MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 01055 9643

THESIS
V.1

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled
AN HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ROLES OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN DEVELOPING THE PROCESS-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION

presented by

Mary Ellen Van Camp

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Sheila Fitzgerald
Major professor

Date Feb. 7, 1992

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

O-12771

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

AN HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ROLES OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN DEVELOPING THE PROCESS-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION

VOLUME I

By

Mary Ellen Van Camp

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1992

Copyright © 1992 by Mary Ellen Van Camp

ABSTRACT

AN HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ROLES OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN DEVELOPING THE PROCESS-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION

By

Mary Ellen Van Camp

The purpose of this historical study was to examine the roles of selected professional associations in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. Through an analysis and evaluation of professional literature produced by selected professional associations, particularly the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the researcher identified various conceptualizations of writing instruction during the years of the study, 1957-1991. The early conceptualizations included the grammar and mechanics first approach, the models method, the product-correctness focus, and the organizational approach. The process-oriented approaches developed after calls in the profession for more research on writing and writing instruction. Since 1964, when the first process-focused research was published, the process approaches evolved from a simple three-stage linear format of prewriting, writing, and rewriting, to elaborated recursive formats in which the writer revisits the phases of the writing process in an intertwining manner. At a minimum, the elaborated forms included prewriting, writing, editing, and revising. The professional

associations, particularly NCTE, have contributed to this development through their publication of books, journal articles, monographs, and research reports which focused on process approaches to writing instruction. Since 1980, there have been more than 12,000 books, articles, monographs, and research reports on writing, many of which were published by professional organizations interested in improving writing instruction. The study also reports on a series of twenty national and international professional association conferences and seminars, held between 1958 and 1987, which gave examined and proposed writing instruction and research. Some of these conferences considered writing research and instruction as a part of the broader fields of the teaching of English and Language Arts while others focused exclusively on writing instruction and research. The data indicate that the association conferences and seminars also contributed to developing the process approaches to writing instruction through the interactions among conference participants. This study concludes with recommendations for the professional associations and further research.

To my mother and father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank the members of my guidance committee, Drs. Charles Blackman, Patricia Cianciolo, Marilyn Wilson, and, especially, Dr. Sheila Fitzgerald, who served as adviser and dissertation director. Each of them contributed immeasurably to my program through their professional insights, critiques, and encouragement.

I am indebted to my sister, Norma Cunningham, who took on many extra responsibilities in the care of our parents that I might have the time to devote to this project.

I wish to express my appreciation to Drs. Janice Dressel and Linda Dykstra for their friendship and personal encouragement that kept me focused on the goal.

Finally, I would like to thank Marsha Groff for helping to unravel the subtleties of MLA documentation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS ix

1. INTRODUCTION 1
   - Purpose of the Study 7
   - Significance of the Study 8
   - Research Questions 10
   - Definitions of Terms 12
   - Delimitations of the Study 17
   - Overview 22

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 24
   - Introduction 24
   - Research on the Roles of Professional Associations 25
   - Research on the Act of Writing 34
   - Research on Writing Instruction 47
   - Conclusion 73

3. METHODOLOGY 76
   - Introduction 76
   - Assumptions 77
   - Research Questions 80
   - Sources of Evidence 81
   - Analysis and Evaluation 84
   - Limitations of the Study 86

4. CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF WRITING INSTRUCTION 87
   - Introduction 87
   - Conceptualizations of Writing Instruction 88
   - Conclusion 112

5. PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION AND INTER-ASSOCIATION CONFERENCES 113
   - Introduction 113
   - 1957-63: A New Wave of Reform 117
   - 1964-71: Toward a Writing Curriculum 148
   - 1972-79: New Research and Writing Conferences 172
   - 1980-87: Cooperation at Home and Abroad 183
   - 1987-90 and Beyond: Trends and Issues 198

6. CURRENT STATUS OF THE ROLES OF THE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN DEVELOPING THE PROCESS-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION 202

7. REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 216
Introduction 216
Reflections 220
Recommendations for the Professional Associations 230
Recommendations for Further Research 236
Conclusion 241

WORKS CITED 245

WORKS CONSULTED 262

APPENDICES 270
A. Major Professional Association and Inter-Association Conferences 271
B. Professional Association Chronology 277
C. Basic Issues Conference Series (1958) 297
D. Woods Hole Conference on the Process of Education (1959) 300
E. Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English (1962) 302
F. Allerton Park Conference (1962) 305
G. Research Development Seminar (1963) 310
H. San Francisco Research Conference (1963) 312
I. Boston International Conference (1965) 317
J. The Arts of Language Conference (1966) 321
K. The Dartmouth Seminar (1966) 326
L. NCTE Minnesota Seminar (1972) 331
M. Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing (1975) 332
N. The English Curriculum Under Fire Conference (1978) 333
O. CCTE Conference on Learning to Write (1979) 335
P. Third International Conference (1980) 338
Q. IFTE Seminar (1984) 340
R. NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar (1985) 347
S. English Coalition Conference (1987) 350
T. Cumulative List of Conference Participants 354
U. Selected Professional Association Leaders 403
V. Selected Publications Resulting From Professional Association and Inter-Association Conferences 481

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

AATE - Australian Association for the Teaching of English
ACEI - Association for Childhood Education International
ADE - Association of Departments of English
AERA - American Educational Research Association
ASA - American Studies Association
ASCD - Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
CCC - College Composition and Communication
CCCC - Conference on College Composition and Communication
CCTE - Canadian Council of Teachers of English
CEA - College English Association
CEE - Conference on English Education
CEL - Conference on English Leadership
CLA - College Language Association
CSSEDC - Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairs
ERIC - Educational Resources Information Center
ETPS - English Teacher Preparation Study
IFTE - International Federation for the Teaching of English
IRA - International Reading Association
ISC - International Steering Committee
ISCPET - Illinois Study Center for the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers
MLA - Modern Language Association
NASDTEC - National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
NATE - National Association for the Teaching of English
NCRE - National Conference on Research in English
NCTE - National Council of Teachers of English
NEA - National Education Association
NSSE - National Society for the Study of Education
NZATE - New Zealand Association for the Teaching of English
PETA - Primary English Teaching Association
RTE - Research in the Teaching of English
SAA - Speech Association of America
SLATE - Support for the Learning and Teaching of English
USOE - United States Office of Education

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the professional academic community, membership and participation in one or more national and international professional associations provide significant means for learning about and making contributions to one's professional field. Professional associations function to serve their members in specific ways, usually by providing publications on topics of interest to their members and holding annual or semi-annual themed conferences. With each of these professional association functions, the benefits of association membership and participation are reciprocal for both the member and the association. On the one hand, a member may choose simply to read a publication or attend a conference to hear the presentations of others; thus, the member functions as a part of the particular, collective, target audience whom the association serves. On the other hand, a member may choose to write a piece for possible publication by the association, or propose a conference presentation for the next association meeting. Thus, the association may serve as facilitator, mediator, or gatekeeper as decisions are made by association leaders about what to publish and what to present at conferences. In all cases, both parties, the association and the member, stand to benefit from the professional association

functions. If the professional association functions well, the profession as a whole also stands to benefit through the advancement of professional knowledge as reflected in professional association publications and conference presentations. Ultimately, if the professional associations are effective, the benefit will extend to individual classrooms and result in improved classroom practice.

In the academic community, professional associations usually have formal statements of purpose identifying the reasons for their existence. These statements are generally found in the official association constitutions and may often be found in the association's official journals or other publications. For example, the national professional association which has claimed to be "the world's largest independent subject-matter organization for teachers" (Convention program 1990, 3), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), stated in 1911 in its first constitution: "The object of the Council shall be to increase the effectiveness of school and college work in English" (Hook 1979, 286). In more recent times, NCTE has revised this statement of purpose. In the program for its sixty-sixth annual convention held in Chicago in 1976, NCTE stated that "its central purpose [is] to improve the teaching of English at all levels of instruction" (x).

Professional association publications and conferences or conventions are the two most common means for carrying out an association's purpose. For example, in the official program for each of its annual fall conventions since 1982, NCTE has published this statement: "The Convention is but one of the many ways the Council

seeks to improve the teaching of English at all levels of instruction" (Convention programs 1982-1990, 3). While NCTE's journals and other publications do not carry a parallel purpose statement, four NCTE journals (Language Arts, Research in the Teaching of English, Teaching English in the Two-Year College, and College Composition and Communication) and all other NCTE association publications currently carry the following policy statement which indicates the role that the publications play in carrying out the association's official purpose:

> It is the policy of NCTE in its journals and other publications to provide a forum for the open discussion of ideas concerning the content and the teaching of English and the language arts. (N. pag.)

The underlying assumption of the policy statement is that open discussion of ideas will lead to improvement in instruction.

From the earliest days of its founding in December 1911, NCTE has indicated an interest in improving the teaching of writing or composition. In the inaugural issue of its first official journal, The English Journal, in January 1912, the first article was entitled "Can Good Composition Teaching Be Done Under Present Conditions?" The article, written by Edwin M. Hopkins who would later become an NCTE president, had originated as a speech at the founding convention. Hopkins and others were especially concerned with the work load of English teachers which they believed was "too heavy to permit adequate time for evaluation of student writing" (Hook 19). In a study completed by Hopkins, the average work load for

English teachers was six classes a day and 181 students. Consequently, if a teacher assigned a theme a week and allowed ten minutes per student to evaluate the writing, it would take over thirty hours per week outside of regular school time for the teacher to complete the evaluation of all of the students' papers.

