates the trends in the theories of the teaching of literature in American secondary schools since 1900.

Need for the Study

Recognizing the need for historical investigation that would throw light on problems related to all branches of English in the schools, the National Council of Teachers of English appointed a committee to make a study of the history of the teaching of English. The present study of the theory of the teaching of literature in the secondary schools since 1900, and other investigations suggested by this committee, should contribute to an understanding of the teaching of English in the past and give an indication of the direction to be taken in the future.

Sources of the Data and the Special Terms of the Study

The major sources of this study are books, pamphlets, monographs and collections of essays and suggestions, published in the United States after 1900, on the methodology of the teaching of literature in secondary schools. These publications, dealing with the purposes and procedures of the teaching of literature in American secondary schools, because they are designed for use in the training of teachers, often called professional training, will be referred to in this study, for convenience, as "professional books," their authors as "professional writers" and "theorists." Professional books are of necessity the data to be utilized in studying the theories underlying the teaching of literature. Periodical articles, for instance, might also be looked upon as a major source of theories. Important suggestions, however, appearing in periodicals, usually reappear in published book form, either in a book by the same author or in the works of other writers. The concern here is not with courses of study or the practice of the teaching of literature. The objectives and aims contained in courses of study usually imitate or adapt the objectives and techniques stated in the professional books; seldom, if ever, advance new theory. Besides the major sources, American professional books, the study utilizes for comparison some publications dealing with the theory of the teaching of literature in Great Britain and

some books outside of the teaching of English field, in philosophy, history of education and criticism.

Method and Limits of the Study

The time covered by this study is divided into three periods:

- I. 1900 - 1917
- II. 1917 - 1935
- III. 1935 -

This division of time is determined by the appearance of three epoch-making publications, each representing a different phase of the teaching of literature. Since the study is limited to the theories of the present century, the first period begins in 1900, shortly after which appeared Chubb's The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School (45), the first book designed specifically as a textbook in the methodology of the teaching of English. The background of the first period is treated in a discussion of the "forerunners," the nineteenth century books on the teaching of literature. The second or transition period begins with the publication of Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools (111), a report of the National Joint Committee, representing the National Education Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, a subcommittee of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The present period

begins with the publication of An Experience Curriculum in English (95), a report of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English.

In each of the three periods all of the material under investigation published during that period is treated as a unit. The framework for examining the theory of a period consists of five aspects or subdivisions of the general problem. These subdivisions are adapted from those features of the teaching of English which were emphasized in the conclusions of an important monograph of the National Survey of Education, Instruction in English (186), by Dora Smith. In her investigation Smith analyzed 156 courses of study from various parts of the country, visited classrooms in thirty cities and fifteen states to discover how the procedures suggested in the courses of study were put into practice, and in conclusion (186: 83) posed a number of questions, from which the following subdivisions are taken. The subdivisions of this study are:

1. The aims of the teaching of literature.
2. The core of literary material required for all pupils.
3. The differentiation of objectives and materials of literature for pupils with diverse interests and abilities.
4. The suitability of the course in literature to the needs of the pupils.
5. The specific content and methods of the course in literature.

Related Studies

There have been normative surveys, experimental studies and a few historical studies in the field of the teaching of literature. Two surveys made at Teachers College, Columbia University, were concerned with books used in the secondary schools. Crow (63), in 1924, for his study, Evaluation of English Literature in the High School, questioned two thousand pupils to determine the effectiveness of the teaching of seventy-four classics in the secondary school. Ideal aims of the course, as determined by Crow, were to interest the pupil in reading for his leisure time, to inspire the pupil with high ideals, to give appreciation and to lead the pupil to understand the permanent value of books and reading. The conclusion of the study was that method and subject matter should be adapted better to these aims. Stroh (192), in 1926, in Literature for Grades VII, VIII and IX, made a survey to discover what literature was taught in the junior high school and what method of teaching was used. Teachers, theorists and "writers on American culture" were used as sources. Stroh concluded that interpretation must be elastic, that children should not be too conscious of what others consider "good" literature, that a formal approach to literature can be harmful and that there must be a variety of material, especially contemporary literature.

Crawford's Achievement of Secondary School Pupils in Twelve Classics in Literature (59), made at the University of Indiana in 1932, was a survey of the achievement of Indiana pupils in mastering twelve classics taught throughout the state. There were few conclusive results from the study; the two negative findings were that some classics are unsuited for certain grades of the secondary school and that there should not be an indiscriminate teaching of the same classic in several grades.

Some of the experimental research in the field of the teaching of literature has emphasized evaluation of method and content. Coryell (56), in 1926, in an experiment at Teachers College, Columbia University, with an eleventh grade, An Evaluation of Extensive and Intensive Teaching of Literature, discovered that pupils doing extensive reading comprehend as much as those engaging in intensive study and that the former cover six times as much reading in the course. Burch (37), in her study at Clark University in 1928, Determination of a Content of the Course in Literature of a Suitable Difficulty for Junior and Senior High School Students, made an investigation to discover how interested pupils were in literary selections being taught and how well they understood these selections. She concluded that pupils should be sectioned according to ability and that the difficulty of every piece of literature considered for the course in the secondary school should be determined in advance. Irion

(116), in his study at Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925, Comprehension Difficulties of Ninth Grade Students in the Study of Literature, concluded that literary comprehension correlates with intelligence, that it is possible to measure literary comprehension fairly accurately, that comprehension varies with the type of literature; and that special help must be given in the ninth grade to pupils lacking the foundation or background needed for understanding literature taught in that grade.

Many of the historical studies on the teaching of English have been limited to reviews of periodical articles making suggestions about the methods and content of the course in the secondary school. Kloppel's study (124), "A Survey of Current Theories and Tendencies in the Teaching of High School English as Revealed in Periodicals Published from June, 1923, to June, 1927," made at Teachers College, Columbia University, contained a statement of inconclusive findings. It was noted that there was an awareness of unsatisfactory results and of weakness in content and methods in the teaching of English. Such an awareness was indicated, according to Kloppel, by the failure of secondary-school graduates to read widely and to write acceptably in their college work. A study by McKay (139) at Ohio University, in 1938, entitled "Some Aims, Methods, and Devices in the Teaching of Literature in the High School; A Study Based Upon the English Journal from

1930-1938," was concerned only with suggestions for teaching the classics, although its findings indicated that there was a movement in 1938 toward the use of contemporary materials. Other conclusions of the study were that there existed a functional program of literature organized by content and theme, that free reading programs and remedial reading were more frequently used, that the teaching of literature had changed since the abolition of the "restricted" college entrance examination, and that the pupil had come to be the center of the instructional program in literature.

Another historical survey, "Development in the Methods of Teaching English Literature in the Secondary Schools (1912-1937)," made by Miller (145) at Brown University in 1938, utilized findings in a few professional books, periodical articles and research studies, and occasionally resorted to encyclopaedias for information. Miller noted several trends in the teaching of literature, among which were the tendencies to replace the classics with modern literature, to allow greater freedom in teaching, and to stress aims other than college preparation. Although Miller found appreciation a dominant aim, she did not recommend any specific method for acquiring it.

A more careful and more comprehensive study was made by Beckham (13) at Leland Stanford Junior University in 1938. This study, entitled "The History of the Teaching of High School English from 1870 to 1900," was an attempt to present

the historical influences and trends in the teaching of English in the secondary school before the turn of the century. The investigation indicated that English in the secondary school changed from an unimportant study in 1870, with literature used for drill in the study of grammar, to a significant course in 1900, aiming at enjoyment and appreciation. Beckham noted the influence of the Committee of Ten in gaining recognition for the study of English and of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements in strengthening the study in the secondary school and giving uniformity.

Some investigations closely related to the history and development of the theory of the teaching of literature are utilized in later chapters of this study. Instruction in English by Dora Smith (186), referred to as the source of this study's subdivisions, was a significant comparison of courses of study and the teaching of English in 1932. Gruen's English Grammar in American High Schools Since 1900 (37), a study made at the Catholic University of America in 1934, surveyed the teaching of another phase of English in the secondary school. Careful search discloses no comprehensive historical study dealing with the teaching of literature since 1900.

CHAPTER II

THEORIES OF TEACHING LITERATURE BEFORE 1900

Although this study deals with the theory of the teaching of literature in American secondary schools in the twentieth century, an adequate survey should include a discussion of earlier books on the subject. The books of the nineteenth century on the teaching of literature are interesting for their own theories and suggestions, but significant here as forerunners of the professional books of the present century.

There were a few treatises dealing with the teaching of literature even before 1800. Charles Rollin's The Method of Teaching and Studying the Belles Lettres (166), translated into English and published at London in 1769, was originally published in French in 1731. Benjamin Franklin (78), in 1749, in a Proposal Relating to Education of Youth in Pensilvania quoted copiously from Rollin's book in presenting proposals for the study, exercise and general conduct of pupils in an academy. There is no reference, however, to Rollin in the nineteenth century books on the teaching of English. He must have had little, if any, influence in shaping the theory of the teaching of literature, although the writers with whom this study deals were aware of Franklin's theories - theories admittedly based in part on Rollin's writings.

Like so many later American writers in the field of "belles lettres" and educational theory, Rollin (166: 11) suggested that he was not setting up a plan or method of his own invention, but rather reported methods he had observed in practice by his masters and methods he had practiced in his own teaching. Rollin thought study was of greater importance than the mere acquisition of knowledge, since learning must have some influence upon the pupil's character. Rollin wanted the pupil to find reading interesting, not just the drudgery of a school task. "If possible," he wrote, "profit and pleasure should go together, that this kind of reading may induce young people to be fond of it" (166: 66). Far in advance of much later writers, Rollin recognized the practical value of school work, especially as preparation for some aspects of life outside of school.

In 1886 Mead (142: 161), writing in The Academy magazine, regretted that "the combined thinking of the last ten generations has not produced a single book on the teaching of English that has attained a wide circulation." He stated that suggestions can be found in almost every other department of teaching, but that strangely enough, there were no suggestions to be found in the field of English literature. It was only a few years before that schools had turned to the teaching of English and of English literature. Less than twenty years before the publication of Mead's article Hales

(90: xi-xii), an Englishman, referring to English as a school subject, wrote:

There comes a time when school doors are thrown open to subjects long barred. As in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Greek and New Philosophy at last found a place in our schools and universities, so now Modern Language and Natural Science appear to be establishing themselves.

Elsewhere, Hales (90: 299) indicated that in England scholars did not translate their Latin lessons into English until the close of the fourteenth century and not until the latter half of the nineteenth century had scholars begun to study English in school.

Although Hales wrote about schools in Great Britain, American schools followed the same pattern, not introducing masterpieces of literature, or classics, as they were called, in the mother tongue, until late in the nineteenth century. Hays (97: 13), in her historical research study of one phase of secondary-school English, concludes that it was not until 1870 that the English classics were taught in American schools. Classics were introduced before that time, but not read or studied for their literary value. After 1870 the new subject of English literature struggled for recognition in competition with the study of Latin and Greek classics. The teaching of literature was established only incidentally in the next twenty years, if we are to judge by Pattee's statement (155: 27) in 1891:

The pupil has now reached the high school and will pass the next two or three years with his mathematics, Latin and the sciences, and not until the last year of his course will he again [after the eighth grade] meet with anything from English literature. In the senior year the pupil, as our curriculum now stands, first studies literature in school.

The college entrance requirements were responsible more than any other factor for the provision of a course in English literature for the secondary schools. In 1888 the New England Commission on College Entrance Requirements prescribed a list of books to be studied in the secondary schools. In 1892 the Conference on English of the Committee of Ten recommended the reading of certain masterpieces of English not fewer in number than those assigned by the New England Commission on College Entrance Requirements. The National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English, formed in 1893, accepted the books of the New England Commission, and, following the recommendations of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, divided the books into "books for reading" and "books for study." The Conference, struggling at first against most educators' unwillingness to accept English as a key subject, asked that it be given as much time as Latin, recommended that the study of English be in all respects as serious and informative as the study of Latin, and finally, provided an English course in the secondary school. According to Hays (97: 70), little was done before 1900 to formulate the method of teaching the subject. The Conference of

Teachers of English (150: 86) called by the Committee of Ten did set up objectives of the study of English in the schools:

1. To enable the pupil to understand the expressed thoughts of others and to give expression to thoughts of his own; and

2. To cultivate a taste for reading, to give the pupil some acquaintance with good literature, and to furnish him with the means of extending that acquaintance.

Aims

Aid in developing writing skill was one of the most often repeated aims in the teaching of literature before 1900. The college entrance requirements literally foisted the "composition attitude" upon literature in the secondary school. Harvard's first requirement for entrance was a short composition based upon a knowledge of six required books. In 1893 the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements (150: 94) linked the study of composition and literature, suggesting that they be given together throughout the course. The five hours a week recommended for the study of English were divided with a balance in favor of literature. Literature was to be given three classroom hours of study a week, composition two. But the Conference cautioned the secondary school that admission to college, as far as English was concerned, depended largely on the pupil's ability to write English. Not until 1894, according to Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 189), was there any indication that literature was to be studied for its own sake. The study of composition and

literature were closely linked in the college entrance requirements, and composition seems to have been the predominant study in spite of the greater time allotment for literature.

The composition aim or attitude appeared in much of the writing on the teaching of literature. Pattee (155: 41) stated in 1891 that the study of literature should be closely allied to the study of composition; that it is best to begin such study by having the pupil write short summaries of the works of classical writers. In Great Britain in the same year, Bowen (31: 2) expressed a similar aim in the teaching of literature - that pupils learn to express themselves in correct English. Bowen, however, prefaced this writing aim with a discussion of appreciation of beauty and art. Gayley and Bradley (82: 7), in their suggestions to teachers of secondary schools in California, placed composition first as an aim in secondary-school instruction, and then tacked on love of literature almost as an afterthought. Corson (55: 52), in his book The Aims of Literary Study, thought it an accepted fact that the leading aims in the teaching of English should be the following:

1. To enlarge the student's vocabulary, and 2. to cultivate a nice sense of the force of words, 3. to speak and write good live English, of the best verbal material and texture, and closely fitting the thought which it clothes.

Hays (97: 71) hazarded an opinion in her study that the entanglement of literature and composition retarded for many

years progress in the teaching of English.

There were questions about the purpose of literature in the curriculum, since all did not accept it only as a means of developing writing skill. Hinsdale (103: 128) insisted that the teacher must settle in his mind first what the aim in his teaching is to be, and then determine what literature is. Much of the discussion of aims in teaching, and even of method, began with the definition of "literature." The same concern existed over the distinction between prose and poetry. Crawshaw (60: 8) was willing to admit several definitions of literature - all record of thought that is of any value to mankind, writing that is distinguished by its style, writing that has aesthetic or thoughtful purpose. Less dogmatic than many other writers of his time, Crawshaw permitted the word "literature" to be defined according to the purpose for which the term was being used and the purpose of the person using it. Bates (9: 32), also admitting the difficulty of defining rigidly literary art or literature, asked only that teachers be aware of the influence it has on every human being coming within its wide and powerful sphere. Bates indicated that he was not satisfied with a hazy respect for literature; he must have a seriousness worthy of the time and effort to be expended.

Writers of the nineties had more certainty about what the aims of literature were not than they had about the affirma-

tive statement of aims and objectives of the study. Most of the negative comment concerned the acquisition of knowledge, of facts about literature and authors. Hales (90: xv), much earlier, in 1869, stated that the purpose of education was not to give information but to guide the pupil to a method of getting information and using it. In 1891, one writer (155: 28) could find no practical use in the mere knowledge of names and literary opinions of others, all of which the pupil of the time was usually expected to acquire. Corson (55: 82-83) suggested that a pupil may know facts concerning the biographies of writers, or English history, without understanding or appreciating a single poem. Hinsdale (103: 132) struck out at the tendency to establish the same goals and methods for English literature that classical literature had. Other writers of the period stated that the technical study must not be an end in itself (55: 26); that students are not to be taught methods without any goal in mind (55: 50); that the study of literature is not the mere reading of books (9: 61); and that the secondary school does not need the high standards of scholarship of the colleges and universities (103: 135). These attacks on technical study, memorization of facts, unimaginative picking over of the classics, lack of an aim and an unsuitable aim, indicate a recognition by the professional writers that the schools had not taught pupils to know or to appreciate English literature.

Writing affirmatively, the nineteenth century theorists saw as one aim of instruction in literature the development of taste in reading. The Department of English at Harvard University (94: 8) suggested to the secondary schools in 1897 that every book studied should be of service to the pupil in developing taste, imagination and a love of literature. According to Bates (9: 141), it is only from the masterpieces of classic literature that one can learn to make necessary distinctions in literature and promote discrimination in the difficult task of sifting books coming from a contemporary press. Pattee (155: 13) felt that if once a pupil were taught to enjoy the best literature he would be able always to utilize those standards, especially in rejecting the indecent in contemporary literature. Hinsdale's aim (103: 135) was to have the pupil acquire an understanding and love of literature. To Hudson (113: 28-32) reading without pleasure and only because the books were suggested as a classroom duty was of little benefit, and probably the cause of an aversion to reading later on. He did not feel ^{that} schools instructed the pupil to choose his reading for himself after school years were over. These were aims embracing appreciation and understanding of literature in an effort to establish standards for future use.

Only in Talks on the Study of Literature by Bates was there a statement of the social or cultural aim in literature.

Bates (9: 40) assured the reader of the nineties that he could make friends more easily if he knew characters in fiction and that talking about books was a social accomplishment. This seems to be an echo of earlier writers like Franklin (78: 11) who wanted students of his academy to learn things that were likely to be ornamental as well as useful.

Several writers touched upon aims in the teaching of literature that approach the religious. Corson's "hidden soul," Scudder's "spiritualizing life," Hudson's "minds... dressed for the abode of the Deity" indicate the religious element in the theory of the teaching of literature in the secondary school before 1900.

Hudson (113: 24) suggested the importance of the teaching of English in making intelligent citizens who cannot be tricked by demagogues. Scudder felt that teaching American literature would contribute more to patriotism than a formal course in history would contribute. In this connection, Pattee (155: 30) suggested that instead of American literature as an afterthought in the course in English literature, the literature of America be taught as a separate and important study.

The few authors before 1900 concerned with aims in literature directed toward the development of character were not usually specific. Most of the aims in terms of attitude were implied rather than named. Pattee (155: 38) thought of lit-

erature in terms of character building, provided the pupil could be taught to relate his reading to his own experiences. Hudson (113: 68) believed that literature could make pupils wiser and happier adults.

In spite of the numerous and varied aims in the theory of the teaching of literature before 1900, the aims never seem out of keeping with a basic assumption that pupils in the secondary school are preparing for college and need certain required materials. The minor attempts to vary the offerings and the approach of the course in literature to meet the different abilities and needs of the pupils are discussed in the following sections of this analysis.

Differentiation

Before 1900 there was no differentiation in the educational aims and objectives for pupils of different levels of ability. In fact, the Conference on English (150: 93) reported to the Committee of Ten that it was unreasonable to suggest that there should be different courses for those pupils of the secondary school not intending to go on to college, for those entering a scientific or technical school and for the pupils intending to enter college. Hinsdale (103: xiv-xix), a few years later, had the temerity to point out that foreign schools have three different courses and objectives; while schools in this country have one preparation with one goal - entrance into college. Most writers, however, ac-

cepted the domination of the college entrance requirements over the secondary-school course. For instance, Gayley and Bradley (82: 67) argued that the sequence of studies was adapted as well for those who would not enter college as for those who need work for entrance.

The only concern with differentiation was with an adjustment of books to the various grade levels. Bates (9: 195) disagreed even with this minor differentiation, believing that children should be taught the same literature read by adults. Such an unreasonable defense of the classics at any level was not general. Woodward (216: 9) had suggested in 1887 that children's interests and tastes were being recognized by the schools. Hill (102: 69) advised that every book chosen for reading should be suited to the age, accomplishments and taste of the student and that every book should be a book the student will enjoy. Others suggested that the particular class being taught should be taken into account; that the secondary-school teacher should not try to be too scholarly or set his goals beyond his students.

Suitability

In a general way the English course was thought to be suitable for all pupils. It was suggested that English is the only study that will continue after school years, since everyone talks, writes and reads. Therefore, it was argued,

the teaching of literature was beneficial and must have an important place in the curriculum. Hales (91: 310) writing in 1867, surprisingly aware of the non-university man, asserted that for one who was not to continue a classical education, English must be the most prominent language and literary study. This is reminiscent of still earlier pleas for English in the curriculum, of Rollin's apology for study of an hour or two a week in the native tongue. Until the end of the century there was almost nothing written on the suitability of the course in English to the life needs of any group in school. Rather, it was the college needs that were being considered. Thurber (205: 2), answering his own question and title: To What End Do High Schools Teach English?, stated that teachers should not attempt to produce literary masters or artists, or even exclusively to prepare youth for college. Thurber and a few others before 1900 looked to the pupil's success in later life as the ultimate goal.

The Teacher

In spite of the scant attention paid by most professional writers to the variety of aims and offerings needed for the course in literature in order to cope with pupils' problems, nearly every writer of the period considered the qualifications, training and attitude of the teacher of literature. It was noted that the same method may be successful for one teacher and be a total failure for another (113: 58). In

1824, in his essay on English education, Keagy (122: 9) commented on the teaching profession:

The profession of teaching, next to the ministry, is doubtless the most noble and respectable of all the professions. But in the present day it has become very much degraded through the ignorance and the parsimony of the community. Men of talents are not inclined to remain in the employment of teaching longer than circumstances may require it. Sufficient encouragement is not given to retain them, and as numerous situations of a more lucrative kind offer themselves, they will abandon this occupation for one less intrinsically respectable.

The later theorists were not as concerned over the remuneration or the mistreatment of the English teacher as they were over the ability of the teacher. Hudson (113: 34) felt that there were twenty times as many competent teachers of classical language as there were teachers of English literature. Others pointed out that the subject seemed so simple there was an accepted and fallacious notion that any teacher could teach English. Gayley and Bradley (82: 6,45) suggested to the teachers of California in 1894 that the teaching of English was made difficult because the instructor had a poor background in his subject. They advised teachers to take advanced studies to meet the requirements of the University of California. The ability to read aloud well, even dramatically and inspirationally, was suggested as one of the first requirements by several authors, with some adding the necessity of knowing Latin and Greek and at least one modern foreign language. There was often the complaint that teachers of literature were more difficult to find than the teachers

of any other subject, principally because more was required of them than of teachers of history, science or mathematics.

Hales (90: xxxvii) had said in 1869, generalizing about teachers, that no teacher could succeed who was not enthusiastic about his subject. Writers in the nineties stated repeatedly that the inspirational qualification is an absolute essential in the teaching of literature. The "inspiring power" of the teacher was looked upon as more important than knowledge of the subject. Corson (55: 27) did not think that a teacher who had acquired for himself the spiritual values of literature would allow his teaching to become deadening, technical or detailed. Most impressive of all the statements in the nineties regarding qualifications of teachers is the list of attributes Hinsdale (103: 201) considered requisites for the teacher of literature: an aptness to teach, a broad background of reading, literary taste and appreciation, insight, soundness of judgment, high ideals.

Methods

According to Pattee (155: 37), a teacher trained well and with a thorough background in literature will need little help from a text book. Yet Pattee in a brief presentation, and most other writers at great length, offered plans of teaching and suggested techniques they hoped would prove effective in teaching literature. Here is the early eighteenth century method of Rollin (166: 67-72):

This story [Flecher's History of Theodosius] should be read by all at once by one or two of the scholars, the rest casting their eyes down upon their books ... After this first reading the master should briefly make comments relating to orthography and language... After these grammatical observations, the story should be read over a second time, and at the end of every period boys should be asked if they find anything remarkable as to expressions, thought or the conduct of the manners. This interests them in a more lively manner in the coming at the sense of the author, by the secret satisfaction they take in discovering all the beauties of themselves, and by degrees enables them to dispense with assistance of the master, which is the end of all the pains he takes in instructing them. The master then adds and supplies what is wanting in their answers, enlarges and lays open what they have said too succinctly, and mends and corrects whatever mistakes they have fallen into.

Hudson (113: 49) utilized (apparently without knowing it) much of Rollin's procedure:

.... the pupils reading the author under direction, correction and explanation of the teacher. The thing is to have the pupils, with the teacher's help and guidance, commence with the author while in class and drink in the spirit of workmanship.

Hudson often criticized the method by which the student was expected to have a one word answer or be prompted to the exact answer by the teacher, but he did expect the pupil to examine carefully the author's technique. A. F. Blaisdell (18: 52-57) in the "Guide Analysis" of 1886 focused attention on minor details, once the general meaning is brought out. This method of getting details had many advocates. Several authors regretted the rapid reading that was acceptable for daily reading fare but not for the classroom. Mead (142: 169) stated that nothing could take the place of an intensive study of literature.

By 1890, however, there was a reaction to this intensive reading. Hill (102: 68) suggested a first rapid reading for general understanding and for pleasure, with a second reading for details. The Department of English at Harvard (94: 7), giving advice to the secondary schools, stated emphatically that instead of reading books as if they were in a foreign language the student should concentrate on the general significance and spirit of the works. All of the writers on the teaching of literature were not, of course, in agreement with this pronouncement. Bates (9: 122) said by way of contradicting the Harvard statement:

The language of literature is in reality a tongue as foreign to every-day speech as is the tongue of the folk of another land. It is necessary to learn it as one learns a foreign idiom.

Thurber, however, reiterated the Harvard position repeatedly in his writings. He argued that since most of the reading pupils want to do is of the entertaining variety the teacher should have copies of interesting books in the classroom for the student to read and should get the student to read books outside of school. In 1897 it was voted that the Conference of Uniform Entrance Requirements (49: 11) recommend:

That a certain amount of outside reading, chiefly of poetry, fiction, biography and history, be encouraged throughout the entire school course.

Hill (102: 67) felt that pupils enjoy the books they choose themselves, and dislike those read chapter by chapter in class. Along with this opposition to the picking apart of

the literary selection, came disapproval of the practice of paraphrasing. Corson (55: 91) condemned paraphrasing, while Gayley and Bradley (82: 34-35) stated that paraphrasing might be resorted to if the student does not understand the passage of literature under discussion.

A. F. Blaisdell (18: 11) believed there is as much need for specific advice in the teaching of literature as in the teaching of other subjects. He felt that the student must have directions that can be followed so that his reading will be effective. Sherman (176: xi), in his Analytics of Literature, proposed to use the method of science in treating literature, in order to make the study completely objective. Of more use in the classroom than Sherman's pseudo-scientific study were specific suggestions concerning the recitation, oral reading and memory work. Hudson (113: 16-17), in the 1848 preface to his school Hamlet, condemned the recitation as an exercise for the pupil to repeat bits of information he had learned by heart. Later, "recitation" referred to the work of a class period rather than to this exercise of memorizing and repeating facts. Hinsdale even proposed that pupils in class answer questions with their books open before them.

There were a few suggestions in the "forerunners" of the necessity for reading aloud appreciatively and effectively. Franklin (78: 14-15) had suggested for his academy:

Reading should also be taught and pronouncing, properly, distinctly, emphatically; not with an even Tone, which under-does nor a theatrical, which over-does Nature.

Corson (55: 120) required a distinct reading and one that gave sense. Memory work connected with the facts of literature was often condemned late in the century, although A. F. Blaisdell (18: 45), in 1886, still believed that the dates of the birth and death of representative authors should be memorized. Thurber argued that only the weakest teaching utilizes memory. He was not condemning the often suggested procedure of memorizing lines of poetry, which was looked upon by most writers as an aid to appreciation.

Thurber (205: 20), who also raised his cudgel against the examination, wanted the pupil's writing in a course in literature to be some kind of report of his progress in reading or in studying for the course. He was certain that examinations did not stimulate the pupil. Corson (55: 66-67) did not want the reading in a course of literature to be done with an examination of details in mind. Hinsdale (103: 138-39), taking a less extreme view, admitted that it was difficult to examine in literature. The literature examination, according to Hinsdale, must be about the real nature of the work but not the type of factual examination given in science or mathematics.

Content

Suggestions dealing with the examination in literature

and all of the other techniques and procedures of method involve the content of the course. The suggestions about specific content, to be presented here, necessarily involve methods of teaching, particularly in connection with the presentation of types of literature. Many of the writers before 1900 appeared dissatisfied with the tendency of teaching about literature rather than teaching the literature itself. A. F. Blaisdell (18: 10), writing in the eighties, called it his "key-note" when he stated that the texts of a few standard authors should be studied, the course embracing the writings by the authors, not writings concerning the authors. Hill (102: 67), in 1890, wanted the pupil to know the classics, not short extracts from literature as presented in most manuals of the time. Corson (55: 30) admitted that it is of some significance to know the relationships taught in the history of English literature, but that the secondary-school student should know literature first. The Conference of English (150: 90) of the Committee of Ten asked for the teaching of acceptable authors, not the teaching of a literary manual. All the theorists did not dispose of the teaching of the history of English literature; many suggested the necessity of showing the relationship of the works to the times in which the works were written - but only after studying the masterpieces. Gayley (82: 11) thought that a teacher in a few hours could give an outline of the various periods of English literature, and that such an outline would be suffi-

cient to explain the relationship of authors and masterpieces studied in the secondary-school course.

By 1896 the classics of the college entrance lists had become the accepted reading for the secondary schools. Hinsdale (103: 140-41) wrote in that year that all questions regarding courses of study in English had been answered. In books of literary criticism as well as in the books on the teaching of English, classics were the accepted reading fare. Bates (9: 126) facetiously defined a classic as any book which should be read, but which nobody wants to read. The classic, the book that has proved its worth to a generation or many generations of readers, was not, however, seriously threatened as the total required reading for the secondary-school course. Shakespeare and Scott were included in all suggested lists; Shakespeare predominating all requirements and becoming almost the backbone of reading for the English course in the secondary schools. Hudson (113: 56) urged that Shakespeare could be of great value in after school life, and even suggested excluding the study of Shakespeare if such a study would instill a dislike for the bard in the pupil's mind. Others did not think a secondary-school education complete without Shakespeare, considering the study of Shakespeare an introduction to fiction and the key to understanding character in the contemporary world of the nineties.

Harvard University, in its catalogue for the year 1891-92, listed as required reading for entrance one or two works

of Shakespeare, Scott, Arnold, Addison, Macaulay, Emerson, Irving and Dickens (97: 42). Earlier, A. F. Blaisdell (18: 15-16) had chosen as representative authors to be studied in the secondary schools Longfellow, Whittier, Gray, Irving, Bryant, Goldsmith, Burns, Addison, Byron, Scott, Milton, Cowper, Shakespeare, Tennyson, Spenser, Bacon and Chaucer. These authors were chosen because they represented every period of what Blaisdell termed "our literature," and because they would prove most useful and convenient for the classroom of the secondary school. Introduction of American authors was certainly not uniform in the various lists or even in the college lists. Gayley listed only one American poem "Snow-Bound" in his list of twelve poems from Milton to Tennyson. Scudder (171: 127), confining the study of American works to the elementary school, argued that American writings are not effective for critical study since they are not remote or foreign enough. Pattee (155: 33), on the other hand, suggested the study of the Colonial period and asked that authors too difficult for secondary-school students be avoided.

No writer of the nineties held a brief for the study of contemporary literature. If the newspaper and periodical were mentioned, it was only by way of disparaging them, classifying them as outside of the field of literature and marking them as unworthy of study. Tennyson, who died in 1892, was the sole exception, spoken of almost as reverently as Shakespeare. Tennyson's works were considered classics.

Sherman (176: 105) felt that many pupils must wait to grow in stature to Tennyson's height in order to understand him.

The Conference on English (150: 87-90) of the Committee of Ten mentioned pre-secondary-school English as well as the literature of the secondary-school years. In its report of 1893 the Conference suggested that the reading book used in grades earlier than the seventh and eighth grades should be of a literary character. In the seventh grade the "reader" should be discarded in favor of prose and narrative poetry selections. The recommendations of the college entrance lists for study in the various years of the secondary school showed little uniformity. There seemed to be little regard for placing reading matter in an ascending scale of difficulty, although Hinsdale (103: 141), an exception, suggested that less renowned plays of Shakespeare, particularly the comedies, and Julius Caesar, should precede Othello, Macbeth and Hamlet. He even argued that the greatest plays are too profound for the secondary-school student. The Department of English, Harvard University (94: 9-12), recommended for secondary schools the following Shakespearean plays: Julius Caesar in the first year; Merchant of Venice or Midsummer Night's Dream in the second; Richard III or Henry V and Twelfth Night or As You Like It in the third year; Macbeth, Hamlet and King Lear in the fourth year. In the same lengthy list of books for study, required reading and outside reading, Scott's works were listed by years: Lay of the Last

Minstrel, Ivanhoe and The Talisman in the first year; Quentin Durward, Rob Roy and others in the second year; "Lady of the Lake" in the third year and none in the final year. In the list Milton's Paradise Lost, Books I and II, was suggested for the same year as "Lady of the Lake." Treasure Island by Stevenson and the Jungle Books by Kipling were included in the outside reading books of the first year, but Hughes' Tom Brown at Rugby was outside reading for the fourth year. There was evidently an attempt in the Harvard list, as in some of the other suggested reading lists and in the books on the teaching of literature, to include prose and poetry of increasing difficulty for the progressive years of the secondary-school course.

Although Crawshaw (60: 25) apologized for putting emphasis on the division of literature into prose and poetry, he and other authors of the period were careful to make such a distinction in presenting types of literature. Discussions of the teaching of types of literature were limited. Corson would have pupils appreciate poetry, not be busy defining it or turning it into prose. He felt that it must be appreciated in its own language. Corson and others suggested reading aloud and reciting poetry as a means of stimulating interest in poetry. The study of the novel in the secondary school received more attention than the study of any other single type of literature.

Gayley and Bradley (82: 43) wanted to distinguish between enjoying a novel and "finding pastime for an idle hour," but they also insisted that a novel should not be treated as a textbook and that a student should be encouraged to complete his reading at home, not waiting for the slower study of the book in class. Cook (53: 13-14), in her pamphlet Methods of Teaching Novels, did not consider the reading of novels an important class activity, unless the pupils had not learned to read intelligently. She thought time was better spent in composition work. She also suggested oral and written themes about novels. According to Cook, stimulating the imagination and making a revealing study of character are the chief ends in the study of the novel; merely telling the story in class reveals the ending and curtails student interest. Other writers (82: 43) wanted to use the novel as a comparison with life.

Summary

Latin lessons were not translated into English until late in the fourteenth century; English was not studied in British schools until after 1850. The teaching of English literature, begun in American secondary schools about 1870, was a small and insignificant study until the influence of the college uniform entrance requirements established the new subject.

The Report of the Conference on English of the Committee of Ten, made in 1893, gave recognition to the theory that literature should be studied through the works themselves. Stressing the interrelation of composition and literature, the report suggested its list of classics for uniform entrance requirements for college entrance so that an essay could be written on the same material by all students. This essay was said to be a better test of writing for the student entering college than any test provided before. The influence of the English conference was strengthened by such pamphlets as that issued by the Department of English at Harvard with work for the secondary schools according to the plan of the Committee of Ten and according to college requirements.

In agreement with the colleges' recommendations and carrying their recommendations farther, the books devoted to theorizing about the teaching of literature made an attempt to discourage the practice of memorizing facts about classics rather than studying the classics themselves and attempted to establish definite aims for the teaching of literature. Aims of the teaching of literature, however, were disposed of in relatively short order by the nineteenth century forerunners of the professional books. Differentiation of aims and courses for students of different abilities, and the suitability of the secondary school course for the later needs of the pupils, were neglected entirely or given brief mention.

Contemporary literature was passed over as unworthy of study in the secondary school. The correlation of the course in English with other studies was mentioned once or twice, but with no practical suggestions.

Most of the space in the professional books, essays and pamphlets was devoted to planning courses and setting up a method of teaching. Often the writer adopted the attitude or practice of Rollin in the eighteenth century, who gave the content and method of courses he had seen taught or had taught himself. Most of the writers under discussion were teachers writing for teachers, and were wise enough to qualify their advice. In many cases the authors insisted that their methods and plans were suggestive rather than definitive.

All of the writers in the field of the teaching of literature in the secondary schools before the twentieth century cannot be reviewed in summarizing the "forerunners." Alike in their social theories and underlying philosophy, they all found trusted values in great literature and had a belief in the elevating influence of literature. Their interest in the classics, their belief that literature could develop character and make pupils wiser and happier adults, their desire for high ideals in the teacher of literature, all stem from a social theory of humanism based upon an underlying philosophy of idealism. A few writers, motivated like the rest by the same philosophy and social theory, nevertheless loom large

as innovators and as able analysts of their own teaching practices. In 1867, Hales, almost apologetic in writing about the teaching of English, defended the inclusion of English in the curriculum of the secondary schools. Hudson, in most of his essays, used the theme of his own teaching - fostering in students the feeling for literature. He saw literature as a method of developing character and an opportunity for attaining a friendly atmosphere in the classroom. A. F. Blaisdell gave specific suggestions for teaching a selected list of classic authors and their works. Bates discussed aims and standards in the study of literature, and like Hudson sought appreciation of the values of prose and poetry. He accepted with reservations "moderns" who were not too unconventional and realistic. Thurber noted in his pamphlet of 1893 that there is no acceptable method of training for examinations, that the success of the pupil in his own life is the only measure of success of a course in literature.

Repeated reference has been made to Pattee's little book, Literature in the Public Schools. Published in 1891, this book was in effect a plea for the introduction of literature into elementary and secondary-school curricula, stressing the study of the writings instead of the mastering of facts about the writings. In addition, Pattee gave the pupil himself a prominent share of attention - insisting upon pupil initiative. The pupil was not only allowed, but encouraged,

to have opinions about works studied before he learned the critical opinions of literary experts. Pattee suggested an extra-curricular book circle or book club and a library collection for the classroom made by pupils and teacher.

There is no marked separation between writers already discussed and the twentieth century writers. Nineteen hundred has been chosen as an arbitrary boundary. In the nineteenth century forerunners, there were suggestions that are borrowed or utilized by later authors. Some of these suggestions are developed by the latter, some taken over in their entirety. A few of the authorities of this early period continued to write. Bates' Talks on the Teaching of Literature, although published in 1906, utilized much of the same experience and thought that was the foundation of the author's Talks on the Study of Literature, published in 1897. The title of the later volume, Talks on the Teaching of Literature, is significant; the teaching of literature and methods of teaching were becoming more and more prominent. After 1900, normal schools for training teachers of English came to use as texts many of the books on the teaching of literature. The next chapter deals with the first methodology textbooks in the field of English, called in this study the first professional books.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE FOR ACADEMIC ACCOMPLISHMENT

This chapter analyzes the professional books on the teaching of literature in the secondary schools from 1900 to 1917. During this period the professional books, which were not very numerous, were mostly designed as textbooks in methods courses for the training of teachers of English. Although the college entrance requirements dominated much of the theory and the practice of the teaching of English in the secondary school, and in addition the authors of the professional books were almost all college and university teachers, there were traces of cleavage between school and college that led to new and independent attitudes and methods.