Over the nearly eighty years since its official founding, NCTE has often given particular attention to writing instruction in its journals and other publications. In recent years, NCTE and some of the other national and international professional associations, which are primarily concerned with the teaching of English and language arts, have devoted significant attention to writing and writing instruction. Literally hundreds of publications about the act of writing, theories of writing instruction, and improvement of writing instruction have appeared. The publications of several national and international professional associations have devoted considerable space to concerns about writing and writing instruction, especially its importance across the curriculum, and ways in which current instructional practice might be improved. As a result of the increasing number of professional articles, books, and other publications, the researcher wondered why there had been so much interest within the professional associations in writing and writing instruction in recent times and how this interest developed. At the beginning of the study, she looked for recommendations that professional association publications had made about writing instruction at various times in their history and whether the recommendations for writing instruction in recent professional

association publications reflected any differences or changes from the recommendations for writing instruction in earlier publications from these associations. As reading for the study progressed, the researcher was interested in how the professional associations had functioned to focus the attention of English educators on issues related to writing and writing instruction. More specifically, she wanted to know what roles the associations had played that may have contributed to the development of the process-oriented approaches to writing and writing instruction. These interests set the historical context for the specific research questions which would be pursued during this study.

In recent years, many books and journal articles by various professional leaders have emphasized what are called either "process-oriented approaches," or simply "process approaches," to writing as a means to improving writing instruction. These approaches focus attention on the creation of the writing as opposed to the final product. Among these publications are those by Murray (1968, 1972, 1973, 1982, 1990, 1991); Emig (1971); Elbow (1973, 1981, 1990); Graves (1978, 1983); Calkins (1986); Applebee (1986); Langer and Applebee (1987); Jensen (1989); Lloyd-Jones and Lunsford (1989). These publications peaked the researcher's interest in why the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction have received so much attention and how were they were originated. These interests led to the consideration of the professional association involvement of the authors of publications on process-oriented approaches to writing and writing instruction

and whether that involvement contributed to the ideas they presented in their books and articles.

The value of professional association membership and participation has been acknowledged by some of those who have focused their attention on the improvement of writing instruction. Donald M. Murray (1982), a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, has written:

> I'm grateful to the academic communities, especially the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the National Council of Teachers of English, its parent body, that have given me the chance to talk and to publish, to listen and to read, to be part of an exciting profession in a period of significant growth. I have been stimulated and supported by the colleagueship of writing teachers from every part of the English-speaking world. (Preface, N. pag.)

Murray's point about international collaboration also is worthy of further investigation.

While the publication of monthly or quarterly journals and the convening of annual conferences are primary activities of national and international professional associations, they are not the only activities of such groups. Over the years, particularly since January 1958, there have also been a number of national inter-association meetings that have brought together leaders of various professional associations for discussion of topics and concerns of mutual interest to English and language arts educators from a variety of disciplines and perspectives. In addition, particularly since 1965, there have been a number of international meetings of English language

association leaders not only from around the United States, but also from other English-speaking countries, including England, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. Many of these national and international inter-association meetings have resulted in publications and many of these publications contain articles about writing with a particular focus on writing instruction. A close examination of these publications provides a basis and means for gaining both a national and an international perspective on the historical development of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction.

Purpose of the Study

The overarching purpose of this study is to examine from an historical perspective the roles of selected professional associations, particularly the National Council of Teachers of English, in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. The professional associations to be included, in addition to NCTE, are those major national and international professional associations which have indicated through their publications a concern for and interest in writing instruction. Among these are the National Association for the Teaching of English in Great Britain (NATE), the Canadian Council of Teachers of English (CCTE), the Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE), the International Federation for the Teaching of English (IFTE), the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) and the

International Reading Association (IRA). Also to be included are associations which for one reason or another have joined with the previously named major professional associations in order to participate in particular projects, conventions, conferences, and/or inter-association meetings. Among these are the the Modern Language Association (MLA), the American Studies Association (ASA), the College English Association (CEA), the College Language Association (CLA), the Association of Departments of English (ADE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), and the National Conference on Research in English (NCRE).

Significance of the Study

On one level this study is significant for its focus on what has been learned in recent years about both the act of writing and writing instruction. On another level it is important for its examination of the roles associations have played in developing and disseminating professional knowledge about those topics. Although there have been changes in professional knowledge about both the act of writing and writing instruction over the past years, it is not fully understood how these changes came about, or what they indicate for the future of writing instruction.

The primary significance of this study is its historical examination of the roles that selected professional associations have played in the development of the process-oriented approaches to

writing and writing instruction. This study looks closely at how the National Council of Teachers of English and other selected professional associations have functioned to further the understanding of the act of writing and writing instruction by means of their professional publications and various other specific activities, particularly several professional association and inter-association conferences.

There are indications in the professional literature that there is a need for such a study. Wendy Bishop in Released into Language: Options for Teaching Creative Writing (1990) writes about the undergraduate creative writing workshop. As a part of her study, she examined the works of various authors on both institutional and rhetorical history as well as the works of those who have written about the history of creative writing. Bishop comments:

> The difficulty I have experienced trying to trace these sometimes overlapping, sometimes widely diverging historical strands suggests that more of us should be examining the ways our institutional pasts inform our teaching presents. (x)

Bishop's statement of her experience explicitly summarizes the experiences of this researcher in searching out the possible historical connections between the professional associations and the development of the process approaches to the teaching of writing.

A further indication that such a study is needed is found in a study entitled Professional Associations and Municipal Innovation

(1981) by Richard D. Bingham, Brett W. Hawkins, John P. Frendreis, and Mary P. Le Blanc. The authors write:

> Two important points emerge from the relevant literature. First, studies of innovation in state and local governments make frequent reference to the influence of professional associations; and second, none of the literature examines this impact in a systematic manner. (4)

The researcher's own findings during this study were similar to those of Bishop and to Bingham, et al. There are a considerable number of studies, especially doctoral dissertations, which have collected data on the professional association affiliations of those who participated in their studies. This information was usually obtained by means of questionnaires. In some of the studies, the data on professional association membership was actually one of the variables. In nearly every instance, professional association membership was found to be significant, but there was seldom any explanation of the significance. Consequently, it remains unclear what roles the professional associations play that may cause these research findings.

Research Questions

In conducting this study, the researcher examined three major research questions. The first of these was: How has writing instruction been conceptualized in journal articles and other

publications of the selected professional associations, particularly those of the National Council of Teachers of English? Key historical issues implicit within that question included how the concept of process-oriented writing instruction was developed and when various process-oriented approaches began to appear in the professional literature. As a consequence of these questions, it was also important to consider, has writing instruction reached a new focus or level of development? Hillocks's research in Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986) suggests that it has. Langer and Applebee and others also have written about current problems with process writing instruction and given indications of what might be done about them. This first research question and the related historical issues will be addressed in Chapter IV.

The second research question of this study was: How have specific major national and international professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars, which resulted in publications, contributed to the development of the process-oriented approaches to the teaching of writing? A related historical issue was which professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars contributed to greater shared knowledge among professional leaders about process-oriented writing instruction as evidenced in publications resulting from such meetings. This research question and the related historical issue will be addressed in Chapter V.

The third major question of this study was: What is the current status of the roles of the professional associations in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction and what does this status suggest for the future? Related issues included: How do the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction fit into a broader spectrum of on-going curricular development in American schools and what roles should the professional associations play in continuing the evolution of theory, research, and practice? This research question and the related issues will be addressed in Chapter VI.

Definitions of Terms

In this study professional associations are defined as educational groups in which membership is entirely at the discretion of the individual and not in any way a condition of employment at any school, college, or university, or other educational agency. Professional associations are also understood herein to be dues-collecting groups which operate generally in a self-supporting manner and which exist to serve their members in particular ways. Professional association members often have a shared curricular content or subject-matter focus, or shared generalist interests which bind them together to support or work toward mutually agreed upon aims, objectives, or purposes. The term is being limited to subject-matter groups and does not include those teacher organizations at local, state, and national levels which work

primarily to address matters of collective bargaining and issues concerning teachers' working conditions.

Professional association activities generally include some or all of the following, depending upon the association under consideration:

- conferences and conventions (regional, national, and international)
- publication programs (i.e., production of journals, books, monographs, and position statements)
- cosponsored speaker programs (national association shares costs with state and local affiliates when elected officers or headquarters staff members serve as conference speakers)
- study tours
- joint committees with other associations
- teacher workshops (offered by associations before, during or after convention or conference periods; and at other times, such as during the summer)
- inter-association meetings (meetings of officers and directors with leaders of other associations--at the national and international levels)
- political action programs
- press release programs

The term professional leaders is used herein to refer to those who demonstrate professional leadership by one or more of the following qualifications:

- •serving as an elected officer of a national professional association
- •serving as editor to a regularly published indexed professional journal
- •serving as a regular or frequent contributor of articles to indexed professional journals
- •serving as an author or editor of a book published by a national professional association
- •serving as a member of the directorate of a national professional association
- •serving as a regular or frequent presenter at professional association conferences or conventions

The process-oriented approaches to writing instruction are defined from an historical, evolutionary perspective as instructional strategies which serve as a means for assisting students through the stages or phases of creating a piece of writing. Early process writing researchers, who studied students in the act of writing, initially perceived the act of writing as having three stages or phases. In a three-stage format, the stages were identified as "prewriting," "writing," and "rewriting" (Rohman 1964; Tovatt and Miller 1967). Later, as other researchers examined students in the act of writing, they identified additional stages or phases in the process. Emig (1971) refined the term "rewriting" by referring to its separate components of "correcting" and "revising." Glatthorn (1982) discussed a four-stage format in which the stages were called

"exploring," "planning," "drafting," and "revising." As the definitions of the stages involved in the writing process were refined and elaborated, the concept of recursiveness (Emig 1971), wherein the stages or phases of writing were revisited by an author while a piece of writing was being created, became a part of the explanation. Emig's research examined what student writers do during the process of creating and completing a piece of writing and her identification and recognition of the concept of recursiveness advanced professional knowledge of the process approaches to writing instruction to a new level of understanding. No longer were the stages or phases of writing discussed in terms of a linear sequence, wherein writers were thought to move from stage one, to stage two, to stage three, to completion of the writing. As a result of Emig's research, the stages or phases of writing were discussed in terms of a recursive, cyclical process, wherein a writer moved from stage to stage in an intertwining manner.

In one of the more elaborated instructional formats, the California State Department of Education (1986) identified the stages of writing as "prewriting," "writing," "responding," "revising," "editing," "developing skills with the conventions of writing," "evaluating," and "postwriting." These stages were identified as part of a state-level curriculum for writing instruction for grades K-12. The specific aim of each of the aforementioned formats for describing the writing process was to help writers and writing teachers think about the process used to create a piece of writing so

that both writing instruction and students' writing might be improved.

In more recent times, the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction have been defined by various characteristics of the classroom environment; for example, the activities of the student-writer while the piece of writing is in progress, the interaction of the teacher and the students, and the interaction of the students with each other. Hillocks (1986) examined research on the process-oriented approaches and created the term, "the natural process mode," to differentiate the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction from other approaches he had examined. He labeled these other approaches as the "presentational mode," "the individualized mode," and the "environmental mode." In Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching, Hillocks defined the "natural process mode" as:

> characterized by (1) generalized objectives, e.g., to increase fluency and skill in writing; (2) free writing about whatever interests the students, either in a journal or as a way of "exploring a subject"; (3) writing for audiences of peers; (4) generally positive feedback from peers; (5) opportunities to revise and rework writing; and (6) high levels of interaction among students. (119)

Hillocks's definition focuses on process writing instruction as it was characterized in its early years, except that he does not mention the role of the teacher at all. Further, he does not include any reference to the peer or teacher-student conferencing techniques advocated by many of those who researched and wrote about the process-

oriented approaches to writing instruction. This is a significant omission because it was the use of conferencing techniques that provided a substantial means for individualizing instruction. Hillocks's definition tends to trivialize the process-oriented approaches and fails to recognize their significant value both for teaching children (and other beginning writers of any age) and for tailoring instruction to individual needs. It should be noted that such instruction does not lend itself to the kind of experimental treatment studies that Hillocks examined through his meta-analysis in Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching. Hillocks's research findings and his suggestions for writing instruction will be examined in Chapter II along with the reviews of his work by other researchers.

Delimitations of the Study

The time frame of this study is from 1957 to 1990. The date of October 4, 1957 was selected because it has become a benchmark in historical perspectives for discussing various aspects of American education. The launching of Sputnik was linked to American educational reform at the time and has continued to be a focal point for discussants in a variety of forums. Arthur N. Applebee in Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974) writes about "A Crisis of Confidence" in the 1940's and 50's when American schools were criticized from a variety of fronts. He writes, "The final blow was Sputnik. Launched in the fall of 1957, it

became a symbol of the failure of the schools and a milestone marking the end of one era and the beginning of another" (188-89).

The year of 1957 is also significant for the historical perspective of this study because it was during that year that Harold B. Allen, then the Second Vice-President of the NCTE and later to become an NCTE President, suggested that NCTE hold an international conference for teachers of English from around the world. Such conferences had already been held for those who were interested in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. Given the conditions and limitations of international travel in the 1950's, those meetings were a significant undertaking. Perhaps also because of the costs involved, no such meeting was held for teachers of the mother tongue in the 1950's, but later on, beginning in 1965, international meetings of English teachers from Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States were held on several occasions and provided for significant exchange of pedagogical perspectives on various aspects of the teaching of English, including the teaching of writing.

The date was also selected partly because it is familiar to many in the education profession. There are specific references in the writings of a number of authors (Jenkins 1958; Shugrue 1968; Applebee 1974; Judy 1979; Hook 1979; Judy and Judy 1981) to the launching of the first Russian Sputnik satellite. All of these authors indicate in one way or another that the date became a significant historical point of reference in discussions about American education.

The ending date of 1990 was selected because it appeared that, between the years of 1986 to 1990, there were new points of departure appearing in the professional literature regarding the roles of professional associations, and a new focus in the research on both the act of writing and writing instruction. In Hillocks's Research in Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986), Langer and Applebee's How Writing Shapes Thinking (1987), and Purves's The Scribal Society (1990), it appears that the authors have identified new areas of emphasis in discussing writing and writing instruction. Langer and Applebee refer to ways in which process approaches to writing and learning are used "particularly in the context of academic tasks . . . to improve the quality of thinking required of school children" (1987, 3). The Langer and Applebee study is significant particularly because it does not debate the values of process approaches versus the values of other approaches to writing instruction; the study utilizes a process approach to writing instruction to examine "the specific thinking and learning processes involved in various writing tasks" (8). Further, Langer and Applebee offer this explanation of their study:

> We were concerned with writing as a tool for learning, a context within which students could explore new ideas and experiences. In particular, we were concerned with what are often called "process" approaches to learning, where ideas are allowed to develop in the learner's own mind through a series of related, supportive activities; where taking risks and generating hypotheses are encouraged by postponing evaluation; and where new

> skills are learned in supportive instructional contexts. (69)

Hillocks's work, Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986) begins with a chapter entitled, "Research on the Composing Process" and continues with chapters which report on various experimental studies. Perhaps the most significant feature of Hillocks's book is its meta-analysis of sixty experimental research studies. Hillocks indicates that his aim in preparing the book was to provide a comprehensive review of the research on composition, particularly the studies that had been completed since the publication of Research in Written Composition (1963) by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. Hillocks makes significant recommendations for improving writing instruction, and indicates specific areas for future research. He also identifies ramifications for policymakers. Though not specifically identified by Hillocks, professional associations could play significant roles in carrying out some of his recommendations if those recommendations continue to appear feasible and desirable.

Alan Purves's book, The Scribal Society (1990), identifies another direction that process-approaches to writing instruction are taking in the 1990's. It considers the broader issues of literacy and the consequent implications for schooling. Purves makes a significant distinction between the literate village and the scribal society. More information, analysis, and reflections on the studies by Hillocks, Purves, and Langer and Applebee will appear in subsequent chapters of this study.

The ending date of 1990 was also selected because of the publication that year of the third major book about the 1987 English Coalition Conference, a national inter-association conference which brought together professional association leaders concerned with the teaching of English in the United States. What Is English? by Peter Elbow (1990) provides a significant perspective from which to view not only the English Coalition Conference, but also to take a retrospective view of the roles and activities of the professional associations concerned with the teaching of English.

The focus of this study is on professional associations, concerned with the teaching of English Language Arts, which identify a major concern for or interest in writing instruction. The study is not intended to be a comprehensive history of the teaching of writing. It focuses on a particular time period and on the activities of particular associations. This study is also delimited to information which is available in the professional literature; that is, the books, journals, monographs, and position statements, which provide information about the development of the process approaches to writing instruction and the related roles of the professional associations.

It is also important to recognize that the changes identified in this study regarding the professional understanding of the act of writing and writing instruction may have had other causes resulting from political, social, and/or economic conditions in the society which are not fully evident and which we do not fully understand.

When these external influences are evident, they are noted in the study.

This study is not concerned with all facets of the act of writing or the process approaches to writing instruction. It examines the roles that specific professional associations have played in developing process approaches to writing instruction as significant means for understanding the nature of the acts of writing and writing instruction. Insofar as it is necessary to understand related topics as a contextual base for understanding the role of the professional associations, those topics will be discussed in light of what has been presented about them in specific professional books and articles on writing instruction.

Overview

In the chapters which follow, the researcher presents a review of related literature, identifies and explains the study methodology, reports and examines the study data, and analyzes the roles professional associations have played in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. The review of related literature focuses on the roles of the professional associations, and the historical development of research on the act of writing and writing instruction. The chapter on methodology identifies the assumptions on which the study is based, delineates the sources of evidence, and explains the process used in identifying, analyzing, and evaluating the relevant sources. Chapter IV reports

and analyzes the study data on the conceptualizations of writing instruction which have appeared in professional association publications, including books, journal articles, and monographs. Chapter V reports and analyzes the study data on several professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars which resulted in publications that present information and historical perspectives about the act of writing and writing instruction. Chapter VI reports and analyzes the study data on the current status of the roles of the professional associations in furthering the development of the process approaches to writing instruction and disseminating current knowledge to their members and the profession as a whole. Chapter VII reflects on the significance of the roles of the professional associations in developing the process approaches to writing instruction, provide suggestions for the professional associations, and makes recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

There is a considerable body of relevant research and professional literature available on the topics involved in this study, i.e., on professional associations, the act of writing, and writing instruction. Much has been written about the activities of various professional associations, and there is research in a number of subject areas which has inquired into the value and influence of professional association membership. To date, however, there appears to have been rather limited research on the impact of educational professional associations on either curricular movements or pedagogical theory related to topics in the teaching of English and language arts. Given the numbers of professional associations which exist to identify ways in which teaching of particular content areas might be improved, it is unfortunate that so little research exists which looks specifically at how the professional associations have functioned to accomplish this goal.