Three important books dealing with the teaching of English were published within a few years of the turn of the century: The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School, by Chubb, published in 1902; The Teaching of English, by Carpenter, Baker and Scott, published in 1903; and Handbook on the Teaching of English by Hopkins, published in 1904. Often looked upon as the first professional texts in the field, sometimes even called the "first pedagogical books" on the teaching of English, they were preceded by the numerous pamphlets, booklets and volumes of the nineteenth century.

A ten volume work by Sylvester, entitled English and American Literature; A Course of Study in Literary Interpretation and History, with Applied Methods of Teaching Reading and Literature, published in 1902, was not usually accorded mention with the professional books. Sylvester's work included a detailed course in English and American literature, complete with assignments and examination questions. His volumes were designed to be used as literature textbook, manual, and course of study. It was a pseudo-professional book, evidently designed more for the self-education of the reader than for aid to teachers of English in the schools.

The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School, by Chubb, was the first book to give detailed suggestions for the teaching of literary masterpieces and to formulate systematically principles of the teaching of literature. Like earlier publications, Chubb's book contained many suggestions stemming from the author's teaching experience; unlike the earlier works there was an expression of the author's friendly understanding of his pupils. The Teaching of English, by Carpenter, Baker and Scott, dealt historically with the whole problem of teaching English in the schools. A large portion of the book was devoted to the development and condition of the teaching of the native tongue that displaced Latin in the secondary school. After disposing of the historical background, the authors noted the requirements for the teacher and, like Chubb, presented aims and principles of

teaching literature and composition. Handbook on the Teaching of English was not as original as the other two books, because it used material from many earlier sources. Hopkins' book was designed for teachers of English, specifically those teachers engaged in training pupils for entrance into the University of Kansas.

The notation by Chubb (45: 1) on the first page of The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School that a scientific method is being utilized in the teaching of English looked back to an earlier theory - Sherman's attempt in his Analytics of Literature, published in 1893, to make the study of literature scientific, objective and accurate. There had been frequent references before 1900 to the lack of organization of the English course in the schools. In a book (170: 1) published in 1907, it was noted that, although English in the secondary school, including literature, was accepted as part of the curriculum, there was still a poor organization of the course and the results were not commensurate with the time and effort spent in the study. Fowler (77), writing in England in 1908, spoke of the failures of the teaching of English in the secondary schools due to lack of method, poor editions of the classics, emphasis on philology, and above all the English examination system.

There was less questioning in the United States of the college entrance examination. In the Cincinnati Board of

Education's Report for 1900, quoted by Hays (97: 54), the measure of excellence of the secondary schools of the city seemed to depend wholly or at least in the board's eyes on the preparation for higher institutions of learning. The Cincinnati secondary schools had become "fitting" schools for the colleges and the school board thought it proper they should remain in that position. As late as 1915 a bulletin of the University of Texas contained high praise for the list of books selected every five years by the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English, because these lists were viewed as a necessary guide for the secondary schools, without which the schools would be confused in their curriculum. Hays (97: 82), tracing the Conference's influence, suggested that there was no other organized program except the uniform entrance requirements for the secondary schools to accept; that this conference did recognize the needs of schools and tried to assist in building an adequate course in English; that it was instrumental in broadening the range of subject matter and improving instruction. Baker (4: 232) answered the disapproval of the teaching of English in the secondary schools by noting that considerable improvement had been made in a course advancing from dull grammar and aimless composition to a broad teaching program in literature. Baker felt that this progress was due in large measure to the influence of the college entrance requirements.

A few writers questioned the influence of the college entrance requirements before 1910, but after that date questioning became common. Bates (10: 37) in 1906 wrote that the college entrance requirement books did not help develop understanding and appreciation of literature. Brown (35: 48) in the same year stated that he did not believe the college entrance examinations should dominate the secondary-school course. Instead, he would have had the college accept as preparation the English course that is best for the student during the secondary-school course. The National Conference (62: 487-88) itself introduced alternatives into the college entrance list for 1908-1912, and eliminated many of the books too difficult for the secondary-school student. In 1910 a committee of the English Round Table of the High School of the National Education Association suggested the need for a new trend in the college examination. Many of the professional writers from 1910 to 1915, not only doubted the value of the college entrance requirements list for the literature of the secondary school, but introduced new methods and a limited amount of new subject matter that did not follow the college entrance plan.

Aims

Most early writers indicated a dissatisfaction with the undirected teaching of literature. Chubb (45: 236) recognized the existence of aims in the teaching of English in

CONTINUED

the secondary schools, but he thought them inadequate and misleading. His book made an attempt to set forth certain principles that would give secondary-school teaching of English a logical and purposeful plan. Bates (10: 27) in Talks on Teaching Literature praised the careful instruction of literature in the schools, but noted that the instruction was not always intelligent, and that it needed aim and direction. Thomas in 1910, and other writers of his time, demanded clearer aims in the teaching of literature. Moulton in 1915 still referred to the tradition of a disorganized study of literature.

According to Hopkins (108: 54) it is always necessary to follow an aim or principle back of a scheme of teaching, or the teaching becomes uninspiring and even pointless. Bates (10: 10) insisted that the teacher of literature in the secondary school must decide what the teaching of literature can and should accomplish. Hadsell (89: 7) stated in Handbook for English Teachers for Use in Oklahoma High Schools that the purpose of his book was to give the teacher a definite aim. Without an aim Hadsell felt the teacher would not enjoy his work and the pupil would not be enthusiastic. Lack of an aim seemed a more serious threat to other writers. Blain (17: 2) in 1914 saw the teacher's idea of goals^{as} only slightly less important than the information about his subject and understanding of his pupils. Several writers declared that all

English courses should have similar principles and aims, but still there was little agreement on what those principles and aims should be.

Negative statements about aims.-- A few writers after 1900 specified what should not be taught in the English course and what should not be aimed at. Chubb (45: 241), breaking away from the classical tradition, did not want the secondary school regarded as a place for careful research and scholarship. He objected specifically to the formal discipline and thorough treatment of a few literary details. Several writers, like writers before 1900, disapproved of the amassing of facts as an aim in literature. Bates (10: 71), attacking an insincere appreciation, thought it preferable for a student to admit boredom than to mouth acceptable words of praise.

College preparation and composition.-- The aim of the study of English in the secondary school was accepted by many writers as preparation for college. Baker (4: 233-34), defending the college preparatory function of the secondary schools, stated that people forget that secondary schools on their own are trying to accomplish exactly what colleges expect of those entering and taking the entrance examination. Frequently the function of the secondary school as preparation for college was taken for granted. The influence of

the college entrance examination undoubtedly put emphasis on composition in the teaching of English in the secondary schools. The aim in the study of literature was often connected with writing, understanding the meaning of words and utilizing pieces of literature as models for composition work. Although the Uniform Entrance Requirements Conference in English recommended in 1909 that ability in composition and knowledge of literature be tested separately, the composition aim still persisted in the teaching of literature. A research study (119: 128) in 1912 concluded that there is a need for a closer relation between reading and writing in the secondary-school course. Theorists wrote that an understanding of the mechanical elements of punctuation, capitalization, precise use of words and forceful paragraph structure were among the prime aims in the teaching of literature.

Appreciation.-- In spite of this persistence of the college preparation ideal, utilizing facts about literature and aiming at correct expression, the chief aims for the teaching of literature as noted in the professional books from 1900 to 1917 were those dealing with appreciation and enjoyment of literature, developing taste in reading and the acquisition of vicarious experience through books. Most significant of the three was appreciation. Chubb, Carpenter, Baker and Scott and other early professional writers referred to appreciation as the most important aim in the teaching of

literature, but appreciation was accorded its fullest treatment by Bates in Talks on Teaching Literature. Bates (10: 53) insisted upon the importance of reading for enjoyment. He preferred to have literature in the secondary school abolished rather than to accept the theory that literature is to be respected but not enjoyed. Bates did not demand, however, a high degree of appreciation from pupils, asking instead for understanding and enjoyment, however limited and imperfect. Requisites for appreciation, according to Bates, are familiarity and understanding. He did not offer a fixed recipe for attaining what he considered the chief aim of literature, but protested against the formal, deadening presentation that prevented appreciation. In a later book, concerned wholly with the teaching of poetry in the secondary school, Fairchild (74: 81-82) emphasized an understanding appreciation, with its "right feeling for poetry." By 1915 the aim of appreciation was thoroughly accepted, and accorded mention by every writer on the subject, but Judd (120: 184), in his Psychology of High School Subjects, questioned the careless and "mystic" use of the term.

Taste.-- Generally, the aim referred to as "taste" was thought to follow the attainment of appreciation of literature, appreciation being utilized to establish worthy literary habits. Fairchild (74: 91) believed there could be a blending of the two major aims in the teaching of literature:

appreciation and the development of taste in reading. Chubb (45: 238,274) saw as a master aim the establishment of permanent literary interests with a feeling for style and a delight in the spirit of the classics. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 25), writing as usual in more circumspect phrases, suggested instilling "sound taste" for acceptable literature. Hopkins' Handbook emphasized the same "sound taste." Hopkins was concerned over the popularity of the cheap novel and newspaper, because he felt that reading only the best literature, the classics, would develop a proper taste for the student with which he might combat the appeal of popular contemporary writing. Brown (35: 52), following the same reasoning, suggested that students properly taught would be able to distinguish a faulty piece of writing from the genuine literary masterpiece. In spite of the findings of a research study by Jones (119: 129) in 1912 that teaching does not seem to be an important factor in determining literary taste, professional books published from 1913 to 1915 reiterated as an important aim the development of taste in reading. Pearson (156: 3) set up three purposes of instruction in literature, showing all three related to the development of taste in reading. Blain (17: 2) thought development of taste for good literature the prime aim of the study of literature. Bolenius (28: 7), in one of the most complete works on the teaching of literature written before 1917, de-

parted from the older insistence on "good" literature and "sound" taste. She noted that the needs of the student must be met if the teacher would succeed in fostering and developing a taste for reading.

Vicarious experience and ideals.--- Both vicarious experience through literature and ideals to be attained through literature were given attention after 1900 and often stated as aims. Speaking before the National Education Association in the summer of 1900, Halleck (92: 163) argued for the value of English in ethical training, pointing out that there are two sources of ideals: the world of experience and the literature read and studied. Halleck (92: 168) also suggested that no other study develops as many traits of character as the study of literature. Chubb (45: 237) wrote more fully on the aim of character development and the aim of securing vicarious experience than any other writer of the years before or for fifteen years after the publication of his book. He used the terms "vicarious experience" and "formation of character" in noting the importance of literature in developing the outlook and attitude of the pupil of the secondary school. Chubb asked that literature be used as an aid to students in interpreting life. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 250) also thought that literature could be a means of knowing life. Brown (35: 52), a few years later, referring to literature as vicarious experience, pointed out that the

student in reading the classics will be able to live over again the greatest feeling and thought of the ages. Bates (10: 238) felt that the instilling of honesty in readers was an important purpose of the teaching of literature. Thomas (200: 490) noted that the reader's narrow personal experience could be broadened by reading.

By 1910 it became customary to include in the list of aims of any professional discussion of the teaching of literature, experience through reading and development of character. The language, however, was often complicated and sometimes almost meaningless. Pearson (156: 241) wrote in 1913 that "literature contributed to the preservation of life." Fairchild (74: 16) believed poetry's importance was in aiding the student to adapt himself to see life and its problems with a new perspective or "other-mindedness." Fairchild (74: 15-16) noted that the pupil can learn about himself as well as about life, discovering through poetry his strength and his weakness. Fairchild (74: 134) used a term that later became common, the term "experience." Chubb in 1902 and Fairchild in 1914 were both concerned with literature as experience and literature as a mold of character. Other writers between them chronologically indicated similar interest in these aims, but did not express their ideas as forcefully or as clearly.

Moral aim.--- Almost no mention was made of better

citizenship or patriotism as an attitude to be derived from the study of literature, although there was a hint here and there of the preparation through English studies of citizens with high principles and high ideals. A moral purpose in the teaching of literature was suggested by Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 250), who called literature an ethical force. More frequently, however, literature and the teaching of literature as vehicles for preaching were condemned. Chubb stated that a work of art is not a sermon, and Bates that no pupil of his own accord drew a moral from a story or poem he had read. The latter insisted the teacher should not impose moralizing upon the student.

Accuracy in reading.-- With the persistent, if minor, aim of accuracy in the understanding of language was linked the more commonly accepted skill of reading with understanding. The colleges demanded an ability to read with accuracy, intelligence and appreciation. From the point of view of college entrance, stress was on the accuracy and intelligence of reading. Cross (62: 492), speaking of what the colleges demanded of the secondary schools, stated that knowledge should be stressed because knowledge is a necessary requisite of appreciation. Judd (120: 210), the outsider, more critical of courses in English than the professional writers and teachers in the field, insisted that it was the duty of English teachers in the secondary schools to train students to

read, not to dissect the masterpieces. None of the professional writers suggested a course in reading for the secondary schools.

Emotional release.--- Opposed to the dissecting of literature that Judd railed against, is an emotional or imaginative aim suggested by the professional writers. Both of the terms "power" and "imagination" were used by Chubb in 1902 and Bolenius in 1915. Bates (10: 200) also used the terms explaining that the student not only had the right to an opinion, but should be expected to have an opinion and to express it. Chubb (44: 45), in an article in 1912, noted that all teachers tend to suspect emotions, although it is the job of the teacher of literature to stir the heart and the emotions. Fairchild (74: 20) wished to stir the pupil within, and to inspire a fuller enjoyment of life and literature.

Core of Required Materials for all Pupils

In spite of the variety of aims suggested before 1917 in the theory of the teaching of literature in secondary schools, there was a tendency to accept use of the same materials for all pupils. The core of the same required materials was dictated by an influence still dominating the teaching of literature in the secondary school - preparation for college. Hopkins (108: 29) stated that the teacher's job is to arouse and inspire every member of the class rather

than a favored few, but he insisted more dogmatically than any other professional writer after 1900 that the English taught in the secondary schools should be the same whether it is in preparation for entrance into college or for any other purpose. He did make the concession that for those who did not intend to enter college there might be a fourth year of English, since only three years were required for college entrance in 1904. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 290) had also suggested that for the first three years the course in English be identical for those going to college and those not going. As late as 1914 Blain (17: 7) wrote that the college entrance requirements gave the secondary schools an ideal program. More specifically, Law (128: 18) declared:

No intelligent person, whether preparing for college or not would be ungrateful to those responsible for making him acquainted with Shakespeare, Milton, Tennyson, Macaulay, Scott, Lowell and like masters during the formative years of his high school course.

In each case noted, the insistence upon a set training in literature for all secondary-school students and a set body of material for all to study in common stemmed from the college requirements and was dictated by an adherence to those requirements.

Differentiation

Injected into a body of theory which generally accepted

college preparatory aims and content with a core of study alike for all pupils, were some suggestions for varying the approach and development of courses in literature in the secondary school.

Grade level differences.-- Chubb (45: 264), because he recognized the change in the adolescent from the first to the fourth year of the secondary school, wanted the work planned progressively year by year to develop an understanding and appreciation of the more profound classics. Chubb (45: 389-90) advised the teacher to work always in relation to the work accomplished in the grade below and with an awareness of the aims and work of the next grade. Such integrated work, he believed, would make the study in each grade more effective in an over-all plan and would give the work of the secondary-school course in English greater purpose and continuity. Hopkins (108: 49) did not agree that requirements should specify certain classics to be studied in certain years. He preferred to have each teacher determine what part of the required work of the secondary school should be accomplished in any year. Hopkins' generalizations (108: 53) about differentiation were to the effect that work should progress from the more familiar to the less familiar, from the less difficult to the more difficult, from that which is close to the student's experience to that which is removed from it. Bates (10: 217), less concerned with different grades

or years of the secondary school than with individual variation in each class, warned each teacher not to assume that a pupil has learned the lessons of a previous grade until the pupil has given proof of such knowledge. Such a reminder preached against rigid aims and content for each grade in the secondary-school course in literature. Thomas (201: 126) believed that the essential principle is gradation according to difficulty of the material studied. Chubb (45: 272-73) had noted earlier that it was not so much what works were taught in each grade but what approach was taken. He also pointed out that certain works studied in the secondary school were too difficult and unsuited to any level of the secondary school. Bates (10: 44) went further in his condemnation of school work not adjusted to the student, accusing teachers of expecting work from pupils beyond the level of the teacher's own ability.

Individual differences.-- Bates was not alone in his interest in adjusting teaching to the particular class and the individual student, but he gave more attention to this subject than any other writer before 1917. Bates (10: 59-60) warned that the limitation of pupils must be accepted; that the teacher must recognize that all pupils cannot attain the same literary appreciation and understanding; that no rigid rules for setting up a course can be formulated. The only rule, according to Bates (10: 136), is to consider

the individual teacher and the individual class to be taught, since the time a class requires to understand and appreciate a piece of literature is the time to spend on it.

Brown (35: 48) asked that each pupil read literature in the fields of his own interest. This was far removed from the attitude of other theorists who accepted without question the domination of literature in the secondary schools by the college entrance requirements. When there was a choice of reading proposed, however, only a limited choice was offered. Scribner (170: 3), in a proposed course of study, noted that each teacher finds classes with varying ability, needs and tastes, and that a teacher may be able to teach certain classics more effectively than others. Chubb (45: 314-15) warned that plans for any year's teaching must be modified to suit the development or lack of development of the pupil. Bolenius (28: 313) in 1915 insisted that all teachers should know their pupils, as well as doctors know their patients, in order to diagnose and administer to the needs of individual pupils.

Judd (120: 169-70) commented critically on the teaching of English before 1917. He felt that all teachers in the secondary school made an assumption that the pupil could read, that teachers of English, instead of teaching a basic reading skill, substituted an intensive study of the classics. The theorists were aware of these difficulties even if teachers were not. As early as 1903, Carpenter, Baker and Scott

(39: 251) commented on the limited ability in reading of every beginning secondary-school pupil. There was some recognition of the problem that Judd wanted the teachers of English to grapple with, even though there were no writers before 1917 who suggested including in the course of literature the teaching of reading in the secondary schools.

Suitability

The differences for which professional writers provided before 1917 were often minor differences of grade level or variation in class and teacher, necessitating some change in the order of teaching the required classics. The theorists were more cognizant of the need for fitting the teaching of literature to the immediate and future needs of pupils, although college preparation and the required classics also impeded suggestions for suitability as well as for differentiation.

Training for adult life.-- Chubb (45: 22) noted that teachers may be balked in their teaching of English by "bad habits caught from the nurse ... or from the barbarian playmates on the street." He was not always guilty of such snobishness, and even in this quotation there is evident an awareness of out-of-school influences. Chubb (45: 248) recognized the fact that the majority of pupils in the secondary school do not go to college and that the teaching of

English must prepare for social and political aspects of later life, and must serve to discover aptitudes and make the pupil conscious of vocations he may follow. Chubb would have the teacher measure his success by results of teaching that show in after-school life.

College preparatory work for those not going to college.--

Carpenter, Baker and Scott also considered the non-college student, but in a more academic manner, suggesting that language should be studied in addition to literature. Philology, although regarded as a college subject, was said to strengthen the secondary-school course in English for those who could not go to college. In other words, the way to make a course in the secondary school suitable for those not going to college was to offer a bit of college work during the secondary-school course.

Meeting adolescent needs.-- Bates (10: 89, 148) ignored preparation for college, trying to make a realistic and suitable approach for the teaching of literature to teen age pupils. Cognizant of the boy's and girl's dislike of the formal teaching of literature, Bates insisted that the teacher make an effort in dealing with pupils to recall his reactions at the pupils' age in order to keep the teaching always on the level of the child. Bolenius felt that teaching could not be suitable for any pupil until the teacher knows qualities of boys and girls as well as qualities of literature.

In Judd's Psychology of High School Subjects are more critical thrusts at the pedagogy of English courses, reminders of the failure of the teaching of literature to adjust itself to life requirements. Judd (120: 170,204) objected to the minute, intensive study of literary fragments, with the resultant disastrous mental habits it fosters and to the failure to explain the social implications of a purely verbal literature. Professional writers in the field of English were in accord with Judd's views, and desired in the theory of the teaching of literature what Judd found so sadly lacking in practice.

In 1913 Pearson (56: 215) wrote that the period in which the pupil was being taught was the most significant period and one often overlooked, for the "life" preparation to come after school years. During the years when the boy or girl is formulating his philosophy or attitude toward life, Pearson (156: 224) felt that the seemingly unimportant little lessons of literature mount up to be a potent factor in developing personality and character. Such an outlook makes the teaching of literature fit the present as well as the future needs of pupils. Fairchild (74: 14), also speaking for the immediate needs of the pupil, indicated that what the pupil wants had come to be more important than what the pupil knows. Fairchild (74: 135) believed that poetry preaches without the student being aware of sermonizing and that the student often applies such lessons to his own life. Bolenius

(28: 222-23) was even more specific about the influence of literature on the lives and character of secondary-school pupils. She did not adhere to the fragmentary, intensive, question-answer method in secondary-school instruction in literature. Instead, she found characters in fiction doing more to give pupils an understanding of friendship, philosophy and moral ideals than all the lectures that could be directed at adolescents.

Content

Aims and purposes of the course in literature in the secondary school sometimes escaped the domination of the college entrance requirements. The specific content of the course in literature, even in the books on the teaching of literature, followed fairly closely the college entrance requirements.

College entrance reading lists.-- The college entrance requirements lists from 1900 to 1917 contained almost all of the books suggested for study and reading in the secondary schools by professional writers, although there were frequent questionings of the lists. Bates (10: 138) took illustrations for teaching prose works from the college lists because he suggested that most teachers will be required to use these books. In a proposed course of study (170: 1) in 1907 all of the college entrance requirement classics were in-

cluded in the course for study in class or for outside reading. As late as 1915 Law (128: 16) praised the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements for its 1915-1919 list of books, because its list for study was brief and its list for reading long, with more options than in earlier lists. Law (128: 19), an outspoken champion of the classics against all comers, nevertheless suggested supplementing the college list with some contemporary material and even with books by local authors. To Law the list was suggestive and aimed at stimulating the teacher in book selection rather than at stifling his judgment. In 1904 Hopkins had objected to the college entrance requirements list because it did not include American works. Only one short American poem was included in the 1904-1905 college entrance list. Hopkins (108: 147) wanted the list supplemented with additional books for class and outside reading. Brown (35: 54) acknowledged the value of the National Conference's suggestions for reading, but warned that the list should not be directive. Thomas (199: 94), demanding reform in 1912, was willing to accept neither the 1912 college entrance list, nor an open list. He wanted only an "advisory list." Finally, the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements instituted in 1916 a comprehensive examination, and from that time on did not require knowledge of any single classic for entrance to college.

Difficult classics.-- Many of the individual classics of the Uniform Entrance Requirements lists before 1916 were accepted by professional writers of the period only with qualification or explanation. Chubb (45: 305), recognizing the fact that the "Spectator Papers" bored students, blamed such boredom on improper teaching. Bates (10:37,90) declared a few years later that pieces to be read should appeal to the student of average ability and average taste. He noted, however, that the average boy of normal intelligence should find Ivanhoe, Macbeth and "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" interesting and appealing. Bates, however, was not always so arbitrary. He regretted the fact that the teacher was required to teach such books as Silas Marner, Irving's Life of Goldsmith and Macaulay's Life of Johnson, which must be taught in a formal and pedantic manner and are boring to most youngsters.

Hays noted that after 1905 the College Entrance Requirements list did not include the difficult Chaucer's "Prologue", Spenser's Faerie Queene and Bacon's Essays, and substituted Robinson Crusoe and Treasure Island, on the 1909 list. Jones' study in 1912 showed that only 73 of 987 pupils questioned in his survey enjoyed "Sir Roger De Coverly Papers," Pilgrim's Progress or Franklin's Autobiography, required reading for all pupils in the survey. In spite of the simplification of the college list, its greater latitude with substitution of simpler, more interesting works, Fairchild (74: 173) wrote

in 1914 that it included unnecessary books. More specific criticism was directed against the poetry of Milton than against any other writer because his poetry was thought unsuited for secondary-school study. Bates stated that teachers have confessed they take no pleasure in Milton, even though they teach their classes that his poems are beautiful. Blain recommended that Milton be replaced by Shakespeare's As You Like It and The Merchant of Venice. Baker (4: 235) found the course of study in need of improvement, particularly for the pupil who is more interested in travel, science or biography than in the belles-lettres.

Modern literature.-- Early in this period the professional writers occasionally deigned to consider the newspaper and popular contemporary prose. One English writer (77: 4-5) was afraid that teachers might be too enthusiastic over modern literature, and that it might induce sentimental and uncritical standards. Bates ruled out the contemporary by defining literature as a higher treatment of life than that given in periodical or newspaper. But in 1913, Pearson (156: 225-26), attacking the thesis that in pieces designed to entertain it is usually thought there is nothing to teach, insisted that when this reading for entertainment is chosen wisely and in moderation it can add variety and interest. Bolenius (28: 7) warned the teacher not to disapprove of any literature that might awaken interest in the classics. She

remarked that often a book considered inferior may carry the student from trashy writing to the classics. Moulton (149: 363), in a book of literary criticism published in the same year as Bolenius' book, was tolerant of the newspaper, arguing that it presented the philosophy of modern life better than other contemporary literature. The professional writers in the field of literature approached Moulton's point of view, but did not reach it. By 1915 teaching of literature in practice was turning more to contemporary literature than the theorists appreciated or approved.

Time allotment.-- The theorists after 1900 were seldom as concerned with securing adequate time allotment for English courses in the secondary school as were the writers before the turn of the century. There was often discussion, however, about the time that might be given for profitable study. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 300) stated that a good teacher can cover more literature than is included in the college entrance list in three lessons a week for the four high school years. Hopkins (108: 44), on the other hand, insisted upon a period every day of the four years. Most writers accepted the time element as established and merely gave directions for determining the order or sequence of the course in literature.

Chronology and sequence.-- Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 293) disapproved of the chronological approach to litera-

ture, since by that method students would encounter many difficult works they could not understand. The teacher, according to Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 296), not the board of education or the superintendent, must set the order for himself; the best order involving a progress from the easy to the difficult, from the short and simple to the lengthy and complex. Hopkins repeated these principles with the argument that the chronological order throughout a course was an aid to memory, nothing else. A final chronological review was acceptable to Hopkins (108: 57-59), after the class studied the nineteenth, eighteenth and seventeenth centuries in that order. Scribner (170: 1) wished the order of the classics to be determined by these three considerations:

The most interesting and readable classics should be studied first; they should become increasingly complex in structure and thought as the work progresses and power is gained; and they should be such as will illustrate and furnish models for the work in composition.

Fairchild (74: 22-23) did not approve of studying poems in the order in which they appear in textbooks, but suggested treatment in relation to ideas and the mood of the poems to enable the teacher to adapt his work to individual classes.

Detailed contents.--- Chubb (45: 312) went so far in setting up the order and treatment of literary work that he apologized for not giving the work of the fourth year of the secondary school in detail. For the other three years

Chubb gave specific hints for teaching each work included in the course. Only occasionally did Chubb offer an alternative or suggest deviating from his proposed content and methods. After the Idylls of the King and The Merchant of Venice, Chubb (45: 268) allowed the teacher to introduce some work in the essay or to pass on to Tennyson and compare Tennyson with Browning, if the class could understand such a comparison. Other writers also listed the works to be studied in each year, but there was little agreement about the books to be studied in any one year. The following suggestions for the second year of the secondary-school course in literature taken from Chubb, 1902; Carpenter, Baker and Scott, 1903; and Thomas, 1910 show the variety of proposed readings:

CHUBB

The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School, 1902

Lowell, "The Vision of Sir Launfall" and other poems.

Emerson, selections.

Bryant, selections.

Spectator, Tatler

"The Rime of the Ancient Mariner"

Idylls of the King

CARPENTER, BAKER AND SCOTT

The Teaching of English, 1903.

The poetry of Gray, Bryant, Dekker, Shirley, Byron, Milton, Lowell, Burns, Keats, Wordsworth.

Idylls of the King

The Merchant of Venice

Prose: Stevenson's Travels with a Donkey,

Blackmore's Lorna Doone, Burroughs'

nature studies, and some history selections.

THOMAS
How to Teach English Classics, 1910.

Novels: Scott's Guy Mannering, Dickens' David Copperfield, Thackeray's Vanity Fair, Blackmore's Lorna Doone.
 Several poems of Byron, "Sigurd the Volsung" by William Morris.
Coriolanus.

These writers and others giving a proposed course of study showed little agreement in the selections suggested for any year, except that in most cases a short literary history of England was included for the fourth year of the secondary-school course.

History of literature.— Almost every author in the period had some comment on the historical review of English literature. Hopkins in 1904, Bates in 1906 and Fairchild in 1914, all insisted that the facts about literature to be derived from the review in the fourth year be kept subservient to the literature read earlier. Hopkins (108: 69), having noted that the study of literature involves more than the mere memorization of facts, stated that the object of the historical study was to explain facts already learned. Bates (10: 30-41) in Talks on the Teaching of Literature made few, but pertinent, remarks on the teaching of the history of literature. He wanted the teacher to do no more with the history of authors than is absolutely necessary for the student's enjoyment. For Bates the teaching of literature was a significant job requiring an understanding of the stu-

dent and a literary breadth; the teaching of the history of literature just hard work. Fairchild (74: 83-91) gave a general rule for the amount of literary history to teach by stating that after the pupil has been given an appreciation of poetry, he should be carried as far into facts about literary history as he can go without losing interest.

In a book (125: 87-88) published in Great Britain in 1901 on the teaching of English, the author suggested that the fundamental interest in a classic is in the writer's life and personality. This extreme position, giving more importance to biographical study than the reading of the work, was modified by most American writers of the period, who often advocated some study of the writer's life in connection with a study of his writings. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 281-82) not only wanted the pupil to get a feeling of what the author is, but suggested learning biographical facts as a kind of cultural attainment. Pearson (156: 23) found facts of biography helpful in understanding literature and in appreciating it. Fairchild (74: 87), who had more than any other author to say about biographical study, took the position that knowing about an author will usually aid in the study of his works, although he admitted biographical material is "gossip" to interest those for whom poetry does not have a natural appeal. Bolenius (28: 221) did not find biographical study necessary with Kingsley, Reade and Thackeray; absolutely essential in the study of Scott, because his life

can be an inspiration to boys and girls. Both Fairchild and Bolenius took into account the student rather than the author in considering biography as an accepted aid in the teaching of literature. Bates (10: 223) took exception to the opinion that biographical material had any place in the curriculum. Speaking from his own teaching experience, he declared that he had never found a pupil who enjoyed a literary masterpiece because he knew facts about the author's life.

Types.-- Much of the discussion of specific content in the teaching of literature was concerned with the type of literature suggested for study, and was included in the professional books in the sections dealing with each type. Only one writer, Fairchild (74: 106), suggested relating works on the same subjects, or according to theme. He felt that literature would have more unity, were it studied according to similarity of theme or incident. Moulton (149: 20) disapproved of classifying literature according to the form or type of its composition, since he maintained that all the elements of literature may be found singly or in combination, regardless of the form. Writers on the teaching of literature, however, usually dealt with types separately. Chubb (45: 256), for instance, recommended that the leading literary types should be studied in the work of each year of the secondary-school course. Shryock (178: 17) noted that the literature used in school presents five dif-

ferent and clearly marked types: poem, novel, drama, essay and oration. Following are brief summaries of the suggestions made in the professional books for teaching each of these types of literature.

Fiction.-- The novels used as a basis for discussion in the professional books and suggested for reading in the secondary school were Ivanhoe, Silas Marner, the Vicar of Wakefield and occasionally some works of Dickens and Thackeray. Repeated references were made to Ivanhoe and Silas Marner, both of which were on the college entrance lists. The novel as a type was said by Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 263) to be well suited to the juvenile mind. Most writers agreed that study of the novel was not to be too minute or detailed, although few went to the extreme of Chubb (45: 300), who stated that the novel should be read at home and reviewed rapidly in class. Blakely (20: 8) and Bates (10: 56) cautioned against too cursory a reading. Bates (10:152) disapproved of the exclusive use of the books on the college entrance lists when he stated:

Whatever may be the entrance requirements and whatever the prescribed course in the way of fiction, I should begin the study of the novel with a modern book.

Only Bolenius (28: 237), of all the writers of the period, had original suggestions for increasing class interest: students impersonating characters, enacting scenes from the book, studying the clothes and customs of the people of the novel,

making reports and informal talks about the story. The short story was suggested in connection with the study of fiction only by Bolenius; other writers ignored it as a type of literature.

Drama.-- Although there were comments which seem to refer generally to the teaching of the drama in the secondary school, no plays other than Shakespeare's were mentioned in books on the teaching of literature from 1900 to 1917. Julius Caesar and Macbeth were the plays most often used for illustrating the teaching of Shakespearean plays. Chubb (45: 267) made the recommendation that Hamlet, King Lear and Othello should not be taught in the secondary school. Pearson (156: 195) believed King Lear to be within the scope of the patient pupil. The method of teaching the plays was for the most part a careful analysis of the plot to study the development within the play, with discussion in class of the characters and of the historic background. Chubb suggested supplementary study of Shakespeare's life, age, dramatic development and his language. Other writers warned against detailed and pedantic teaching connected with the drama, but only Bolenius remembered in her teaching that Shakespeare was writing for the stage and not for the classroom. One of the aids in teaching Shakespeare Bolenius (28: 182) suggested was an impromptu production by the class of Julius Caesar, with the lines recited as remembered, not read. One or two scenes

were to be performed, not the entire play.

The Essay.-- "Sir Roger de Coverley Papers," a designation used to indicate a selection of essays from The Spectator, and Macaulay's essays were most often used as illustrative material for suggestions about teaching the essay. There was some apology for difficult essays at the secondary-school level, but most professional books accepted the essays of the college requirements with little complaint. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 270) excused placing essays in the curriculum, although they admitted essays must be taught with moderation because they hold little interest for boys and girls. The intellectual profundity and definiteness of the essay were thought to equal in difficulty other subjects of the secondary-school course, and thus to warrant a place in the course. Blakely (20: 86) noted that a careful plan must be followed to overcome the disinterest of most pupils. As in other types of literature there was sometimes the hint that the essay as a whole be understood before a detailed analysis be made. The composition aim of the teaching of literature was often connected with the study of the essay, writers seeing in the essay an example for studying style of writing and a model for imitative composition work.

The oration.-- Connected with the study of the essay was the study of orations. Burke's "Speech on Conciliation" was the oration most often discussed. Bolenius (28: 311-12)

called this speech "the best tonic on the college entrance requirements list for inert, sluggish minds." Bates (10: 141) believed every class should summarize the oration, paragraph by paragraph, noting its imaginative or literary qualities only after a study of its logic. The intensive work on the orations of Webster and Burke was always suggested for the last two years of the secondary school; and the study or recitation of Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" sometimes earlier in the course.

Methods

The review of each type of literature suggested for study in this period has described the methods suggested for teaching fiction, drama, essays and orations as well as the content. As was suggested earlier, the method of teaching was necessarily injected into most of the discussion of content. In the following section the techniques and procedures of methodology are emphasized, although content cannot be divorced from the manner of teaching it.

A prescribed method.-- None of the professional writers, from Chubb in 1902 to Blain and Fairchild in 1914, was willing to set forth a method to be slavishly followed in every classroom for every book to be taught. Chubb (45: 72) felt that the teacher must be able to fall back on many techniques, dictated by the type of pupil being taught. Carpenter, Baker

and Scott (39: 250) found in the teaching of literature more than in the teaching of any other subject a variety of techniques or methods depending upon the personality and training of the teacher. Hopkins (108: 54) desired a method of teaching that could be changed or even discarded. Bates (10: 124) made it clear to the reader of his book that illustrations of a possible method of teaching were being presented, not models to be followed exactly by another teacher. Fairchild (74: 7) declared there should never be a set method, but instead, a method for each class, for each poem, for each individual.

The whole selection.--- When Judd wrote in Psychology of School Subjects in 1915 that the pupil gets into the bad habit of thinking of poems and prose selections as something to be analyzed in detail rather than understood for a larger meaning or significance, he may have been describing accurately the teaching of literature as practiced in the schools. He was not, however, suggesting anything new to the theorists about the teaching of literature. Every writer from the turn of the century had anticipated him on this point. Chubb (45: 5) called the perception of the whole spirit or idea of a piece of literature the first step in its study. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 262) noted the need for the instructor to have a large aim in teaching a literary work. Bates (10: 157) felt it was most important to deal with a book in its

entirety and the first of Thomas' specific suggestions for treating literature was to consider the selection as a whole.

Rapid first reading.-- To insure the understanding of the literary selection as a whole, or to get the feeling of the work, many writers, beginning with the British author, Knowlson (125: 53), suggested a first uninterrupted reading, ignoring notes and glossaries. Bates (10: 178-79) allowed passing comment in a first class reading, but not a sentence by sentence reading. Pearson (156: 125-26) wanted the first reading distinguished from later readings by not requiring pupils to understand all references and allusions. Other writers, suggesting preliminary stages in reading or studying, qualified somewhat the uninterrupted first reading. Bates (10: 63), an advocate of a not too careful first reading, believed the difficult points of language and thought should be cleared up before any reading by the class. Fairchild (74: 72-79) made many suggestions regarding preparation for a first reading of a poem. He wanted the student not only ready for a poem but eager for it after the teacher explained the background of the poem and cleared away any misconceptions in the pupil's mind.

Intensive study.-- There was divergence of opinion concerning the studying of mechanical or technical details of literature, especially in the study of poetry. Bates (10:

49) felt that the teacher must show pupils that understanding and appreciation go beyond mechanical treatment of masterpieces. Pearson (156: 5) made a distinction between secondary-school and college literature, allowing advanced study to include technical details, the secondary-school study primarily to tell the story. Bolenius (28: 14) cautioned teachers not to make the reading of poetry mechanical and dead even when teaching its technique. On the other hand, Carpenter, Baker and Scott and other writers after them wanted the structure of poetry and prose studied very carefully. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 17) commented on the importance of knowing the English language thoroughly and of reading with care and precision, after the fashion of their arguments for the educative value of Latin and Greek. Numerous writers in Great Britain as well as in the United States believed that the science of poetics, including versification, must be an important part of the course in English. In the field of criticism, outside of the professional books designed for teachers of English, there was the same insistence upon a study of form. Moulton (149: 64) thought the basis for appreciating literature was an understanding of the external elements of form. Connected with the advocacy of studying form and details was the warning that studying literature means discipline and hard work. Fairchild (74: 162-76) noted that poetry is not easy, that it requires application and attention to details. Thomas (201: 14)

demanded patience on the part of the teacher, a concentration on the meaning of each passage. Bates (10: 165) even insisted that the teacher tell the student a literary piece is difficult, and that the lesson in literature is to be learned in the same manner lessons in science and arithmetic are learned. Such a suggestion was not in keeping with Bates' comments on appreciation, enjoyment and understanding, or the theory of a pleasurable, uninterrupted first reading.