There also has been considerable research and other professional literature devoted to the act of writing and writing instruction. Two significant publications, Research in Written

Composition (1963) by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer and Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986) by George Hillocks, Jr., have extensively reviewed the research and serve as important references for examining research related to the process-oriented approaches to writing and writing instruction. Chapter II will present the pertinent research and other related professional literature on the roles of professional associations and the historical development of the process approaches to writing and writing instruction.

Research on the Roles of Professional Associations

Of the research that exists on roles of professional associations, much of it considers the value and influence of professional association membership and participation. In carrying out studies related to various topics, researchers also have inquired about the professional association affiliation and level of participation of the participants in their studies. The data often are gathered by means of questionnaires or personal interviews and then analyzed for their degree of relationship to other variables in the studies. For example, doctoral dissertation studies by Lewis (1984), and Bauck (1984) have indicated that professional association membership and participation appear to be significant factors in career effectiveness of school principals. Lewis studied a random sample of 439 elementary school principals in Texas and found that 94.4 percent of them were members of a professional association. Lewis also found

that the elementary principals, determined by the study to be effective in their positions, actively supported professional growth activities including professional association membership for both teachers and principals (DAI 45/03A, 709). Bauck studied a random sample of 1,413 middle level principals along with 50 effective principals selected by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) research team and compared the two groups on a number of variables. Among his findings, Bauck indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the two groups in their levels of participation in professional associations, with the effective group having the higher level of participation.

There also has been some research at the state level which has focused on the professional development of association members. One such study is that by Betty Jo Buckingham (1978) entitled, "The Role of Professional Associations in the Development of School Librarians in Iowa." In this study Buckingham examined the historical development of three state-level associations for librarians in Iowa (the Iowa Association of School Librarians, the Iowa Library Association, and the Audiovisual Education Association) and presented the history of each of them. She also examined how each of these associations provided (or failed to provide) support in meeting the needs of school librarians. Buckingham indicates that while the three professional associations had very little effect on the professional development of school librarians during the years studied, 1890-1972, two of the associations appear to have been

influential in their contacts with outside agencies, such as the state department of instruction, on behalf of school libraries.

There is also considerable research on state and local organizations which function primarily as "teacher unions" representing individual and collective teacher interests in contract negotiations concerning salary and improvement of working conditions. One such study worthy of note is the doctoral dissertation study by Douglas Ward (1973), entitled "The Role of Teacher Organizations in Professional Development and Instructional Improvement as Perceived by Selected Teacher Organization Leaders." Using a form of the Delphi technique to gather the study data, Ward developed a priority ranking of twenty-five role statements about local, state, and national teacher organizations. The role statement which received the first (i.e., highest) priority ranking was:

> Local teacher organizations should participate with school boards in policy decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. (26)

The role statement which received the second priority ranking was:

> State teacher organizations should, within state legislative guidelines and administrative regulations, participate in the licensing and certification of teachers. (26)

This doctoral study resulted in a booklet published jointly by the National Education Association and the Michigan Education

Association in 1974. In this booklet, each of the twenty-five role statements is listed with its priority ranking. The role statements also are categorized as "Short Range Priorities for Local Associations" (9-12) and "Long-Range Priorities for Local Associations" (13-18). It is significant that what is identified as a "role priority" essentially means a goal which the local associations were to work toward over a designated number of years. "Short-range priorities" were to be achieved in a year or two, while "Long-Range Priorities" were to be pursued and gradually achieved in a range of ten to thirty years.

The two aforementioned statements were the first two short-range priorities identified in the NEA/MEA booklet. The role statement given "Long Range Priority 1" status in the booklet was:

> The local [association], through participating members, should establish systems to determine policies and procedures for professional development programs. (13)

This doctoral research and the resulting publication are significant because they represent one of the ways in which national and state professional associations may cooperate with the academic community to utilize university research to bring about change in public education. Ward's research also is significant especially in relation to this study because it identifies prioritized areas in which professional national and state subject-matter associations might function independently, or along with the national and state teacher organizations (i.e., unions), to bring about curricular improvement For example, professional subject-matter associations concerned

with improving writing instruction might participate with school boards in policy decisions regarding the development and implementation of a writing curriculum. In addition, professional associations might function at state levels to influence policies regarding the licensing of teachers who are both certified and qualified to teach writing at the level of schooling where they will teach. Further, national professional associations also might participate with other educational organizations in establishing and maintaining state and local professional development programs for teachers.

Some of the research on professional associations has examined the work of those associations primarily concerned with the teaching of English and Language Arts. One such research article is that by James R. Squire written for and presented at a major national conference during his tenure as NCTE Executive Secretary. The paper entitled, "The Relation of College English Departments to Other Groups Interested in Research in the Teaching of English," was presented at the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English in December 1962 In it, Squire delineated the nature and purposes of a number of professional associations interested in the teaching of English, including the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association, the Association for Childhood Education International, the International Reading Association, and the National Conference on Research in English, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. The thrust of his article was that because these

associations have some goals and interests in common, they need opportunities to work together. Squire wrote:

> My experience with many groups leads me to believe that intelligent, imaginative individuals interested in English teaching can work very well together, provided they have opportunity to meet--that the critical problem is not the existence of diverse groups, but the isolation of groups within our campuses and within our school hierarchy, and isolation which sometimes makes it virtually impossible for truly thoughtful people to meet together. (1962, 5)

Squire's comments foreshadow the considerable number of professional inter-association conferences that would be convened thereafter which would provide opportunities for leaders of diverse associations to work together. In fact, between the years 1965 and 1985, Squire took either direct or indirect responsibility for organizing some of these conferences.

Another article which identified successful activities of national professional associations was that by Asher Cashdan entitled "Language and the Curriculum" which appears in Literacy: Teaching and Learning Language Skills, a book edited by Cashdan (1986). In the opening chapter, Cashdan writes:

> It must now be something like twenty years since groups of teachers, particularly those involved in English teaching, began to study what came to be called "language across the curriculum". They focused attention, not just on the language of the pupil, but on that of the teacher also. Their concerns reached a wide public, both through the work of the National Association for the

> Teaching of English (NATE) and, perhaps even more, through the publication of two seminal books. The more applied of these texts was undoubtedly Language, the Learner and the School (Barnes, Britton and Rosen, 1969) and the more theoretical, Language and Learning (Britton, 1970). In 1971, NATE devoted a whole issue of English in Education to this subject. (4)

Cashdan's acknowledgement that NATE appeared to have influence beyond the boundaries of its membership supports the concept that professional associations may play significant roles in influencing public opinion and directing the course of events in public education.

There also are a number of publications which focus on the functions, management, and long-term planning that professional associations must assess and facilitate within their own operations. One such publication is Principles of Association Management (1975). Published jointly by the American Society of Association Executives and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, this work provides information on a variety of topics for those who work within professional associations. Topics covered include the history of voluntary organizations, association activities, membership development, association publications, financial management, and long-range planning. This work is presented from the perspective of the association that serves association executives and offers basic information about how an association may serve its members as well as influence opinion and action within areas of association interest beyond the boundaries of its membership.

Some of the publications on the work of professional associations come from diverse fields and areas of interest, but they

are useful in providing perspectives on professional association functions and roles. A publication which offers an opportunity for comparison of academic and civic professional associations is Professional Associations and Municipal Innovation (1981). This work by Richard D. Bingham, et al., offers this perspective in its opening chapter:

> Innovation. The term alone connotes something new, exciting, and beneficial. As our society becomes more complex, organizations and individuals hold out innovation as the answer to many of the nation's problems, especially the problems of our cities. . . But there are difficulties in bringing innovation to cities, at least according to some. Local governments are said to be hostile to innovation . . . . They are accused of being unable to change and unwilling to take political risks. They are also believed to be hampered by budget constraints and job security requirements, to lack performance and cost data, and to have little capacity for technical evaluation. (3)
>
> Certain groups in society have responded to this . . . by promoting innovations as a way to keep costs down and still provide services. One such group is the type known as a professional association or public interest group. Many recent studies suggest that these groups are significant intermediaries in bringing innovations to the city. (4)

Bingham cites a study sponsored by the National Science Foundation (1976) in which Roessner, the author of the study, indicated:

> that communications networks among city and state officials, and between these officials and national-level professional associations, are an important element in innovation at the state and local level. He reaches this

> conclusion not because there has been any systematic investigation of the role of professional associations but because most innovation studies at the state and local levels have suggested professional association influence. (4)

Bingham's study appears significant beyond its original intent. Some of his comments about cities and city officials also might be applied to schools and teachers. It also seems possible to consider his comments about professional associations in a wider context. In summarizing his review of relevant literature, Bingham states:

> Two important points emerge from the relevant literature. First, studies of innovation in state and local government make frequent reference to the influence of professional associations; and second, none of the literature examines this impact in a systematic manner. Additional research is clearly needed. (4)

These statements also appear applicable to the literature related to academic professional associations concerned with the teaching of English.

There have been some studies which, although their main focus was in other directions, have indicated that professional association membership was valuable for teachers and would have educational benefits for their students. An example of one such study is that done by Thorndike (1973) and cited by Merritt (1986) in "What's Wrong with Teaching Reading?" Thorndike investigated reading comprehension of ten-year-olds in an international survey of fifteen countries. There were a variety of findings about variables related to improvement of children's reading comprehension, one of which

was a slight indication that "membership in professional associations of educators or subject matter teachers was a favourable indicator" (Merritt 181).

A dissertation study which has also provided support for the value of professional association membership for teachers is that by Beth Ann LaForce, entitled "A Study of First-Year Teachers' Conceptual Understandings, Values, and Implementations of Integrated Language Arts," (1988). In this study, LaForce found that professional association membership was a significant variable in helping first-year teachers develop their understanding and implementation of an integrated language arts program in their elementary school classrooms.

It is significant for this study that the review of literature did not identify any studies which have examined the value or effect of professional association membership on the effectiveness of writing instruction.

Research on the Act of Writing

In 1963, Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer published Research in Written Composition. This book was the result of an extensive review of the research available on written composition. It was a significant publication in that it would serve for nearly twenty-five years as a guide for needed research in the field of written composition.

In this book Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer acknowledge NCTE as a significant factor in encouraging their work. They write:

> The impetus to prepare this report came from the Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English. Concerned over the nature of public pronouncements about how writing should be taught . . . the Executive Committee appointed an ad hoc Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition. The Committee's charge was "to review what is known and what is not known about the teaching and learning of composition and the conditions under which it is taught, for the purpose of preparing for publication a special scientifically based report on what is known in this area. (1)

Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer go on to explain how they responded the Committee's charge:

> An extensive research study developed out of this charge and it was determined that the committee chair [Braddock] should apply for funding from the Office of Education of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The committee members received a Cooperative Research grant in the amount of $13,345. Funding was also received from the University of Iowa in the amount of $4,397. The University of Iowa also provided Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer with released time to devote to the project . (2)

It must be remembered that in the early 1960's this federal grant of more than $13,000 was a sizeable amount of money. In The Uses of English (1967) Herbert J. Muller makes parenthetical mention of this funding as a "munificent grant" (102).

The members of the NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition, which had encouraged this study, included Alvina Treut Burrows of New York University, Richard Corbin of Hunter College High School, Dora V. Smith of the University of Minnesota, Erwin R. Steinberg of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Priscilla Tyler of the University of Illinois, Harold B. Allen of the University of Minnesota, an ex officio member by virtue of his position as a Past President of NCTE, and James R. Squire, also an ex officio member by virtue of his position as NCTE Executive Secretary. (See Appendices T and U for additional information about the professional association activities of each of these committee members.) All of these people were NCTE leaders who either had played important roles in the association in the past or would in its future, especially during the 1960's. With the exceptions of Squire and Steinberg, all of them served NCTE at some time as president or vice president. Steinberg was chair of CCCC in 1961. In addition, one of the co-authors of Research in Written Composition, Richard Lloyd-Jones, would remain an active NCTE member and serve as NCTE president in 1985-86. (See Appendix B for further information.)

Several of the committee members also had long-standing interest in the improvement of writing instruction. Burrows, for example, was co-author of They All Want To Write: Written English in the Elementary School, which at the time was in its second edition, having been published in 1939 and 1952. Two other professional association publications on composition by Burrows also reflected her concern for improving writing instruction: Children's

Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills (NCRE 1960), and Teaching Composition (NEA/AERA: 1st ed. 1959; Rev. ed, 1963).

The NCTE committee chair and chair of the study was Richard Braddock of the University of Iowa and the associate chair was Joseph W. Miller of Moorhead State College. Richard Braddock also remained active in NCTE for several years, serving as chair of CCCC in 1967, and as the first editor of Research in the Teaching of English from 1967 to 1972. Because of her expertise in children's writing, Alvina Burrows was selected to serve as special consultant in Elementary Education for the Braddock study (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer 1967, 3).

In chapter one of their book, Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer delineate the requirements which led to the particular organization of their study on composition:

> Under the provisions of the Office of Education grant, the main responsibility for the project had to be focused in one university. Consequently, a director and two associate directors on the University of Iowa faculty were released from some of their ordinary responsibilities to accomplish these tasks--Richard Braddock, associate professor of English and Rhetoric; Richard Lloyd-Jones, associate professor of English; and Lowell Schoer, assistant professor of Education Psychology. (3)

After extensive review and analysis of the existing research on composition, Braddock, et al, identified what they believed to be the "unexplored territory" (52) of research in composition and composition instruction and made an appeal for more research

concerning "what is involved in the act of writing" (53). This suggestion for further research is, in itself, process focused.

Whether these findings alone can be identified as the cause of the abundant research on composition that followed is uncertain, but a review of the research indicates that the publication of the Braddock book, as it came to be called, serves as a significant referent point for changes in the perception of composition as an area worthy of significant research and for the increase in the number of composition research studies which would be conducted. It may well have been the size of that grant from the United States Office of Education (USOE) which made other college professors take note that the USOE was interested in research on both composition and the teaching of composition and would support it.

The Braddock book is significant for this study because it makes clear that, prior to 1963, there were no significant studies of composition as a process as the term is now understood. Braddock, et al, identify only one study which examined writers while they were in the act of composing: a doctoral dissertation by John Van Bruggen (1945), entitled "Factors Affecting Regularity of the Flow of Words During Written Composition" completed at the University of Chicago. Van Bruggen's study focused on the rate at which a sample of 84 junior high school students were able to compose using an electric stylus and disc. The study, however, does not examine the process of writing and provides no significant information to improve writing instruction.

Twenty-three years after the publication of the Braddock book, George Hillocks, Jr. discusses the influence of the work in Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986). He writes of the its initial influence on him as a teacher and chair of a progressive junior high school English department which had de-emphasized the study of formal grammar. Hillocks writes that there was considerable pressure on him and his colleagues to give up their progressive program with its emphasis on "developing higher-level skills in reading literature and writing" (xv) and "return to the conventional junior high program of the time" (xv) which placed great emphasis on the study of traditional grammar. Hillocks continues:

> When the Braddock report reached me, I read it avidly to find what it said about grammar and written composition. I found the now-famous statement in short-order: "The teaching of formal grammar has a negligible or, because it usually displaces some instruction and practice in actual composition, even a harmful effect on the improvement of writing" (pp. 37-38). My colleagues and I rejoiced. . . . Unfortunately, after I found what I wanted, I put the book aside for many months. I finally returned to it, and learned a great deal from it--about the problems of judging quality of writing, about research design, about needed research, and so forth. It was indeed a valuable book for me. (xv)

During the years from 1957 to 1990, the field of education would see the development of alternative forms of research and the acceptability of forms of research that originated in other fields of study. For example, ethnographic research gained significance in the field of anthropology, and gradually gained acceptance in some areas

of education. The development of ethnographic research was a significant factor in facilitating various studies of the act of writing. One of the researchers who advocated changes in research design for the study of the teaching of English was Carol Talbert. As a featured speaker at the NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education in 1972, Talbert addressed the topic of "Anthropological Research Models." In her conference presentation and in a journal article which appeared later in Research in the Teaching of English (1973), Talbert advocated an anthropological research model which stressed:

> fewer statistics and more personal involvement, fewer rigid conceptual forms for investigating educational processes, and greater willingness to consider cultural factors that influence behavior in educational settings. (Rosenbaum 153)

Talbert was not alone in suggesting the need for alternative forms of research in studying the teaching of English, nor was she the first. Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer had specifically advocated use of both the longitudinal study and the case study for research in composition (31-32). They indicated that these two methods had been used successfully in other research fields and might prove enlightening in composition research as well.

Taking her cue from the Braddock book's recommendations for research, Janet Emig conducted her doctoral dissertation study utilizing the case study method to observe eight twelfth-graders in the act of composing. The dissertation, completed at Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1969, led to the publication of The

Composing Process of Twelfth Graders which appeared in 1971. This research report (NCTE Research Report #13) brought national recognition to Emig's work. The study was significant because it was one of a very few research projects at the time to focus on writing as a process rather than as a product. Donald Graves alludes to Emig's work in his book A Researcher Learns to Write (1984). He writes:

> Although Janet Emig preceded me with her research on the composing processes of twelfth-grade students, my committee was unaware of her work when I first started. (2)

Graves's statement indicates the nature of doctoral research, which is likely to go unrecognized unless it is published in a professional association forum, such as a journal, book, or monograph.