Techniques for intensive study.--- There was considerable criticism of poor and tedious techniques, often by those writers advocating careful scholarship. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 280) pointed out the difficulties of a too careful analysis of literary works. Bates (10: 221) disapproved of paraphrasing and diagramming, which were termed artificial and superficial methods of study. Hopkins (108: 31) pointed out that the application of too many teaching suggestions to one classic would spoil the classic for the pupil. Judd (120: 170) voiced similar objections about a too detailed study of books, a study which he felt impeded the student mentally. All of the writers were not in agreement with this position against techniques for the detailed intensive study of literature. Chubb (45: 282) used several diagrams to show intricacies of plots, tracing the complex plots of Shakespearean plays in a five columned diagram. Bolenius (28: 99-100) also accepted diagramming of plots as a helpful technique in the study of literature. Pearson (156:

118-19) wanted the student to note the average length of sentences of a literary selection and to make a careful analysis of the literary workmanship.

Reading without drill.-- Most writers did not want teaching of literature to become a stereotyped, obvious drill on essentials of literary composition. Chubb (45: 30) asked teachers to have a belief in the purposefulness of a slow, unconscious absorption through reading. Bates also believed in the efficiency of a leisurely manner of teaching, and in the pupil's ability to discover in his study much that the teacher does not specifically point out. As in his earlier book on the reading of literature, Bates (10: 146) in the 1906 volume, Talks on the Teaching of Literature, hankered after that old pedagogical "truth" that pupils should never be told what they can find out for themselves. Bates believed that a pupil will not think for himself if the teacher does the reasoning for him. On the other hand, Bates seemed to believe in guidance in his own teaching, and advocated sympathetic guidance for other teachers of literature.

Techniques for gaining interest.-- When Judd criticized the teachers of English in the secondary schools for failing to relate situations encountered in literature to their pupils' experience, he was again touching upon an element in the teaching of literature of which many professional writers were fully aware. Bates (10: 67,70) suggested that the

teacher begin with something in the student's experience, something with which the student is familiar. Bolenius (28: 127) gave a detailed example illustrating this same point. In a sample lesson for introducing "The Lady of the Lake" Bolenius described the class following with keen interest the action of Canto I, pretending the chase was a game of "hare and hounds" or a treasure hunt. Thomas (201: 17) indicated that the pupil who relates what he has read to his own experiences has a better understanding of what he has read. Several suggestions were given for establishing a closer relationship between the classroom study and life outside of school. Bates (10: 180) advised the teacher to make his talk about the ambition in Macbeth personal talk pupils could understand. Bolenius (28: 200-201) encouraged students to pretend they were the characters in the plays and stories they were reading. Chubb (45: 81) asked that the teacher seek literature with which it is possible to interpret the simpler facts of the pupil's own life, always using those situations and concepts that are within the pupil's range of experience and understanding. Pearson (156: 14) showed a similar awareness of the pupil's limitations, if not of his needs. He suggested that pupils must be aided in interpreting classics which were written and intended for adults. Bolenius (28: 160), subordinating her sympathetic interest in the pupil to adherence, at any cost, to classics required for entrance into college, wrote: "Boys and girls

must be led to like their Shakespeare for their own sakes." In other words, the teacher was to force her standards and desires on the pupil of the secondary-school course in literature, but was to pretend those standards and desires were the pupil's own.

Discussion.-- Class discussion was often suggested to stimulate student interest. Bates (10: 180) preferred pupils speaking about literature to their writing about it, because their talk would interest and encourage other students in the class. Hopkins (108: 64) believed that every class recitation or discussion should have a definite objective, that a definite statement of it be made by way of introduction and that at the close of the class period there be a summary of what had been accomplished. Illustrative class lessons were sometimes given in detail by the professional writers. Fairchild (74: 22-69), for instance, included in his book, The Teaching of Poetry in the High School, a stenographic account of four class periods dealing with a single poem, Browning's "Andrea del Sarto." The detailed lessons included the work carried on in class, homework, the teacher's suggestive questions and the pupils' participation in class reading and discussion. In commenting on the class work Fairchild insisted that comprehensive questions should be addressed to the class as a whole, not to a single student. In this way it was suggested the entire class has an interest in what is going on

during the lesson. Recitation was no longer merely the repetition of memorized phrases; it was a discussion by the pupils of their own opinions expressed in their own language.

Aids for teaching.-- In addition to general techniques and illustrations for class lessons, many theorists suggested specific aids for teaching: effective oral reading by teacher and by pupils, memorization of famous passages from literary selections, dramatizing selections studied in class and visual aids used in presenting literature.

Oral reading.-- Cross (62: 492) stated in 1919 that the art of reading aloud is seldom practiced in the secondary schools. Williams (213: 67), about the same time, found American students did not read aloud very well. Poor reading aloud in practice was not due to the failure of the professional writers to recognize its importance. The notion that literature was something to be spoken and heard rather than read was a pet theory of Chubb's. "Literature," Chubb (43: 19) wrote, "is not in the book. Her language is that of the lips." In commenting on the first reading of a literary selection by the teacher, Bates (10: 176-77) warned the student who cannot read aloud well not to become a teacher. Thomas (201: 13) repeated this admonition when he stated that the meaning of literature can be secured in part through oral reading. Others agreed that effective oral reading requires an under-

standing of what is read. There was always agreement about the style of reading. Fairchild (74: 99) stated that it is better to fall into a sing-song than to read poetry as though it were prose. In the same year, Blain (17: 14) stated that pupils should be taught to read poetry and prose in the same manner and should be given practice to insure that similarity.

Memorization.-- Memorization was suggested usually as an aid to appreciation. There were no adverse comments on memorizing passages of poetry, but reasons for committing passages to memory differed. Thomas (201: 125) considered memory work mental drill, and thought it could result in a gain in vocabulary and the acquisition of moral standards. Chubb (43: 25-26) believed the pupil could get the melody of verse by memorizing, and, incidentally, demanded that the teacher be able to recite without looking at the text in which the poem being recited is written. Bates (10: 191) suggested that memorization should be used in connection with work being studied, and that the student be given an opportunity to recite in class. Fairchild (74: 92-93) argued for an extensive amount of memory work in the English course of the secondary school because he felt the pupil can learn most readily during adolescence. There was never questioning of a need for memorization, although one or two writers believed in allowing some latitude in selecting passages to be committed to memory.

Dramatization.--- Dramatizing literary selections was not given as much attention as the other aids, memorization and oral reading. Chubb favored pageants and simple dramatics, especially in connection with the English of the elementary school, but most other theorists either ignored or gave brief mention to dramatics in the secondary school. Simons and Orr (180) dramatized a number of selections from the English classics. Hadsell, referring to these dramatizations, starred those selections in his proposed course in literature which were included in the Simons and Orr collection. Both Fairchild and Bolenius, who had most to say about the importance of dramatization in the teaching of literature, suggested impromptu plays, the virtue of which lies more in quickening imagination than in presenting a finished performance. It was suggested that pupils will remember these little playlets and the literature they represent much longer than literature merely discussed in class.

Visual aids.--- Lantern slides, illustrative material collected by the pupils, pictures and art works in the classroom were all suggested by Chubb (45: 269) as most helpful in the teaching of literature. Later, Fairchild (74: 155) and Bolenius (28: 61,136) suggested objects and pictures to help visualize poems. No other writers mentioned the visual materials these three writers considered so important when used judiciously. Bolenius (28: 172) devised and used many

other aids to stimulate class interest in literature. She believed that an English club during the class hour, with a member of the class in the chair, could make one minute literary talks and other literary exercises profitable and interesting. Bolenius (28: 166) suggested the writing of motion picture scenarios to aid specifically in reviewing novels studied in class and to lead eventually to better taste in motion pictures.

Composition.-- Written work claimed some attention as an aid in the study of literature. Several writers believed that the teacher of English should give some training in note-taking in an early grade of the secondary school. Bolenius (28: 102-3) suggested outlines and reports as regular written work in the literature class. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 233) declared that masterpieces of literature should not be used as models for student writing, although they noted from observation that many teachers think of composition as a subdivision of literature. Bates (10: 188) was adamant on the point that students should not be required to write with style and literary excellence what they think about literary selections.

Outside reading.-- Reading outside of the classroom was considered an important part of the course in literature, sometimes as parallel reading with the prescribed books of

the college entrance lists, sometimes having little connection with the required reading of the classroom. Blain (17: 17) set a minimum of one book a month as outside reading during the entire secondary-school course. Fairchild (74: 143-46) considered the real measure of the worth of outside reading to be the development of the pupil's interest and taste. Bates (10: 227) advised the teacher to bend all of his efforts to the stimulation of reading out of school, using tact and understanding, to improve student taste, especially in popular books and magazines. The school library and the teacher's own library seemed of vital importance to Hopkins (108: 79) in stimulating and improving outside reading.

Examinations.-- In writing of the evaluation of the teaching of literature and the measurement of its accomplishments, several writers were unwilling to accept as the only evaluative criterion the examination with its measure of some related skills and factual knowledge. The British writer, Knowlson (125: 44), called the examination an evil because he felt that the literary appreciation, for which teachers are striving, is subjective and not to be measured objectively. Bates (10: 121) thought the teaching of literature was worthless if it were merely for the sake of an examination, although he admitted that teachers have to accept examinations as part of the educational system. Fair-

child (74: 157) found some defense for the examination, claiming it a safeguard against slovenly and disinterested class work. Instead of depending upon an examination, Chubb (45: 75) measured the effectiveness of work in English for children of the elementary and secondary school by answering the following questions:

1. Has the work depressed or braced the mind and character of our pupils?
2. Has it developed power?
3. In what attitude toward the subject have pupils been left?

Correlation.-- There were slight attempts to correlate literature, composition and oral exercises and to connect English with other arts and other subjects of the curriculum. Chubb (45: 24-26) insisted that standards in poetry, language and music could not be considered separately. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 295) believed only poor teaching of English failed to refer to other fields of knowledge. A British professional writer, Fowler (77: 6), used the term "correlation" and warned against isolation in the teaching of literature. He suggested a close relationship with history and other subjects. Jones (119: 130) made the recommendation that the teacher of English in the first year of the secondary school study the writings of the great naturalists in order to correlate the literature course with the first year course in biology.

The teacher.-- Since the aim of the professional books under discussion was to improve instruction and to give the teacher a better grasp of the problems involved in the teaching of literature, it was natural that many writers should make recommendations concerning the training, qualifications and attitude of the teacher of English. Carpenter, Baker and Scott (39: 306) set up in detail the qualifications and proposed training they felt teachers of English needed. According to these authors the qualified teacher of literature must know well masterpieces he intends to teach, must have read extensively in English literature and English literary history; speak and write clearly and accurately; understand the principles of literary criticism; know something of Anglo-Saxon, at least one modern foreign language, and Latin, have a thorough knowledge of the English language; possess a passion for teaching; and have sufficient educational training to discover his powers and limitations. Chubb (45: 361) stressed not only the academic accomplishments, but tact, personal adjustment, exemplary habits of speech and an interesting and dramatic reading voice. Other professional writers suggested as requisites for the teacher of English a large and sympathetic "view," literary appreciation, sense of historical insight, inspirational power, artistic imagination, enthusiasm, honesty, knowledge of results to be attained in teaching. Goldwasser (84: 60) noted that methods cannot replace knowledge, while according to Pearson (156: 9) success

in teaching depends for the most part on the teacher's personality. Bolenius (28: 322) felt that the teacher must know the subject so well he will have time to discover and satisfy the needs of pupils. Brown (35: 51) sought masculinity as a requisite for the teacher of boys, since he objected to the predominance of women teachers, almost to the exclusion of men in the profession, especially in the field of English. Several writers remarked on the poor training of teachers and suggested better preparation and training. Hays (97: 85-86) noted that by 1900 courses for teachers of English literature were being offered in many colleges and schools of education. Hosic (110: 594) in 1911 saw the time near when teachers of English would have what he termed adequate professional training. In the same year Baker (4: 235) observed that teachers of English were improving and that in spite of being overworked they had clearer aims and better standards of teaching.

Summary

In summarizing the theory of the teaching of literature from 1900 through 1916 the general trends in the suggestions reviewed in this chapter are presented. The diversity of suggestions and points of view, apparent throughout the discussion of aims, content and techniques, is minimized in drawing the general picture of the period.

From 1900 on there were persistent demands for clearer

aims in the teaching of literature. Almost every professional writer recognized the need for defining aims and utilizing those aims in teaching. A few theorists still thought of preparation for college as a dominant aim in teaching literature in the secondary schools, but the majority emphasized the importance of other aims and principles while following the pattern of the college dominated program in literature. Understanding of what is read, establishing taste for acceptable reading fare, and appreciation of literature were the aims most often suggested. Appreciation was emphasized more than any other aim. Gaining vicarious experience through reading and attaining ideals through books were also stressed as important outcomes of the teaching of literature.

There was an acceptance of the same program in English for all students in the secondary school, since college preparation dictated the choice of books to be read and to some extent the manner in which the books should be read. An attempt was made to take into account the experience and understanding of the pupil, his needs while in school, his interests, and his knowledge and skills attained in previous grades. The teacher was asked to teach at the pupil's level, as well as to try to understand the pupil and to administer to his needs.

The content of the course in literature in the secondary

school, with its treatment almost exclusively of the English classics and a short survey of English literary history, usually in the fourth year, was the content suggested and approved by the uniform entrance requirements of the colleges. A few writers half-heartedly suggested contemporary literature. There was little agreement about the order in which the classics were to be studied, and many writers disapproved of the literary facts taught in the customary review of literary history.

The professional books on the teaching of literature agreed on no set pattern for presenting books and literary selections in the secondary school. Sometimes works were treated according to the year they would be met in a proposed course of study. In connection with the study of literary history, works were grouped according to the period in which they were written. Only once was there a suggestion that books be grouped according to the theme or subject matter. Books and literary pieces were often grouped according to type or the form in which they were written. One professional book of the period was written to present exclusively the teaching of poetry, and the general books in the field often dealt singly with poetry, essays, orations, novels and other types. Such treatment led to more careful analysis and to more thorough study of each kind of writing.

Since the professional books were for the most part

"methods" textbooks, with suggestions for or a method of teaching literature, they gave considerable attention to the techniques of presenting literature to pupils. Almost always, however, teachers were reminded that the method set down could not be slavishly followed in any classroom. Teachers were asked to have their students get an understanding of the literary work as a whole. Detailed study was often put in a subordinate position in the secondary school, although some writers insisted upon the importance of detailed analysis and study. Memorization of poetry, oral reading, dramatizing literary selection, written work about reading assignments, and outside reading were suggested as aids for increasing understanding and stimulating interest in literature.

With college entrance requirements a guiding factor, the dominant social theory of the professional books was humanism. The aims of appreciation of classic masterpieces and of vicarious experience through the great feeling and thought of the ages indicate that the teaching of literature in the secondary schools during this period was humanistic, based on an underlying philosophy of idealism. The dominant literary theory of the period 1900 to 1917 was academic accomplishment, the belief that instruction in literature endows the pupil with scholarly distinction as well as the knowledge needed for college entrance.

In nearly every professional book of the period, however, there were hints of new tendencies in the teaching of literature, tendencies which pointed ahead to a period of transition. The emphasis on understanding the pupil, adapting work to individual classes and careful techniques for studying various types of literature, savor strongly of social realism. A belief that what the pupil wants is more important than what the pupil knows, the diagnosis of the needs of individual pupils, the recognition of the importance of literature as a source of entertainment, the suggestions that instruction in literature be revised to provide for pupils more interested in travel, science and biography than in the belles lettres, all seem experimental in theory, pragmatic in philosophy.

The professional writers in the field of the teaching of literature seldom acknowledged conflicts in their own theories of teaching, conflicts arising from diverse social theories, and the differing, even antagonistic, philosophic assumptions. Fortunately, many of the professional writers expressed grave doubts about college domination and spurred on the reorganization of the secondary-school course in English. The publication, Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, treated in the following chapter as a statement of new aims, marks the transition of the theory of the teaching of literature in the secondary schools from a college preparatory program to a program closely related to the

elementary school, a program important for its own purposes and goals. From the review of professional books before 1917 it is clear that the groundwork for the reorganization of English was laid little by little from 1900 on.

CHAPTER IV

LITERATURE FOR INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENT

From 1917 to 1935 numerous books in the theory of the teaching of literature were published. These were years of reorganization in the theory and practice of the teaching of English in the secondary schools, but were also years of disagreement and sharp conflicts. College preparation and the exclusive use of the classics were still proposed by some theorists as dominant factors in the teaching of literature. On the other hand, new tendencies and new attitudes bloomed and flourished during the period and gave rise to innovations and experiments beyond the scope of the reorganization proposed by earlier writers.

The report of the National Joint Committee on the Reorganization of English in the Secondary Schools, published in 1917, may be singled out as a milestone in the literature on the teaching of English. It is being used in this study as a convenient starting point for a period in which the study of literature in the secondary schools came to be considered more important for its own sake and as an outgrowth of work in elementary schools than as preparation for college. The dissatisfaction with college requirements before 1917, pointed out in the preceding chapter, and the review of the background of the report by the National Joint Committee, to be presented

in this chapter, indicate that there was no obvious cleavage between the theory of the teaching of literature in 1916 and the theory of the teaching of literature in 1917, that instead there was a continuous and evolutionary development of the theories embodied in the report. The Committee on the Reorganization of English, it is also to be noted, was one of fourteen subcommittees reporting to the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, whose widely-read general report, entitled Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, was published in 1918.

In 1912 the Committee on the Articulation of High School and College, authorized by the secondary department of the National Education Association, became the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The National Education Association authorized appointment of fourteen committees to report to the commission on various areas of the curriculum. The already existing Committee on College Entrance Requirements of the English Round Table of the National Education Association and a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English which had been considering types of organization of English in the secondary school were combined to become the National Joint Committee of Thirty to consider the reorganization of the teaching of English in the secondary schools for the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education.

The Commission was not required to create a committee to consider a new problem. As early as 1906 there had been discontent with the uniform requirements for college entrance. The problem of college entrance requirements was discussed at city-wide and state-wide meetings held in 1907, 1908 and 1909 by the New York City Association and New York State Association of Teachers, and nationally by the English Round Table of the National Education Association, which in 1910 appointed a committee to study the system of entrance requirements and examinations. The chairman of the Committee of the English Round Table published a statement, "Questions at Issue" (110), in 1911. The Committee of the English Round Table, enlarged and combined with a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English, published in 1913 a progress report as one of the preliminary statements submitted by the several committees of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (112). In 1914 a second report was made for the National Education Association; in 1915 a report of the committee's work gained approval of the Department of Superintendents of the National Education Association. The final report, Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools (111), which is referred to, for convenience, in this study, as Reorganization of English, set forth the point of view and philosophy of the committee as a whole and contained the special reports of subcommittees on literature, composition, oral expression, business English, reading and library.

One committee on the teaching of literature confined its report to the problems of teaching literature in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades; the other literature committee to the problems of teaching literature in the ninth, tenth and eleventh grades.

Reorganization of English (111: 6-11) contained an emphatic declaration that the secondary school was no longer primarily a preparatory school for the colleges and that with the increased school population a more democratic philosophy was needed. Hays (97: 104), in a study of the history of college entrance requirements in English, noted that the report of the National Joint Committee represented the first breaking away from the influence of the college entrance requirements and indicated that a social aim had supplanted an academic aim.

Even the gradual progress, marked arbitrarily here as coming to a head in 1917 with the publication of Reorganization of English, was not without marked reversions to the teaching of the past. In 1926 it was noted that aristocratic and democratic ideals were still existing together (79: 157), and in 1931 it was said that the college course still dominated the teaching of English (126: 8). There was no high barrier set up in 1917, preventing a return to older methods of teaching approved before 1917. Inglis (202: xiv), editor, pointed out that most of the material in Thomas' book, published in 1917, was the accumulation of the author's study

and experience in twenty years of teaching English in school and college. As a matter of fact, Thomas (202: 171-78) called his own method of teaching prose "Lancastrian," a monitorial system dating from the beginning of the nineteenth century. Thus, a book published in the same year as Reorganization of English depended in part, at least, for its theory on the thought and the schools of the nineteenth century, before the publication of Chubb's The Teaching of English, here considered the first professional book on the teaching of English. Simons (179: 212-13) used repeated quotations in 1920 from Chubb's book, published in 1902, and also quoted Chubb's quotation of Corson's book, published in 1894. Many of the professional writers restated in books published during this period theories they had advanced in earlier books. The first writings of Abbott (5), for instance, dating back as early as 1902, suggested principles basic to Reorganization of English. The objectives of the reports by the committee of the Round Table and the Joint Committee were adapted from a statement written by Abbott and appearing in the October, 1912, English Journal under the title "The Aims of High School English." It was pointed out in 1926 that the theories and practices of the teaching of literature have borrowed from every period of the historic development of such theory and have utilized a variety of conflicting theories of education. (79: 44-45).

In spite of conflicting theories and theories reverting to the past, an effort is made in this chapter to determine what aims and attitudes were recommended for the teaching of literature in the secondary schools in the professional books beginning with Reorganization of English. Although the latter was singled out for historic comment by way of setting up a starting point for a "new period" distinguished from the years before 1917, the aims, differentiation and suitability suggested in Reorganization of English are considered with the suggestions of other theories in publications of the years 1917 to 1935.

Aims

In Reorganization of English (111: 26-32) it was stated that the goals to be attained in a course in English must be made clear, although clarification should be made through teaching, rather than through statements of aims submitted to pupils. In the same year, 1917, Inglis (202: xi) wrote that only when the aims and purposes of English corresponded with the aims and purposes of secondary education in general could the study and teaching of literature become truly effective. The aims of secondary education of this period were stated in The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, the report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, of which the Committee on the Reorganization

of English was a subcommittee. As a main objective of education, the Commission stated:

The purpose of democracy is to organize society so that each member may develop his personality primarily through activities designed for the well being of his fellow members and of society as a whole (123: 9).

With this objective and the famed seven objectives of education (health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, civic education, worthy use of leisure and ethical character) a broader, more democratic program was proposed than that of the Reorganization of English or of most professional books on the teaching of English from 1917 to 1935.

That demands for new and definite aims in English were not immediately successful in establishing, even in theory, a well-defined, purposeful course in English is clear from statements by later writers. Hitchcock (105: 9-12) in 1921 asked for a redefinition of aims; Sharp (174: 16-17) questioned the tendency of authors to make statements of high sounding objectives that were not significant in determining the whole course. In The Social Objectives of School English, Pendleton (157: 3) wrote in 1924 that English was poorly defined and that goals set are often goals beyond attainment in the classroom. In a research study (152: 8-9) written in 1925 it was noted that aims in the teaching of literature have been stated somewhat definitely, but in general and large terms. LaBrant (126: 4-5) in 1931 still deplored the

vagueness of aims in the teaching of literature.

Negative statements about aims.--- With the tendency of reports, investigations and books on the theory of the teaching of literature to criticize the absence of a statement of aims or the vagueness of a statement of aims, came comment on what aims in the teaching of literature should not be. McGregor (137: 2), like so many earlier writers, did not approve of factual information as an aim in literature. McGraw (136: 2-11) stated that improvement in vocabulary, in reading ability, in general information, in straight thinking, are all side issues of literature and not the controlling aim. McGraw would have such skills as outlining, digging out definitions and gaining factual information accomplished in other courses more prosaic than the course in literature. Thomas (202: 196) warned that teaching that prevented aesthetic enjoyment devitalized the study of literature. Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 88-90) ruled out as primary aims in literature: the process of getting meaning from what is read, enjoyment, entertainment, development of taste and love for good literature.

Appreciation.--- Still foremost as an aim in the theory of the teaching of literature, as it had been before 1917, was the appreciation or enjoyment of literature. One year before the publication of Reorganization of Literature, Dewey (68: 278-79) declared that appreciation is the prime

function of literature. Reorganization of English and the preliminary report in 1913 included as a major aim of the teaching of literature thoughtful reading and appreciation. Stratton (191: 1-9) indicated that in spite of many changes in courses in English every course claims one of the four basic aims: knowledge and appreciation of literature, ability to write, ability to speak and ability to think. Seely (172: 130) claimed that one goal in studying poetry included all others, and that goal or aim is "active, appreciative understanding."

Recognized as one of the most important aims, and sometimes a basic, inclusive aim, few attempts were made to define appreciation. Hitchcock (104: 18-19) admitted that literary appreciation was difficult to define, but insisted that it could be taught, and that without appreciation there could be no effective teaching of literature. Broening (33: 5-6), in her study, Developing Appreciation Through Teaching Literature, defined her use of appreciation as "emotionalized insight: an idea with a glow, an understanding with sympathy, a laugh with a cause, a sob with sincerity." Appreciation, as Broening used the term, involves intellectual, physical, humorous, social, aesthetic and ethical factors. No other writer in the field of the teaching of literature during this period analyzed or defined his concept of appreciation as carefully. Several writers, however, noted the active quality of appreciation. Tracy (207:

183-84) ruled out a passive absorption of knowledge in favor of a creative response to what is read. To Seely (172: 48-58) attitude and response are the important elements of appreciation, and come from the whole personality and experience.

Appreciation, as defined by Broening, Tracy and Seely, is recognized by others as a primary aim in the teaching of literature, but is not always called "appreciation." Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 54), for instance, called the primary objective in the teaching of literature the "literary experience" of the pupil. To clarify this "literary experience," the pupil's position was compared to that of a spectator at a football game, to an alert spectator who is responsive to the game itself as well as to the sights, sounds and colors of the crowd, and the thrill of the songs and cheers. Cox (57: 4-5,73), writing of appreciation in different terms, demanded that the teacher offer friendship through a kind of communion in the classroom in which the teacher sets out to teach little but to enjoy a great deal together with his pupils.

Enjoyment of reading.-- One aim closely related to the objective, worthy use of leisure, of the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, is what Reorganization of English (111:26) called the training for enjoyment of leisure as distinct from vocational training. In England (75: 10-11)

during this period there was an inclination to strive for an acceptance on the part of the pupils of reading as a delightful occupation for their leisure time. In America, Dudley (72: 329-34), writing about college English, claimed one of the purposes of literature and other arts is to serve as a pastime and as a means of forgetting troubles. McGregor (137: 58), in the secondary-school field, claimed that the first aim should be to interest pupils in books and to stimulate love of reading. Crow (63: 7-8) pointed out that books on education and literature, school surveys and courses of study, agreed on a major aim of reading for entertainment and acquiring the habit of reading the best books during leisure time.

Vicarious experience.-- Another objective like appreciation, carrying over from the theory of the teaching of literature before 1917, is the vicarious experience to be gained through reading. Hosic (109: 1-3), the editor of Reorganization of English, in a book dealing with elementary-school reading, referred to older writers, most of whom agreed that the purpose of literature was to enlarge and enrich vicariously the limited emotional experience of the pupil. Reorganization of English (111: 63-64) enlarged upon the qualities to be derived from the experience of literature: more sensitivity, keener intellect and wise application of what has been learned or read. Hitchcock (104: 15) believed that the

experience of literature can make pupils aware of their limitations and deficiencies. According to Barnes (7: 63, 87) literature taught effectively becomes real experience. Ideally, the pupil through literature becomes a democratically cultured person, with an appreciation of beauty, an emotional breadth and a wide sympathetic interest in life. Such a "culture" is far removed from the superficial social accomplishments indicated as a goal in the teaching of literature before 1917 and persisting as late as 1926, in which year Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 3-4) wrote that when a student has been given literary discrimination and critical ability he has been prepared to adorn a dinner table in the best society. Vicarious experience through literature, according to some writers (132: 256), involved incidents and relationships the pupil could not get outside of books or would get through life only in a distorted way. Reading was said to lead the pupil to an appreciation of his own experience (104: 60; 117: 125); develop his own personality (52: 237-38); build his character (202: 125); restrain and discipline his individuality (104: 66-67).

Familiarity with the classics.-- In setting forth the aims of the English course Reorganization of English (111: 32-33) mentioned getting the most from books by the "better authors" and gaining some knowledge of the "greatest authors" and their works. Dudley (72: v) also offered as one of the

lasting values of literature knowledge about the great classics. Mearns (143: 124-28) proposed as an aim the acquaintance of pupils with the best English of the past, and by English he meant British, not "inferior" American literature. Hitchcock (105: 10-13) suggested a thorough training in about thirty varied masterpieces as one of the fundamental aims of the course in literature. The few masterpieces were to be acquired permanently by the pupil through drill and "cracking the whip," a contrast to the friendly manner of Cox (57).

Acquiring literary standards.-- Many writers went beyond mere acceptance of the classics and mastering them as an aim in and of itself. Hitchcock (106: 157-58), who believed in familiarity with the classics, noted as a primary aim of the study of the classics the training of pupils to recognize artistic and inartistic material. Stratton (191: 185-88), like most other writers of the time, agreed that appreciation of the best in literature was an important aim, but admitted that it is difficult to discover what the best in literature is. Leonard (132: 239), also demanding a knowledge of the classics, aimed eventually at the establishment of literary standards set by the pupil, not dictated by the teacher.

Skill in reading.-- Before 1917 development of the fundamental process of gaining thought from the printed page was evidently assumed to be accomplished in the elementary school

or not worthy of notice in the curriculum of the secondary school. The increased population of the secondary school and the attempt to relate the teaching of literature in the secondary school to the work in the elementary school led educators to examine more carefully the fundamental processes necessary for the understanding and appreciation of literature. Sharp (174: 106) in 1924 stated very emphatically that reading was not taught adequately in the elementary schools and that the job of the secondary schools included correcting bad habits of reading. In 1921 McGregor (137: 163-65) had pointed out that skill in the mechanical process of reading was necessary if the pupils were to attain objectives set by the junior high school, and that readers who had not acquired skill in the elementary schools must be given special attention in order to read quickly and efficiently. Simons (179: 16-17, 134) also recognized as an aim the teaching of intelligent reading, consisting of the ability to get the thought from the printed page rapidly and accurately. In fact, Simons stated that the course in literature in the junior high school and in the first year of the senior high school should be a course in reading. Hitchcock (104: 6) called teaching boys and girls to read the first and major purpose of the teaching of literature in the secondary school, but like other writers who spoke of reading as an essential of the course in English and in all other courses he believed that the rudiments of

reading must be taught in the elementary school. Several writers of this period referred less directly to skill in reading as an essential of the course in literature. One stated that the aim of the course is to train intelligent readers (134: 10); another, to help pupils to acquire power to understand literature (19: 2). LaBrant (26: 10,32) pointed out that, if one deals with literature which involves the use of skill in reading, the use of the skill or the art of reading must be taught. Comparing teaching in 1931 with earlier teaching of literature, LaBrant noted that pupils now must be taught to read, not just have classics presented to them in class.

Various types of reading.-- With stress on the teaching of the skill of reading came the recognition of various kinds of reading and the skills necessary to master different literary materials. Reorganization of English advised development of skill in cursory, careful and reference reading. Barnes (7: 27) demanded that pupils be taught to get the thought rapidly and accurately, whether the material was literary or informational. Finch (75: 131-33), in Great Britain, differentiated between rapid reading of books and periodicals and careful reading of "pure" literature and reference material. Cook (52: 43-44), an American writer, explained that since there are various types of reading, the teacher must determine the kind of reading as well as

the reason for reading it before a method of reading can be decided upon. Opdycke (152:144) specified twelve aims in reading that embrace almost all the types and skills of reading: utility, knowledge, information, interpretation and recreation. The awareness of the different types of reading and the skills required for each kind stems directly from Reorganization of English.

Moral aim.--- The social and ethical "reasons" for teaching skills of composition and literature suggested in Reorganization of English were in effect a moral aim for teaching literature. Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 30, 56) accepted what they called the demand in English for using literature to teach Americanization, ethics and morality. Thomas (202: 197) contended that the moral message of literature needs teaching as much as the intellectual message, not agreeing with many writers and teachers who argued that the moral is self-evident or cannot be taught. Leonard (132: 226-27), in opposition to Thomas, did not believe in emphasizing the moral, and called it the duty in the teaching of literature not to lecture about the central theme or lesson. Hitchcock (104: 25) also disapproved of what he called "moral propaganda" through literature. He would have the teacher a teacher of reading, not of morals. McGraw (136: 8-9) asked the teacher to guard against using literature for teaching morals, political ideas or patriotism.

Numerous aims.--- In the discussion of aims suggested from 1917 to 1935 it has been necessary to discuss aims singly, as though each were a separate aim distinct from the others. No writer utilized a single aim for what Thomas (202: 19) called the "complicated" task of the teacher of literature. Craig (58: 5) pointed out that the English course must adjust and balance two diverse aims, the pleasurable aim of literature and the practical aim of composition and oral expression. Other writers (79: 4-5) also noted that English teachers can attain in literature a practical aim as well as a "higher objective" of culture.

Some statements of high sounding aims seem hardly justified by the programs or methods suggested. Garber and his co-authors (80: 3) claimed that their method of study made literature:

systematic training in thinking, in 'chaste' and powerful feeling, successful solution of the problems of life as well as pleasant pastime, elevating recreation and sentiment builder.

Cox (57: 79-84), however, seemed to make a sincere effort to justify his wide claims. His true essentials or aims were to discard dishonesty, throw off lethargy, display interest in people, and utilize the energy in response to literature that is usually expressed in play.

Aims were qualified and fortified through suggestions for varying the teaching for different schools, different classes and different pupils and through suggestions for ad-

justing the course in literature to the needs of the pupils. The discussion of required materials for all to study, to be presented in the next section of this chapter, is bound up with aims of writers suggesting the reading of the classics as an important aim in the teaching of literature.

Materials for All to Study

Even after 1917 there were pleas for a course in literature which limited study to a set group of classic masterpieces. In spite of the statement of the committee (111: 26,32) reporting in Reorganization of English in 1917 to the effect that varying abilities and backgrounds require a range of subject matter, it must be noted that the committee also suggested specifically that familiarity with a few of the greatest authors and their chief works was an important aim in the course in literature. Thomas (202: 114) pleaded for the retention of a small group of literary selections to be read in practically every secondary school, on the grounds that an English course should select books that are part of a common traditional culture.

Often the advocates of the same material for all pupils adhered to the college preparatory program and its selection of classics. Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 167) insisted that the program in literature that prepared pupils for college is also the best course for all other pupils. The authors (79:136) recalled their own study of two classics,

The Deserted Village and The Vicar of Wakefield, by way of approving the traditional place of such pieces of literature in the present program of the secondary school. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 406-7), as late as 1930, advocated teaching the literature required for college entrance, even if that literature required an extraordinary effort to keep pupils interested. Sharp (174: 19-20) noted that a large percentage of the average and superior pupils of the upper grades of the secondary school continued their education in college, and that the schools must continue to emphasize college preparation.

Other theorists suggested that literature was similar to "an exact science" (191: 6), and was "the right sort of culture" (27: 25). Hitchcock (105: 11-15) specified minimum essentials for all the pupils in each grade, with even the slower members doing the work, without coaxing, urging or clever motivation. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 266-67), admitting his debt to Sherman's Analytics of Literature (176), published in 1893, advocated the use of concrete methods for establishing a uniform appreciation. Here, the "core" was a definite body of methods for the teacher to follow, but with an aim for all teachers to attain similar and measurable results for all pupils.

Differentiation

The fixed body of literature for all to study and the same objective for all pupils were less often advocated after

1917 than the differentiation of objectives and materials for different classes and for different pupils. Reorganization of English was the report of a committee originally formed for the express purpose of examining work in English that provided for one end- preparation for college. The report stated that the secondary school should be made democratic for its varied and more numerous pupils, with provision for a wide range of materials. In spite of this commitment to differentiation of the course in literature, the report (111: 26) guardedly stated that such provision of different materials was not inconsistent with uniform aims and a uniform culture. Actually, making special provision for the commercial, vocational and rural schools, as distinguished from the academic and college preparatory schools, was the sort of differentiation recommended in Reorganization of English. There was almost no recognition of grouping according to ability or individual differences within a group, or provision for guidance through remedial procedures. Thomas (202: 305-6), in 1917, on the other hand, was aware of the need for guidance for each pupil and the need to develop the personality of the student in spite of the routine of teaching. Sharp (174: 34) in 1924 still demanded more flexibility in the teaching of literature to take care of pupils with different abilities and backgrounds. LaBrant (126: 108-9) reiterated this position and also pointed out that pupils with equal abilities may react very differently to poetry, just

as there are some adults who enjoy music and some who do not.

Courses other than college preparatory.-- A few professional writers (19: 409) suggested separation of college preparatory pupils and others, somewhat begrudgingly, noting that the results of the college entrance examinations were a reflection on the teacher. Sharp (174: 138), on the other hand, stated emphatically that for some groups the classics required for college entrance should be abandoned. He even suggested abandoning Shakespeare for the poorer pupil in favor of simpler, more purposeful books. Special materials, if not special aims, were suggested during this period for students in curricula outside of the classical-college preparatory program. The Committee on Business English (111: 97-98) of the National Joint Committee, reporting in Reorganization of English suggested that for pupils in commerce schools and those taking vocational courses, modern literature related to their commercial subjects should be assigned along with some of the "standard" authors. Wide home reading about vocations was suggested with modified class study of the classics. Thomas (202: 84,271), somewhat in disagreement, warned against turning from literature to practical reading matter for vocational, commercial and technical schools, but agreed that literature should be offered through simpler works for literary tastes not highly developed. Randall (162: 32-

47) provided for two-year commercial pupils by permitting them to read whatever books they wanted to read from the required list of the four-year students. Rather generally the teacher was asked by the theorists to avoid too critical an attitude toward the reading of the special student, and to make every effort to interest commercial and all other non-college students in any books, without requiring the same reading program as that demanded of students preparing for college.

Differences in reading ability.-- The differentiation of aims, materials and methods was not confined to provision for pupils not enrolled in college preparatory programs. There came to be a recognition of many differences within groups; one difference was that of reading ability. Stratton (191: 19), without approving reading instruction for individual pupils, reminded teachers that the assumption could no longer be made that all pupils in the secondary school can read, and suggested finding suitable reading material within the comprehension of poor readers. Hitchcock (106: 4) advised adapting the work to poorer pupils, with difficulties pointed out in advance. Craig (58: 63-64) suggested reviewing the plot of a book like Ivanhoe several times for the slower reader. Here there is an acceptance of intensive study and difficult material, with some concession made to the student who cannot keep up. Fries, Hanford and Steeves

(79: 14), acknowledging the individual differences of pupils, stated that the teacher should try to instruct effectively more and more pupils, instead of being satisfied to stimulate a few advanced students. Some writers (52: 134; 11: 4) suggested special attention for the fast reader and the advanced pupil who enjoys philosophic books too difficult for the average secondary-school senior.