The Emig study was significant for its development of knowledge about the process features of the act of writing. Various authors (Walshe 1981; Graves 1984; Bishop 1990) have also alluded to her work as a milestone in two respects: first, its use of the case study method as the means for eliciting data, and second, its study of students while they were in the process of composing. Graves has written:

> Emig's study with twelfth grade students was the most thorough investigation into the composing processes of young writers. Indeed, her study involving the actual viewing and recording of the composing of individuals dispelled many of the popular notions about how young writers arrived at their final products. (1984, 19)

One of the key findings of Emig's study was the concept of recursiveness. Emig writes:

> Finally, the composing does not occur as a left-to-right, solid, uninterrupted activity with an even pace. Rather, there are recursive, as well as anticipatory, features; and there are interstices, pauses involving hesitation phenomena of various lengths and sorts . . . . (57)

Emig's recognition of recursiveness as an aspect of the composing process and her consequent description of it in her NCTE Research Report (1971) advanced professional knowledge about the act of writing. Several years later, in 1985, Raymond Rodrigues, writing in the English Journal, offered a figurative description of the recursive model of process writing. He wrote:

> The [ideal] model . . . was actually recursive. It wound back upon itself. And it wound back differently for different writers. Rather than being linear, it was more like a tangled string after a kitten had played with it. (25)

After the appearance of Emig's NCTE publication, research on the act of writing did not progress significantly until Donald H. Graves selected one of Emig's suggestions for further research and began his case study investigation of the writing processes of early elementary children.

Graves began his doctoral studies at the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1970 and completed his dissertation, "Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based upon

an Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children" in 1973. Graves's dissertation research became the catalyst for the highly influential work that he would conduct while teaching at the University of New Hampshire. Between 1973 and 1976, Graves published four articles based on his dissertation research, three of them in NCTE journals. The first of these, "Sex Differences in Children's Writing" appeared in Elementary English in October 1973. This article is reprinted in Graves's A Researcher Learns to Write (1984) accompanied by the author's comments on how he came to write the article. Graves writes:

> I suppose everyone remembers the moment they received the acceptance of the first thing they ever published. . . .The trail of this article began many months before. Janet Emig gave a lecture at the State University of New York at Buffalo, where I was studying. After her talk, Janet gave me a few minutes of her time in which I shared my preliminary findings on sex differences in children's writing. She urged me to write an article for the special issue on Girls and Women that she was coediting with Iris Tiedt [editor of Elementary English]. (7)

In June 1973, Tiedt notified Graves that his article had been accepted for publication. Thus, at the very beginning of Graves's university teaching career at the University of New Hampshire, his research on writing was published in a professional association journal.

In 1974, almost a year to the day after the completion of his dissertation, Donald Graves learned that he had been selected as an

NCTE Promising Researcher. The award provided Graves with two opportunities: first, to have an article on his dissertation research published in Research in the Teaching of English (RTE); and second, to present his research at the next NCTE Annual Convention.

Graves made his presentation in November 1974 at the NCTE Fall Convention in New Orleans and his research article, "An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children," appeared in the Winter 1975 issue of RTE. This article established Graves as an advocate of a process approach to writing and writing instruction for children, and was a significant factor leading to the grant he received in 1976 from the Ford Foundation. Of this grant, Graves has written:

> In April I received a small grant from the Ford Foundation to study the status of writing and its relationship to reading. This was an "in-house" study to help Ford decide on future funding for the foundation. (3)

It was also during the spring of 1976 that Julie Jensen, then the new editor of Language Arts, invited Graves to write a regular column on research for the NCTE journal for elementary classroom teachers. Elementary English had been renamed Language Arts in 1975, and Jensen was making plans to implement her vision for what the journal was to become during the next three years. Graves acknowledged this invitation as a significant event in his life. He writes:

> When I enthusiastically accepted [sic] I told her that I wanted to write about research in such a way that the data would be more accessible to teachers. Although I wanted to help teachers, make no mistake, I was out to help myself as well. If I could write about research in such a way that teachers wanted to read it, I knew that my writing would also improve . . . . (1984, 3)

Graves's comment expressing doubt about his ability to write may have surprised some readers in the 1980's, but it is indicative of his perspective toward writing and writing instruction. Graves has indicated in several of his publications (1976, 1978, 1983) that he believes writing is learned through writing. His view applies not only to the seven-year-old children he studied during his dissertation research, but also to novice writers of any age. In 1976, Graves still considered himself a novice writer in search of his own voice. Over the ten-year period, from 1973 to 1983, delineated in A Researcher Learns to Write, Graves candidly explains how he believes he learned to write, and how his research on the act of writing, particularly his study of the writing processes of early elementary children, led him to his perspectives on writing instruction. Graves also acknowledges Donald M. Murray's influence on his writing, especially in helping him to develop his own voice and style. Murray, a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, and Graves were colleagues at the University of New Hampshire and they became close friends. For this study, it is important to note that both men were active NCTE members: they contributed numerous articles for NCTE journals, were frequent conference presenters, and regularly served as members of committees.

As the results of Graves's research were published in NCTE journals, he gained wider recognition and respect for his research on the act of writing. This recognition and respect extended beyond the boundaries of the United States and was specifically acknowledged in Donald Graves in Australia (1981) by R. D. Walshe. In the opening chapter of this Primary English Teaching Association (PETA) publication, Walshe writes of the visit Graves made to Australia in 1980 to address the Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, as the meeting came to be called, in Sydney:

> P.E.T.A. specially invited him to the International Conference for two reasons: first, because we'd discerned a great upswing of interest since 1978 in the teaching of writing, in all of the English-speaking countries but most of all in the United States; second, because we'd decided that, world-wide, the most promising research into primary school writing was coming out of the Writing Process Laboratory, whose Director was Professor Donald H. Graves. Later, Time magazine [May 19, 1980] seemed to confirm our choice by giving top billing to Graves in an article which reported "a wave of writing reform sweeping the schools, colleges and businesses of the United States." (6)

While Time magazine does not represent a scholarly source for this research, its citation by Walshe is an indication of Graves's popularity, and how educators and others in countries around the world may learn more about educational trends in the United States.

Graves believed that his research had significant implications for writing instruction at all levels, but he believed the approach needed further study. Graves's decision to continue his research

represents a partial fulfillment of the call for research issued by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer in 1963. They too believed that composition instruction could be improved if the act of writing were better understood. The work of Emig and of Graves contributed significantly to the professional knowledge of the act of writing, and it set the stage for research that would further investigate the "unexplored territory" (52-53) of composition instruction identified in the Braddock book in 1963.

Research on Writing Instruction

In reviewing the research on writing instruction during the years which are the focus of this study, 1957-1990, one finds two professional association publications which reviewed previous writing and writing instruction research. The National Council of Teachers of English was involved, either directly or indirectly, with both publications. These two professional association publications provide historical perspectives for examining the research on process approaches to writing instruction.

The first of these two writing research reviews was Research in Written Composition (1963), written by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer, which was discussed previously in Chapter II for its research and recommendations related to the act of writing. The Braddock book (also commonly referred to as the Braddock study or the Braddock report) was initiated in 1961 by the

NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition and NCTE published the book. The research study was intended:

> to review what is known and what is not known about the teaching and learning of composition and the conditions under which it is taught . . . . (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer 1963, 1)

Consequently, the publication is significant not only for what it presents about the act of writing (see previous section), but also for what it presents on writing instruction.

Nearly all of the 504 studies included in the Braddock report examine, either directly or indirectly, aspects related to writing instruction, but none of the studies included in the report focused on writing instruction as a process. The studies focused on topics such as mode of discourse, time afforded for writing, rater fatigue, frequency counts of grammar errors, writing vocabulary word counts, and examination situations involving writing. With only one exception, the studies, reported by Braddock, et al., examined finished written products. The exception is the doctoral dissertation study of John A. Van Bruggen. Van Bruggen's study (1945), previously cited in Chapter I, examined frequency and rate of students' flow of words through the use of an electric stylus and disc. His subjects were eighty-four junior high students who were studied as they wrote school themes. He makes no comment on aspects of the writing process or on process elements of writing instruction. Thus, the Braddock report is significant not only for what it reports, but also for what it does not report. Either

Braddock, et al, overlooked significant studies on the process of the act of writing and on process approaches to writing instruction, or such studies simply did not exist at the time. More than twenty-eight years after the publication of the Braddock study, it still appears that their report was quite thorough in this area. There were no studies on process approaches to writing and writing instruction that had been published at the time.

The second professional association publication to present an extensive review of previous research was Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986) written by George Hillocks, Jr. NCTE's connection with this publication was indirect. The book was jointly published by the National Conference on Research in English (NCRE) and the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). At the time of publication, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills (ERIC/RCS) was housed at NCTE headquarters in Urbana, Illinois and the two organizations, NCTE and ERIC/RCS, shared some staff members who coordinated the publication programs. It also should be noted that NCRE, founded by C. C. Certain in 1932, was originally part of NCTE. When it began, it was only concerned with elementary schools (Hook 88), but the group's interests expanded to include research in English at all levels of schooling. Because of the long-standing historical connection between these two associations, the Hillocks book is just one of many that were jointly published by NCRE and NCTE, or by NCRE and ERIC.

Hillocks's study begins with a chapter entitled, "Research on the Composing Process" (v). The use of the "composing process" terminology in the chapter title alone indicates that conceptual understanding of writing as a process had evolved over the years since the publication of the Braddock report. The Hillocks book also examines experimental treatment studies of writing instruction and categorizes instruction into four modes, the "presentational mode," the "natural process mode," the "environmental mode," and the "individualized mode" (vi). A closer look at Hillocks's description of each of these modes is necessary to understand where his book fits in an examination of the process approaches to writing instruction.