Some attention was given in professional books to varied reading interests and reading rate. Thomas (202: 249) advised against setting a definite amount of outside reading for all students. He felt the required reading should be varied according to the kind and type of books to be assigned. Hawley (96: 67-68) suggested reading tests to separate pupils of different reading speed and skill. LaBrant (126: 41-42) had more to say about diagnosis of reading skill. She advised making provision of a remedial class for those with reading disabilities: the slow reader taught separately with short, easy, narrative material.

Grouping and special work.-- Provision for individual differences extended beyond those with reading difficulties. Thomas (202: 23) warned against taking the pupil's ability to study literature for granted, and a research study (116: 74-75) published a few years later made a similar warning against assuming that students know the most obvious facts or have the information basic to the study of literature.

The same study bore out the need for grouping for individual differences, with simpler work for poor pupils and more difficult work for better students (116: 76). The segregation suggested by Sharp (174: 132-34) divided the class into an A group containing the upper ten per cent, the C group containing the lower ten per cent and the B group containing the others. The sub-normal and the superior were to be given special work, while the middle group would not be hampered in its average work. McGregor (137: 6-8) in her book, Supervised Study in English, stated that successful teaching depends upon ample provision for handling the inferior, average and superior pupil in every class through supervision of silent study, special attention to the inferior pupil, varying assignments according to ability and correcting and stimulating study habits. McGregor and other writers were dissatisfied with the attempt to meet individual needs through grouping according to ability. Hitchcock (104: 59-65) asserted that the practice of grouping could not assure the individual pupil that his needs would be understood or provided for. Opdycke (152: 3) called the failure to know pupils individually and to give them personal attention one of the faults of our educational system. LaBrant (126: 104) stated that only after the teacher had diagnosed the difficulties of his pupils could he determine what to teach. Some authors looked beyond the diagnosis and the beginning of teaching with the reminder that the teacher must always know how well in-

dividuals are getting the ideas of the literature being taught and how far they have progressed.

Junior high school.-- The individual differences already discussed were differences of pupils in the same grade or year in the secondary school. There was also during this period a growing awareness of different aims, methods and content for the different levels of the secondary school. The report of the committee on literature in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades in Reorganization of English was separate from the report of the committee treating the literature in the senior high school, or tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades. The junior high school committee recommended the reading of simpler works than those proposed for the senior high school, with reading devoted almost entirely to narrative material. Thomas (202: 126-27) suggested simple material for the early years of the secondary school: the adventurous narratives of Cooper, Stevenson, Scott and London. Sleman (179: 7-10), who termed the course in the junior high school a preparatory program for the course in literature in the senior high school, was the author of one of several books published during this period from 1917 to 1935 dealing specifically with the problems of the teaching of literature in the junior high school. Supervised Study in English for Junior High School Grades, English Problems in the Solving for the Junior and Senior High School, Teaching English in Junior

High Schools and several books in part on the teaching of composition and literature in the junior high school, all published at this time, indicate the increased interest in the problems of English in the early years as differentiated from the later years of the secondary school.

Development of the pupil.-- Also connected with different levels or grades of the secondary school was the concern in the professional books for providing literary material of progressive difficulty for the developing maturity of the pupil. Reorganization of English (111: 69-71) stated that a book should be presented when it has the greatest appeal for the pupil. Thayer (196: 280) felt that the reading program at any time in the course should lead to a higher development, and that it was necessary to consider the future needs and interests of the pupil to provide the most beneficial literary experiences. Thomas (202: 126) pointed out that work in literature must conform to the maturity of the pupil and provision must be made at each stage of his development for material that is consistent with his changing thought and feeling. Opdycke (152: 21) refused to accept grade divisions as a basis for the choice of literary classics or the method of teaching them. He recommended only that the method of teaching literature be adjusted to the level of attainment and development of the pupil and to what is to be taught and attained in the future.

Suitability

When all the pupils of the secondary school entered or attempted to enter college, the college preparatory course in English met the needs of all the pupils. As more pupils entered the secondary school who did not need college preparation, it became the responsibility of the secondary school to recognize in-school and after-school needs and to provide for these needs through the course in literature as through all the other courses. One of the chief reasons Reorganization of English marked the beginning of a new era in the theory of the teaching of English was its avowed purpose of meeting the needs of the greatly increased population of the secondary school. Anxious to make the teaching of English more democratic, the joint committee (111: 26,32) set forth its belief that the course must help the pupil to make a better personal and social adjustment. Literature was said to be taught for vocational adjustment as well as for cultural and ethical benefits. The report of the literature committee for the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades in Reorganization of English (111: 63) set as its first objective the interpretation of life through the acquisition by the pupils of a more profound and more accurate picture of themselves.

Responsibility for each pupil.-- Barnes (7: 1-2), in a book entitled The New Democracy in the Teaching of English,

stressed even more than Reorganization of English the need for democracy in education. To democratize the teaching of literature, according to Barnes, literature with a greater appeal must be selected for the more diverse pupils of the secondary school, and each individual must be helped to utilize his opportunities and to develop his talents. Implied here, but not expressed, is the increased need for responsibility on the part of the pupil, what Dewey (69: 209) called having a full education or having a full share in shaping the objectives and principles of society. Rusch (168: 16) stressed the need for responsibility and resourcefulness which she felt could be attained only when the teacher, with faith in children, can keep himself in the background as a guide instead of a leader. LaBrant (126: 102-3) likewise stressed the need for responsibility and independence on the part of the class. A program giving pupils responsibility allowed them to read about subjects and incidents in which they were interested and to acquire a sense of social responsibility.

Recognition of the pupil as an individual.-- Along with the consciousness of the need for personal adjustment and the recognition of the need for responsibility on the part of the pupil came an acceptance of the inherent worth of each pupil. There were some professional writers from 1917 to 1935 who accepted the worth of the pupil without reservations; there were others who consciously or subconsciously made a distinc-

tion between the child worthy of attention and the socially inferior child. Generally, the writer who was more concerned with the literature being presented than with the pupil being taught made social distinctions and belittled and disapproved of pupils. Such writers as Cox (57: 32-39) and LaBrant (126: 21-22), who urged the teacher to be more concerned with pupils than with authors or literary facts, were deeply concerned themselves with guiding pupils. Lyman (134: 229), who termed the reading that opened up new personal and social areas the "purest literature," recognized that literature has little meaning if it does not become part of the reader's personal experience.

There were, on the other hand, the writers mentioned above who conceived of the English classroom as an ivory tower existing for itself, removed from everyday life and needs of the pupil. Hawley (96: 28), for instance, wrote of "an untidy little girl" who talked about uncultured music, and "an undernourished-looking little boy" who could not answer the difficult question put to him in class. Reorganization of English also seemed to express disapproval of a foreign element in some schools and those training for industrial pursuits. With such snobbish, undemocratic statements went a disregard for the social welfare and the life needs of the pupil. Referring to the inspired, patriotic literature of the first World War, the statement was made that "pedagogically speaking, the benefit of the World War to our

English course is beyond measuring" (179: 175). This statement could reveal that for some professional writers subject matter in the classroom took precedence over interest in the welfare of humanity.

Cox (57: 32-39), steering clear of "cultured" bias and superficiality, wrote most boldly on the relationship of literature to attitudes. He insisted upon honesty, the avoidance of careless and shallow thinking, trying out and testing continually the principles set forth in the classroom. Cox suggested that the teacher himself must try to relate his own theories about literature to his own living, and to change his theories when they do not work outside of the classroom. It is interesting to note that Thomas (202: 119,120), writing in the same year Reorganization of English was published, measured the effect of the teaching of literature by its effect on the life of the pupils, and argued for the inclusion of modern literature because it dealt with problems the pupils themselves had to solve in their own lives. Barnes (7: 12-13), who claimed that the aristocratic tradition persisted in the schools and attacked the ignorance of teachers in relation to world problems, insisted upon the course in English training for all walks of life, with the training of the housewife and plumber as important as the training of the professional man and the cultured man and woman of society.

Providing for psychological needs.--- Closely related to life needs of pupils are specific psychological benefits said to be derived from literature. In earlier books, before 1917, when the emphasis was primarily on preparation for college, there was little attempt to aid in the adjustment of pupils psychologically. Cox (57: 30), however, believed that the teaching of literature was not succeeding if the pupil was not changing emotionally and spiritually, and such change, he declared, might come from what he considered a stimulating antagonism between teacher and pupil. Like the British writer Bracken (32: 28), Cox was convinced that the best student is not always the well behaved student who accepts the teacher's opinion, but often the pupil who expresses an opinion antagonistic to that presented by the teacher. In the same way that theorists recommended calling on poorer students to recite, Stratton (191: 118) used plays for psychological adjustment, having boys and girls play parts in which they were not skilled and for which they were not naturally suited. The effect of literature on the child had come to be more important for these writers than the performance in the classroom or the impressiveness of the recitation.

Utilizing interesting material.--- Beginning with Reorganization of English there was some questioning of the use of material in English that did not interest pupils of the

secondary schools and that therefore did not cater to their needs. Stratton (191: 78) pointed out that literature that appears to be easy to any adult may be far beyond the interest and scope of the pupil. Hitchcock (104: 17) went farther to say that a great deal of the literature which pleases older readers is inappropriate for secondary-school pupils. Thomas (202: 112) and Craig (58: 4), writing during the same period, but thirteen years apart, insisted that if literature were to be taught effectively it must be adapted to the needs and interests of adolescents. Thomas (202: 119-20) suggested changing the course so that it would have a close connection with the everyday thought of the average pupil, even to including the study of magazines and newspapers. Even a college text of this period criticized the exclusive use of classics beyond the ability and outside of the interests of pupils. Sharp (174: 28-29) stated that if students are not interested in the classics after two years' work, interest probably cannot be awakened and the course in literature should not be required in the junior and senior years. Even for a writer like Sharp, advocating the exclusive use of the classics, the measure of success in the course depended upon meeting the needs of the pupils.

Providing for post-school needs.--- The task of choosing literature of immediate interest to the pupil was not the

entire solution to meeting reading needs of pupils in secondary schools. Since the reading done in school was no longer considered by all writers the only reading of importance to be done in the pupil's life, it was suggested that literature in the secondary school might be the time for an introduction to reading done later in life and for broadening and raising the level of reading interests. LaBrant (126: 44-45) in numerous passages advised utilizing reading materials that will help the pupil when he has finished school. She replaced the categories of reading suggested by the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements (the classical in translation, the Shakespeare group, prose fiction, essays and biography, oratory and poetry) with what she considered the divisions more helpful in the reading to be met in later life: novel, drama, essay, general information, poetry, short story and periodical. Stratton (191: 10) reminded the teacher that reading in school is merely an introduction to adult reading. A British writer argued that literature cannot be taught; that literature can be put before pupils in the hope that they will continue to read after they leave school.

The post-school interests considered in the books on the teaching of literature were not all reading interests. Both in the field of English and in educational psychology there was a tendency during this period to relate what was being taught in the secondary school to adult life. Cardinal

Principles of Secondary Education emphasized the relation of work in the school to out-of-school life. Thayer (196: 269-70) stated specifically that schooling in all subjects is preparation for adult life. In the field of English, Leonard (132: 112) informed the teacher that it was fairly easy in the secondary school to discover interest in adult problems; while Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 131) insisted that discussion of adult problems should begin in the secondary school. Suitability of the course in literature not only catered to the interests of the pupil in school, but made some attempt to prepare for ultimate goals - intelligent adult attitudes and a socially adjusted adult life.

The Teacher

The aims and objectives of the course in literature, the differentiation of work in literature and suiting literature to the needs of readers are all concerned with what is done with and to be done for the pupil, but the teacher must be the agent through which aims and attitudes are attempted and attained. It is for the teacher, moreover, the prospective and practicing teacher, that the books on the teaching of literature are written. That the choice of a teacher and the training of the teacher were important factors in the theory of the teaching of literature in the professional books

•

from 1917 to 1935 is already evident from repeated references to the teacher in the discussion of aims, differentiation and suitability. Reorganization of English, setting forth the point of view of the committee responsible for its publication, commented on the teacher as follows:

The supreme essential to success in high school English is the trained teacher - the teacher trained by the study of his subject, trained by the study of educational principles and methods, and trained by practical experience. The novice and the itinerant - often one and the same - are the chief stumbling block to progress in English as in other fields. They must give way to the professional imbued with the sympathetic spirit. Such a person will have rational standards, mature judgment, and definite methods of measuring results (111: 29).

Most of the comments concerning teachers in the professional books pertain either to the qualifications of the teacher or the training necessary to carry through the program in literature effectively.

Qualifications.-- A long list of virtues needed by the teacher of literature, according to the professional writers, seems to be the same qualities needed for success in any job. Sharp (174: 2-10) suggested that the teacher must be human, and not a book worm; must have patience and a driving ambition; have initiative, without being too anxious for a change. Opdycke (152: 14-17) listed broad-mindedness, alertness, attractiveness, and a refreshing and stimulating attitude as requisites for teaching. Some writers (79: 2) pointed out that it is more often the wisdom, imagination, feeling and ex-

perience of a teacher that helps him than his knowledge of literature. Hitchcock (104: 26-47) added to the list of traits needed by the teacher: a restless spirit, a desire to learn, enthusiasm, cheerfulness, "a touch - no more - of madness," an ability to enjoy himself.

Some of the qualifications for teaching relate to the field of literature and to the teacher's attitude toward literature and the teaching of literature. Abbott (5: 26) stipulated that the teacher should see the field of literature as an art rather than as a science and should be able to read aloud effectively. Hitchcock (104: 31, 119) believed that the teacher must be an independent thinker to evolve his own philosophy of life and of teaching, and that unconsciously he would impart some of his philosophy to his pupils. Sharp (174: 50-51) warned the teacher not to pose as a lover of all literature or to make a fetish of criticizing all literature. Most writers, touching upon the capacities and interests of teachers or prospective teachers, noted the need for an interest and enjoyment in wide, varied and mature reading. LaBrant (126: 182) wrote that if the teacher is a poor reader, he should be teaching science or some subject other than literature. Cox (57: 143) believed it was necessary for the teacher to get and retain the respect of his pupils. He felt that the ideal teacher of literature felt close to students

and was willing to spend an evening a week reading and talking with students.

Training.-- There was considerable advice in professional books of the period on the special training for teachers of literature, but the chief concern during this period was that teachers be taught how to teach literature. Some writers still insisted upon certain academic accomplishments including foreign languages, ancient and modern, Anglo-Saxon and the study of philology. Reorganization of English recommended the study of literary types, a course in the application of educational principles to the teaching of English in the secondary school and supervised practice teaching. Thomas (202: 299-300) pointed out that professional training of English teachers was not recognized by many colleges, but advocated a course for teachers that would train specifically for the secondary schools. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 509-13) regretted the fact that so many teachers in 1930 had had little training in methods of teaching, but pointed out that since 1920 schools of education had been providing better training, with supervision and special instruction in the teaching of English. Broening (33: 78) concluded in her research study that teachers should be provided with sources of materials to stimulate appreciation in boys and girls. The training process was not, however, to be just a matter of taking courses

and getting methods and materials handed out ready-made. Hitchcock (104: 32-37) believed that even the task of learning how to present books taught in class was a long slow process the teacher had to work out for himself, experiment upon and improve.

Advice on professional matters.-- Some advice was given to prospective teachers, for whom most of the professional books were written, about securing a job, professional matters encountered by the new teacher, the attitude to take in class, the relationship with other teachers and administrative officers and even the teacher's appearance. The teacher was asked to become a member of the National Council of Teachers of English and to read the English Journal and to take professional courses in summer schools. Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 11), on the other hand, found more important than professional memberships and training, the following of interests outside of literature and the acquisition of new ideas and a new outlook.

There seemed to be rather general agreement among writers on the teaching of literature that the English teacher was overburdened and that teaching needed improvement by lightening the teacher's heavy load of pupils and classes. Reorganization of English (111: 28) advocated a small num-

ber of pupils assigned to teachers of English, and several writers pointed out that teachers of English generally are engaged in numerous extra-curricular activities which take away from their efficiency. It was proposed in Class Size in High School English by Dora Smith (183: 210) that an actual saving, with more time for study and for individual conferences, could be made if competent teachers of English were allowed to handle smaller classes.

Summary

The report, Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, was the culmination of many years of agitation against the domination of the course in English by the requirements for college entrance. The significant report made by the National Joint Committee representing the National Education Association and the National Council of Teachers of English in 1917 was part of the work of the Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education, with committees studying the courses in thirteen other fields besides English. The significant report of the commission itself appeared in 1918 under the title, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Reorganization of English stressed the relationship of the elementary and secondary school, which had been subordinated to the secondary school-college relationship.

The joint committee's report expressed disapproval of the classics, when they were offered as the only readings

in a course in literature, but suggested retaining a few masterpieces as books most pupils should read. Although the report recommended business English and special courses for vocational and rural schools, there was no attempt to interrelate the vocational and the cultural. In effect, Reorganization of English proposed a rejection of college preparation as the major aim of the secondary schools, but seemed to regard the potential college student as superior and of more importance than the vocational pupil or the pupil in rural areas.

Although pointed out in this study as the starting point of a somewhat new approach in the teaching of literature, Reorganization of English was followed by books in the field of the teaching of literature that expressed a more democratic philosophy of education. The New Democracy in the Teaching of English, for example, a series of lectures by Barnes, not only attacked vigorously the teaching of the classics, but proposed literature within the tastes and interests of most adolescents, literature that was to be taught with the express purpose of stimulating the kind of reading pupils will do after school years. Teaching of English by Cox summarized the philosophy and practice of a teacher of English who established a free, friendly and honest relationship in the classroom and saw the importance of literature in the help it could offer the pupil for de-

veloping emotionally and spiritually. Supervised Study in English by McGregor, based upon a belief in developing through individual instruction skills needed in and out of the school, aimed at the development of independence in the classroom.

On the other hand, Reorganization of English was followed by books which made no attempt to set up new aims in the teaching of literature and by handbooks designed primarily as aids to the intensive study of the classics and nothing but the classics. Teaching English in High Schools by Sharp is a rehashing of suggestions for teaching literature from sources Sharp cannot often recall, but most of which antedated Reorganization of English. Ways to Teach English by T. C. Blaisdell adhered for the most part to the worth of the college entrance requirements, the classics and the intensive study of literature. Teaching of English in the High School by Stratton, in spite of Stratton's avowed progressive aims, recommended aims and methods similar to those of the earliest professional books. The Teaching of Literature in the High Schools; A Manual for Teachers by McGraw made the claim that the manual was to help teachers teach literature for the purpose of enriching experience, but the book was a handbook for intensive group study of the classics. Other handbooks and early books of theory for intensive study of the classics, used prior to 1917, were revised and re-

issued after that date.

Books on the teaching of literature, which can be grouped together chronologically for the period from 1917 to 1935, show a variation in basic objectives as well as in conclusions. They do not contain a fixed and agreed upon set of aims, provisions for differentiating the course or suiting it to the pupils in the secondary school. In the remainder of the summary an attempt is made to indicate the trends in the aims and attitudes of the theory of the teaching of literature.

Although there was an effort made repeatedly from 1917 until after 1930 to define aims and objectives for the teaching of literature definitely and clearly, there were still writers who deplored the vagueness of aims. Appreciation was the most commonly accepted major aim, although it was variously described. Vicarious experience through literature was said to lead to an understanding of the pupil's own experiences and to a development of his personality and character. A somewhat new aim for the secondary school, developing skill in reading, was related to the fundamental processes of Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Reorganization of English, however, stressed various types of reading rather than the development of the basic skill of getting thought from the printed page. The social and ethical purposes of teaching literature were accepted by some writers; disapproved as a conscious aim by others. There were undoubtedly high

sounding and unsubstantiated objectives claimed for the teaching of literature, but definite statements of aims, in the main, gave the teaching of literature impetus and blocked to some extent turning back to the older aims connected with the classics.

There were a few writers who still proposed a fixed group of readings for all to study, even disavowing the separation of college and non-college pupils. More often there was a recognition in the professional books of a need for differentiating aims and content to reach students of varying abilities and interests. The non-college pupil, the commercial and vocational pupil, the junior high school pupil, the poor reader, the pupil in special groups and the pupil requiring special work were recognized by various writers as requiring a different approach in literature from a fixed course for an average pupil. In stating the difference in each pupil requiring individual attention and development, few writers went as far as Tracy, who ruled out all fixed standards, insisting that what may have meaning for one individual may mean nothing or something different to another individual.

It became more common in the professional books after 1917 to demand for the larger population of the schools provision for suitable training and development of more diverse interests and talents. With few exceptions, theorists agreed

that each pupil should be given recognition and understanding, with some provision through interesting materials for meeting psychological needs. Keeping the pupil interested in school and providing for his adjustment during school years were given more attention than the newly recognized skill of reading and reading interests of post-school years.

After 1917 more emphasis in the professional books was given to the teacher's qualifications and training, especially professional training in the teaching of English. Along with older demands for the well-rounded and ideal teacher of literature were presented practical suggestions for improving working conditions of teachers of English, with smaller classes and more time for individual work, and establishment of a professional interest through local organizations and the National Council of Teachers of English.

For convenience, the discussion of the suggestions in the professional books beginning with Reorganization of English and continuing to 1935 has been divided,^{and} the section dealing with aims and other general provisions treated in this chapter. No attempt has been made here to show the philosophic and social bases for the conflicting aims and purposes so evident in the theory of the teaching of literature from 1917 to 1935. The philosophic interpretation is deferred to the summary of Chapter V, a chapter also dealing with professional books of this period, more specifically

with their suggestions of methods and content for realizing the aims and purposes already described. The division in this study does not imply a natural dichotomy or separation, since methods and content have been brought repeatedly into the presentation of objectives, of provisions for the pupil and of suggestions for the teacher.

CHAPTER V

LITERATURE FOR INDIVIDUAL ATTAINMENT - METHODS AND CONTENT

This chapter is a continuation of the discussion begun in the last chapter on the theory of the teaching of literature from 1917 to 1935. Aims, differentiation of the course for pupils of varying interests and abilities, and adjusting of the course to fit the needs for the population of the secondary school suggested in the professional books beginning with Reorganization of English have already been presented. In this chapter the methods and content suggested in the same books are reviewed and summarized. The suggested methods for realizing the aims and purposes of the course in literature are presented with the specific content and the methods and content for teaching each type of literature.

Methods of Teaching

One part of the report by the committee on literature for the senior high school in Reorganization of English is entitled "Changes Needed in the Methods of Teaching"; a section of the report by the committee on literature for the junior high school is entitled "Method." In effect, the few suggestions in a pamphlet not purporting to be a complete methods

text merely pose problems of method as distinguished from the more specific and thorough suggestions contained in many of the professional books of the period.

Diversity of methods.--- General comments on the method of presenting literature show more diversity than the aims or the provisions for varying the program in literature to fit the needs of the pupils. It is not surprising that in 1921 McGregor (137: 11) wrote that English had more problems than any other subject, partly because of the variety of methods followed in teaching it. A research study (116: 4) in 1925 noted that literary materials had been rather definitely decided upon, but that the methods of teaching them were far less definitely settled. The latter statement can be readily proved by pointing out how nearly every suggestion made about the general technique of teaching literature is either contradicted or qualified by another suggestion. The disagreements or contradictions are in the same body of literature, in the same period, 1917 to 1935.

Some writers of the period warned against the use of a set method of teaching literature. The most outspoken critic of teaching by a formula was Cox (57), who in many passages in Teaching of English insisted that there is no one best way to teach, that a method cannot be set down like a formula in a science (57: 3), that teaching must be flexible and not depend upon specific preparation (57: 94), that the teacher may

not only change his theories in class if he discovers himself in error but that he should tell the pupil of his error (57: 17-18). Mearns (143: 42-44) asked teachers to be courageous enough to ignore a course of study and to follow the interests of the pupils; Seely (172: 5) warned the teacher not to say all the things about literature which were part of the course of study. An Australian book (138: 32), admittedly patterned after American professional books, advocated experiment in the classroom instead of a set method.

There are writers in the period who advise changing the method and the devices of method for each literary selection, but generally in the method of their own books follow a set pattern. Others specifically offer advice on following a pattern of teaching. Opdycke (152: 281, 384-86) suggested a careful analysis of each piece of literature and the development of a suitable method adjusted to the interests and ideas of the class. Opdycke believed the teacher should plan what he is going to teach, that it is better for a teacher to overplan than to underplan, and that he should be certain at the beginning of class just what he is going to teach and how he is going to teach it. One group of writers (68: 135) presented a detailed method of teaching literature with specific steps that must be followed by any teacher using this set method.

Intensive study.-- In the matter of discarding intensive study of literature Reorganization of English (111: 73-74) added its official voice to the protest against careful, minute analysis of literary masterpieces. Thomas (202: 219-20), in the same year, warned that study should not be too prolonged or too much in detail. In the following year, 1918, Barnes (7: 30-31) made more specific complaints against teaching the intricacies of style and line by line analysis. He objected to teaching for three weeks a play that can be acted on the stage in two hours. In numerous books on the teaching of literature from 1920 to 1930 there were objections to a careful analytical treatment of literature. Sleman (179: 10) stressed the need for extensive reading rather than careful literary analysis in the junior high school. Cox (57: 99) termed intensive study with a view to teaching every detail "teaching to death." A research study (192: 93) of the period concluded that time should be given to exploratory reading rather than to intensive study. Leonard (132: 200-202) claimed that numerous worthless notes tend to destroy the "real value of literature," and that classical literature does not need formal, critical study.

Leonard (132: 198), however, qualified his position against detailed analysis by suggesting that the senior high school, not the junior high, might utilize analysis once the pupil understands the whole selection. Thomas (202: 191) believed formal analysis was helpful and even stimulating

when used sparingly. There were a few advocates of intensive study during the period who were more ardent than Leonard and Thomas. Craig (58: 74-78) contended that masterpieces of literature must be studied intensively because they are too difficult for the average pupil to enjoy without study. Craig (58: 32) approved of one month devoted to a single classic, and stated that the profound thought in a speech of Burke's could keep a class busy for two months. Marsh (141: 7), in a manual designed for the study of English classics, originally published in 1912 and reissued in 1921, insisted upon the accurate understanding of every word and every phrase in a literary selection. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 379-80), another staunch advocate of intensive study of literature, borrowed his method from Sherman's Analytics of Literature, published in 1893.

Pupil opinion.-- There is nothing in Reorganization of English concerning the pupil's expression of his own opinion about a piece of literature. To several writers during the period an essential part of the method of teaching or discussing literature was to allow the pupil freedom in discovering what a piece of literature meant to him and in expressing his reaction to that meaning. Stratton (191: 22) believed that the pupil should discuss his personal reaction. A writer (115: 44) in Great Britain advocated setting aside time for boys to talk about books as a change from the teacher's lec-

tures, and suggested that the boys' tastes are sometimes sounder than the teacher's. Opdycke (152: 66) believed that pupils were sometimes far in advance of the teacher, and that their interpretations of literature, whether expressed in complete sentences or not, must be respected. Cox (57: 25-37) also disapproved of the demand for careful phrasing of answers, instead of honest and sincere comments, and objected to the pupil guessing what the teacher would say. The pupil was to give his own reaction to what he had discovered in his reading, not an accurate written record of what the poem or essay said. Mearns (143: 59-67) was convinced that children learn to criticize poetry by feeling it themselves, and not by the imposition of the authority of the teacher. There were, during this period, however, writers who believed in the absolute values of static criticisms, which Tracy (207: 53) claimed "have all but killed the appreciation of literature." Such writers advocated the learning and repetition of the "correct" meanings which the teacher seemed certain the author of the selection had intended when he wrote. Broening (33: 16) stated in a research study that the central theme of a piece of literature must be discovered by every pupil. Craig (58: 62-63), wary of freedom of discussion and opinion, wrote:

In teaching we must be on guard against the vague notion that a poem can properly mean one thing to one person and something else to another ... must always strive for the idea and impression intended by the author.

The paraphrase or *précis*, rejected by the professional writers and critics opposed to a single meaning and a single reaction, was the accepted device of those writers who wanted a means of setting down the exact meaning of a selection. Reed Smith (188: 42) recommended paraphrasing as an aid in understanding difficult poetry. Two British writers (75: 142; 86: 12) advocated the *précis*, paraphrase and "expansion." Leonard (132: 180-81) believed in utilizing the written summary, provided it were limited to the main thought and not an outline of the whole selection.

Literature as pleasure.--- The advocates of the *précis* and the intensive work-study of literature did not, as has been indicated, completely dominate the theory of the teaching of literature. There were many writers who wrote that literature must be taught for pleasure and enjoyment. In attaining this end it was necessary to make the classroom as informal as possible. Cox (57: 23-24) desired in every classroom and had in his own classroom a great deal of laughter, some of it loud laughter. Seely (173: 184) wanted the discussion about books to be friendly and informal like the conversation about books intelligent adults might have in their homes. LaBrant (126: 149) recommended lounge chairs and a comfortable corner for brief free reading periods during school hours.

Socialization of the classroom.--- The attempts through

the methods of teaching literature to secure the pupil's opinion and to promote an informal, friendly atmosphere in the classroom were manifestations of the trend from emphasis on subject matter to emphasis on the pupil. The socialized classroom, the socialized recitation and the use of projects stem from the same trend and from a closer relationship of the secondary school to the elementary school than to the college. Most of the professional writers dealing with the junior high school stressed socialized methods. Simons (179: 124-26) recommended that a member of the class act as chairman of the group, with all the pupils sharing some responsibility. According to Hawley (96: 19-26) the pupils should not only conduct the class, but assign the work, prepare questions and ask other members to answer and discuss the questions. McGregor (137: 73) advocated a lesson in literature in which pupils could discuss their reading in a natural situation. Leonard (132: 120) pointed out that situations in the classroom could be used more effectively than the literature or the teacher's comments to instill ideals and attitudes. Thayer (196: 223), in his book The Passing of the Recitation, claimed that school projects in which pupils actively participate lead to wider reading than the recitation method under the teacher.

There were theorists who disapproved of freedom in the classroom and saw socialization as a fad. Sharp (174: 126)

questioned the feasibility of using the project method in literature, unless the classic being studied was considered the project. The writers quoted above did not consider the study of an unrelated piece of literature a "project."

Craig (58: 355), also in disagreement with the advocates of projects and socialization, insisted upon a much more rigid discipline in the classroom, with the pupil required to stand to recite and recitation always formal. She did advocate class discussion, but with the reminders that "practical matters in the classroom are nearly as important as scholarship" and that the time spent in class should not be wasted.

Skill of reading.-- As closely related to articulation with the elementary school as the socialization of the English classroom was the new interest after 1917 in the skill of reading. The recognition by some theorists of the need for developing skill in reading as part of the teaching of literature has been mentioned under a discussion of aims in Chapter IV. McGregor (137: 163-65), who was one of the first professional writers to emphasize skill in reading and to point out that many pupils in the junior high school had not acquired in the elementary school a skill in the mechanics of reading, advocated drill and exercises in reading designed to aid slow readers. She also suggested exercises for increasing speed in reading as an important part of the course

in literature. Hawley (96: 65-67), like McGregor writing about the junior high school, suggested specific informal reading tests to discover reading needs and drill for gaining reading speed. In a book (194: 12) dealing with oral English at the college level, it was noted that there is a need for careful supervised practice in silent reading.

In analyzing the reading problem professional writers came to recognize some of the factors involved in reading skill and different types of reading requiring different methods of reading. Irion (116: 8), in a brief statement in a research study of the period, listed as essentials for reading or literary comprehension the ability to understand pivotal words, unusual words, word combinations, to get specific facts, to react to the selection as a whole and to state the significant ideas of the selection. Hitchcock (104: 8-13) pointed out that pupils cannot read unless they know words, with their shades of meaning, and are curious and able to visualize what they read about. In 1933, Cook (52: 54, 128-31) considered the span of recognition in reading, and tried to analyze the different types of reading to be used in reading a novel. She pointed out that the reader does not always read in a careful, analytical manner. Instead, he glances through the book, skims, gets an impression, skips, and reads at top speed.

Outside reading.-- Outside reading as contrasted with

books studied in the classroom was an accepted feature of the program in literature by 1917. The junior and senior high school committees on literature reporting in Reorganization of English (111: 99-102) stressed outside reading in their individual reports. In addition, a special section of the report was devoted to "general" or home reading because of its importance. The class in literature was asked to devote some time to informal talks and discussion about reading, and to hold conferences to stimulate reading of books and magazines outside of the classroom.

Some theorists disapproved of such lists of books for outside reading as are found in Reorganization of English and any restrictions upon the amount or kind of reading. Mearns (143: 92) wanted no lists, because he believed pupils should read a book only when they had an interest in it and a need for it. Opdycke (152: 167-69) argued that pupils must look for the books that they want to read, rather than being told that they ought to read certain books. A few writers required a definite amount of outside reading for all students. Reed Smith (188: 67) recommended the assignment of a definite number of pages for all members of the class to read, although they were free to choose their own reading. In what was termed a successful experiment (144: 78) with a class in literature, each member of the class had been required to read fifty pages outside of class each week.

Barnes (7: 20-21) believed that each pupil should be

expected to read a certain number of books during the year, although the books and the number of books would be different for different members of the class. Barnes proposed a restriction or prohibition on the reading by any pupil of too much of one kind of literature.

Book report.--- LaBrant's attitude toward reading is indicated by her comment (126: 66) that the pupil should be encouraged to re-read a book if he wants to. She would not have the child read another book, if one he has read before interests him more. This same tolerant attitude toward outside reading extended to the report on outside reading, which even during this period was looked upon by many writers as a formal check on the pupil. LaBrant (126: 151-54) insisted that the child must be free to enjoy and understand the book he is reading outside of class, without dreading the report he must make in class. In fact, she favored abandoning the written book report in favor of a record of reading kept for the pupil himself. Opdycke (152: 168) would not have the teacher act as a detective, discovering how carefully the outside reading had been done. Instead, book reports would be voluntary, informal, written or oral statements of the pupil's impression of the book.

For some, however, the book report remained a test on outside reading. Stratton (191: 170) called the marking of outside reading an important factor in classroom procedure

and management. He advised a written test in class with definite questions requiring exact answers. Craig (58: 92) recommended checking student reading by keeping a card file of what they had read and by testing with unexpected questions about minor details of the story. Craig wrote of the enjoyment of outside reading and even about guidance in reading, but seemed primarily concerned with checking on the pupil.

Oral reading.-- The literature committee in Reorganization of English objected strenuously to the wasteful practice of having a student read aloud in class while the other members followed with open books, and suggested silent reading in its place. Reorganization of English (111: 31), however, included as one of its aims in the English course the ability to read aloud effectively; a separate committee on oral expression recommended regular practice in oral reading in the elementary and secondary school. McGraw (136: 9-10) declared that silent reading was given too much emphasis, since he believed oral reading of all poetry and most prose was beneficial in communicating the "effects of literature." It was claimed by another writer (162: 24-25) that children who do not get accurate impressions through silent reading should read aloud or be read to. Dorey (70: 24), writing about literature and music, reiterated the thesis of Chubb that literature should be restored to its oral tradition.

Leonard (132: 192) insisted upon preparation for reading aloud, not just calling upon a pupil unexpectedly to read to the class. Like McGregor (137: 59-60), Leonard required oral reading that displayed an understanding of the ideas of the selection read and a communication of those ideas to the audience. Cox (57: 28-29) recommended having poor pupils as well as good pupils read aloud, but suggested giving special attention and help to improve their oral reading.

Memorization.— Often connected before and after 1917 with reading aloud of favorite passages in literature was the practice of memorizing famous lines or passages taken from accepted masterpieces of literature. Definite approval was given to memorization by Reorganization of English, with a recommendation for regular, required, short memory selections. The report stated:

The habit of memorizing can in most cases be trained by practice, so that the task becomes easier; and the result, a body of good verse and prose permanently in the mind, is perhaps the best thing pupils can get out of their study in English. (111: 74).

Only a few of the books on the teaching of literature after 1917 expressed such unqualified approval of memorization. Sharp (174: 61) claimed memorization increased appreciation, understanding and even vocabulary; Thomas (202: 155) that it led to a better literary taste, and even to an improved intelligence and higher spiritual development. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 495-96) in 1930 made the somewhat doubtful comment

that all educators approve of memorization; but went on to say that the modern educator approved of encouraging memorization rather than requiring it. Seely (172: 207-12), disapproving strongly of required memorization, specified that pupils should memorize only lines that have meaning for them. Junior high school pupils, according to McGregor (137: 103-9), needed lessons in memorizing to insure learning by ideas instead of word for word. The tendency in memorizing was to assign and require little, and to find much less virtue in being able to recite famous lines than Reorganization of English attributed to such an accomplishment.

Assignment.-- Important factors in the methodology of the teaching of literature are the preparation for a lesson or series of lessons and the final evaluation of what has been learned. The "assignment" received more extensive treatment in the professional books after 1917, especially in Reorganization of English, where it is the subject of a lengthy discussion, considering the space devoted in the pamphlet to methods of teaching literature. A change was demanded in Reorganization of English (111: 71-72) from the usual practice of merely assigning so many pages to read without any discussion of what is to be read or any helpful suggestions to guide the pupil in his reading or study. A definite and accurate assignment was recommended, with careful planning to give the pupil a background for work

to be done. McGregor (137: 5-6) set aside two-fifths of the entire class period for the assignment of the new lesson so there would be ample time to explain objectives and complete directions for study. Only Opdycke (152: 237), of the professional writers before 1935, recommended a long term assignment covering the work of a week or more. Sharp (174: 45-49) dealt with the assignment fully, limiting the material covered in an assignment to reading or studying requiring less than one hour of preparation. In some suggestions for giving and clarifying the assignment special guidance for the slow reader and careful directions for the difficult assignment were considered a necessary part of preparing the class for the next lesson in literature.

Examination.-- Most British professional writers of the period from 1917 to 1935 pointed out that the work of the secondary school in literature should prepare students for the general school examination so that English school boys will be able to give the exact meaning of the literature they have studied. With the teaching of literature in American schools removed from the domination of the college entrance examinations, the theorists did not, in the main, approve of an examination of facts as the goal or end of the course in literature. There were still American writers like Stratton (191: 44) who wanted some kind of a measure of the acquisition of what he considered an exact knowledge. Sharp (174: 53-54)

approved carefully planned examinations to summarize the work of the course and to test the knowledge that has been retained.