In his discussion of the modes of instruction, Hillocks describes the "presentational mode" as:

> . . . characterized by (1) relatively clear and specific objectives, e.g., to use particular rhetorical techniques; (2) lecture and teacher-led discussions dealing with concepts to be learned and applied; (3) the study of models and other materials which explain and illustrate the concept; (4) specific assignments or exercises which generally involve imitating a pattern or following rules that have been previous discussed; and (5) feedback following the writing, coming primarily from teachers. (116-17)

Hillocks's description of what he calls "the natural process mode" is as follows:

> The natural process mode is characterized by (1) generalized objectives, e.g., to increase fluency and skill in writing; (2) free writing about whatever interests the students, either in a journal or as a way of "exploring a

> subject;" (3) writing for audiences of peers; (4) generally positive feedback from peers; (5) opportunities to revise and rework writing; and (6) high levels of interaction among students. (119)

The third mode of instruction identified and defined by Hillocks is the "environmental mode." According to Hillocks:

> The environmental mode is characterized by (1) clear and specific objectives, e.g., to increase the use of specific detail and figurative language; (2) materials and problems selected to engage students with each other in specifiable processes important to some particular aspect of writing; and (3) activities, such as small-group problem-centered discussions, conducive to high levels of peer interaction concerning specific tasks. (122)

The fourth instructional mode identified by Hillocks for his discussion of various experimental studies is the "individualized mode." Hillocks writes:

> In the individualized mode of instruction, students receive instruction through tutorials, programmed materials of some kind, or a combination of the two. The focus of instruction may vary widely, from mechanics to researching, planning, and writing papers. The chief distinction is that this mode of instruction seeks to help students on an individualized basis. (128)

The Hillocks book received mixed critical reviews. Writing in College Composition and Communication (1990), Richard Fulkerson comments that Hillocks derived his four categories of writing instruction "to serve his own research purposes" (419). Fulkerson's comment may be taken to mean that Hillocks's categories were

created to give greater credibility to Hillocks's own previous research. Fulkerson also points out that Hillocks's categories are "based only on teaching methods that had been the subject of empirical research" (419) and are far from being all-inclusive when they are compared to categories identified by other writers, such as the contributors to Donovan and McClelland's Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition (NCTE 1980). The contributors to the Donovan and McClelland book, including Donald Murray, Stephen Judy (Tchudi), Janice M. Lauer, and others, identify eight separate, differentiated approaches to composition instruction. Among these are "Writing as Process," the "Prose Models Approach," the "Experiential Approach," the "Rhetorical Approach," "The Epistemic Approach," and "Writing in the Total Curriculum," which is presented as a cross-disciplinary approach. The variety of approaches in the Donovan and McClelland book supports Fulkerson's point that Hillocks's categories are not all-inclusive. Writing in Research in the Teaching of English in the introduction to a set of commentaries entitled "Research in Written Composition: A Response to Hillocks' Report" (1988), Judith A. Langer commented more favorably on Hillocks's book. She wrote:

> It is an important work because: 1) it provides a synthesis of research in writing from the 1960's to 1982; 2) it reports the finding of a meta-analysis of studies on writing instruction; and 3) it suggests directions in research and instruction based on its findings. (89)

Langer comments further on the Hillocks book and indicates that the RTE article resulted from a session at the 1987 American Educational Research Association (AERA) Conference. She writes:

> Even before the book was released, when Hillocks presented his work at professional meetings, it caused quite a stir--the kind of stir that only an important book can make. From early on it was obvious that whether you agree with Hillocks' assumptions or not, it is the kind of book that makes you think And so, for the 1987 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, I invited several scholars to respond to the book. (89)

As one of the respondents at the AERA presentation and in the RTE article, "Research in Written Composition: A Response to Hillocks' Report" (1988), Sandra Stotsky, a researcher at Harvard University, presents an extensive analysis of Hillocks's study. She writes:

> There are two related questions we must explore with respect to these modes of instruction. Has Hillocks constructed a fair description of the natural process mode, or process-oriented instruction, and how distinctive is the environmental mode? (95)

In examining these questions, Stotsky continues:

> The basic criterion is whether the description of the model is truthful to the writing of its proponents and captures what they suggest are its critical features. One must also keep in mind that Hillocks is citing works published only through 1982. Since then, a great deal of structure has been added to the original conceptualization of the natural process mode by its proponents, but this

> development cannot be used legitimately to criticize the model Hillocks constructed for the meta-analysis. (95)

Stotsky's point clarifies her approach for examining Hillocks's book. Her point also makes clear that a thorough review of all research related to the various process-approaches to writing and writing instruction was still unavailable in 1988.

Writing in The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1986), Arthur Applebee comments extensively on Hillocks's research. He writes:

> . . . while I find Hillocks's review helpful, I interpret his results quite differently. First, I think his most important finding is that the search for alternatives to the traditional, product-centered mode of teaching writing has been well-motivated: each of the alternatives considered in his meta-analysis leads to a greater gain in student writing achievement than do traditional approaches Because of this finding, I interpret the problems [related to process-oriented instruction] . . . as part of the process of developing a new instructional paradigm, rather than as part of a call for a return to older patterns of instruction. I am convinced that the movement toward process-oriented approaches has been a beneficial one. . . .
>
> . . . Hillocks interprets his findings as a condemnation of process-oriented approaches because he finds that classrooms using an environmental mode of instruction do better than those using a natural process mode. . . . The "environmental" mode that Hillocks champions is itself a version of process-oriented instruction and draws on the panoply of techniques he seems to be attacking. What differs in "environmental" instruction is that materials and problems are orchestrated by the teacher . . . . (105)

Applebee goes on to say that he views Hillocks's environmental mode of instruction as "a series of process-oriented activities" (105) and "a natural extension" of "the pedagogical trends of the past decade" [i.e., 1976-86] (105).

Stotsky (1988), writing in the aforementioned RTE article, views Hillocks's environmental mode differently from Applebee. She writes:

> Since the environmental mode does feature small-group interaction and activities for developing and revising a piece of writing, it is not surprising that it might be considered a version of the natural process mode. But the presence of process-oriented activities does not mean that they are the critical feature of the environmental mode; as Hillocks points out, the environmental mode incorporates elements of both the natural process mode and the presentational mode. In fact, one could more easily argue that the environmental mode is basically an activity-laden version of the presentational mode. (96)

The researcher's own review of Hillocks's research leans toward that of Applebee with this particular difference: Hillocks's environmental mode focuses instruction on having students complete teacher-planned and teacher-directed activities, rather than on having them do self-initiated writing. Hillock writes:

> In [the environmental] mode, the instructor plans and uses activities which result in high levels of student interaction concerning particular problems parallel to those they encounter in certain kinds of writing, e.g., generating criteria and examples to develop extended definitions of concepts or generating arguable assertions from appropriate data and predicting and countering opposing arguments. In contrast to the presentational

> mode, this mode places priority on high levels of student involvement. In contrast to natural process, the environmental mode places priority on structured problem-solving activities, with clear objectives, planned to enable students to deal with similar problems in composing. (247)

One of the significant features of process-oriented approaches to writing instruction is their emphasis on students engaging in the act of writing, often on self-selected topics, rather than completing writing exercises. Consequently, the problem-solving activities identified by Hillocks are not an integral part of a process approach to writing. At best, they might be considered pre-writing activities, assuming that students are then assigned to select either the same topic, writing strategy, method of development, or another aspect of writing covered in the activities as preparation for their actual writing.

There are other aspects of Hillocks's book which merit comment in regard to his analysis of the process approaches to writing instruction. First, Hillocks claims to be thorough in his review of research. He writes:

> The attempt was to be exhaustive between the years 1963 and 1982. Items included in the Braddock bibliography were not included here. However, a few items published prior to 1963 but not in the Braddock study are included. Items produced in 1981 and 1982 which did not make their way into the ERIC system, Dissertations Abstract International, or one of the standard bibliographies until 1983 are probably not included. (xvii)

Further, in introducing his first chapter, Hillocks begins his discussion with comments on the 1970's:

> The decade of the seventies brought a surge of interest in the composing processes of writers. Following the recommendation of Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer (1963), researchers set out to determine what is involved in the act of writing and of what such skill consists. (1)

Hillocks's attempt to be exhaustive falls short in that he did not examine two studies of process approaches to writing instruction which appeared in the 1960's after the publication of the Braddock book. These two studies, one by D. Gordon Rohman and Albert Wlecke and another by Anthony L. Tovatt and Ebert L. Miller, were both supported with funding from the United States Office of Education (USOE) and were far from obscure. Both studies had been cited and discussed by Janet Emig in her review of literature in The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971) and the Tovatt and Miller study was cited and discussed by Alvina Treut Burrows and Sara Lundsteen in a chapter they wrote for the NCRE and ERIC/RCS publication Help for the Teacher of Written Composition-K-9: New Directions in Research (1976).

Hillocks was apparently aware of the studies because he lists the original Rohman and Wlecke USOE report in his bibliography; and, although he omits the original USOE report by Tovatt and Miller, two articles about their research, one by Tovatt (1965) and another by Tovatt and Miller (1967), are included. Since the articles were readily available through the ERIC system and the studies each

offer significant perspectives for considering the process of writing instruction, it is unfortunate that Hillocks did not include them.

The Rohman and Wlecke study was conducted in the Department of English at Michigan State University in 1964 with students in three sections of a sophomore-level expository writing course. After dividing the writing process into the stages of "prewriting," "writing," and "rewriting," Rohman and Wlecke concentrated their research on "prewriting." This study is significant for two reasons: first, because it studied students while they were in the act of writing; and second, because it is generally acknowledged as the first to use the term "prewriting" in reference to a process approach to writing instruction (Walshe 1981; Bishop 1990).