More theorists approved examinations after limiting or changing their conventional function. Leonard (132: 245), for instance, was willing to use an examination if it dealt with the main ideas instead of the factual details of the literary selections studied. Opdycke (152: 307), advocating tests throughout the course to replace a final examination, demanded facts subordinated to thought, judgment and imagination. He declared that tests could be constructive and diagnostic if the teacher considered the pupil taking the examination. McGregor (137: 83) stressed the importance of the review rather than the quiz, because the former is designed to get an intelligent attitude toward new problems, not a means of determining how much has been remembered. Actually, McGregor (137: 111) approved of little testing in literature. Like Tracy (207: 319), she believed the examination could change the course in literature from pleasure to a task. The most outspoken opponent of the examination was Barnes (7: 84), who objected to the attitude toward literature that fosters examinations. Barnes needed no proof that pupils acquired something from literature; he had faith in his teaching and wanted other teachers to have that same faith. Since people did not take examinations after listening to music, or looking at a landscape, Barnes saw no reason

why they should take an examination after the comparable aesthetic activity of reading literature.

Composition and literature.-- The connection or separation of literature and composition is another example of disagreement among theorists in the field of the teaching of literature from 1917 to 1935. Barnes (7: 91) advised complete separation, with different periods for literature and composition, different teachers if possible, and separate credit. He argued that language subjects are practical, literature entirely cultural. LaBrant (126: 10-21) felt that there was as much difference between the methods and content of composition and literature as there was between mathematics and history. She reasoned that composition repeats old experiences, literature offers new. Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 84-85) suggested that literature and composition be separated so that literature would not be used to develop writing skill. Neither subject could be taught effectively or correctly, according to McGregor (137: 60), if they were taught together.

The committee reporting in Reorganization of English took a position between the writers who would keep literature and composition separate and the advocates of interrelation of the two subjects. In setting forth the organization of the English course, the report stated:

The study of expression for practical purposes should go hand in hand with the study of books of a practical

character; in the same way the study of literary composition in the narrow sense of that term should accompany the study of novels, dramas, essays and poems (111: 33).

McGraw (136: 22) asked teachers using his book to make a similar distinction between compositions written to teach the fundamentals of language and those written to help pupils appreciate literature. Mearns (143: 1-26) elaborated on the teaching of appreciation through creative writing. Writing poetry, he believed, taught the pupil to understand and to criticize the poetry of others.

Some professional writers insisted upon interrelating composition and literature. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 27-33), for example, advocated utilizing the literature studies as a model for compositions. Thomas (202: 116-17) called literature the handmaid of composition because the pupil could discover elements in his reading to use in his compositions. Hawley (96: 58) found a close connection even between the grammatical drill in composition and the teaching of literature, claiming that sentences used for drill exercises stimulate interest in reading the book from which the sentences were taken. In other words, if sentences for grammatical drill were taken from Ivanhoe, the pupils would not only learn the grammar but would be anxious to read Ivanhoe. The "separatists" of this period would disagree violently. Lyman (134: 98) recommended the correlation of composition and literature on the grounds that one branch of English must serve another, and that this correlation within English

would lead to correlation with other subjects.

Correlation.-- Except in matters of correctness of usage, Reorganization of English expressed little interest in correlating the course in English with other courses of the secondary-school curriculum. One of the primary concerns of the report (111: 26), however, was the articulation of the elementary and secondary schools. The work of the seventh, eighth and ninth grades was considered an introduction into senior-high school work, and an attempt was made to utilize this work in the junior high school as a link between the elementary and secondary school. Interest in the elementary and junior high school replaced a dominating older relationship of the secondary school and college. Thomas (202: 32) indicated that the relationship between what he called the grammar school and the secondary school should be closer than it had been before, with the supervisor of English helping to establish this more helpful relationship. Other necessary correlations were pointed out by Hitchcock (104: 44)-- the connection between various pieces of literature studied, and the relation of work in one grade to the work of the preceding grade and the following grade. Teaching within the program of literature must be correlated with a single distant goal in view, not the separate goal of one book, one year's course, one grade or even one school.

The connection with other courses in the curriculum of the secondary school suggested by many professional writers in the field of literature was a close cooperation rather than an actual correlation or interrelation of courses, although there were a few writers bold enough to suggest breaking down the departmentalization of the secondary school. Before 1917 Chubb and others suggested the close connection between literature and the other arts. Dewey (68: 292) noted that literature and the fine arts involve appreciation and have a natural relationship and mutual purpose. In 1920 in a book (70: 3-24) published by the manufacturer of phonograph records, an attempt was made to show the necessity of utilizing music in the teaching of literature. In the professional books after 1917 a systematic study of paintings to accompany the study of literature was explained (80: 172); the combination of singing, dancing and playing of instruments with literature was suggested (57: 21). None of these suggestions, however, was clearly explained or the correlation pointed out carefully. Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 126) believed that every teacher of literature is in a measure a teacher of psychology, ethics, social sciences and of almost every subject except the physical sciences and mathematics. In other words, all of these subjects are treated in the books read in a course in literature and cannot be skimmed off so that only a novel or poem as pure literature is

taught. Leonard (132: 127-30) also felt that the English teacher must strive for a general broadening of interests, and pointed out that English teachers could cooperate with other teachers and other departments by acting as textbook critics and by setting up reading related to other subjects of the curriculum.

For a few professional writers of the period correlation was more than a friendly cooperation between departments or the use of pictures and phonograph records as aids in the teaching of books. Lyman (134: 229) urged combination courses in English and social studies and presented experimental projects. By utilizing numerous projects in Practical English Projects for the High School, Davis (67: 175-84) proposed breaking down the unnatural specialization and departmentalization of the secondary school. One project, based on A Son of the Middle Border by Garland, had as its aim giving city children some understanding of other parts of the country. Collateral reading and study dealt with the history and geography of the American frontier. Another project, based on The Odyssey, correlated Greek history, religion and general social problems with literature. Books on history, Greek and Roman life, art and architecture, mythology, models and exhibitions and compositions in the form of reports were all utilized.

Some of the so-called correlations of the professional books seem to stretch the connection between literature and

other fields of experience, and one or two writers disavowed any correlation. As an example of a far fetched correlation (179: 209-11), there is a study of The Odyssey to be connected with modern life through discovering industrial companies with Greek names, allusions to Greek mythology in newspapers and the Greek terms used in describing architecture. Stratton was a writer who believed in a rigid departmentalization, with each subject competing for time and interest. Speaking of outside reading he wrote:

If complaints come from other departments be as politic as you can, but in secret chuckle for the evening up for English usually neglected because problems in mathematics had to be solved and a map for history had to be drawn (191: 165).

Stratton and Davis are at the two extremes on the subject of correlation; one antagonistic to the work of other subjects in the curriculum and the other attempting a well-rounded, integrated program for the secondary school ignoring departmental and subject lines.

Using aids in the teaching of literature.— Pictures, photographic slides, motion pictures, illustrated editions of the classics and phonograph records came to be so commonly accepted as supplementary materials in the teaching of literature that in 1930 an entire book (212) was devoted to cataloguing these "aids." Most of the professional books of the period utilized some of these suggested aids to make literature more pleasant or more effective. Thomas (202:

266-70) mentioned moving pictures, lectures, concerts and trips to museums as possible supplementary aids to the teaching of literature. Reed Smith (188: 64) insisted that a sketch or picture is worth pages of description. The wide claims for aids in teaching literature were opposed by some writers. Hitchcock (104: 93-94) believed that time could be consumed in the use of pictures and other "contraptions" that might be spent more profitably with literature itself. Stratton (191: 27) reminded teachers that devices and aids did not take the place of the study of literature itself, and LaBrant (126: 72) found devices of use only if they were used as tools for understanding what has been read.

Dramatization, class programs, class assemblies and clubs were also suggested for stimulating interest in literature and increasing appreciation. Randall (162: 65) believed a better class interest in literature and better cooperation could be secured through simple programs based on classics studied in the course. McGregor (137: 99) recommended concluding the study of a piece of literature with a class program to which other classes and parents were invited. Thomas (202: 167-70, 267-70) suggested an English club with programs centered about a famous literary figure and a book club for talking about books read outside of class; Sharp, a literature club to discuss modern literature. It was Broening (33: 16) who stated as a guiding principle

of all these supplementary activities that they should be naturally adapted to the type of literature being studied in class.

Library.-- Reorganization of English (111: 74-76, 114-15) also suggested the need for literary societies, dramatic clubs, pictures and displays, but gave special emphasis in the report to what might be considered the most important aid in the teaching of literature - the library. A special committee chosen to examine the relation of the library to the teaching of English submitted one of the reports, in which the teacher of English was asked to cooperate with the librarian, informing the librarian of class plans and the reading interests of the pupils. An innovation suggested by the library committee was the library classroom, devised originally by Abbott. This room was to adjoin the library and to contain all the visual aids equipment and a stage for the regular use of the class in literature. Many other professional books of the period reiterated the advice to establish and use the library as a cooperating unit in the teaching of literature. Mearns (143: 108) emphasized the librarian's part in establishing an appreciative attitude in the literature class. He believed that a close cooperation between the library and the classroom was absolutely necessary to establish a strong interest in literature. Opdycke (152: 174) suggested that the librarian talk in class about

books or the use of the library.

There was a disagreement in the professional books on the function of the library, or at least on the kind of books the library should have. Leonard (132: 133) thought the school library should not have fiction that did not meet the strict standards set by the teacher of literature, a notion which does not seem to be in keeping with the position of McGregor (137: 116-19), who wanted only reading for pleasure done in the library, with lessons and assignments barred. Thomas (202: 261-65) wanted the library to have magazines as well as reference volumes, to remain open after school hours and to make every effort to get pupils to use the books in the library.

The librarian's job, like the job of the teacher of English, is to utilize books, the materials or content of the course in literature. Any comments on methods necessarily involve content, which has been touched upon repeatedly in the treatment of methods in this section of this chapter. Materials or content of the course in literature suggested by the professional books from 1917 to 1935 are treated in the next section of this chapter.

Content

The methods of presenting literature suggested by the professional books of the period 1917 to 1935 have already been presented, yet as the content of the suggested course

in literature is described it is to be borne in mind that methods and content are seldom divorced in the professional books. In discussing types of literature, for instance, it is extremely difficult to separate the books or kinds of books for study from the suggested ways of teaching them. Methods of teaching novels, drama and short stories will be treated in this section devoted to content because the manner of teaching a novel, a play or a short story is inextricably bound up with the subject matter itself.

Classics.-- As was indicated in the last chapter the classic was not yet rejected as an important element in the course in literature in the secondary school. There were many defenders of "college entrance classics" and other accepted masterpieces. Reorganization of English (111:65) defended the classics, stating that selections of readings for the literature class should favor accepted masterpieces and that if there is a failure in teaching the classics it is because the teacher doesn't know how to teach them. Sharp (174: 30) preferred the classics on the college entrance lists, and was willing to accept a change to a non-classic only if the latter had a special advantage over the classic, an advantage he was not likely to admit. Craig (58:20) stated that the classics had been tested and that they had been found to have an interest for pupils and to be suited to various grades of the secondary school. McGraw (136: 31),

writing a manual for the teaching of the classics, stoutly defended their use with the argument that human nature had not changed and that therefore classics remained extremely important.

There were some qualifications concerning the use of the classics in the professional books on the teaching of literature. There was a complaint against the stereotyped teaching of a few classics (79: 84), and the reminder that there are many things in the classics to avoid (207: 99-100). Barnes (7: 26-35), convinced that the classics are not the only books worth reading, asked that the content of the course be suitable for adolescents, whether it was classical or contemporary. Cox (57: 39) stated that English or literature is not an elegant accomplishment by which one avoids ugly reality, which the classics tend to do because they are not dealing with modern ugliness or modern reality. The point of view of Cox stemmed from or resembled the philosophy of Dewey (68: 301-2), who wrote in 1916 that classics were kept in colleges and secondary schools because they did not have a useful purpose, and were thus thought to have a cultural value. Such content of purely cultural and aristocratic value does not belong in a democracy, according to Dewey.

Contemporary literature.-- There were a few professional writers before 1917 who approved and even advised the inclu-

sion of some modern books in the course in literature in the secondary schools. Even the Reorganization of English advocated some modern books and included contemporary titles in the suggestive lists of books for study and general reading. It must be remembered, however, that modern books were allowed grudgingly, and only in a subservient position to the classics. The report noted that modern literature was a reflection of life as it is lived today, but still stressed the fact that a foreign element in the schools and those seeking a utilitarian education justified the use of "books not truly deserving the name of literature." Such an attitude is far removed from the democratic outlook on literature expressed by Dewey and by Cox and others in the field of the teaching of literature. An advocate (79: 125-35) of contemporary literature stated that it was a mistake to choose only conventional writers in the old tradition, since modern writers might prove as great or greater than Dickens or Eliot. In a book entitled The Use of Modern Literature in High Schools, Phillips (158: 28,107) pointed out that teachers and theorists about the teaching of literature were just then, in 1928, beginning to realize that pupils want to read modern literature. Opdycke (152: 254) and Phillips (158: 6-7) recommended first the teaching of contemporary books, which they believed led later to an understanding of the classics. Neither writer advocated modern books only as an introduction to the more important classics, but both

believed that classics would have more meaning for pupils if they had read and understood modern books.

Several books in the field suggested contemporary reading in non-literary and specialized fields. Reorganization of English (111: 76-8, 102-5) recommended in non-fiction such books as Twenty Years at Hull House by Addams, Florence Nightingale by Richards, The Making of an American by Riis, The Forest by White and vocational readings in various fields. Thomas (202: 119) differentiated somewhat between the industrial and vocational-school reading and the reading of the academic secondary school, although he felt that vocational books were justified in any modern secondary school. He suggested: Heroes of Every Day Life by Coe, Captains of Industry by Paston, Triumphs of Science and Industries of Today by Lane, America at Work by Husband and Girls Who Became Famous by Bolton. Such books on occupations and books of value for vocational adjustment as a part of the course in literature indicate a trend away from purely literary books and from the classics, at least from the exclusive use of classics. Hitchcock (104: 22) was one writer who resented such a trend because he found cheap modern literature dragging down the literary standards that could be preserved only by the classics. But for every Hitchcock there was a LaBrant (126: 28) who admitted that many pupils who have studied Milton and Scott prefer Zane Grey and Harold Bell Wright, and concluded that the content in the course in literature must be adjusted to

the actual reading the pupils are doing.

Newspapers and magazines.-- Before 1917 newspapers and magazines, like modern books, were occasionally allowed in a supplementary capacity in the literature course in the secondary school. As the classics came to be of somewhat less importance in the theory of the teaching of literature, magazines and newspapers came to have more acceptance.

Reorganization of English (111: 65), having proposed as an aim of the course that the teacher direct the pupils' reading in well written magazines and newspapers, recommended such magazines as Harper's Monthly, Atlantic Monthly, Century and Scribner's for the best contemporary short stories, essays, poetry, travel and biographical sketches. Simons (179: 167-70) believed magazines were important enough as content for the course in literature to set aside one day a week for their study. Leonard (132: 189) urged teachers of English and other teachers to guide pupils in the intelligent reading of newspapers and periodicals. Davis (67: 117) advocated the study of newspapers to train in critical reading and to make pupils better judges of the truth or falsehood of news. Sometimes periodicals were introduced into the course in literature because of their importance in adult reading fare. Opdycke (152: 241) pointed out that, since adults read magazines and newspapers more frequently than books, the secondary school should increase the use of periodicals. Here is an

interest in adult reading superseding interest in college reading or the reading necessary for college entrance. There were warnings, however, that if periodical literature were taught poorly it could become a fad or frill. Such warnings could have referred to a study of periodical literature, in which magazines were used for the study of pronunciation, derivation and definition of words, the analysis of imagery in the articles, cartoons and pictures, and for "sales talks based on one of the striking advertisements" (80: 166).

History of literature.-- With the introduction of modern books and periodicals, the study of the history of literature was of even less importance in the theory of the teaching of literature than it had been before 1917, although knowledge of literary periods and of authors persisted as an aim and as part of the suggested course in literature after 1917. Reorganization of English (111: 32) indicated a recognition of study of the lives and chief works of the greatest authors as part of the course in literature, with the qualification that literary history should be incidental and informal unless it were an elective course. Few objected to teaching the history of literature, provided it was kept in a minor role. Barnes (7: 31-32) thought the study of authors and the history of literature pointless unless the pupils had done sufficient reading as background. Although recommended for study in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades, sometimes with the reading of literature

itself, the consensus was to study the history of literature late in the course. Reorganization of English (111:70-71) advocated the chronological study of literature and facts about literature in the twelfth grade, or in earlier grades in schools in which the pupils have an adequate background of literature. Stratton (191: 176-77) also placed history of literature late in the course when pupils will have read many masterpieces of literature. A tendency to limit study of literary history is indicated in T. C. Blaisdell's advice (16: 485) that a pupil should not have more than twenty lessons in English or American literature. Other advice or warning concerning the teaching of history of literature appeared in some of the professional books. Cox (57: 99) cautioned against idealizing authors and Leonard (132: 236-39) against teaching English and American literatures without relating them to Greek and other literatures in our heritage.

Set courses of study.-- With the introduction of modern readings and more freedom in the content of the course in literature only a few of the professional books continued the older practice of giving the complete contents and sequence of the course in the secondary school. Sharp (174: 35) set forth the following basic course of study for class work for the four years:

Year I

Ivanhoe, Ancient Mariner, Vision of Sir Launfal, Sketch Book, Julius Caesar or Richard III, selections from Burroughs, Mills or Muir.

Year II

A Tale of Two Cities, Poe's Tales, The Odyssey and The Iliad (selections), collections of American poems, Merchant of Venice.

Year III

Idylls of the King (selected), Silas Marner, Macbeth, a collection of short stories, collection of modern essays.

Year IV

Chronological study of British and American literature, with emphasis on the study of the classics themselves. The study of each period should be a classic representing each period.

In the suggested course of study in her book, Craig (58: 41-43) gave the classic to be studied, the time of each year when the classic was to be studied and the amount of time to be spent on each. For example, "Sohrab and Rustum" was to be taught for eight days in the eighth month of the tenth grade. The Teaching of Literature in the High Schools (136) followed automatically the practice of accepting a set course of study, since the book was designed to give procedures for teaching the classics of the college list. The college entrance examination itself, however, under the alternate comprehensive plan from 1929 to 1934 prescribed no definite books for reading or study. The teacher was free to choose books for reading in the secondary school, provided the kind of literature indicated in the appended list of books to the college examination requirements was followed. Under this plan of examination the candidate was asked to prove that he had read and understood a certain amount of English literature in an examination requiring him to apply to passages

of literature he had not seen before what he had learned through his previous reading and study. In the theory of the teaching of literature in the thirties Seely (172: 55-64) stated emphatically that a fixed curriculum must be militated against, since the best literature is that literature which best suits the group. He termed the belief that one poem or group of poems is needed by everybody a superstition that had been harmful to the teaching of literature. "The Lady of the Lake," according to Seely, is not a poem every pupil should study; there are many other poems more significant and more interesting to most pupils. Cox (57: 50), like Seely, regarded the secondary-school syllabi and set courses as evils which the teacher with likes and dislikes of his own must oppose.

Content determined by interest of class and teacher.--

Cox (57: 46-52) repeatedly noted the right of every teacher to introduce into the course his own favorites, provided a critical attitude and objectivity accompanied his enthusiasm. In his own teaching Cox was able to point out the weakness of Poe, a writer whose stories he liked, and to express an antagonism to some ideas of Whitman, whose poems he greatly admired. For some writers the important factor to be considered in determining the content of the course in literature was whether the pupil liked the selections, and often the appeal to the teacher was linked with the appeal to the

pupil. Opdycke (152: 109-10) suggested books pupils like rather than required and specified books in order to secure material that would lead to natural and wholesome appreciation. A research study (192: 92) examining the content and methods of literature in the junior high school declared that "authorities" in and out of the school feel that the literary materials should be based upon children's interests. Barnes (7: 7), like so many other theorists of this period, wanted writers with a strong appeal to the average pupil included in the course, and less interesting writers eliminated. According to Barnes, Shakespeare and Scott have appeal; Milton, Dryden, Pope, Addison and Johnson have little or none.

Book lists.-- With the search for interesting and appealing materials for the content of the course in literature, lists of the books available or acceptable for use in the teaching of literature were more frequently used, particularly in connection with the more diverse and simpler material of outside reading. Reorganization of English contained several extensive lists of books including the one on vocational subjects already mentioned. Thomas (202: 245), the first individual professional writer to make reference to other published outside reading lists, recommended Books for Home Reading of High School Pupils, issued by the National Council of Teachers of English and later reissued and reedited several times, and the List of Books for Home Reading,

published as a leaflet by the New York City Association of High School Teachers of English. Besides these published lists, Sharp (174: 64-68) suggested the posting of a list of supplementary reading by the teacher, and others advocated large and flexible reading lists, created in part by the pupils themselves.

Moving pictures as content.--- Bolenius and a few others before 1917 had considered motion pictures as an aid in teaching books. It has been indicated in the discussion of methods that this treatment of the "movies" continued in the theoretical books on the teaching of literature after 1917. In 1923 Stratton (191: 284) declared emphatically that motion pictures are supplements to literature, not in themselves wordless, literary masterpieces in pictures. But in the early thirties, two books, How to Appreciate Motion Pictures and Photoplay Appreciation in American High Schools, the very titles of which indicate their approach, treated motion pictures in a manner different from that utilized earlier. How to Appreciate Motion Pictures by Dale (65), for instance, is not a treatment of the movies as an aid in teaching books, but the treatment of an art form comparable to reading material which is to be enjoyed, understood and critically appreciated. Dale took for granted the place of motion pictures in American life and in the schools and argued that just as the reader must be taught to increase his understand-

ing and appreciation of books, so pupils, as the audience, must be taught a critical awareness of the story, acting, directing, photography and settings of motion pictures. The teacher must know enough about the movies to guide pupils to plan their moviegoing, as they plan their reading. Although more closely related to the earlier use of motion pictures as aids in the teaching of literature, Photoplay Appreciation in American High Schools by Lewin (133) introduced standards for judging motion pictures as well as procedures for making the teaching of literature more effective. Lewin reminded teachers that both movies and books can stimulate the use of the other media, pupils choosing movies based on books they have read, and reading books from which the pictures they have seen have been taken. Both Dale and Lewin believed that by teaching standards and methods of evaluation of motion pictures in the secondary school, pupils learn to choose outstanding pictures and eventually to raise the standard of movies demanded by an intelligent and trained audience.

Types

The variety of reading suggested by many professional books has been indicated in the preceding section on content. In recommending a variety of reading, a few books of the period listed literature by theme and by moods of writing. Opdycke (152) based much of his program on the pupils'

choice of reading revolving around a theme they are interested in. He suggested that pupils in reading groups make lists of books with similar themes, such as sea poems, baby poems, animal poems, train stories, war stories, school stories. Most professional books from Reorganization of English in 1917 to The Teaching of Literature in the Secondary School in 1931 demanded a balanced program of varied types of writing. Reorganization of English (111: 72-73) mentioned the fact that different types of literature required different treatment, but gave only a brief comment to each general type. LaBrant abandoned the six categories of the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements: classics in translation, Shakespeare, prose fiction, essays, oratory and poetry. She suggested methods for teaching drama, poetry, the novel, the periodical, the essay, the short story and biography, with a varied program of different types throughout the course in the secondary school. The emphasis on types of writing or general categories, like other emphases in this period, indicates a trend toward a course determined by the style and intent of the various writings rather than by the titles of accepted masterpieces. The remainder of the chapter deals in turn with suggestions for teaching the various types of writing: poetry, the novel, drama, the essay and the oration. The discussion of the teaching of each type contains mainly methods of teaching based on content,

and for that reason is treated in this separate section rather than under the section devoted separately to methods or content.

Poetry.-- Three publications of this period in the field of the teaching of literature were devoted exclusively to the teaching of poetry, but the approach differed considerably. Poetry in the High School by Reed Smith (188) is an attempt to set up a thorough, detailed plan for interpreting poetry, for the most part accepted masterpieces. Enjoying Poetry in School by Seely (172) suggested attaining active appreciation of poetry through unforced discussion of poetry in a pleasant classroom where pupils and teacher read together poetry they have enjoyed. Creative Youth by Mearns (143) is a report of a period of successful teaching by the author in the field of poetry. He claimed that the success of teaching depended upon the atmosphere of a democratic, artistic classroom, talking frankly about poetry and learning about poetry through writing verse.

Many professional books gave specific advice on the teaching of poetry without agreement on method and content. Most writers believed, though, that a careful distinction between prose and poetry, formerly such an essential part of the introduction to the study of poetry, was not a clear distinction and was not to be used in beginning the study of poetry. It was asserted that it is difficult to tell the difference

between prose and poetry because prose often has the sound and feeling of poetry (79: 141). A college text (42: 155) also stated that there was no clear dividing line between prose and poetry. Books on the teaching of literature and poetry and books of literary criticism emphasized the intensity of experience or feeling which produces and is produced by the poem rather than the acclaim accorded the piece of writing.

There were different techniques suggested for teaching a subtle and elusive subject that almost defies teaching. It was suggested that the teacher must decide upon the best method for teaching each poem, although there were repeated reminders of the need for an impressive beginning. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 272-74), not only proposed a long introduction for each poem to prepare the class, but the complete explanation, as the study progressed, of every allusion, every phrase, the meaning of every word. Stratton (191: 72) and Reed Smith (188: 33-41) also insisted that unless every word and allusion are understood the poem has not been mastered. The same and a few other writers (191: 79; 148: 25; 202: 140-41) recommended mastering poetic form, especially the four main rhythms (iambus, trochee, anapest and dactyl) and the more important metrical and stanzaic forms: quatrain, heroic couplet, blank verse, Spenserian stanza and terza rima.

There were more writers who cautioned against too technical a treatment of poetry than who advocated an intensive study.

Simons (179: 188) pointed out that, since the aim of the teaching of poetry is to have the pupil like poetry, any kind of drill is ineffective. Seely (172: 180-91) warned the teacher that the study of technical forms of verse does not lead to an understanding of poetry but to the memorization of forms. Seely's six goals in the teaching of poetry (discovering what the poet is talking about, what makes the poem real, participating, visualization, surrendering to the poem and observing the poet's skill) are consistent with his philosophy of teaching and in a different spirit from that of the theorists who believed in the analytical study of poetic technique. Others in the Seely "camp" permitted treatment of the technique of poetry, provided only the simplest forms were discussed without technical detail. (79: 149-50).

The content of the course in poetry must depend, Seely (172: 2-5) suggested, on the teacher's philosophy of poetry, a philosophy he must develop by reading poetry and thinking about it. This is in keeping with the opinion of Boas (21: 85), who pointed out that the test of a poem is the pleasure and feeling it gives the reader rather than its universal acceptance. It is interesting to note that anthologies intended for use in the secondary schools as late as 1933 contained, for the most part, such old favorites as "The Vision of Sir Launfal," "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner," "Lady of the Lake," "A Cotter's Saturday Night," "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," "Sohrab and Rustum" and Idylls of the King,

many of which were questioned by the theorists in dealing with the content of the course in poetry in the secondary school. Mearns (143: 119) criticized the schools for including "Lady of the Lake" in most secondary-school literature programs, when it was no longer considered the best poetry available. Many writers criticized the intensive study given many of these poems, an intensive study which was generally advocated in the theory of the study of literature before 1917, and persisted in some professional books after the appearance of Reorganization of English with its warning that poetry should be studied less exhaustively than prose. In Leonard's poetry lists, from which class readings were to be selected, were included English writers from Chaucer through Hardy and Yeats, and American poets from Emerson and Whitman to Benét, Frost and Lindsay.

The novel.-- Two books during the period 1917 to 1935, one in the secondary-school field of the teaching of English and another based on experience in a teachers' college, dealt exclusively with the teaching of the novel. The former, Study Plans for Novels Read in High Schools by Hitchcock (106), was a compilation of notes used in preparation for teaching four novels. Plot is treated in detail; full review questions, assignments and tests are suggested; unfamiliar words are noted. The four novels were acceptable to the author for study in the secondary school, in spite of

their acknowledged difficulties. Reading the Novel, by Cook (52), expressed disapproval of the study of novels in schools because it was said to be a study in which the pupil is so lost in details he doesn't grasp the whole story. These books represent different points of view, both of which, in some particulars, the professional books of the period followed.

Reorganization of English (111: 73) suggested reading some novels swiftly, reading mainly for the plot. Thomas (202: 195) called it "pedagogically criminal" to study a novel for two or three months. He did not go as far as Cook (52: 94), who advocated reading a novel in a single evening. Opdycke (152: 116), to avoid the intensive study of the novel, suggested reading only the most interesting portions of books studied ordinarily in their entirety. Certain chapters, according to Opdycke, might prove very interesting to a student when reading the entire book bored him. LaBrant (126: 49-54) stated that if a novel needs written outlines and reminders it is too difficult for the secondary school. Like Opdycke, LaBrant would break the novel into shorter units to give pupils who have previously read only short stories a sense of accomplishment. In preparing pupils for the novels it is necessary to explain that little happens in the first few pages and that a novel requires more patience to read than a short story. All

such hints and methods of LaBrant's were designed to make reading the novel an easier and more enjoyable experience for the pupils.

There were few advocates with Hitchcock of the intensive study of fiction, but intensive class study persisted after 1917. Hitchcock (106: 157-59) wanted the teacher presenting Eliot's novels to remind the pupils to think soberly about the deep thought of the book. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 427-28) recommended reading aloud from novels during much of the time in class given over to the study of fiction, a practice condemned many years before in Reorganization of English, and required careful study of important chapters and paragraphs in order to "master" the novel. To avoid penalizing pupils who have read ahead in the novel, Stratton (191: 35) advised them to study again the assigned portions of the novel. Fowler (76: 132), a British writer, insisted that the great novels should be studied and not read just for relaxation, which he considered an unworthy reason for reading.

There was as little agreement about the choice of novels as about the method of teaching them. Many writers accepted Silas Marner as a tried and proved classic, and utilized it for illustrating the method of teaching novels. Hitchcock had found Silas Marner one of the most successful novels in his own teaching, and gave detailed plans to help an inexperienced teacher present it to the class in literature. Stratton (191: 38) stated that Silas Marner is the

best book for beginning the study of the novel, and Fries, Hanford and Steeves (79: 66) were convinced that if Eliot's novel were well taught it would be an important imaginative experience for pupils. Leonard (132: 248-49) admitted that the first chapters of Silas Marner and Ivanhoe were difficult for ninth graders, but suggested that the teacher could easily clear up any difficulties with a discussion that related the novel to the pupils' lives.

Barnes and other writers refused to accept Silas Marner for use in teaching the novel. LaBrant (126: 52), convinced that pupils need a transition from their juvenile books to an adult book, suggested reading Typee, Treasure Island and other books more exciting than Silas Marner. Hitchcock (106: 80) admitted that no novel is perfect for classroom use, not any of the four for which he gave complete plans for teaching: Silas Marner, A Tale of Two Cities, Quentin Durward and The House of the Seven Gables. The novels and novelists most often suggested during the period in the professional books are Scott, Dickens and Hawthorne, usually presented through Ivanhoe, A Tale of Two Cities, The House of the Seven Gables. Opdycke recommended chapter selections from Jane Eyre and Vanity Fair; others rapid reading of Treasure Island, Robinson Crusoe and Gulliver's Travels.

Hints for teaching important facts of the novel deal with character, plot and setting. Stratton (191: 77) believed that if students kept a list of the characters in a

book and wrote compositions about them they would be helped in understanding the novel. Writing in a more profound vein, LaBrant (126: 54-61) suggested that novels chosen for reading must have characters whose motives are understandable to most pupils. Thomas (202: 178-85) wrote about "teaching plot" with suggestions for showing in the classroom the design of the plot through its struggle, foreshadowing and suspense. But Thomas qualified this technical study with the comment that the work with the technique of the plot should never obscure the story itself. LaBrant (126: 61-63) wrote that the pupil must be taught to expect and recognize the various threads of the story in a novel, but need not be expected to memorize the story. If something is forgotten, the pupil may turn back just as an adult turns back when he has forgotten some passage in a book or some detail of the story. LaBrant also suggested a careful study of the setting to break down the barrier of the strange atmosphere of such a book as A Tale of Two Cities, and as preparation for the enjoyment of other books about other countries in other times. For writers like LaBrant the teaching of any novel was an introduction to the type, not an attainment and accomplishment in itself, or preparation for college.

Drama - Shakespeare.-- Finch (75:80) in 1924 wrote that in most schools drama means Shakespeare. Mackaness (138: 148) in 1928 began his dramatic creed with the statement

that Shakespeare is the greatest dramatist who has appeared and will always be the greatest dramatist. Finch and Mackanness are English and Australian, but American professional writers of the same period advocated almost exclusive use of Shakespeare in the teaching of the drama, even if they did not predict that the world would never produce Shakespeare's equal. The few modern plays which were recommended were to be taught mainly as stepping stones to Shakespeare. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 466) declared that all teaching of the drama should be aimed at the appreciation and understanding of Shakespeare's plays, and that even the study of Shakespeare early in the secondary school was not harmful to future enjoyment, as many critics outside of the field of the teaching of literature contended.

In the suggestive lists of books for study and general reading for the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades Reorganization of English included playwrights other than Shakespeare: in the tenth grade Maeterlinck, Peabody, and Rostand; in the eleventh Goldsmith and Sheridan; in the twelfth grade Marlowe and Tennyson. Galsworthy, Hauptmann, Ibsen, Synge, Yeats and other modern playwrights were suggested for outside reading in the twelfth grade. Yet the basic plays proposed by Reorganization of English for study each year in class were Shakespearean.

In discussing the technique of teaching the drama, Thomas

(202: 198-217) agreed that Shakespearean plays could be taught in different ways, depending upon the development of the class, the time for the study and the books available on the subject. Allusions and language were considered by Thomas less important than the mental picture of the play which the pupil must be able to visualize. Leonard (132: 227) ruled out analysis of plots by the use of the Freytag drama triangle and other devices. Instead of a thorough and detailed study, unsuitable for the class in the secondary school, Leonard asked the teacher to discuss the story of the play in terms of forces of character and situation.

Stratton (191: 106-15) stressed the importance of teaching the drama as a type of literary production differing in method and performance. More thorough than any writers before her on teaching the concept of the drama, which Stratton and others had attempted, LaBrant (126: 68-82) explained to teachers that reading a play presented difficulties in the cast of characters and the division into acts and scenes which must be cleared up at the very beginning of the study. The student must understand that the play begins near the climax of the situation presented, and that the first speeches and early action of a play may seem unnatural and difficult. Teachers must not assume that pupils have seen a play or even know ~~what~~ one is like. Instead, they must explain

and describe the performance of a play, so that pupils understand, for instance, as they read a scene, how many characters are speaking. LaBrant would begin with Shakespeare because the Elizabethan stage was simple, but if the pupils are familiar with the modern stage then drama is best presented in modern form.

Reorganization of English (111: 141) suggested developing interest in plays through dramatization in class, with pupils reading parts. Craig (58: 84-87) also recommended presentation of several scenes before the class, with parts memorized. The complaint against the common practice of one member reading aloud in class while the rest of the pupils followed, books opened on their desks, was not levelled against the study of the drama.

The essay and the oration.-- Besides advice and illustrations for teaching the major types, poetry, the novel and the drama, there were a few professional writers, and those the remaining adherents of a college preparatory or semi-college preparatory program, who accepted the essay as an important type of literature to be read in the secondary school. Thomas (202: 234), recognizing the difficulty of teaching the mature thought of the essay, suggested using an interesting approach and stressing the emotional and intellectual stimulation to be derived from the essay. T. C. Blaisdell (19: 443-50) advocated outlining

the essay after it had been read and enjoyed, and Craig (58: 66-67) wanted the main impression and major ideas emphasized before a careful outline was made.

Stratton (191: 128-40) suggested some essays in every term of every year of the secondary school course in literature, essays by Macauley, Ruskin, Newman, Emerson, Thackeray, Steele, DeQuincey and Stevenson. Stratton admitted the modern essay as a supplement to these others only because he was convinced that the modern essay had been dignified by Presidents Taft, Roosevelt and Wilson. Craig (58: 29-31), in a most conservative position for theorists, who usually disavowed practices in the schools, argued that even the most difficult essays that have remained in most curriculums must have some excuse for being there, the assumption being that if Macaulay's essays on Johnson, Carlyle and Burns had not served a practical purpose they would no longer be taught in the schools.

Craig found similar excuse for suggesting the inclusion of orations in the English course of the secondary school. Simons (179: 221-35), another theorist advocating the teaching of orations, insisted upon the teaching of the "Speech on Conciliation" by Burke, who was, Simons pointed out, fighting for principles of liberty and was a highly significant orator and writer for Americans of 1920. Stratton (191: 172-73) and Phillips (158: 41) told teachers to use speeches

by Lincoln, Macaulay and modern orators. Stratton believed that the study of speeches should lead the pupils to delivering speeches themselves; Phillips, that it ^{should} lead to oratory and debate. Cox (57: 105), in disagreement with much that writers like Stratton, Craig and Phillips had to say about essays or nearly any topic connected with the teaching of literature, warned against the demoralizing effect of debating. If any kind of speaking is used in the secondary school, Cox believed it should be a discussion in which there is an attempt to seek the truth rather than to prove the other fellow wrong.

Summary

The methods of teaching, content of the course and the newly emphasized suggestions for teaching various types of reading in the theory of the teaching of literature from 1917 to 1935 have been presented apart in this chapter from the aims, differentiation and suitability of the professional literature for the same period discussed in Chapter IV. Nearly all the books in the field dealt with aims as well as materials and methods, although not with equal emphasis. Reorganization of English, The New Democracy in the Teaching of English by Barnes and Teaching of English by Cox were devoted generally to presenting aims and attitudes. In this chapter repeated references have been made to the following books devoted chiefly to a presentation of content and methods:

Teaching of English in the Secondary School by Thomas, Teaching English in High Schools by Sharp, Essential Principles of Teaching Reading and Literature by Leonard, Teaching of English in the High School by Stratton, The Teaching of High School English by Craig, The Teaching of Literature in the Secondary School by LaBrant and manuals for teaching the classics required for college entrance.

Although the content and methods hinted at in Reorganization of English and discussed in more detail in books by Thomas, Leonard and LaBrant do not represent a decisive break with teaching of the classics by an intensive method, more varied and more interesting reading ~~is~~ utilized, and teaching in the secondary school is related to skills learned in the elementary school and needed in adult life rather than to college entrance. Books by Sharp, Craig and Stratton, on the other hand, adhered to a college preparatory program in spirit, if not always in word, and often defended the conservative practices of the secondary-school courses in literature. With an acceptance of certain required readings and a methodology for the most part intensive and authoritarian, their suggestions for content and methods conflicted time and again with recommendations of professional books which stressed student responsibility in the classroom, the right of the pupil to form an independent opinion about literature, voluntary and varied outside reading of periodicals

and books, disapproval of Silas Marner and other classics used in the secondary schools.

These conflicting points of view expressed in the theory of the teaching of literature in the same period allowed very few suggestions of methods or content to meet unqualified approval from all writers. Oral reading was stressed and minimized; memorization approved and disapproved; the *précis* accepted and rejected; an historical review of literature defended, relegated to a minor role and questioned. Although an expression of original opinion by pupils about the reading they have done was sometimes sought, it was also noted that the enthusiasm of the class might be misleading and that answers by pupils should be correctly phrased. The examination, accepted only for diagnosis by many professional writers, was heartily approved by others as an excellent measure of the factual knowledge retained from the study in the course in literature. The study of the classics was defended, sometimes with qualification, and sometimes disapproved as a literary and social accomplishment of little use in a democratic society.

Those writers demanding a change in the theory of literature from the careful study of required masterpieces advocated a study of literary types: poetry, the novel, the essay, the drama and periodicals. Three books in the field of the teaching of literature in the secondary school dealt exclusively with poetry, one with the novel. There were

many advocates after 1917 of enjoying poetry rather than studying or drilling on it and reading novels rapidly for pleasure, but there were still theorists who believed in the intensive study of poetry, the novel and formal essays. The drama, even in theory, was still mostly a study of Shakespearean plays, with a few modern plays sometimes included and more attention given to the understanding of the form and technique of the drama. Writers who were interested in preparing pupils for the reading of adult life introduced newspapers and magazines into the course in literature.

There were varying suggestions about the relationship of literature and composition: that cultural and practical subjects had no reason for being joined, that only practical composition and practical reading as distinguished from the cultural belles lettres should be linked, and that all composition and all literature must be taught together. Most schemes of correlation with subjects outside of English amounted to little more than friendly cooperation between departments, or occasionally were nothing more than far-fetched schemes for relating literature to other fields of experience. Only one writer advocated experimental projects which crossed departmental and subject matter lines, and only one writer expressed resentment to the competition of other subjects. One tendency during this period, stemming from Reorganization of English, was to articulate to some extent the work of the ele-

mentary school and the secondary school, minimizing the content and methods required for college entrance. The defenders of the conventional practices used in the teaching of literature in American secondary schools, theorists Craig, Stratton, Sharp and others, were at odds with the progressive theorists. Advanced theory in the teaching of literature seemed far removed from the conservative practice of the teaching of literature before 1935.

The period 1917-1935 was a period of transition, a bridge from the aim of academic accomplishment of 1900-1917 to the aim of individual and social adjustment from 1935 on. The earlier period has been described as motivated by a social theory of humanism with an underlying philosophy of idealism. The transition period discussed in this chapter and in the preceding chapter was not a clear, undivided expression of any one social theory or philosophy. To state the case more simply than the diverse and conflicting factors warrant, one might note throughout the theory of the period professional writers looking back to the humanism of the previous period and other writers pointing forward to the experimentalism of the present. In both groups there was a trend toward social realism. The focus on reading ability, analytical methods, objective tests and special emphasis on types of literature are expressions of scientific education and social realism. More significant aspects of this social theory were interest in pupils super-

seding interest in books, reading for entertainment, provision for pupils taking vocational courses, adjustment of teaching to the level of pupil attainment and the use of interesting materials to replace required classics and knowledge of great authors. The dominant literary theory of the period 1917-1935 was individual attainment. The pupil had come to be the prime factor in literature instruction. His attainment was no longer, for most writers, one of academic accomplishment.

For a few theorists there was an immediate need for realizing individual and social adjustment required by modern society. Such progressive thinkers of the transition period turned the theory from the past to the present and forced the theory of the teaching of literature into closer relationship with progressive practice. The National Council of Teachers of English, in the vanguard again, engaged in preliminary work similar to the agitation and study which led to the publication of Reorganization of English in 1917, and endeavored in the late twenties and thirties to develop a more functional program in English. Nineteen hundred and thirty-five marks the end of the era of Reorganization of English and the beginning of a period stemming from the National Council's monograph, An Experience Curriculum in English, which had been in the process of development for several years. The period of 1935 to the present, discussed in Chapter VI, is a period more experimental, more pragmatic and more concerned

with individual and social adjustment than was the transition period 1917-1935.

CHAPTER VI

LITERATURE FOR ADJUSTMENT

The present period, from 1935 on, resembles in its beginnings the inception of what has been termed the transition period, 1917 to 1935. In 1917 the publication of Reorganization of English was the outgrowth of years of dissatisfaction with a course in English designed primarily as preparation for college. The theorists whose agitation and creative efforts led to the publication of Reorganization of English complained against a course which utilized academic accomplishment as aim, classics as content and intensive study as method. Reorganization of English seemed a satisfactory statement of new aims in 1917. In the twenties, educators requiring guidance in revising their courses in English made numerous requests to the National Council of Teachers of English for materials other than Reorganization of English, requests which indicated that the earlier report was no longer considered adequate. Although the conditions of the school had changed since 1917, and aims in the theory of the teaching of English had new emphases, related to the abilities and interests of pupils, most of the dissatisfaction with the report was due to the fact that it was not detailed enough in its treatment and that it covered the work of only grades seven through twelve.

In 1929 the executive committee of the National Council of Teachers of English approved the proposal to choose a curriculum commission to create a curriculum in English from kindergarten through the graduate school of the university. Serving with more than one hundred members chosen by the National Council of Teachers of English were representatives of the National Education Association, American Association of Teachers Colleges, National Association of Teachers of Speech, National Association of Journalism Advisers, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The report of the commission, published in 1935 as An Experience Curriculum in English, A Report of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English, W. Wilbur Hatfield, Chairman, presents the curriculum in English from kindergarten through the secondary school. A separate report issued for college work is entitled The Teaching of College English.

An Experience Curriculum in English, which is called for convenience, in this study, An Experience Curriculum, is a pattern or model program to be utilized by local curriculum committees in constructing their own curriculums. The commission points out the impossibility of developing an English course of study suited to the needs of all schools in all the states. Instead, the commission aims to present principles for a basis of organization of the course in English, sugges-

tions for correlating with other subjects and outlines of units based upon specific types of experience in literature, reading, creative expression and communication. The model units of An Experience Curriculum are not cut to fit what has been called "that educational bed of Procrustes - college entrance requirements" (211: 232); the units are designed to present experiences in literature that have meaning and worth for the pupil at the time he is reading.

An Experience Curriculum developed in response to demands for more detailed materials than the hints offered by Reorganization of English. Further requests for more fully explained and more detailed classroom practices than the brief model units of An Experience Curriculum led in 1939 to the publication by the National Council of Teachers of English of Conducting Experiences in English, an attempt to translate into classroom activities the "experience philosophy" set forth in the 1935 report. Conducting Experiences in English is the report of the teaching practices of 274 cooperating teachers, following in general the suggestions of An Experience Curriculum. Another collection of classroom practices, Modern Techniques for Improving Secondary School English, was published in 1940. There are other collections of techniques, devices and practices actually used in the schools, not by a few teacher-authors of professional books but by numerous practicing teachers. The actual teaching of literature in progressive secondary schools is more a part of the

theory of the teaching of literature in secondary schools than it was in the years before 1935.

Preoccupation with content and methods does not leave aims in the discard. The "strands of experience" and the units of An Experience Curriculum are based upon a well-developed body of principles or aims. Conducting Experiences in English also sets forth its aims as well as the procedures of the course in literature. In 1942 a group of the National Council of Teachers of English printed and distributed a statement of the aims and objectives they believe should prevail in the teaching of English, under the title "Basic Aims for English Instruction in American Schools." As in previous chapters the aims suggested in the period under discussion are treated together, but the role of An Experience Curriculum in determining the aims as well as the type of work for use in the classroom is not to be minimized.

Aims

There are several varied aims in the theory of the teaching of literature from 1935 to the present, aims which one writer (177: 36) terms traditional, modern, and a mixture of the two. It is also true that there is still little satisfaction with aims set forth in Reorganization of English and in the books that followed it or even with the aims of An Experience Curriculum. Although Hosic (175: 52-55) terms

the philosophy of An Experience Curriculum "progressive," he notes that at a time when there is a need for new and more purposeful aims, in the report and in most courses of study aims are subordinated to content and methods.

Appreciation.-- A persistent aim, stressed before 1935 and even before 1917, was the cultivation of taste and literary appreciation, which Shreve refers to in Psychology of the Teaching of English as a traditional aim. Whether "traditional" or "modern" this objective is stressed by many professional writers of the present period. Wrightstone (85: 390) indicates that literary appreciation as an objective in the teaching of literature needs definition and explanation if it is to serve as a valid goal. Appreciation is variously defined as "intelligent enjoyment" (189: 169), "rewriting . . . in the imagery of his, the reader's own experience" (34: 4), a "respect for good writing" (14: 28). Often appreciation, without definition or explanation, is appended to taste as an aim in literature.

Appreciation and taste as objectives usually involve "good" books and the assumption that the teacher has a commodity of considerable value which pupils should look upon with awe and respect. A methods text, Teaching English in High Schools by Cross and Carney (61: 25), which upholds preparation for college as a major aim, also sets up appreciation of the classics as a goal. Dakin (64: 214) states

as a lesser or secondary aim, the knowledge of works of "our greatest authors," and as late as 1941 acquaintance with literary materials and facts is proposed as an objective (99: 143).

Entertainment and recreation (167: 217) and the sheer fun and joy of reading (69: 42) are also suggested as aims. Shreve, a psychologist in the field of the teaching of English, who takes issue with the writers proposing enjoyment and appreciation as distinct and separate aims, states that thoughtful and delightful reading must be a single, integrated experience.

Reading as an aim.-- Several goals of literature, stressed at the present time, deal with the reading of books, the opportunity for reading and the manner of reading, rather than with the reading of acceptable masterpieces of literature. Mirrielees (146: 419) and others believe one of the prime aims of literature to be the development of reading skill, not by using required books, but through books not too easy or too difficult for the individual pupil. Another objective (167: 59) is to make students more sensitive to their reading and to stimulate the students to become active rather than passive readers. Heller and LaBrant (98: 84) state that the aim of both the teacher of English and the librarian should be to help children find and read books. Finally, one of the major objectives set up by the Basic Aims

Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English (187: 40) in 1942 is intelligent reading, or the accurate interpretation and critical examination of what is read.

Experience and adjustment.--- The aims and purposes of the course shift from emphases connected with appreciation of classical masterpieces and literary qualities to the acquisition of the skill of reading and to the individual and social needs of pupils that can be met through the study of literature. Shreve (177: 13-15) insists that no teaching can be effective that does not help develop personality and help make a better intellectual and spiritual adjustment. Rosenblatt (167), throughout Literature as Exploration, expresses belief in the personal value of literature that allows the pupil to see problems like his own and different from his own, to find emotional release, to solve specific problems, to gain confidence and even to overcome neurotic tendencies. One of the basic principles of An Experience Curriculum is that literature must relate to "real life situations." The report states its objective of experience and adjustment in the following way:

The school of experience is the only one which will develop the flexibility and power of self-direction requisite for successful living in our age of swift industrial, social and economic change. To inculcate authoritarian beliefs, fixed rules of conduct, unreasoned and therefore stubborn attitudes, is to set our youth in futile and fatal conflict with the forces of modern life. By meeting situations, modifying conditions and adapting themselves to the unchangeable, our boys and girls will learn to live in a dynamic and evolving world. Today, more than ever, the curriculum should consist of experiences (95: 3).

Rosenblatt (167: 180-91) also stresses the aim of an exploration of society as well as an understanding and adjustment of the individual. She believes that literature can provide the adolescent, through presentation and explanation of cultures other than his own, with an understanding of human nature. Parker (154: 88), in similar fashion, sees the study of literature as an opportunity to discover new ideas in order to break down prejudice. More specifically, "Basic Aims for English Instruction in American Schools" (187: 46) expresses the notion that racial, religious and social prejudices can be lessened and sympathy increased through wide reading. LaBrant (85: 212) sees as a fundamental aim in the teaching of literature the understanding by pupils of the confused and complex society in which they live.

Literary Materials for All Pupils to Study

Occasional expressions of the need for reading the right books, the classics, are limited to a few professional writers during the present period. Cross and Carney, Dakin, Reed Smith, Mirrielees and a few others stress the need for teaching various types of literature, including biography, orations and serious essays, although even they seldom specify the titles of the selections that must be read as a core of studies for all pupils. These writers argue that if such reading is not done in school it is not done in adult life.

The assumption, of course, is that the pupil has some social or cultural need for reading certain types of literature or certain masterpieces. That the pupil should read Shakespeare in school is commonly accepted by these and many other writers.

LaBrant (85: 199) sums up the attitude of most professional writers toward reading specified books, when she describes as undemocratic and false the attempt to read certain selections of literature because the best people read them or because such reading seems to give the pupil an academic or social distinction. In Literature as Exploration and in The Psychology of the Teaching of English there is manifest an unwillingness to admit that any books in particular should be read and acquired by way of gaining social distinction and culture. Rosenblatt (167: 76) insists that the teacher must fight the notion that it is necessary to read certain books or even to know about them in order to be educated. No units in An Experience Curriculum are required of any group of pupils in any school. They are all suggested as a pattern for experiencing literature and learning how to enjoy and profit from a variety of writings.

If, as Rosenblatt (167: 32, 37, 41-42, 48-52, 80, 134-35) reiterates so frequently, the teacher is aware that a book has value for a reader only when it meets his emotional and social needs he will avoid teaching specified books in a stereotyped way. Shreve (177: 259) believes that teaching the same material by the same methods to all pupils is apt

to cause maladjustments to the bright and to the dull. The realization that a literary selection may have several meanings also seems to influence the method and outlook of the theory of the teaching of literature in the secondary school. Richards (164: 396) in 1938 writes:

No one eye, no one creative outlook settles anything. We must take meanings from one another.

Thayer (197: 59) writes in 1940:

The fact that two people read a book with the same title is no guarantee that they are reading the same book.

Both of these statements from outside of the field of the teaching of literature in the schools have implications which Rosenblatt and a few others in the field tend to utilize as their basic assumptions. Rosenblatt (167: 72), for instance, suggests that there is a need for the pupil to develop a personal sense of literature and not just to accept the teacher's point of view. Kilpatrick (1: 30), writing in Pupils Are People, classifies the authoritarian attitude of the conventional teacher as a philosophic attitude that has persisted from Aristotle until recent years. Such statements stress the importance of pupils' varied needs and problems and minimize the set or fixed standards of adults and teachers that impose themselves upon the materials and methods in the teaching of literature.

Discarding required books, and even to some extent a fixed interpretation, does not imply that the professional writers are unwilling to search for a common basis underlying literature to be taught. Shattuck and Barnes (175: 3) state in A

Modern Program:

In order to create a program of English for the schools it is necessary to discover what experiences are common and acceptable, but which people do not engage in happily or effectively.

Differentiation

The philosophy of teaching that rules out the books that ought to be read, and substitutes books that fit pupils' needs, requires to implement it a differentiation of materials and methods. The provision for individual differences has become more than a mere corroboration of the psychological truism that all individuals differ. The National Council of Teachers of English appointed a committee on individual differences whose report, Pupils Are People, published in 1941, consists of twenty-five chapters contributed by thirty college and secondary-school teachers. The report stresses in general the uniqueness of each pupil, and the necessity for meeting the needs of each pupil through an analysis of individual problems and work directed toward the objective set for each pupil. In Pupils Are People, Leonard (1: 13) points out that the teaching of literature has shifted from a selective to a democratic process. First there was instruction for only bright students, followed by the teaching of classical subjects for a select group and practical training for others. Later, ability grouping and different amounts of the same work were utilized to provide for different interests

and abilities. What Leonard sees as the emerging period involves attention to the individual's education.

The comments and suggestions on differentiation in professional books during this emerging period fall mainly into three categories: defining and explaining differences, discovering and diagnosing differences and recommending provisions for meeting differing abilities and interests. Although the subject of reading is inextricably bound up with the present discussion, reading and reading problems, including analysis and provisions for remedial reading, are treated in a separate section of this chapter.

Explaining differences.--- There is an attempt during the present period to point out specifically what the teacher's attitude should be toward differences in pupils. Rosenblatt (167: 176) quotes the anthropologists when she writes that that which a social group considers normal is normal, and that the teacher must sense the temporary and varied acceptance of certain qualities as normal. Cross and Carney (61: 12-13) are aware of the numerous gradations of individuals along any scale of values, and the hypothetical quality of the average pupil. Reed Smith (189: 382-83) points out that differences between boys and girls demand the attention of the English teacher. Pryor (1: 81) notes the great differences in maturity of secondary-school pupils, and other writers point out that children differ religiously, socially, politically and economically. Introduced with differences

of sex, maturity, religion and social standing, are important physical differences so often ignored. Leonard (1: 8) quotes a study by Pressy to prove that in the schools of the United States fifteen per cent of the pupils have eye defects, five per cent have speech defects, fourteen per cent are without normal hearing and twenty-five per cent are malnourished. Such numerous physical problems and needs are now recognized as important factors in the teaching of literature as well as in the teaching of other subjects. Accompanying the explanations of differences is a warning by Jenkins (1: 102) that differences are individual and not racial. The negro child, according to Jenkins, must be treated with respect for his abilities and deficiencies as a white child is treated, not pitied, hated or isolated because of his color difference.

Analyzing differences.-- Methods of discovering the difference in pupils extend from such vague suggestions as knowing how many of the pupils in a class hate literature (64: 211) to the difficult task of discovering signs of the defense mechanisms of introversion, rationalization and hysteria (177: 258). Keene (1: 119) indicates that the teacher can often discover difficulties by watching the pupil as he takes part in class discussion. Observing the pupil's reaction to different books is another method of ascertaining differences and difficulties (85: 128). Although intelligence

tests have been used for many years as a means for discovering differences and intelligence often is the only basis for sectioning, it is pointed out that there are more differences to be taken into account than those measured by the intelligence quotient.

Providing for individual differences.-- Grouping pupils is accepted and rejected as a means of providing for individual differences. Parker (154: 31-32) feels that grouping according to ability is helpful in providing for individuals, although Leonard (1: 11) points out that pupils sectioned accurately for one subject may differ a great deal in another subject. It is also suggested that teachers should know how to judge the difficulty of various books in order to adapt books to different pupils (85: 16), and that such ability is based on an interest and a knowledge of books and magazines that appeal to adolescents (1: 149). Heller and LaBrant (98: 32-33) advise the teacher to provide books for pupils, to have books at the desk, and to permit pupils to read or browse in the library during class time. It is noted that the teacher of literature must get to know pupils well and to encourage pupils to see their own psychological, vocational and family problems objectively before there can be any provision for differences through literature (130: 17-27). The teacher is not to neglect the brilliant pupil, according to Cross and Carney (61: 338), and is to teach the very dull pupil simple

lessons. Closely related to provision for individuals is the problem of how well the course provides for the needs of most pupils in the secondary school.

Suitability

With college preparation ruled out as a dominant factor in the teaching of literature in the secondary school, more attention is given to the suitability of the literature presented and the manner of teaching it for most of the pupils in the schools. The first requisite for material suitable to the pupils is that the literature taught should be related to what pupils know. According to Dakin (64: 34), a teaching program must be based upon a diagnosis used to discover what the pupils have already learned. This contrasts with the older concept by which pupils were forced to the attainment required for college entrance. If the teacher is anxious to find books that are satisfying and that are simple enough, he must know the class ability (98: 37-38), must relate the work to the emotional and intellectual development of the class (167: 254) and must not choose material too mature or too different from the pupils' experience.

Rosenblatt (167: 81,108), more than any other professional writer, stresses the need for convincing the pupil that every book must have meaning for him and must influence his behavior. Literature must have, according to Rosenblatt,

a personal and direct meaning for the reader, and for the reader's life. Such a point of view is also expressed in An Experience Curriculum (95: 18) where it is noted that, if the pupil does not get pleasure from what he has read, he has not gained a significant experience.

In setting up the course in literature to help the pupil, the teaching of masterpieces for their own sake or for appreciation, and the training of pupils in a literary tradition are often ruled out. Instead there is an attempt (177: 36) to have literature aid in the adjustment of the pupil and in the enrichment of his personality. The teacher is warned not to choose selections for reading that appeal to the teacher (64: 216), or to stress what he himself has studied (198: 304). An Experience Curriculum (95: 13) notes that often the teacher tries to find an excuse for what he has been teaching rather than trying to find literature which will aid the student.

The pupil's present experience and his immediate problems are stressed in An Experience Curriculum (95: 18), which focuses on the immediate value of literary experiences during the school years. Lenrow (130: 8) states that the goal of literature can be reached if books are chosen because the student has a pressing and vital need for them at the moment. There are hundreds of books in Lenrow's Reader's Guide to Prose Fiction which are related to personal problems

that might be troubling pupils. In meeting immediate problems and providing for growth and maturity, it is deemed necessary to offer opportunities for character development in the classroom itself. A Correlated Curriculum (211: 124-25) offers suggestions for improving self-confidence and initiative, group responsibility, courtesy and free expression of opinion through activities in the classroom.

Although A Correlated Curriculum (211: 4,201) suggests introducing problems of immediate significance to the pupil, later in the report it is stated that there is a danger that information, taste and skill needed in later life will not be developed. An Experience Curriculum (95: 9) advocates a course in literature which presents experience of school and after-school life, requiring for the pupil in school and for the adult more careful evaluation of everything read, heard and seen than the world formerly required. Looking beyond school problems or adult problems while pupils are in school, Rosenblatt (167: 199-201) wisely points out that young people will meet new and different problems when they reach maturity, and that they must be given the basis for an individual development that will enable them to work out their own adult problems.

Reading

In the discussion of differentiation and of the suitability of the course in literature, reading is an important

factor. The poor reader requires remedial procedures; the solving of immediate problems requires up-to-date reading in modern books; the solution of adult problems requires an ability to read and an interest in reading. The teaching of literature is always dependent upon the reading process, but in the professional books from 1935 on there is more recognition of the close bond between the teaching of reading and the teaching of literature in the secondary schools than there was in earlier professional books. Not only remedial reading, but the teaching of reading to all pupils has come to be of such importance in the teaching of literature that it can no longer be thought of as a subject apart. The books specifically on reading and reading problems relate closely to the teaching of literature, and writers of independent professional books are asked to contribute to collections of essays on reading and on the reading process.

An Experience Curriculum (95: 83) states very emphatically that reading should be taught in connection with literature, and that there cannot be appreciation, adjustment or experience without an ability to get meaning from the printed page. According to Cross (85: 13-14), the failure to recognize the teaching of reading as a requisite for the teaching of literature in the secondary school is due to the assumption that pupils learn to read in the elementary school and need no guidance from the teacher in the secondary school. He points out that there are so many deficient readers that

almost one fourth of the pupils in the secondary schools are unable to get meaning from the reading assigned in the class in literature. It is repeatedly pointed out in books on reading and on the teaching of literature that reading is not always well taught in the elementary school and that there is so much room for improvement in the secondary school that reading should be taught in every grade. The Basic Aims Committee (187: 44) points out the fallacy of conceiving of reading as a static ability or skill learned once and for all either in the elementary or secondary school. The committee notes that there must be constant growth in the continuous process of reading. Shreve (177: 162-63) also insists that the pupil should be learning to read in the secondary school, since reading is a process that is never entirely learned or completed. Even Hitchcock (81: 146), usually conservative in his theories, calls more meaningful reading the aim of the teaching of literature, and adds that it does not matter what books are read as long as there is development in the ability to read.

Although the theorists in the teaching of literature advocate the development of reading ability in the secondary school, they are not always in agreement and not always specific in defining what they mean by the term "reading."

Parker (154: 42-52) describes reading as a complex skill involving the intensive study of the meanings of words, sen-

tences and paragraphs, the author's conception of the world, the author's attitude and the author's aim. Other writers string together a number of loosely connected skills in their definition, or make little attempt to define reading. It is necessary to turn to Reading in General Education and other books and studies devoted specifically to reading problems to discover a more detailed explanation of the broader concept of reading and the skills and processes involved in reading. Even the editor of Reading in General Education (85: 18-27) notes that there is no agreement on the exact meaning of reading, which may imply the simple process of word recognition or numerous complex skills of interpretation, such as literal or sense meanings related to the reader's experience, meanings implied by the author's mood and tone, drawing inferences, judging the validity of ideas presented, recognizing the underlying assumptions of the author, applying ideas gained to new situations and to personal and social problems.

While the professional books devoted to the teaching of literature do not analyze the reading process in any detail, they differentiate several kinds of reading and different reading techniques. Cross and Carney (61: 31-32) distinguish several kinds of reading: informal and formal oral reading, silent reading to get information from newspapers, magazines and books, silent reading of plays, essays, poetry, history and biography. Literary reading (154: 73) is sometimes considered an advanced or more complete reading than informa-

tional reading. Mirrielees (146: 334) thinks it is the job of the teacher to teach three kinds of reading; rapid reading for information, study reading, and recreational or outside reading.

Remedial reading.-- Besides giving attention to different types of reading, most professional books recognize the need for a program of remedial reading for the many non-readers and poor readers in the secondary school. In order to know how well pupils read, it is suggested that a reading diagnosis be made as pupils enter the secondary school. A diagnosis (177: 175) aids the teacher and gives the pupil himself an idea of his own deficiencies, but the diagnosis is not merely for the purpose of separating those who can from those who cannot read. Wrightstone (85: 396) suggests an appraisal program which provides for continuous redefinition of the aims of reading, and continuous rechecking and improvement. Cross and Carney (61: 341-50) believe it is necessary to know the reading speed and reading comprehension of each pupil. Groups of slow pupils are to develop speed in reading and improvement in comprehension by such various methods as reading aloud, or reading a selection and explaining what it means, and through studies of eye movements, span of recognition, regressions, eye jumps and fixations by means of the opthalmo-graph and the tachistoscope. Cross and Carney explain these devices for diagnosing and improving reading, and give a

brief review of the mechanical nature of reading, which they feel is needed by every English teacher in order to test reading ability and to teach reading. Even a secondary-school textbook in literature mentions the physical disabilities that impede reading, and calls the teacher's attention to numerous pamphlets dealing with eye movements, lip reading and perceptual span. The teacher is asked in connection with the teaching of literature to investigate physical, psychological and social factors to determine the cause of poor reading (15: ix).

Reading in General Education proposes the diagnosis of reading difficulties on three levels: lay, semi-technical and clinical. The lay level of diagnosis is to be made by the observant teacher with little need for technical knowledge of reading. The tests of impressions and the measurement of eye movements on the semi-technical level ~~are~~ said to be possible for the teacher to handle through skilled interviews. The clinical level is reserved for problems meriting a reading expert or a psychologist. Heaton (1: 185-90) suggests for each school a reading counselor, given several periods each day for his job of adviser to both pupils and teachers.

As important as making a first diagnosis and utilizing experts for extreme reading difficulties are the suggestions that careful reading records be kept for each pupil and pro-

vision be made to secure for retarded readers books suitable for them. Teachers are to note the reading interest of pupils of different intelligence levels, recognizing the need for getting into the hands of dull pupils books that are interesting and not too difficult (85: 253,338). Suggestions are also made for individual reading programs for slow and retarded readers (41: 93), easy material for poor readers (1: 158), and separate standards for poor readers so that they are not required to do work expected of average readers (61: 356).

Individual reading.-- Remedial reading needs individual attention, but reading for the pupil without special problems is now looked upon as an individual rather than a group process. The teacher is reminded of the fact that, even though class discussions are planned around group interests and group needs, the reading of each pupil is individual, each reader bringing different abilities and interest to bear on what he reads (211: 228). Mirrielees (146: 333-34) states that each reader should be taught as an individual, since it is impossible to get all pupils to make the same progress. Books assigned for reading in class can be finished at home or the teacher can help pupils with difficult passages. Pupils are never to be expected to do the same amount of reading within the same period, and are not all expected to read the same books.

Extensive reading.-- Both in class and outside of class a program of free, extensive reading is often advocated. Such reading is accepted as a part of the regular work in literature and not as a supplementary, outside activity. There is a general trend in theory and in the practice of progressive schools toward extensive reading. Parker (154: 80-81) points out that many students not interested in the belles lettres devour books about science, radio, animals or many other non-literary subjects. Dakin (64: 302) advocates for class or home-reading, books on travel and adventure, which she believes give pupils a larger view and understanding of the world. LaBrant (175: 40) points out that the wide reading program in the junior high school is taking the place of the classics, reading too difficult and of little interest to the pupil. Although she terms the program a "free" reading program, she indicates that it be guided by the teacher, and that books discussed in class and those read outside are not to be sharply differentiated. Through the habit of extensive reading^{of} a variety of books, magazines and newspapers the pupil is said to attain more power to discriminate in his reading and to gain a better understanding of the complex society in which he lives (115: 4-6; 1: 174-75).

Outside reading.-- In the late thirties and early forties outside reading, as distinguished from the rote reading of the classics in class, is advocated for the most part by pro-

professional writers not fully accepting extensive and individual reading as a part of the in-school program. Freedom in outside reading is not always advocated without some reservation or qualification. Although Reed Smith (189: 376-78) declares that pupils must know books they will enjoy, he notes that outside reading must be aimed at getting pupils to read "better" books. It is also suggested that in choosing books for outside reading the pupil must be watched in order to assure the improvement of his taste in reading (34: 51). Several writers believe that through an outside reading program more purposeful and satisfactory reading can be attained. Heller and LaBrant (98: 30, 58-62) suggest that the teacher and the librarian set up a pattern for reading in order to lead the pupil to "advanced reading." Leisure reading is sometimes said to be wholly for pleasure and enjoyment, but more often is conceived as part of a planned program leading to improved taste and appreciation.

Book lists.-- Reading lists are an important source of suggestions for the outside reading program. Cross and Carney (61: 431) list simple stories for pupils unable to understand Hardy and Conrad, and recommend the home reading lists of the National Council of Teachers of English. The National Council lists, Books for Home Reading, Grades 9 to 12, and Leisure Reading for Grades 7, 8 and 9, are widely recommended. Educating for Peace contains lengthy lists of

selected fiction and non-fiction dealing with various countries, internal politics and international relations. These lists are to be used by teachers in stimulating reading, whether or not that reading is related to a peace project suggested by the book. The most ambitious classified list of novels, Reader's Guide to Prose Fiction published in 1940, lists 1500 novels by subject matter. Like a few other writers, Reed Smith (189: 394) gives a number of his own lists, graded according to difficulty: books for boys, books for girls, realistic novels, non-fiction, and lists he calls "dime novel antidotes" for pupils who want fast moving, thrilling stories.

There are a few writers who question the use of book lists. Ackerman (34: 68-76) suggests that when pupils help make up their own reading lists they take more interest in reading. Leonard (1: 20) declares that, since book lists serve only as reminders of the broad range of reading that interests pupils, it is not wise to choose a book list in advance, and even worse for a college entrance board or a state department of education to choose in advance the books for a large number of pupils to read. Many professional writers feel as Leonard does about prescriptive lists, and only use their own and published lists as suggestions for extensive in-school and outside reading.

Book reports.-- In connection with outside reading

programs it is interesting to note such widely divergent views on book reports as the plan of Dakin (64: 365-71) to prevent the pupil from cheating or reporting a book he has read in a previous year, and the complete reading diary of Noble (34: 51-54) in which the pupil lists comic strips, magazines, horror stories and any other reading he does out of class. The pupil is not reprimanded for any reading he does, is not examined for an outside reading "grade." Rosenblatt (167: 82) points out that the routine book report often forces the pupil to think of what is to be required of him in the classroom rather than thinking about the book itself and its relation to him. Many writers disapprove of a book report requiring a detailed account of plot. They favor class discussion to stimulate outside reading. In Modern Techniques for Improving Secondary School English there are several substitutes for the conventional book report, most of them oral. They include panel discussions, group talks, reading of exciting portions of a book, telling anecdotes from a novel, previews of books by enthusiastic readers, dramatized interviews to present biographies, and book report games. The few demands for traditional, detailed book reports like Dakin's are exceptions, but nevertheless show that such traditional procedures persist at the present time.

Content

Because of the increased importance of the teaching of

reading in connection with literature in the secondary schools, outside reading, individual and extensive reading were reviewed separately. These factors are most certainly aspects of the content of the course, but in a similar way aims, differentiation and suitability also involve content and methods. Professional books after 1935 contain specific comment on the choice of books to be used dealing with the classics, various types of literature to be read, newspapers and magazines, moving pictures and radio programs and some generalized statements about setting up the course in literature.

Choice of books.-- Witty (1: 149) indicates that the teacher must have some knowledge of children's books in order to choose wisely the literature that will be read. Others stress the importance of knowing suitable reading books and textbooks, utilizing check lists to determine the difficulty and suitability of books. Cross and Carney (61: 517) point out that consideration should be given to illustrations, type, size and cover as well as the material contained in the book. The attractive volumes used in courses of literature in the secondary schools during the late thirties and the forties indicate the influence of Cross and Carney and other professional writers. With a knowledge of books for adolescents and a method of evaluating textbooks, the teacher is to choose books that meet the needs of pupils through a wide range of literature,

the harmful and sentimental excluded (95: 18-20). Mirrielees (146: 416-24) states that if pupils start out with books that appeal to them, like Lindberg's We and Paine's Girl in White, they will not dislike non-fiction. Gruenberg (99: 169) defends thrilling books, moving pictures and radio programs, mildly vulgar comic strips and erotic stories because he feels they satisfy needs for individuals at various stages of adolescent development. Books designed for adults, but dealing with problems pupils are facing or must soon face, are often admitted into the course. For many writers the content of a course in literature cannot be circumscribed by strictly literary standards. Rosenblatt (167: 157,317) notes that literary people often fail to realize that books on science are works of literature, that, in fact, "all that man has thought and felt and created is the province of literature." According to this view the classics or masterpieces of literature are only a small part of our literary heritage.

Classics.-- It was probably true in 1941, as Monroe (1: 176) points out, that the era of prescription of the classics for all pupils was drawing to a close, but classics still have advocates in the theory of the teaching of literature, as has been indicated earlier in the discussion of the core of material for all to study. Most writers condemn the exclusive use of the classics or warn against their use. The classics are said to present language difficulties for the

poor pupil (1:143), to cause pupils to hate reading (189: 377), and to fail to stimulate pupils intellectually (41: vii). Rosenblatt (167: 257) attacks the notion that reading the classics automatically gives distinction and sensitivity to those who read them. LaBrant (1: 283-84) points out that college preparatory groups and better students generally are taught the classics, and that even when the classics are not taught some teachers continue to use methods with which they formerly taught the classics. LaBrant, however, does not advocate or approve exclusive use of the classics for even the most brilliant pupils.

Rosenblatt (167: 163) recommends the teaching of both classic and contemporary works; Mirrielees approves the classics, if related to modern life and modern thought. A more interesting presentation of the classics is suggested when modern poems and plays are studied with the classics for comparison (47: 80-82). This plan is followed in a series of textbooks now in use in the secondary schools, and indicates a tendency to teach the classics more effectively and more sparingly. In a research study (59) made in 1938, however, comprehension in literature is determined by using twelve classics widely read in the Indiana schools. Dora Smith (81: 43) states that it is not valid to discard the classics merely because they are old; Jones (91: 11-30), writing in the same volume, an essay entitled "A Modern Caveat

About the Curriculum," staunchly defends the classics, criticizes the easy refuge being taken in modern books.

Teaching according to theme.-- Before 1917 books and literary selections were most often chosen for presentation in the theory of the teaching of literature because they were accepted masterpieces or because they belonged to an important period in literature. In the late twenties and the thirties selections were often used as illustrations for teaching various types of literature: poetry, the novel, the drama and other forms of writing. Grouping by types accompanied the teaching of the classics in the earliest professional books. Once or twice before 1935 it was suggested that selections be taught together because they dealt with a common subject or had a common theme or purpose. Selecting and grouping literary materials by theme or subject matter are basic to An Experience Curriculum, A Modern Program, and several other professional books published after 1935. The first strand or group of literary experiences in An Experience Curriculum (95: 42-44), an example of the majority of units based upon theme, is entitled "Enjoying Action." Unit four of this strand is devoted to hero stories, with Daniel Boone, Skyward and Girl in White Armor suggested for readings; unit six presents adventures with strange backgrounds, using Ivanhoe, A Tale of Two Cities and Kidnapped. Without noting the objectives of these units it might appear that these group-

ings are little different from the grouping by types. The objectives of each unit, however, definitely set this scheme apart from other classifications. For instance, the objectives of Unit Four of Strand A are:

Primary objective: To enjoy hero stories. Enabling objectives: To sympathize with the hero; to realize the seriousness of his difficulties; to see how far his success is due to his own foresight, courage and resourcefulness. (95: 43).

The groupings of the hero stories in An Experience Curriculum and mystery stories such as Front Page Mystery, The Black Wolf Pack and The Gold Bug, and other stories grouped similarly, are based upon gaining interest and understanding through theme.

Mansell (1: 140) suggests that grouping readings by themes makes literature attractive to many pupils, while the study by type or literary style or period appeals only to a few. Anderson (85: 262), noting for central themes animals, adventure, family and home, school life, church and religion, the pioneer spirit, democracy and the common man, declares that organizing reading around a central theme is becoming a general tendency. Rosenblatt (167: 294), however, warns against too much trust in the manner in which the course is organized, and states that merely listing books by themes will not of itself bring the English course to a worthy goal. This warning might well be directed at handbooks similar to the handbook (160: 93) that claims that the ac-

tual content of any course in literature need not be changed much to enable grouping by theme.

Teaching by types.--- Although teaching by theme or grouping based on content is advocated by a number of theorists, such a classification and approach do not displace the more conventional grouping by types, a grouping based primarily on form. An Experience Curriculum contains, somewhat as a concession to college preparation, an example of a presentation of a literary type, and also eighteen units on lyric poetry, although the poetry is grouped according to subject matter and approach. The approach by types, however, is minor in An Experience Curriculum and other professional books stressing organization by theme. There are, however, many writers after 1935 who continue the tradition of presenting sample lessons for teaching poems and prose selections or the literary type as a whole. These books (61: 10) base their interest and concern with types of writing on the belief that the student must come in contact with the various forms of literature he will read in the future. The suggestions regarding the teaching of types are seldom as carefully scheduled as the plan proposed by Confrey (50: 9), who devotes twelve weeks to the drama, six to the epic, six to the essay and twelve to the lyric, with no time for what he calls "easy fiction." There is no particular agreement on the teaching of the novel, short story, poem, essay, biography, ora-

tion or the drama, or any set pattern proposed, by Mirrie-
lees, Cross and Carney, Dakin and Reed Smith, the writers
giving most detailed treatment to the types.

Even the manner of dealing with the different forms
of writing varies. Mirrielees discusses the teaching of
poetry, fiction, drama and non-fiction, but offers little
more than an outline for teaching any of these. Reed Smith,
on the other hand, sets forth eight steps in the intensive
study of literature, with considerable historical and crit-
ical material and examples for each type. Cross and Carney
use the approach by types as the basis of organization of
their book, but also treat the skill of reading, and the use
of newspapers and magazines as fully as the more conventional
literary material. Other writers deal with one or more forms,
but not as fully with all of them as the writers mentioned.
LaBrant (85: 206) repeats her declaration of 1931 that teach-
ing by types has its advantages because it gives an oppor-
tunity for organization of the course, but admits the definite
disadvantage of emphasizing form instead of content. LaBrant
feels that there is still need of investigation to determine
whether a knowledge of form is necessary. In order not to
stress the rather copious suggestions on teaching the novel,
the short story, poetry, drama, essay, biography and oration,
and to avoid standard techniques and methods that do not orig-
inate in the present period, and most of which have already

been touched upon in Chapter V, each type is reviewed very briefly. A few new and less conventional techniques connected with teaching by types, proposed usually by books specializing in the teaching of one type of literature, are also presented.

A distinction is occasionally made between the story of romance which has a natural appeal to pupils and can be read outside of class and the realistic novel which needs explanation in the classroom. In Cross and Carney's presentation of novels (61: 414-15), modern books like So Big, Babbitt and Ethan Frome contrast with the classics, Ivanhoe, A Tale of Two Cities and Treasure Island. Much of the information in the present period about the novel is to the effect that novels are tiresome for secondary-school pupils and that the whole book cannot be discussed in class. Short stories, more often recommended for class study than novels, are suggested for analysis through the situation, initial incident, surprise ending, climax, setting, plot and theme (61: 393).

Reading poetry aloud, recognizing "good" poetry, teaching narrative poetry as an introductory study, explaining rhythm of verse through rhythms in other fields of experience, teaching some of the verse forms, outlining the poem, knowing the background of the poem, getting the sensual images suggested by the poetry are techniques which have been encountered in professional books from 1900 on and in other books

even before that time. Only rarely does the approach to poetry in the American books on the teaching of literature reflect the same profundity and originality of the British publication Poetry in Practice, by Callan, a book dealing with the understanding of poetry and a general pattern for teaching it. According to Callan's poetic philosophy, poetry is not for special occasions but for everyday life (38: 1-2), metaphors are commonplace (38: 129), all imagery is a synthesis of common thought, experience and emotion (38: 121-22), a poet who does not have the reader's reaction can be as great a poet as the one who does have reactions similar to the reader's (38: 94), and poetry cannot be read for some reward it has to offer but only to apprehend and understand its beauty (38: 6-11). Abbott (5: 46, 63) expresses something akin to Callan's philosophy when he states that a poem, leading one's mind into the unknown, does not offer a solution, but instead expresses the problem imaginatively for the reader to get in an emotional and intellectual way. Abbott (5: 64-65) believes that the teacher must be willing to consider unconventional ideas expressed in poetry and to present them without prejudice. Callan and Abbott are concerned primarily with the attitude the teacher instills toward poetry rather than with the technique or method of presentation. Many of the other professional writers of the period are interested in techniques which insure a careful study of poetry. In the

content of the course there is similar disagreement. Cross and Carney (61: 438) accept "The Lady of the Lake" as a successful piece of reading for the secondary schools; others turn from such classical selections to "John Brown's Body" and other modern poems.

The study of the drama in the professional books is still limited primarily to Shakespeare. As Reed Smith (189: 289) notes, nine-tenths of the secondary schools study Shakespeare and only one-fifth study any other plays. Presenting the play as a creation for performance in the theatre, reading parts from the play in class, explaining the drama form, understanding the background of the play, and even the use of the Freytag arch for summarizing the plot are still proposed in various professional books. A special unit of Conducting Experiences in English, entitled "Experiencing Hamlet," offers little but the conventional study of the play in class, except for modified class discussion, home reading and a minor connection with modern plays and moving pictures. Dora Smith (185: 55-59, 65-67), in Helps for Course in Teaching of Literature, lists five pages of Shakespearean references for the teacher of English besides the anthologies of modern plays for reading and acting.

Three more types of literature receive lesser treatment but are touched upon in the professional books after 1935. The teaching of the essay is treated in a conventional manner by most writers dealing fully with types. The oration, called

the least important of the literary types, is given a separate analysis by Reed Smith (189: 349). It is admitted that speeches are not interesting to boys and girls, but the same writers (61: 468) insist that, since educated people must know something about great American political speeches, orations must be included in the curriculum. The argument for the inclusion of biography (61: 463) is that if boys and girls do not read biography during school years they probably will not read it in later years. Too often this is the argument used in proposing various types of literature. The student must, in effect, learn the tricks required to read a poem or an essay, so that he may use these tricks later on, or he must read the poem and the essay while in school because he may not read later without guidance. In books stressing a "types" organization of the English course the attitude and understanding of the reader and the development of the individual are apt to be minimized.

Newspapers and magazines.-- The use of newspapers and magazines has come to be of such interest in the program of literature in the secondary schools that a committee of The National Council of Teachers of English attempted to discover how widely such publications are used and to get comment on the use of periodicals from teachers and writers in the field of education. A preliminary report was made by the committee in 1934; a year later the final report, The

Current Magazines and the Teaching of English, was published in mimeographed form and evidently not very widely circulated. The report contains information about the need for using periodicals, the manner of using them and specific magazines that might be used in the teaching of literature.

The report of the committee on magazines (14: 3-5) points out the popularity of magazine reading by pupils and adults, and the necessity for learning to discriminate between the numerous good and poor magazines. Anderson (85: 237) states in an essay in Reading in General Education that, since people read more magazines and fewer books as they grow older, it is one of the jobs of the schools to improve taste in the reading of magazines. Parker (154: 201-10) approves the use of magazines and newspapers to bring before the pupil modern thought, to accompany the presentation of the past through the classics, but Parker warns against treating the teaching of magazines and newspapers as though such a study were part of a journalism course, or easy reading not requiring careful work.

The Current Magazines and the Teaching of English reports that through the questionnaire sent to teachers no ideal magazines for use in the classroom were discovered. Often, however, there seems to be a basic assumption in most comments in professional books on periodicals that there are two kinds of magazines, good and bad, with exact dividing lines. An exception within Current Magazines and the Teaching of English

(14:32) often utilizing such a dichotomy, is the comment that teachers must read widely in magazines, choosing selections for class reading from magazines other than those traditionally accepted, to show pupils that they must recognize good writing wherever they find it. Cross and Carney (61: 502) point out the abundance of material in magazines on athletes, scientists and travellers that might interest pupils who have little interest in poetry or fiction, and propose using Open Road for Boys to help poorer pupils, even though the teacher himself might enjoy the Atlantic Monthly. The Reader's Digest is suggested for teachers as an aid in keeping up with magazines (146: 429-34).

Two methods of study (14: 13) are approved, reading and discussing content of stories and articles in magazines, and the study of the comparative value of magazines. Numerous devices are suggested for carrying out these studies: visiting newsstands, reviewing magazines, reporting the best short story, essay or verse for the month, from various magazines, using magazines for information with the help of periodical guides (14: 25-27). The study of magazines is usually thought appropriate for all four years of the senior high school, provided the study begins with simple material. A Correlated Curriculum (211: 224) contains the suggestion that continuous reference to periodicals is preferable to a short unit, and that the reference to material in periodicals

should be naturally introduced in the study of themes or units throughout the course in the secondary school.

The newspaper is not as commonly accepted as the magazine for use in the schools; its study, in fact, is called uncritical and doubtful by Anderson (85: 242). A section of An Experience Curriculum (95: 101-6), however, is devoted to informational reading, illustrated by readings in newspapers. Unlike many other units, the work with newspapers is to be done over a whole year or throughout the work of the secondary school. Getting headlines at a glance, reading news articles quickly with the aid of leads and summaries, careful reading of editorials to understand the problem and the organization of the editorial are all skills leading to keeping informed and broadening the range of one's information. In the professional books few newspapers are mentioned by name, with the exception of the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor. Mirrieles (146: 429-34) and Cross and Carney (61: 510) suggest an understanding of the function of the newspaper through discussions of the power behind a newspaper giving it its editorial policy and bias.

Moving pictures and radio.-- Even more prominent than periodicals in the present theory of the teaching of literature are the increasingly popular moving pictures or "movies," which they are now more frequently called than the older terms still in use, "motion pictures" or "photoplays." Moving

pictures had been accepted before 1935, not just as aids to literature in books, but as literary experiences in themselves, before the appearance of An Experience Curriculum. Film and School, published in 1937, another handbook of moving picture appreciation, stresses the movies as a source of information and attitudes, and a medium for acquiring critical judgment. Rand and Lewis (161), the authors of Film and School, demonstrate that the movies are a part of children's education, and insist that it is one of the functions of the school to develop intelligent movie-goers, just as it is the function of the school to develop intelligent readers.

Broadening the content of literature even further is the increased prominence, in the thirties and forties, of the radio, surpassing many times in total audience hours the very popular movies. No book at all comparable to the handbooks on moving picture appreciation appeared in the field of radio until the publication in 1941 of Radio and English Teaching. Professional writers, however, were aware of the significance of radio listening as literary experience at the time of the publication of An Experience Curriculum. Included in the latter are strands of literary experience entitled "Enjoying Photoplays," and "Listening to Radio Broadcasts." In an introductory note to the latter, it is pointed out that the radio has an important place in the lives of young people and an influence greater than the schools. Since

it has such importance, the editors conclude that pupils must learn how to discriminate in choosing their radio programs through training in radio listening. The units on radio (95: 64-65) utilize material clearly literary: dramatic sketches, monologues, criticism and readings of poetry. Study in listening to political speeches, scientific or factual programs is compared to non-literary, informational reading, which the theorists earlier recognized as worthy of attention in literature instruction.

Hatfield and Barnes (175: 25) emphasize the importance of appreciation and discrimination in listening as well as in reading. They point out that listening is a skill needed for movies, radio and the socialized recitation. O'Steen (99: 221) predicts that boys and girls may read much less in the year 1991 because they will see more movies and listen to more radio programs; Darrow (99: 80-81) predicts that libraries of radio transcriptions will become as common as libraries of books. LaBrant (85: 192-93) suggesting that movies might be accepted as a better means of preserving some stories than the book form, and that already the radio is to some extent, in broadcasting news for instance, substituting for the newspaper, concludes that "literature" may change its meaning to include forms of listening and looking. Parker (154: 20-26) and many other professional writers recognize commercial moving pictures and radio, not just the educational variety of film and radio program, as a means of stimu-

lating interest in modern books, and even in masterpieces, but do not overlook these media as a kind of literature in themselves.

Methods

Throughout the study the difficulty of separating content and methods into independent units has been noted. Presentation of literary material in this period by types and themes, utilizing newspapers, magazines, radio and movies, involves a method of teaching as well as a kind of literature to be taught. Several books published after 1935 are concerned primarily with the presentation of methods of teaching. Conducting Experiences in English is an attempt to translate An Experience Curriculum into classroom activities. Modern Techniques for Improving Secondary School English, another compilation of procedures actually used by teachers, is an attempt to show in practice modern philosophies of the teaching of literature. A lesser known collection of techniques and methods of teaching English, with emphasis on the "tricks" of presentation, is Practical Procedures in Teaching Secondary-School English. The report of the Committee on Correlation of the National Council of Teachers of English, A Correlated Curriculum, is another compilation of the methodology being utilized in schools and colleges.

Advice about planning the work in literature carefully, with not too much time given to one poem or prose selection,

about completing the teaching of one selection before beginning another, about making assignments that are not too long, too difficult or too vague, is a repetition of earlier material on methods. Reed Smith (189: 170-73) indicates that indifference must be broken down with a thrilling first presentation, and that the teacher must take advantage of and encourage such beginnings of appreciation. Broening (175: 102-3) reports a lesson in appreciation in which the emotional reaction from the oral reading by the teacher, and the intellectual stimulation from the questioning, are said to be intense and inspiring. Mirrieles (146: 310-11) also wants the pupil to be moved emotionally by literature, and to see the humorous as well as the tragic, to laugh and to cry over literary selections. These techniques as well as paraphrasing, reading aloud and memorization, which are to be discussed, were suggested in the theory of the teaching of literature long before 1935.

Paraphrasing.-- Making a careful translation of a passage of prose or poetry still has advocates in the thirties. Reed Smith (189: 122-23) claims that the *précis* gives thought in a concentrated form, and leads to intelligent reading, clear thinking and concise writing. An even stronger claim made for the paraphrase in one of the practical procedures listed by Prescott (160: 45) is that an intelligent paraphrase is the basis of all learning. Other writers note that the

paraphrase as used in the classroom is merely substituting for the original passage other words which aid little in the reading experience. These same writers point out that an analysis of meaning is more likely to expand the original selection than to summarize or shorten it. Emphatically rejecting the paraphrase for poetry, Drew (71: 52-53) states that poetry cannot be restated in prose without losing its impression and feeling.

Reading aloud.-- From a position of major importance, reading aloud in class had dropped before 1935 to a minor role, because of the emphasis on the skill of silent reading. Reed Smith (189: 158), however, is convinced, like Chubb many years earlier, that reading prose and poetry aloud can set the words free from the printed page. Dakin and Cross and Carney also advocate reading aloud, with some time spent in practicing oral reading. Shreve (177: 189-91), an advocate of oral reading, deplores the ineffective methods used in the schools for securing effective oral expression. Without completely disapproving the oral reading of literature, Hatfield and Barnes (175: 2-5) enter a protest against too much stress on oral expression. They suggest that pupils must be able to read a poem silently and still hear its music imaginatively.

Memorization.-- Remembering and reciting great passages of literature have almost completely dropped out of the

theory of the teaching of literature as a method or technique. Dakin (64: 234) still finds some virtue in the practice of memorizing famous passages, provided it is not overdone. Reed Smith (189: 174) carefully states that "some" teachers stimulate appreciation of a "few poems" by having pupils note their favorite passage. There seems to be an attempt here to placate the new school of theorists who do not approve of getting verbatim the "best" literature, but turn from such old methods to projects and units, utilizing new groupings of literature and new techniques.

Units and projects.-- The most significant development in the method of the teaching of literature is the substitution of units and projects for the page by page assignment and the book by book analysis. Some writers use the old method of teaching a single literary selection or a literary type, but claim the name "unit" for some days spent in the same kind of work. Reed Smith (189: 411) contends that he is using a unit method and a contract plan to offer varying amounts of work according to ability, and an opportunity for individual progress. Smith's "unit" is another name for an old method, with perhaps a long term assignment. Cross and Carney (61: 402), also trying to get on the band wagon with new educational terms, call the study of the short story a "short story unit." Dakin (64: 344-45) manages to include in her book a few pages on units and projects, with-

out actually using units in the regular program of literature which she suggests.

To a large extent, in spite of the pretense mentioned above, the teaching of the classics and teaching by types ~~are~~ giving way before the unit method suggested by An Experience Curriculum. The unit, or group of similar and related experiences, lasting one to three weeks, is an attempt to give the pupil an understanding that will enable him to meet successfully similar experiences of his own. Parker (154: 33-34) defines a unit as:

A series of unified activities through which pupils achieve a specific type of experience.

Activities in units are not always confined to reading or listening. For instance, units in Conducting Experiences in English (34: 26-28, 33-34) entitled "Understanding America" involve not only reading books with social significance, but visits to slums and municipal housing projects. "American Life of the Middle West" includes a discussion of the westward movement, a study of the skills needed by pioneers and the reading of The Covered Wagon, Cimarron and A Lantern in Her Hand. A Correlated Curriculum (211: 134) contains the suggestion that as preparation for the study of Tennyson's Idylls of the King, there can be a unit on the epic, utilizing Greek, Roman, French and Celtic myths. Modern Techniques for Improving Secondary School English (47: 19-20) includes units on social usage, using

books of etiquette, the woman's page of the local newspaper, movies and radio programs. Educating for Peace suggests units designed to stimulate pacifist sympathies through an understanding of various nations. The sample project (117: 181-85) for the twelfth grade utilized: A Farewell to Arms, Journey's End, So Red the Rose, magazine articles on war, radio programs, art, factual reports on the cost of war and interviews with people of various nationalities. All of these units and projects indicate clearly that the unit method leads naturally to correlation with other subjects.

Correlation.-- Not only the influence of An Experience Curriculum with its units and strands of experience, but the concept that literature embraces more than the belles lettres, led to correlation. Even before 1935 there were correlated studies of literature and the arts, literature and history, literature and other activities. Correlation, however, was not firmly established in the theory of the teaching of literature until An Experience Curriculum (95: 10-14) indicated that a correlated program must be attempted to provide the opportunity to see a clearer and less disjointed picture of life and to gain meaningful, related experiences. There are numerous recommendations regarding the relation of literature to history and to the other social studies, a relationship which Parker (154: 85) feels is brought about by the changing social order.

The intimate connection of English and other subjects is most clearly expressed in another report of a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English. A Correlated Curriculum, published in 1936, suggests repeatedly that teachers should utilize the best methods available, trying to correlate wherever possible, not rushing headlong into an entirely new program, but trying to have their curriculum evolve eventually to complete integration. Older attempts at correlation were often done through incidental reference to other fields, without aim or purpose, but to the committee (211:10) correlation is more than an enrichment of the English course by materials from other fields. The newer forms of correlation presented in A Correlated Curriculum (211: 5-6) are: courses based on correlation with one or more subjects without modification of the courses, fusion with one or more subjects, integration of all educational subjects, and a curriculum transcending subject matter divisions. The numerous examples of correlation given in the report relate literature to singing, dancing, the fine arts, crafts, history and science. In the study of strange places, the class is to read Stanley's Through the Dark Continent and other books by explorers; in a unit on heroes of science, such books as Microbe Hunters and Life of Pasteur (211: 36-41). With the correlation of the fine arts, the organization of the course is suggested by period, by art, by basic principle or by theme. For example (211: 156-64) a mood of gaiety, or

the theme of evil, pain or worship can be traced through all the arts. In such a study the student is to attend concerts, visit art museums, art and furniture stores, read and search through art and music books.

The effort to relate and integrate various courses of the curriculum is not limited to A Correlated Curriculum or An Experience Curriculum. Jacobs (1:194) proposes a core curriculum of social science and English for the eleventh grade, dealing with American history and current problems, and utilizing magazines, newspapers, radio and discussions in home and church. The philosophy of correlation is expressed throughout Literature as Exploration by Rosenblatt (167: 187), whose guiding principle is that literature cannot be studied apart from other activities. She notes that it is not nearly as significant for the pupil to get his social studies and literature at the same time or in the same course as it is that he understand that the same factors underlie all fields of experience (167: 322).

As in earlier periods, a few writers seem more concerned with mentioning the relation of several subjects and finding some time during the program when courses can deal with related subject matter, than with a true fusion or correlation. Others still separate literature from other fields, not advocating separation, but following automatically and traditionally the teaching of literature in isolation from other fields

of knowledge. In similar fashion, some of the theorists advocating correlation tend to separate the various phases of English: literature, reading, oral composition and written composition. Even An Experience Curriculum lists separately units for literature, reading, creative expression and communication. Parker (154: v-vi) objects to books of theory in the field of English which unnaturally divide the field into grammar, composition and literature, instead of seeing the study as a single unit. Parker points out that in practice there is a mixture of the various phases of the subject. In Great Britain, Callan (38: 9-20) regrets that little is being done to stimulate children to write poetry, and that teachers who teach poetry do not write it. There is some attempt by the professional writers to relate composition and literature. Mirrielees (146: 278-92) suggests that an imaginative theme be assigned after myths are studied, and that, after studying A Tale of Two Cities, Ivanhoe and Silas Marner, themes be written that are somewhat imitative in style. In units and projects there is often a more natural correlation than the half-hearted attempt on the part of Mirrielees. Reading and speaking are often recognized as a part of the course in literature. But considering the repeated demands for correlation of English with other subjects, it is surprising that there is not a complete integration within the field of English itself. In 1937, after the publication of An Experience Curriculum and A Correlated Curriculum, Center and Persons (41: vi) wrote

that "there seemed to be impending" a revision of the English curriculum in which reading and writing will be considered complementary studies, and even grammar will be studied for its help to the reader as well as to the writer. The unnatural division and separation of composition and literature continue after 1937 in the theory of the teaching of English, with a few books, such as Language in General Education being notable exceptions.

Library.-- Due to the more extensive reading involved in the study by units and in correlated programs, the library is seldom considered apart and separate from the classroom. In creating an interest in books the teacher is asked to recognize library skills as part of the program in literature (34: 108-10). Mirrielees (146: 436) terms the library an "English laboratory." A reading room library and a classroom library are commonly accepted by theorists and teachers as equipment required in progressive schools. The librarian is considered an important member of the regular English staff, in at least one book, The Librarian and the Teacher of English. The latter is an account of the work at the Ohio State University Demonstration School, where the librarian-teacher worked with other English teachers and pupils to develop programs of reading. The librarian comes into the classroom, discusses the problems of reading with pupils, and with the cooperation of the teacher tries to get every child to read

books that will prove interesting and helpful to him. The teacher of English, according to the Ohio State University experiment (98: 31) should spend time in the library familiarizing himself with books, and in the classroom discussing books with pupils. Less ambitious library programs, leading to frequent, natural and helpful use of library facilities, are advocated by other professional writers of the present period.

Aids to literary experience.--- Generally speaking, after 1935 the devices suggested for aiding the teaching of literature are accepted as a regular part of the classroom program. Most of the aids suggested were used and written about before 1935: pictures, phonograph records, bulletin boards, dramatizations, pageants, clay models, slides, charts, literary and dramatic clubs. It is interesting to note that in 1939 Conducting Experiences in English (34: 46-50) includes such devices as the lining up of characters from The Odyssey as members of opposing football teams, and the writing in class of a paper called the Sherwood Gazette, with sensational news items from Ivanhoe, and then in 1940 to read LaBrant's condemnation of such aids. She writes:

Schemes were invented to conceal ineffective teaching. Miniature castles, and models of theatres were used to relieve boredom and to take the place of reading classics (85: 199).

The comment is certainly critical of devices used in a volume which purported to put into practice the philosophy of An

Experience Curriculum. There is no implication in the above quotation that aids and schemes used in teaching are always a screen to cover up poor teaching. The radio, phonograph, pictures and moving pictures are an accepted part of the program in literature, whether used incidentally or as important features of the course.

Tests and appraisal.-- Few American writers go as far as the British writer, Potter (159: 262), who declares that there should be no examination in literature. Instead, the word of the teachers and tutors with whom the student studies should determine the adequacy of the work and the grade to be received. The tests advocated for the American secondary schools (34: 309-18, 343) are coming to be less and less for grades and more for giving the teacher insight into the pupil's thinking. It is noted in An Experience Curriculum that measurement and appraisal should be used for determining whether the individual or the class needs new experiences. Kilpatrick (1: 29) wants to discover whether the pupil is interested in what he is doing, whether the interest is increasing and whether such interest is significant in the development of the child's personality. The real test of what has been accomplished in the teaching of literature, according to Parker, is the attitude that has become habitual, or as Leonard (2:22) expresses it, how well the pupil is solving his problems and how satisfying his life is.

An Experience Curriculum (95: 9) rules out testing for facts about literature, but others still advocate objective and essay type tests based on specific pieces of literature. Mirrielees (146: 511) approves objective tests in literature with questions on the plot of The Great Stone Face, identification of authors, and recognition of the dramatic interest and of the setting of Silas Marner. Dakin (64: 356-62) advocates emphasis in the examination on what had been stressed in class, with most questions "thought" questions, and only one question devoted to facts. Reed Smith (189: 457-66) recommends such standardized tests as the Carroll Prose Appreciation Test, Abbott-Trabue Excellence in Judging Poetry, Hartley Test of Interpretive Reading, the Stanford Comprehension in Literature, and the Logasa-Wright Test for Appreciation of Literature.

Teacher.-- In the theory of the teaching of literature the selection and training of the teacher of English are still considered extremely important. An Experience Curriculum (95: 312-23) devotes a twelve page section to teacher education, recommending training in oral reading, history of language and composition; survey courses in American and English literature, Shakespeare and the drama, world literature, poetry, prose fiction and the essay; and twenty-three semester hours of methods, materials of literature and practice teaching. A year or two after the publication of An Experience Curriculum

there was a tendency to discredit professional courses in the methods and materials of literature, courses which are said in 1940 to be in disrepute. Shreve (177: 268) emphasizes the need for a broad training in other fields besides literature: science, social studies, languages and the fine arts; Rosenblatt (167: 30), the need for learning more about science and social problems at the expense of what she considers ineffective training in college and graduate school.

An Experience Curriculum recommends careful selection of prospective teachers at the end of the sophomore year in college, on the basis of physical fitness, mental ability and personality. The basis for choosing the teacher seems undemocratic, when judged by the following guide for selection:

We would give preference to those who, in addition to possessing these physical, mental and personal capacities, come from rich mental and social backgrounds with high cultural standards of living. That no possible Abraham Lincoln be excluded, we would admit those from lower social and cultural levels who possess superior mental and personal qualities and strong professional interests (95: 314).

Rosenblatt (167: 149, 153), less influenced by consideration of "cultural levels" and "social backgrounds," insists that the teacher must be aware of the assumptions of his own philosophy, must admit his own doubts and inconsistencies and must tolerate points of view different from his own.

"The Basic Aims for English Instruction in American Schools" (187: 54) recommends social awareness and a sympathetic at-

titude toward young people as more important than knowledge of literature and of methods.

Many professional books of the period give advice to the teacher to advance himself professionally by reading widely, attending conferences, joining professional organizations, attending plays, taking vacations and reading the English Journal and other professional magazines. Wide reading by the teacher and prospective teacher of English in magazines, professional books and books of literary criticism is given impetus by books on the teaching of English. Mirrieles, for instance, includes in her book lengthy bibliographies of books, and references to hundreds of magazine articles on techniques and aids for teaching. Hundreds of magazine articles are referred to in Reading and General Education, and Conducting Experiences in English lists over 300 articles.

Conducting Experiences in English (34: 3) also notes that teaching English should be a creative experience for teachers as well as for pupils. In a much more practical vein, several writers discuss everyday problems of teachers: clothes, the relation of the teacher to his fellow teachers, to the superintendent and to the community, discipline in the classroom, and the attitude of the teacher outside of the classroom.

Summary

An Experience Curriculum in English, published in 1935 by the National Council of Teachers of English, is the outgrowth of many requests for curriculum materials. Like Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, which emphasized "new" aims in 1917, An Experience Curriculum is not a pronouncement of new methods and new materials in literature suddenly invented by a small progressive wing in the field of the teaching of English. Instead, the National Council of Teachers of English appointed in 1929 a representative national group, which presented, after years of study, a model program in English to guide teachers, superintendents and local and state courses of study committees in establishing their own courses from kindergarten through the secondary school. Four years after the publication of An Experience Curriculum, the National Council of Teachers of English published Conducting Experiences in English, examples of teaching practices by hundreds of teachers attempting to follow in general the suggestions of An Experience Curriculum. Modern Techniques for Improving Secondary School English, published by the New York City Association of Teachers of English, is another of several collections of devices and techniques utilized in the practice of the teaching of English. The actual teaching of literature in the schools now has more influence on the theory of the teaching of literature, and

is accepted as part of that theory.

More and more, groups and associations formulate the theory of the teaching of English, with the National Council of Teachers of English and its impressive list of monographs well in the lead. Books in such closely related fields as supervision, reading, library and radio also are part of the theory of the teaching of literature. The author or authors unattached to an association or sponsoring group have become less prominent than monographs and collections of essays by numerous experts, but are, nevertheless, still contributors to a theory much more closely allied to practice than before 1935. Even the independent professional writers take more notice of and make more frequent reference to other writings in the field: magazine articles appearing in the English Journal, book lists, educational literature, literary criticism and other professional books.

Five independent writers, Mirrielees, Reed Smith, Dakin, Cross and Carney, tend to follow traditional practices, and to conform to the aims and outlines of An Experience Curriculum and other monographs only in minor respects. There are also single essays in the collections on the teaching of English, and sections of the monographs, which, by undemocratic and superficial attitudes, qualify and even disapprove the stand of the majority of writers in the same publications.

The emphasis on content and procedures in the mono-

graphs tends to minimize aims in the teaching of English, although the clear statement of aims in An Experience Curriculum indicates a broader purpose in the present period for the course in English than that conceived earlier by Reorganization of English or the most advanced professional writer before 1935. The basic aim of An Experience Curriculum is to promote responsible, flexible behavior in a changing world, through a curriculum consisting of experiences related to life as well as to literature. Literature as Exploration and Psychology of the Teaching of English also stress as a prime concern in the teaching of literature the pupil's personal and social adjustment, taking precedence over the aim of appreciation. Appreciation as an aim, however, still persists, in spite of its basic assumption of fixed standards of the "best" reading and of "good taste" in literature. Mirrielees and a few others defend inclusion of the classics, but also advocate modern and simpler readings in the course in literature. For most writers the content of the course in literature has grown far beyond the classics to include informational books, modern belles lettres, newspapers and magazines, and beyond these to include moving pictures and radio programs.

In "Basic Aims for English Instruction in American Schools," published in 1942, the National Council of Teachers of English restates its belief in the need for teaching individuals. It

is recognized by most writers that the course in literature needs to differentiate its objectives and its content for pupils whose differences are physical, social, intellectual and religious. Many writers state that the course cannot provide for its pupils until teachers note these differences, diagnose individual needs, make an attempt to provide for them, encourage pupils to discover and help solve their own problems, and provide corrective teaching for the dull pupil and the poor reader. For some theorists, mainly in the field of literary criticism, one choice of books for all readers still involves differentiation, since meaning is not predetermined and fixed, but depends upon the interpretation of each reader. Deliberate attempts to make the course in literature of immediate value to every pupil while in school are suggested by meeting his vocational as well as his social and psychological needs. Adult problems, however, are not lost sight of, since one of the purposes of the more flexible teaching of literature is to prepare the pupil to meet new, sometimes unpredictable, problems that confront him in after-school life.

The most obvious change in the course in literature suggested in the professional books after 1935 is the organization of the work around themes. The threads of experience and the units of An Experience Curriculum give a new framework to the course in literature that stimulates more purposeful and more unified teaching than that of the single masterpiece pre-

sented for its own sake or as a representative selection of a type of writing. Units, projects and more extensive material were occasionally suggested in the theory of the teaching of literature before 1935, but the broader scope for the course in practice and in theory is now more commonly accepted and implemented. Besides the unit organization based on theme, the closer relationships with the librarian, the supervisor and the reading counselor allow the teacher to engage in a broader, more effective program in literature. A Correlated Curriculum, another publication of the National Council of Teachers of English, recommends cooperation, correlation, integration and fusion of various courses in the secondary school. In many other publications there are objections to the departmentalization and separation of literature from other fields of study, which prevent not only a well integrated course but the understanding of scientific and historical implications of the literature read in and out of school.

Entirely out of keeping with the trend toward correlation is the unnatural separation of composition, literature and other phases of English, a separation which persists in the theory of the teaching of English. An exception to this separation is the recognition by most professional writers of the close relationship between the teaching of the skill of reading and the teaching of literature. No longer considered a skill which one has either acquired or not acquired

in elementary school, reading is often described as a continuous process or a developing skill which is never completely learned or finished. There are even those at the present time who state that it does not matter what books are read, as long as there is development in reading through the course in literature. Reading is variously described and defined, but there is a more concerted effort on the part of professional writers to analyze and understand the reading process.

As in the transition period, 1917 to 1935, any attempt to summarize and classify the dominant social and philosophic forces of the present period with its conflicts and disagreements must take account of conservative writers with an allegiance to the past and liberal writers looking to the future. Unlike the transition period, the period from 1935 on manifests a superficial if not a profound agreement. It has been indicated in this chapter that those professional writers following a pattern of aims and techniques suggested before 1935 and even before 1917 use such terms as "correlation," "units," and "projects" to describe their conventional plans for teaching literature. These same terms are used more meaningfully by other writers, for whom even the social realism of the transition period is inadequate. The dominant social theory is experimentalism, although social realism is still a force in the theory of the most progressive professional writers in the field of literature. The underlying philosophy

of the period is pragmatism, although idealism and realism are basic to the theories of many professional writers.

The social theory of experimentalism in the present period is indicated by the desire of many writers to be ruled by the needs of the present-day world and its problems rather than by tradition, by their trust in the individual and their focus upon his adjustment, by their belief that intelligent conduct is more important than knowledge of the classics. Literature has come to have importance because it is a factor in the pupil's experience, in his way of living as an adolescent and as an adult. The keynote of the present period is individual and social adjustment because the modern theorist suggests literature for its functional value, for adjusting the pupil psychologically that he may find adjustment in his relationships with others. To this end theorists and progressive teachers suggest an experimental program of literary and related experiences based on the pupil's interests and needs, and taking account of his physical, intellectual, emotional and social differences.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem.-- This historical study of the theories of the teaching of literature in the American secondary schools was undertaken at the suggestion of a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English, appointed to investigate the history of the teaching of English. The study, although limited to theories proposed after 1900, traces the background by reviewing the forerunners of the major source of material: books, pamphlets, monographs and collections of essays and suggestions, published in the United States from 1900 to the present time, on the methodology of the teaching of literature in secondary schools. These publications, dealing with the objectives and methodology of the teaching of literature, referred to in this study as "professional books," their authors as "professional writers" and "theorists," were supplemented by books on the teaching of literature in Great Britain and a few publications in the fields of education and literary criticism.

Subdivisions.-- As a framework of reference for examining the theories under investigation, the following subdivisions were used:

1. The aims of the teaching of literature.
2. The core of literary material required for all pupils.
3. The differentiation of objectives and materials of literature for pupils with diverse interests and abilities.
4. The suitability of the course in literature to the needs of the pupils.
5. The specific content and methods of the course in literature.

These subdivisions were adapted from questions posed by Dora Smith (186: 83) in her comprehensive study of the practice of the teaching of English, Instruction in English, published in 1932 as a monograph of the National Survey of Secondary Education.

The periods.-- To facilitate the survey of the theories of the teaching of literature in American schools, the writings examined according to the above subdivisions have been divided into periods according to their years of publication. The following are the three periods of the study:

- I. 1900 - 1917
- II. 1917 - 1935
- III. 1935 -

Although the periods shade into each other, they represent, in general, different approaches to the teaching of literature. The first period began at the turn of the century, shortly after which was published Chubb's The Teaching of English in

the Elementary and the Secondary School, the first textbook designed specifically for use by teachers in training and by experienced teachers studying the methods of the teaching of English. The second period began with the publication of the Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, a report of a subcommittee of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The third and present period began in 1935 with the publication of An Experience Curriculum in English, a report of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Summary by periods.--- Since the classification by periods has been justified by the statement that in each period there was a tendency to use a different approach to the teaching of literature, a brief statement of the trend in each period is presented. The forerunners of the twentieth century books of the first period defended the inclusion of the study of the mother tongue to accompany the study of the classical languages and literatures in the eighteen sixties, seventies and eighties. Influenced by the Report of the Conference on English of the Committee of Ten in 1893 and the college entrance requirements, recommendations were made that in the teaching of literature in the secondary schools, the classic masterpieces of English and some American literature should be read and studied, instead of memorizing facts about the authors and the historic background of the writings. The

first professional books of the twentieth century continued the study of the masterpieces of English and American literature, or the classics, as they were called, under the domination of the college entrance requirements, which dictated the masterpieces to be studied and fostered the close connection between the writing of compositions about the classics and the reading of the classics. Although following the pattern of the course dictated by the college entrance requirements, the professional books from 1900 to 1917 stressed the aims of taste and appreciation of literature, and the attainment of ideals.

The publication of Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools marked the beginning of a period which still included study of the classics for college preparation, but which nevertheless broke away from the domination of college entrance requirements to utilize some modern literary selections, informational reading material and magazines, and to emphasize a familiarity with different types of writing rather than with particular masterpieces. Some provision was suggested for pupils in vocational and rural schools and for pupils not planning to enter college. Finally, the relinquishing of the hold of college entrance requirements on secondary-school teaching, although there were less stringent college requirements for entrance from 1916 on, brought an emphasis on the interrelation of the elementary school, the junior high school and the senior high school, in place of the

close secondary school-college relationship.

In An Experience Curriculum in English and the monographs and books that follow it, study and work units in literature are recommended for all levels of the common schools, often relating the course in literature more closely to the experience of the pupil's everyday life. The unit method of teaching, based upon the themes or content of the writings, marks a distinct trend away from emphasis on form or types of writing and allows unified teaching of more meaningful material for the pupil. The theory of this third and present period suggests a broader concept of literature that includes the skill of reading, and is more closely linked with the actual practice of the teaching of literature in the schools.

Conflicting theories.-- The brief statement of trends in the theory of the teaching of literature has ignored conflicting theories within each period. Such conflicting and antagonistic views within the same period cannot be ignored or even minimized, if the theory is to be presented impartially, and without bias for proving unanimity and constant progress. Among the forerunners of the professional books published in the nineteenth century there was at least one book focusing on the pupil rather than on the classic masterpiece, and striving to secure student initiative and free expression of opinion in the classroom instead of docile acceptance of "good" literature. In the first period, although many theorists accepted literature in the secondary school as preparation for college,

some writers emphasized the need for other aims. Many early professional writers recommended some guidance for the individual pupil, the introduction of modern literature and teaching books by types to gain a general familiarity with literature.

In the second period several professional books, representing a sharper break with tradition than did Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, proposed more democratic aims, a friendlier relationship in the classroom to stimulate honesty and independence on the part of the pupils and individual instruction to provide for differences in ability. On the other hand, another group of writers refused to accept the separation of college preparatory and non-college pupils proposed by Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, and recommended retaining a fixed body of literature for all to study. In the present period, some writers still defend the classics as material most pupils should know, still cling to the method of teaching by type instead of the newer teaching by theme, still stress appreciation and taste instead of personal and social adjustment through literature.

Aims in the teaching of literature.-- At the risk of repeating some of the trends noted in the short analyses of each period, the theories of the teaching of literature in American secondary schools from 1900 on are examined in the framework of the subdivisions without distinction by period,

but with consideration of history and chronology. Before 1900 little attention was given to the objectives of the course in literature in the secondary schools, since, for the most part, college preparation was considered ample aim and goal in itself. After 1900, however, college preparation was not considered sufficient aim or purpose for the course in literature. There was a demand for a clearer definition of principles. The most common aims suggested by the professional writers were the understanding of what is read, the acquisition of appreciation and the establishment of taste for acceptable reading. In the twenties there was much more disagreement than before about the basic purpose of the course in literature. The cry for more definite aims continued. Appreciation was still the most commonly accepted aim, although there were many writers who believed that it was more important for pupils to derive enjoyment from literature. Vicarious experience, suggested earlier as an aim, was directed at leading to an understanding of the pupil's own experience. In spite of the present tendency to minimize aims in favor of methods and content, many objectives hinted at earlier are now stated more clearly and have become more firmly established in theory and even in the practice of the teaching of literature in the secondary schools. To attain through literature personal and social adjustment dur-

ing school years, as well as in adult life, is the dominant aim in the theory of the teaching of literature in the secondary schools at the present time.

The core of literary material required for all pupils.--

The almost exclusive aim of preparation for college in the theory of the teaching of literature in the nineteenth century, persisting in the early years of the twentieth century as one of the major aims, necessitated for all pupils the study of required materials. As the college requirements became less rigid, due to the recognition of the needs of pupils not preparing for college, the classics became at first a preferred core of studies that pupils should study and later a small core of materials accepted by a few professional writers who suggested their inclusion to instill appreciation and taste. Strongly influenced by Dewey and the pragmatists in education and philosophy, the present trend of the theory of the teaching of literature is away from fixed standards of literature, fixed meanings and interpretations, and fixed ideals of attitude and behavior, automatically eliminating any core of required reading material for all pupils. The pupil is to read, according to this philosophy of the teaching of literature, any book which will aid him in his reading skill, in his personal and group adjustment at the time he is in school and in acquiring his conception of social values and purposes for adult life.

Differentiation of objectives and materials.-- As the required literature for all pupils to read diminished, the differentiation of objectives and materials increased. The ever growing and diverse population of the secondary schools required special provision by the theorists; at first for those not entering college; then for those in special schools, in the junior high school and in different grades of the senior high school; and finally for pupils of less than average ability, particularly in reading skill. In the college preparatory course the assumption had been that every pupil learned to read in the elementary school. Diversified and simpler readings were suggested, when it was discovered that many pupils did not have an elementary reading skill and that the classics were too difficult for these and other pupils in school. Although there was a tendency as late as 1935 in the theory of the teaching of literature to separate the skill of reading from the enjoyment and appreciation of literature, many professional writers noted the inseparable relationship of reading and literature, and the need for diagnosing reading difficulties, and providing remedial reading for non-readers as well as more individualized guidance to provide for varying reading abilities and interests. Now that the "average pupil" has been exposed as a mid-point, which does not coincide with any one pupil in all respects, teachers are advised by the theorists to be aware of physical, social, intellectual and emotional differences,

to diagnose individual needs and to provide for them.

Suitability of the course in literature.-- The required study of masterpieces of literature dictated by the Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English met some of the needs of all pupils, if every pupil in school planned to enter college. To claim that this program of literature, even then, met all of the needs of all pupils is to argue that the teaching of literature in the secondary schools had only one purpose - preparation for college. Under the program mainly set by the college requirements, however, an attempt was made in the theory of the teaching of literature to instill appreciation of what the professional writers considered the best writing and the best ideals of conduct. Before 1910 there was expressed a dissatisfaction with literary materials and methods which did not serve those in the secondary schools who were not going to college. The introduction of informational reading, easier and more interesting reading was aimed at providing material that was better suited to the diverse population of the secondary school. Recommendations of enjoyment of reading and reading to solve individual problems, in place of knowledge of the classics, were designed to fit the needs of pupils while in school. The introduction of the study of types of writing to replace the intensive study of single masterpieces of literature and the integrated unit of literary and other experiences to supplant purely literary

considerations were designed to meet reading and social needs of the pupil in adult life.

Content and methods.-- Since almost all phases of content and methods of the course in literature suggested by the professional writers have already been touched upon and since the detailed enumeration of specific content and methods is out of place in this final chapter or summary, only the briefest indication of the general trends of content and methods suggested in the theory of the teaching of literature in secondary schools is given here. For more detailed analyses of the trends and the conflicting materials and techniques suggested in each period, the reader must turn to the other chapters of the study. The content for the teaching of literature, which was suggested originally by the study of the classical languages and literatures, grew from a small body of required and established literary masterpieces to an almost limitless number of materials. In the theory of the teaching of literature in the secondary schools there was a somewhat steady progression from a few required classics to a choice of supplementary classics; from the wider choice of classics to modern belles lettres, informational books and periodicals; from this wide assortment of reading materials to the acceptance of more diversified publications, as well as the new media of literature, moving pictures and radio.

The progression in methods is similar to that of content,

if one is willing to ignore the persistence of authoritarian, neo-Aristotelian professional writers from before 1900 to the present time. From the intensive study of the classics in the classroom, methodology broadened to include outside reading. Drill, parsing, memorization, emphasis on form, written examinations for facts gave way to devices and techniques introduced to interest pupils in literature and to relate the work in literature to out of school experiences. With the acceptance of the philosophic concept that teaching by a fixed method does not meet pupils' needs, theorists advise the integration of literature with other fields of experience, and recommend a functional teaching program for guiding pupils to develop an intelligent and flexible attitude toward literature and toward their own adolescent and future adult problems.

Philosophic bases.— Having noted the general trends of the theory of the teaching of literature according to chronology and according to the subdivisions of the study, summaries follow of the philosophic bases, the social and literary theories of literature in the secondary schools. It has already been suggested that there is no clear agreement at any time among the theorists of the teaching of literature, but the underlying philosophies and the dominant social and literary theories of each period are presented to round out the general picture of the theory of the teach-

ing of literature in American secondary schools from 1900 to the present.

The theorists of the teaching of literature before the twentieth century and in the first decade and a half of the present century were, for the most part, idealists who believed in the established values of the past, who believed that any progress is based upon these absolute values, and that everyone should strive for the breadth possessed by the ancients who led the "Good Life." The idealists saw life separated into practical and aesthetic aspects, and schooling concerned separately with knowledge of facts, mainly about the past, and appreciation of beauty, about which there could be no disagreement.

During the period 1917-1935 a transition in underlying philosophy was taking place. To a certain extent there prevailed a philosophy of realism, which instilled a belief in the schools as a part of the social fabric, dependent upon the demands of modern society. The absolute values and the idealist's disdain for the practical were opposed by realists, but there still persisted a modified belief in certain absolutes and in the virtues of the past. On the other hand there was a trend toward the philosophy of the coming period - pragmatism. Pragmatism is the philosophic basis or foundation for much of the theory of the teaching of literature from 1935 on, although not completely dominant because realism and idealism still persist as philosophic background for some

modern theories of literature. The pragmatist insists that there are no absolute principles which cannot be modified, that whatever is learned must be related to other experiences, that one cannot give the answers to new problems, that life must be prepared for, not in terms of the past, but in terms of free intelligence playing upon experience. These are underlying concepts of the "experience" philosophy in the teaching of literature at the present time.

Social and literary theories.-- Before the turn of the century writers in the field of the teaching of literature were humanists who believed in the elevating influence of the classics. So also were the first professional writers of the twentieth century whose two major aims were appreciation of the best that has been written and learning by the vicarious experience of living over the experiences of the past. The dominant literary theory of the period 1900-1917 was that of academic accomplishment, the belief that literature instruction endows the pupil with scholarly and social distinction. In the period of the reorganization of English, some writers clung to the humanism and academic accomplishment of the previous period and others looked forward to the experimentalism and adjustment of the next period. The major trend was toward social realism, with its scientific methods, its diagnosis, its use of practical, interesting and contemporary material. The literary theory of the middle period was

individual attainment, a recognition of the individual and of the practical aspect of literature, of the need for learning to read and enjoying what is read.

The dominant social theory of education at the present time is experimentalism, with social realism still an important factor. The present literary theory of individual and social adjustment is a natural companion of experimentalism. Both theories conceive of literature as having meaning only as it functions in the life of the pupil. Both theories conceive of intelligent conduct as more important than knowledge of the past. The experimentalist and the modern theorist in the teaching of literature make literature an active factor in the pupil's experience, relate it to his other experiences and judge its effectiveness by its contribution to the pupil's intelligent behavior in a changing world.

A Statement of the Writer's Recommendations

After summarizing the theories of the teaching of literature in American secondary schools, the author of this study turns to his own recommendations, based largely upon the publications investigated for this study, and to some extent on his own observations and experiments in teaching literature, journalism, composition and speech in secondary schools and in a teachers' college.

1. The teaching of literature in the secondary school

should make a contribution to the continuous program of the development of reading and language skills, and should serve as an introduction to future reading.

2. The teaching of literature should be part of a broadly integrated or fused program of studies, whenever possible, and never separated from the teaching of written and oral composition, which are based on the same language and communication skills as reading and literature.

3. Only readings with an appeal and a degree of meaning for the pupil will bring about the necessary individual interaction between reader and what is read.

4. The teaching of literature should stimulate an active appreciative response through a simplified, non-technical understanding of arrangement, emphasis and rhythm of prose and poetry, of clarity and depth of figurative language, of appropriateness and force of words, of the distinction between statements of fact and statements of opinion, and of the basic assumptions, biases, and logic of the author or the characters the author presents.

5. The pupil should gain a critical awareness of the several contemporary literary media: the radio, movies, stage, newspapers and magazines.

6. The pupil should develop an ability to read thoughtfully modern editorials, political commentaries, critical essays and other readings not chosen especially for their literary merit.

7. Through belles lettres, philosophy, history and other readings, the pupil should be given some understanding of ideas and points of view that have molded American culture, the relationship of that culture to the past and to the thought of other nations.

8. The function of the teacher is to serve as a guide, by aiding in the selection of materials, organizing the course, by stimulating discussion in which pupils share their reactions and ideas with each other and with the teacher, by sharing his own experiences and understanding with the class, and by a sympathetic and friendly relationship with individual pupils.

9. In summary, it is the teacher's purpose in the teaching of literature to lead pupils to a fuller intellectual and emotional understanding, through an active response to what is read in the narrow field of literature or the belles lettres, what is read for information in books and periodicals, what is seen on the moving picture screen or in the life about the pupil in and out of school, what is heard on the radio, at the movies, in other school classrooms, in speeches and in the conversation of family and friends.

Problems for Future Investigation

The following related studies are suggested for future investigation:

1. An historical study of the theory of the teaching of composition in American secondary schools from 1900.
2. An historical study of the influence of the National Council of Teachers of English and its publications, particularly the English Journal, on the teaching of English in American schools.
3. An experimental study in the secondary schools in which literature is taught to a control group without special training in language skills, and to an experimental group given a brief, non-technical, introductory study of some of the language skills, such as distinguishing between statements of fact and statements of opinion, discovering basic assumptions, testing the logic of presentation, and understanding appropriateness, clarity, arrangement, emphasis, rhythm and other factors of form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Appy, Nellie, Chairman. Pupils Are People. A Report of the Committee on Individual Differences, National Council of Teachers of English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1941. Pp. xiii / 303.
2. Association of Assistant Mistresses in Secondary Schools. Memorandum on the Teaching of English. London: University of London Press, 1932. Pp. 71.
3. Bain, Alexander. On Teaching English: With Examples and An Enquiry into the Definitions of Poetry. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1908. Pp. xiii / 256.
4. Baker, Franklin T. "Present Discontents about High School English." Proceedings of the New York State Teachers Association 66th Annual Meeting, pp. 232-36. Fort Edward, New York: New York State Teachers Association, 1912.
5. Baker, Franklin T.; Hays, Edna; Grey, Lennox, Editors. A.A.... Teacher of English Teachers; Some of His Writings on Teaching and Literary Art. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941. Pp. 84.
6. Ballard, Philip Boswood. Teaching and Testing English. London: University of London Press, 1939. Pp. xi / 167.
7. Barnes, Walter. The New Democracy in the Teaching of English. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company, 1923. Pp. x / 95.
8. Bate, R. S. The Teaching of English Literature in Secondary Schools. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1913. Pp. viii / 177.
9. Bates, Arle. Talks on the Study of Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1897. Pp. 260.
10. Bates, Arle. Talks on Teaching Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1906. Pp. 247.

11. Bates, Herbert, Chairman. Books for Home Reading for High School and Junior High School; Graded and Classified. Prepared for the National Council of Teachers of English by its Committee on Home Reading. Chicago: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1923. Pp. 64.
12. Bateson, Frederick Wilse. English Poetry and the English Language; An Experiment in Literary History. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. vii / 129.
13. Beckham, Carolyn. "The History of the Teaching of High School English from 1870-1900." Unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1938. Pp. 160.
14. Bessey, Mabel A., Chairman. The Current Magazines and the Teaching of English. Chicago: The National Council of Teachers of English. Pp. 75 (mimeographed).
15. Bessey, Mabel A., and Coffin, Isabelle P. Reading for Understanding. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936. Pp. xiv / 325.
16. Biaggini, Ernest Gordon. The Reading and Writing of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1936. Pp. xxvii / 240.
17. Blain, Hugh Mercer. Literature in the High School. University Bulletin, Vol. V, No. 6. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, June, 1914. Pp. 38.
18. Blaisdell, Albert F. Study of the English Classics; A Practical Handbook for Teachers, A Guide to English Literature. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1886 (revised). Pp. vii / 303.
19. Blaisdell, Thomas Charles. Ways to Teach English. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Doran Company, 1930. Pp. ix / 566.
20. Blakely, G. S. Teachers' Outlines for Studies in English. Based on the Requirements for Admission to College. New York: American Book Company, 1908. Pp. 174.
21. Boas, Ralph Philip. The Study and Appreciation of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931. Pp. 356.
22. Boas, Ralph Philip, and Burton, Katherine. Social Backgrounds of American Literature. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1933. Pp. xii / 353.

23. Boas, Ralph Philip, and Hahn, B. M. Social Backgrounds of English Literature. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1923. Pp. xii / 337.
24. Boas, Ralph Philip, and Smith, Edwin. Enjoyment of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1934. Pp. xviii / 553.
25. Boas, Ralph Philip, and Smith, Edwin. An Introduction to the Study of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1925. Pp. xii / 454.
26. Bobbitt, Franklin. The Curriculum of Modern Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941. Pp. xii / 419.
27. Boillot, F. The Methodical Study of Literature. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1924. Pp. viii / 162.
28. Bolenius, Emma Miller. Teaching Literature in the Grammar Grades and High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915. Pp. xv / 337.
29. Bolenius, Emma Miller. Teaching Literature in the Grammar Grades and High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929 (revised). Pp. xv / 347.
30. Bolenius, Emma Miller, Editor. Widening Horizons. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929. Pp. xiii / 754.
31. Bowen, H. Courthope. English Literature Teaching in Schools; Two Lectures with Examples. London: Percival and Company, 1891. Pp. 56.
32. Bracken, G. H. Teaching of English in Secondary Schools for Girls. London: University of London Press, 1924. Pp. xxxii / 238.
33. Broening, Angela M. Developing Appreciation Through Teaching Literature. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1929. Pp. ix / 118.
34. Broening, Angela M., Chairman. Conducting Experiences in English. National Council of Teachers of English, Monograph No. 8. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939. Pp. xvi / 394.

35. Brown, George P. On the Teaching of English in Elementary and High Schools. Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1906. Pp. 65.
36. Buck, Gertrude. The Social Criticism of Literature. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916. Pp. vi / 60.
37. Burch, Mary Crowell. Determination of a Content of the Course in Literature of a Suitable Difficulty for Junior and Senior High School Students. Genetic Psychology Monographs, IV, Nos. 2-3, August-September, 1928. Pp. 165-332.
38. Callan, Norman. Poetry in Practice. A Case for the Progressive Study of Poetry in Schools. London: L. Drummond, 1938. Pp. xii / 189.
39. Carpenter, G. R.; Baker, F. T.; and Scott, F. N. The Teaching of English. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1903. Pp. viii / 380.
40. Carpenter, G. R.; Baker, F. T.; and Scott, F. N. The Teaching of English in the Elementary and Secondary Schools. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1913 (revised). Pp. viii / 386.
41. Center, Stella S., and Persons, Gladys L. Teaching High School Students to Read; A Study of Retardation in Reading. National Council of Teachers of English, Monograph No. 6. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937. Pp. xviii / 167.
42. Chapin, Elsa, and Thomas, Russell. A New Approach to Poetry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929. Pp. xiii / 189.
43. Chubb, Percival. "The Blight of Literary Bookishness," English Journal, 3 (January, 1914), 15-27.
44. Chubb, Percival. "The Menace of Pedantry in the Teaching of English," The School Review, 20 (January, 1912), 34-45.
45. Chubb, Percival. The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1902. Pp. xxi / 411.

46. Chubb, Percival. The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927 (revised). Pp. xxv / 594.
47. Clarke, Harold A., and Eaton, Mary P., Editors. Modern Techniques for Improving Secondary School English; An Account of Some of the Devices Used by the Members of the New York City Association of Teachers of English. New York: Noble and Noble, 1940. Pp. xvii / 326.
48. Collins, John Churton. The Study of English Literature; A Plea for Its Recognition and Organization at the Universities. London: Macmillan and Company, 1891. Pp. xx / 167.
49. Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English. A Summary of the Proceedings of the Meetings of the Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English. 1899. Pp. 16.
50. Confrey, B. Method in Literature for Catholic Schools. Manchester, New Hampshire: Magnificat Press, 1939. Pp. 232.
51. Connell, F. M. A Text-Book for the Study of Poetry. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1913. Pp. ix / 214.
52. Cook, Elizabeth Christine. Reading the Novel. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1933. Pp. 238.
53. Cook, May Estelle. Methods of Teaching Novels. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1899. Pp. 14.
54. Cooper, Lane. Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature; A Series of Extracts and Illustrations. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1915. Pp. ix / 239.
55. Corson, Hiram. The Aims of Literary Study. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1894. Pp. 153.
56. Coryell, Nancy Gillmore. An Evaluation of Extensive and Intensive Teaching of Literature; A Year's Experiment in the 11th Grade. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 275. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. Pp. vii / 201.
57. Cox, Sidney. Teaching of English; Avowals and Ventures. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928. Pp. vi / 172.

58. Craig, Virginia Judith. The Teaching of High School English. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930. Pp. xi / 372.
59. Crawford, Elizabeth Mary. Achievement of Secondary School Pupils in Twelve Classics in Literature. Terra Haute, Indiana: Indiana University, 1938. Pp. 40.
60. Crawshaw, W. H. Interpretation of Literature. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1896. Pp. x / 235.
61. Cross, Ethan Allen, and Carney, Elizabeth. Teaching English in High Schools. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. x / 561.
62. Cross, Wilbur. "What Should the Colleges Demand of the High Schools in the Matter of Literature?" New York State Department of Education Bulletin, No. 483 (November 15, 1910), 484-94.
63. Crow, Charles Summer. Evaluation of English Literature in the High School. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 141. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1924. Pp. vi / 172.
64. Dakin, Dorothy. Talks to Beginning Teachers of English. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1937. Pp. xii / 478.
65. Dale, Edgar. How to Appreciate Motion Pictures. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. Pp. xii / 244.
66. Damon, Lindsay Todd. Editing English Classics. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1899. Pp. 13.
67. Davis, Helen I. Practical English Projects for the High School. New York: Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1931. Pp. xx / 234.
68. Dewey, John. Democracy and Education; An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916. Pp. xii / 434.
69. Dewey, John. Reconstruction in Philosophy. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920. Pp. vii / 224.
70. Dorey, Joseph M., and Mohler, Louis. Literature and Music. New York: Columbia Graphophone Company, Educational Department, 1920. Pp. 32.

71. Drew, Elizabeth A. Discovering Poetry. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. xi / 224.
72. Dudley, Louise. The Study of Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928. Pp. 396.
73. Eastman, Max. Enjoyment of Poetry; With Other Essays in Aesthetics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939 (revised). Pp. xi / 317.
74. Fairchild, A. H. R. The Teaching of Poetry in the High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914. Pp. xii / 184.
75. Finch, Robert. The Approach to English Literature. London: Evans Brothers, 1924. Pp. 151.
76. Fowler, J. H. The Art of Teaching English; Lectures and Papers. London: Macmillan and Company, 1932. Pp. xii / 218.
77. Fowler, J. H. English Literature in Secondary Schools. The English Association, Leaflet No. 5. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1908. Pp. 7.
78. Franklin, Benjamin. Proposals Relative to the Education of Youth in Pensilvania. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931 (facsimile reprint of original edition, 1749). Pp. xvii / 32.
79. Fries, C.C.; Hanford, J. H.; and Steeves, H. R. The Teaching of Literature. New York: Silver, Burdett and Company, 1926. Pp. iv / 172.
80. Garber, L. L.; Carmichael, James W.; and Stuckey, Melvin A. The Creative Study of Literature. Ashland, Ohio: The Garber Company, 1929. Pp. 192.
81. Gay, Robert M., Editor. Essays on the Teaching of English. In Honor of Charles Swain Thomas. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. xxi / 286.
82. Gayley, G. M., and Bradley, C. B. Suggestions to Teachers of English in the Secondary Schools. Berkeley, California: University of Southern California, 1894. Pp. 68.
83. Glaser, Emma. On the Teaching of Junior High School English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935. Pp. 306.

84. Goldwasser, Israel Edwin. Method and Methods in the Teaching of English. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1913. Pp. viii / 301.
85. Gray, William S., Editor. Reading in General Education; An Exploratory Study. A Report of the Committee on Reading in General Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940. Pp. xiv / 464.
86. Great Britain, Board of Education. Some Suggestions for the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools in England. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1924. Pp. 60.
87. Gruen, Ferdinand Bernard. English Grammar in American High Schools Since 1900. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America, 1934. Pp. xi / 292.
88. Haddow, Alexander. On the Teaching of Poetry. London: Blackie and Son, 1925. Pp. x / 114.
89. Hadsell, Sardis Roy. A Handbook for English Teachers for Use in Oklahoma High Schools. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1913. Pp. 64.
90. Hales, J. W. Longer English Poems; With Notes Philological and Explanatory and An Introduction on the Teaching of English. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897. Pp. xxxvii / 427.
91. Hales, J. W. "The Teaching of English." Essays on a Liberal Education, pp. 293-312. London: Macmillan and Company, 1867.
92. Halleck, Reuben Post. "The Value of English Literature in Ethical Training," National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses of the Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting, 1900. Pp. 160-69.
93. Hartley, Mrs. Helene. Tests of the Interpretive Reading of Poetry for Teachers of English. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 433. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930. Pp. v / 47.
94. Harvard University, Department of English. English in the Secondary School: A Plan for Work in English Adapted to the Programmes of the Committee of Ten. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1897. Pp. 12.

95. Hatfield, W. Wilbur, Chairman. An Experience Curriculum in English. A Report of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935. Pp. xx / 323.
96. Hawley, Hattie L. Teaching English in Junior High Schools; A Study of Methods and Devices. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924. Pp. viii / 142.
97. Hays, Edna. College Entrance Requirements: Their Effects on the High Schools. An Historical Survey. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 675. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936. Pp. vi / 141.
98. Heller, Frieda M., and LaBrant, Lou L. The Librarian and the Teacher of English; Experimenting Together. American Library Association Bulletin, No. 1. Chicago: American Library Association, 1938. Pp. 84.
99. Herzberg, Max John, Editor. Radio and English Teaching; Experiences, Problems and Procedures. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1941. Pp. viii / 246.
100. Heydrick, Benjamin Alexander. How to Study Literature. New York: Hinds and Noble, 1902. Pp. ix / 118.
101. Heydrick, Benjamin Alexander. How to Study Literature; A Guide to the Intensive Study of Literary Masterpieces. New York: Noble and Noble, 1927 (revised). Pp. ix / 158.
102. Hill, Adams Sherman. Our English. New York: Chautauqua Press, 1890. Pp. xv / 245.
103. Hinsdale, B. A. Teaching the Language-Arts: Speech, Reading and Composition. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1896. Pp. xxv / 205.
104. Hitchcock, Alfred M. Bread Loaf Talks on Teaching Literature. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1928. Pp. 119.
105. Hitchcock, Alfred M. New Problems in the Teaching of English. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921. Pp. 16.
106. Hitchcock, Alfred M. Study Plans for Novels Read in High Schools. Henry Holt and Company, 1927. Pp. v / 348.

107. Hoover, Merle M. A Course in English Literature and Composition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. Pp. 46.
108. Hopkins, Edwin Mortimer. Handbook on the Teaching of English. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1904. Pp. 153.
109. Hosic, James Fleming. Empirical Studies in School Reading; With Special Reference to the Evaluation of Literary Reading Books. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 114. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921. Pp. viii / 174.
110. Hosic, James Fleming. "The Questions at Issue," National Education Association Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting, 1911, 592-98.
111. Hosic, James Fleming, Chairman. Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools. A report by the National Joint Committee on English. United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1917, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917. Pp. 181.
112. Hosic James Fleming, Chairman. "Statement of Chairman of the Committee on English," The Reorganization of Secondary Education, pp. 9-16. Preliminary Statements by Chairmen of Committees of the Commission of the National Education Association. United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1913, No. 41. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.
113. Hudson, Henry N. Essays on English Studies. Edited by A. J. George. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1906. Pp. xxii / 206.
114. Hudson, W. H. Introduction to the Study of Literature. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1921. Pp. 471.
115. Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools. Memorandum on the Teaching of English. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1923. Pp. xi / 60.
116. Irion, Theo W. H. Comprehension Difficulties of Ninth Grade Students in the Study of Literature. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 189. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925. Pp. v / 116.

117. Jacobs, Ida T., and DeBoer, John J., Editors. Educating for Peace. A Report of the Committee on International Relations of the National Council of Teachers of English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940. Pp. xiv / 276.
118. Jenkinson, Augustus John. What Do Boys and Girls Read? An Investigation into Reading Habits with Some Suggestions about the Teaching of Literature in Secondary and Senior High Schools. London: Methuen and Company, 1940. Pp. x / 283.
119. Jones, C. E. Sources of Interest in High School English. New York: American Book Company, 1912. Pp. 144.
120. Judd, Charles H. Psychology of High School Subjects. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1915. Pp. ix / 515.
121. Kandel, I. L. History of Secondary Education; A Study in the Development of Liberal Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930. Pp. xvii / 577.
122. Keagy, J. M. An Essay on English Education together with Some Observations on the Present Mode of Teaching the English Language. Harrisburg: John Wyeth, 1824. Pp. iv / 34.
123. Kingsley, Clarence D., Chairman. Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Education Association. United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1918, No. 35. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1918. Pp. 32.
124. Kloppel, Lillian Marie. "A Survey of Current Theories and Tendencies in the Teaching of High School English as Revealed in Periodicals Published from June, 1923, to June, 1927." Unpublished Master's thesis, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. Pp. 19.
125. Knowlson, T. Sharper. How to Study English Literature. London: G. Richards, 1901. Pp. xii / 155.
126. LaBrant, Lou L. The Teaching of Literature in the Secondary School. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931. Pp. 185.

127. LaBrant, Lou L., and Heller, Frieda M. An Evaluation of Free Reading in Grades Seven to Twelve, Inclusive, The Ohio State University School. Ohio State University Studies, Contributions in Education, No. 4. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1939. Pp. ix / 158.
128. Law, R. A. English in the High School. Bulletin of the University of Texas, No. 46. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1915. Pp. 31.
129. Lee, Albert Sherman. Reading and Literature. Ripley, West Virginia: A. S. Lee, 1915. Pp. 60.
130. Lenrow, Elbert. Reader's Guide to Prose Fiction. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940. Pp. xi / 371.
131. Leo, Brother. Teaching the Drama and the Essay. New York: Schwartz, Kirwin and Fauss, 1921. Pp. vi / 81.
132. Leonard, S. A. Essential Principles of Teaching Reading and Literature in the Intermediate Grades and the High School. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1922. Pp. 460.
133. Lewin, William. Photoplay Appreciation in American High Schools. National Council of Teachers of English, Monograph No. 2. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934. Pp. xvi / 122.
134. Lyman, R. L. The Enrichment of the English Curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. Pp. viii / 251.
135. Macdonald, J. W. The Prevailing Methods and Results of English Instruction in the High School. Boston: Wright and Potter, 1904. Pp. 20.
136. McGraw, H. Ward. The Teaching of Literature in the High Schools; A Manual for Teachers. New York: Charles E. Merrill Company, 1929. Pp. 165.
137. McGregor, A. Laura. Supervised Study in English for Junior High School Grades. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921. Pp. xii / 220.
138. Mackaness, George. Inspirational Teaching; A Record of Experimental Work in the Teaching of English. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1928. Pp. xi / 226.

139. McKay, Jeanette Eilene. "Some Aims, Methods and Devices in the Teaching of Literature in the High School: A Study Based Upon the English Journal from 1930-1938." Unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio University, 1938. Pp. 86.
140. McKerrow, R. B. A Note on the Teaching of English Language and Literature; with Some Suggestions. English Association Pamphlet, No. 49. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1921. Pp. 32.
141. Marsh, George L. A Teachers' Manual for the Study of the English Classics. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1921. Pp. 349.
142. Mead, William E. "English Literature in High Schools," The Academy, 1 (June, 1886), 161-72.
143. Mearns, Hughes. Creative Youth; How a School Environment Set Free the Creative Spirit. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1926. Pp. xv / 234.
144. Miller, George Morey. Suggestions to Teachers of English in Elementary and Secondary Schools. The Teachers Bulletin, Vol. 1, No. 4. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati Press, 1905. Pp. 19.
145. Miller, Pearl Louise. "Development in the Methods of Teaching English Literature in the Secondary Schools (1912-1937)." Unpublished Master's thesis, Brown University, 1938. Pp. iii / 112.
146. Mirrieles, Lucia Bush. Teaching Composition and Literature in the Junior and Senior High School. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937. Pp. x / 576.
147. Modern Language Association. Literature in American Education. A Statement by a Special Committee on Trends in Education. Baltimore: Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1944. Pp. 23.
148. Morley, Edith J., Editor. The Teaching of English in Schools; A Series of Papers. English Association Pamphlet, No. 43. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1919. Pp. 34.
149. Moulton, Richard Green. Modern Study of Literature; An Introduction to Literary Theory and Interpretation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915. Pp. xii / 330.

150. National Education Association. Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies with the Reports of the Conferences. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1893. Pp. 249.
151. Odell, Charles Watters. The Secondary School. Champaign, Illinois: The Garrard Press, 1939. Pp. viii / 606.
152. Opdycke, John Baker. In the Service of Youth; Chapters on Certain Phases of the Teaching of English in Junior and Senior High Schools. New York: I. Pitman and Sons, 1928. Pp. xii / 404.
153. Palmer, Herbert Edward. The Teaching of English. London: J. Murray, 1930. Pp. 136.
154. Parker, Roscoe Edward. The Principles and Practice of Teaching English. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1937. Pp. xii / 336.
155. Pattee, F. L. Literature in the Public Schools. Cincinnati: Teachers Co-operative Publishing Company, 1891. Pp. 52.
156. Pearson, Peter Henry. The Study of Literature. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1913. Pp. 247.
157. Pendleton, Charles S. The Social Objectives of School English. Nashville: Charles S. Pendleton, 1924. Pp. 225.
158. Phillips, Barbara E. The Use of Modern Literature in High Schools. Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1928. Pp. 113.
159. Potter, Stephen. The Muse in Chains; A Study in Education. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937. Pp. 287.
160. Prescott, Herbert L., Editor. Practical Procedures in Teaching Secondary School English. Portland, Maine: Platform News Publishing Company, 1940. Pp. 126 (mimeographed).
161. Rand, Helen, and Lewis, Richard. Film and School; A Handbook in Moving-Picture Appreciation. National Council of Teachers of English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937. Pp. xv / 182.
162. Randall, Julia Davenport. Blessing Esau; Experiments in High School English-Teaching. New York: Richard G. Badger, 1919. Pp. 121.

163. Richards, Edwin Bradley, and Cornell, Ethel L. Suggestions for Teaching English. Albany: The University of the State of New York Press, 1927. Pp. 40.
164. Richards, I. A. Interpretation in Teaching. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1938. Pp. xxii / 420.
165. Roberts, Albert Ernest, and Barter, A. The Teaching of English. London: Blackie and Son, 1908. Pp. xvi / 264.
166. Rollin, Charles. The Method of Teaching and Studying the Belles Lettres. Translated from the French. London: W. Strahan and others, 1769. Vol. 1, pp. vii / 484.
167. Rosenblatt, Louise M. Literature as Exploration. Progressive Education Association. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938. Pp. xiii / 340.
168. Rusch, Louise C. The Socialized Recitation in English. Chicago: The Plymouth Press, 1923. Pp. 88.
169. Sampson, George. English for the English; A Chapter on National Education. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1922. Pp. vii / 112.
170. Scribner, W. J. A Suggested Course in English for High Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1907. Pp. 16.
171. Scudder, H. E. Literature in School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1888. Pp. 60.
172. Seely, Howard Francis. Enjoying Poetry in School. Richmond, Virginia: Johnson Publishing Company, 1931. Pp. xv / 267.
173. Seely, Howard Francis. On Teaching English. New York: American Book Company, 1933. Pp. xix / 391.
174. Sharp, R. A. Teaching English in High Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924. Pp. x / 162.
175. Shattuck, Marquis E., Chairman. The Development of a Modern Program of English. Ninth Yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association. Washington, D. C.: Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, National Education Association, 1936. Pp. xi / 193.

176. Sherman, Lucius Adelno. Analytics of Literature. A Manual for the Objective Study of English Prose and Poetry. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1893. Pp. xx / 469.
177. Shreve, Francis. Psychology of the Teaching of English. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1941. Pp. 280.
178. Shryock, H. W. English in the Public Schools. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois Normal University, 1902. Pp. 23.
179. Simons, Sarah E. English Problems in the Solving for the Junior and Senior High Schools. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1920. Pp. 239.
180. Simons, Sarah E., and Orr, Clem. I. Dramatization Selections from English Classics Adapted in Dramatic Form. Chicago: Scott, Foresman Company, 1913. Pp. 88 / 90 / 87 / 95.
181. Smith, Arnold W. Aims and Methods in the Teaching of English. London: Constable and Company, 1915. Pp. 184.
182. Smith, C. Alphonso. What Can Literature Do for Me? Garden City, New York: Doubleday Page and Company, 1913. Pp. 228.
183. Smith, Dora V. Class Size in High School English; Methods and Results. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931. Pp. xii / 309.
184. Smith, Dora V. Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English. A Report of a Division of the New York Regents Inquiry into Character and Cost of Public Education in New York State. English Monograph, No. 11. Chicago: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1941. Pp. xix / 273.
185. Smith, Dora V. Helps for Course in Teaching of Literature. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1939. Pp. ii / 109 (mimeographed).
186. Smith, Dora V. Instruction in English. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 20. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1933. Pp. vi / 88.

187. Smith, Dora V., Chairman. "Basic Aims for English Instruction in American Schools," Prepared by the Basic Aims Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English, English Journal, 31 (January, 1942), 40-55.
188. Smith, Reed. Poetry in the High School. Bulletin of the University of South Carolina, No. 94. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1921, Pp. 79.
189. Smith, Reed. Teaching of Literature in the High School. New York: American Book Company, 1935. Pp. vii / 485.
190. Steinbrenner, E. L. "Studies in Literature as Adjuncts to the Teaching of Literature." Unpublished Master's dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1909. Pp. 32.
191. Stratton, Clarence. Teaching of English in the High School. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1923. Pp. 383.
192. Stroh, Mary Margaret. Literature for Grades VII, VIII and IX; A Study of Prevailing Materials and Methods with Suggestions for their Revision. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 232. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926. Pp. vii / 110.
193. Sylvester, Charles Herbert. English and American Literature; A Course of Study in Literary Interpretation and History, with Applied Methods of Teaching Reading and Literature. Chicago: Bellows Brothers Company, 1902. Ten volumes.
194. Tassin, Algernon. The Oral Study of Literature. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1925. Pp. 431.
195. Tassin, Algernon. The Oral Study of Literature. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1939 (revised). Pp. 497.
196. Thayer, V. T. The Passing of the Recitation. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1928. Pp. viii / 331.

197. Thayer, V. T., Chairman. Language in General Education.
A Report of the Committee on the Function of English
in General Education for the Commission on Secondary
School Curriculum, Progressive Education Association.
New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940. Pp.
xi / 226.
198. Thayer, V. T., Zachry, Caroline; and Kotinsky, Ruth.
Reorganizing Secondary Education. Commission on
Secondary School Curriculum, Progressive Education
Association. New York: D. Appleton-Century Com-
pany, 1939. Pp. xv / 483.
199. Thomas, Charles Swain. "The English Course in the High
School: The New England View," English Journal, 1
(February 1912), 84-93.
200. Thomas, Charles Swain. "Essential Principles in Teach-
ing English," National Education Association Pro-
ceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Eighth Annual
Meeting, 1910, 487-93.
201. Thomas, Charles Swain. How to Teach English Classics.
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910. Pp. 132.
202. Thomas, Charles Swain. Teaching of English in the
Secondary School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
Company, 1917. Pp. xvi / 365.
203. Thomas, Charles Swain. Teaching of English in the
Secondary School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Com-
pany, 1927 (revised). Pp. xii / 604.
204. Thomas, Charles Swain, Editor. A Memorial of Samuel
Thurber Teacher and Scholar 1837-1913. Boston:
New England Association of Teachers of English,
1913. Pp. 71.
205. Thurber, Samuel. To What End Do High Schools Teach
English? Boston: George A. Bacon, 1893. Pp. 24.
206. Tracey, Arthur George. The Appreciation of Literature.
London: I. Pitman and Sons, 1921. Pp. vii / 144.
207. Tracy, Henry Chester. English as Experience. New York:
E. P. Dutton and Company, 1928. Pp. v / 323.
208. Trent, W. P.; Hanson, C. L.; and Brewster, W. T. An
Introduction to the English Classics. New York:
Ginn and Company, 1916 (revised). Pp. vii / 302.

209. Vaughn, William Eugene. Articulation in English Between the High School and College: A Comparative Study of Freshman English in Twenty-One State-Supported Southern High Educational Institutions and of Senior English in their Accredited High Schools. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 370. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929. Pp. 76.
210. Vories, Hervey D. Vories Laboratory Method of Teaching English and Touch Typewriting Together; or A Complete Guide for the Stenographer, the Business Man, the Writer, the Teacher of English and the Public Schoolteacher. Terra Haute, Indiana: The Inland Publishing Company, 1901. Pp. 152.
211. Weeks, Ruth Mary, Chairman. A Correlated Curriculum. A Report of the Committee on Correlation of the National Council of Teachers of English. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936. Pp. xv / 326.
212. Wheeling, Katherine E., and Hilson, Jane A. Illustrative Material for Junior and Senior High School Literature. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1930. Pp. 80.
213. Williams, M. A. Report on the Teaching of English in the United States. Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardeen, 1908. Pp. 88.
214. Winchester, C. T. Some Principles of Literary Criticism. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899. Pp. xii / 352.
215. Woodring, Maxie Nave; Jewett, Ida A.; and Benson, Rachel Theresa. Enriched Teaching of English in the Junior and Senior High School. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934. Pp. ix / 358.
216. Woodward, F. C. English in the Schools. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1887. Pp. 25.

Supplement

217. Berkson, I. B. Education Faces the Future; An Appraisal of Contemporary Movements in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943. Pp. xii / 345.

218. Breed, Frederick S. Education and the New Realism.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. xx
/ 237.
219. Justman, Joseph. Theories of Secondary Education in
the United States. Teachers College Contribu-
tions to Education, No. 814. New York: Teachers
College, Columbia University, 1940. Pp. viii /
481.
220. Kandel, I. L. Conflicting Theories of Education.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp.
xiii / 177.
221. National Society for the Study of Education. Phil-
osophies of Education. Forty-first Yearbook,
Part I. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School
Publishing Company, 1942. Pp. xi / 321.