It seems very likely that it was the publication of the Rohman and Wlecke study that significantly altered how other researchers thereafter thought about the "process of writing." Rohman published the results of this study in 1965 in College Composition and Communication in an article entitled, "Pre-writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process." In this article Rohman argues that:

> . . . without the rhetoric of the mind . . . no course in the rhetoric of the word could make up for the fact that the writer has discovered essentially nothing to say. In fact, to continue to teach rhetoric without attention to discovery reinforces that indifference to meaning that characterizes the modern world of politics and advertising. (112)

Patricia Bizzell discussed Rohman and Wlecke's work in her chapter "Composing Processes: An Overview" which appeared in The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II) in 1986. She wrote:

> Rohman and Wlecke found that successful college-level writers typically traverse three stages in composing: pre-writing, writing, and editing. Most significant here is the concept of "pre-writing," that is, idea-generating activities that provide essential preparation for drafting. This was perhaps the first intimation that we needed to study a whole complex of composing processes, of which the actual writing of the paper was only one. Moreover, Rohman suggested that pre-writing activities such as journal keeping and meditation could be taught--that composing processes, rather than grammar drills, could become the actual content of the writing course. (52)

As Wendy Bishop points out in Released into Language: Options for Teaching Creative Writing (1990), "the Rohman and Wlecke study, though significant both for its methodology and findings at the time, still perceives writing as a linear process" (18). Bishop's point differentiates the nature of linear and recursive processes. In the Rohman-Wlecke study, the stages of pre-writing, writing, and rewriting are discussed as occurring in a sequential pattern; the writer is perceived as moving from the first stage to the second to the third.

The Tovatt and Miller study, conducted at Ball State University over the period from September 1964 to January 1967, was also based on a linear conceptualization of the writing process as consisting of three stages: pre-writing, writing, and rewriting. The

project, entitled "Oral-Aural-Visual Stimuli Approach to Teaching Written Composition to 9th Grade Students," focused on an instructional approach with 60 students randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Tovatt and Miller (1967) explain that their study:

> . . . investigated the effect of oral-aural-visual stimuli in the development of communication skills and the methods by which English teachers can take into account the use of such stimuli in teaching these skills to students at varying levels of linguistic competency. (2)

Tovatt and Miller focused their research on the following areas of inquiry:

> The ability of the student to improve his writing through increased practice in the control of oral forms of language;
>
> The ability of students to engage in systematic oral discussion of what they are going to put down in writing, before they attempt to write;
>
> The ability of the student to give and to accept constructive criticisms of his oral and written composition; and
>
> The impact of the oral-aural-visual stimuli approach on student attitudes toward written composition. (2)

The Tovatt and Miller study, like the Rohman and Wlecke study, focused its investigation of students while they are in the act of writing. It is an experimental treatment investigation of connections

between oral language and written composition. Both studies advanced professional knowledge of process writing instruction by providing specific suggestions for teaching methods that may be used with students of varying ages, levels of ability, and linguistic competence.

Another publication which appeared between the years 1963 and 1986 (after Braddock, but before Hillocks) was Research on Composing: Points of Departure (1978) edited by Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. This book, also published by NCTE, was a collection of papers which developed out of a professional conference on composition research. The conference, funded primarily by the NCTE Research Foundation, was held at the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1975 and the book's articles are revisions of papers presented at that conference. Each of the papers addresses some aspect of the topic of "researching composing" (ix), the theme of the conference. As the conference theme suggests, interest in research on the composing process was gradually increasing.

The Cooper and Odell book includes articles by James Britton, Richard E. Young, Janet Emig, Walter T. Petty, Loren S. Barritt and Barry M. Kroll, Donald M. Murray, Gabriel M. Della-Piana, Phillip Lopate, and John Schultz. Cooper and Odell, as their book title indicates, were trying to identify the directions that composition research might take as a result of the interest that was developing in the field. Three of the book's articles focus on process approaches: James Britton's "The Composing Processes and the Functions of Writing;" Janet Emig's "Hand, Eye, Brain: Some 'Basics'

in the Writing Process;" and Donald Murray's "Internal Revision: A Process of Discovery." More information and reflections on these articles will appear in Chapter 4 as part of an examination of this professional conference and its contribution to development of the process approaches to writing instruction.

As interest developed in discovering more about process approaches to writing instruction, some publications focused on identifying processes used by established authors. The objective was to improve students' writing by teaching them to emulate the processes used by professional authors.[1] One of the works which became well-known for this approach was Donald Murray's work A Writer Teaches Writing (1968). While this book does not qualify as either quantitative or qualitative research, it provides an historical perspective for viewing process writing instruction as it was discussed at the time. Murray is a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist who teaches composition at the University of New Hampshire. As a leading advocate of a process approach to writing and writing instruction, he has published widely and frequently in professional association journals from 1968 to the present. His articles have appeared in most of the NCTE journals, including English Journal, College Composition and Communication, Elementary English, College English, and English Education. Although he is not a researcher, Murray has written extensively about his own writing process and how his methods might be used by others. The

---

[1] For an extensive bibliography of interviews with authors and books by writers on the process of writing, see Donald M. Murray's A Writer Teaches Writing (1985), pp. 254-259.

credibility of his work seems to stem from his success as journalist, as well as from the clarity of his explanations about aspects of writing, such as how to start a piece of writing, what to do when it is going badly, and how to think about one's audience. In the 1968 edition of his book, Murray used the writing terminology that developed from the previously identified Rohman-Wlecke and Tovatt-Miller research; he referred to the stages of writing as pre-writing, writing, and rewriting. In his completely revised 1985 edition, Murray discusses the writing process quite differently in terms of collecting, planning, drafting, revising, and editing (viii). In the Preface to the 1985 edition, Murray writes:

> I did not read a page of the first edition of A Writer Teaches Writing during the writing of this edition. I did not want to view the subject through the lens of old language and old ideas. Since A Writer Teaches Writing was published in 1968, the process approach to the teaching of writing has developed from a fairly new concept to a fully accepted, practiced and researched approach to the teaching of writing. I have learned with and from others across the country who have taught or researched the process approach at every level, from kindergarten through graduate school. There has also been an enormous amount of material published by writers about the writing process in these years. . . . I am indebted to all my colleagues whose journal articles, talks, correspondence, and conversations have instructed me. (xi)

Murray's reference to "journal articles, talks, correspondence, and conversations" implies that his knowledge and understanding of

pro

con

mod

iden

clar

and

und

and

to b

Murr

grou

"who

study

and

who

both

was

W

in wh

teach

Schu

the wa

process writing instruction has developed through his professional contacts.

In another of his books, Write to Learn (1987), Murray again modifies his presentation of "the parts of the process" (6) by identifying them as collecting, focusing, ordering, developing, and clarifying. He indicates that through his repeated attempts to define and describe the writing process, he was able to develop his understanding of the processes of writing and writing instruction, and find a variety of strategies and techniques for teaching writing to his students (6).

It is also significant for this study that in Write to Learn Murray acknowledges the officers of a major NCTE constituent group, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, "whose work has made it possible for those of us interested in studying writing to get together and exchange our views in print and in person" (xiii).

In the 1980's, there was additional research to find teachers who were also successful authors and who could perhaps illuminate both the author's process and the teacher's methods. One such study was that by Bunge (1985). In Finding the Words: Interviews with Writers Who Teach, Bunge reports the findings of a three-year study in which she interviewed more than fifty authors who are also teachers. In the course of her study, she discovered sixteen authors, including Wallace Stegner, Richard Wilbur, Diane Wakoski, and Allen Ginsburg, who gave, in Bunge's words, "fascinating explanations of the way one teaches and learns how to write" (vii). The publication

claims to present the "interviews which best illuminate the writing process" (vii). Through her study, Bunge was able to elicit considerable information on the authors' methods: how they write, where they get their ideas, what they want to accomplish in their writing, what they believe is important for writers to learn, and what they say to their own writing students in class. Unfortunately, for the purpose of developing pedagogical perspectives on the process of writing instruction beyond what can be found in the professional literature elsewhere, the Bunge study offers very little that is new. The author interviews are well-presented and they are interesting to read, but their primary significance derives from the interest value of reading about how well-known authors describe their writing and their work in the classroom.

In 1986 Arthur Applebee published "Problems in Process Approaches: Toward a Reconceptualization of Process Instruction" in The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, edited by Anthony Petrosky and David Bartholomae and published by the University of Chicago Press. In this article Applebee examines:

> . . . the success of process approaches against three criteria: (a) How widely have they been adopted? (b) When adopted, how successfully are they implemented? and (c) When implemented, do they lead to noticeable improvement in students' writing? (97)

Although Applebee affirms his belief in the importance of the development of process approaches to writing instruction as a

significant means for improving students' writing, he also clearly delineates some of the problems that developed as process approaches were advocated by leaders in the field. Applebee writes, "there is almost always a gap between educational theory and educational practice, and process approaches are no exception" (97-98). By this Applebee seems to mean that educational theorists' and researchers' knowledge and understanding of a pedagogical concept may be reflected in the professional literature sometime before many teachers try to implement it in their elementary or secondary classrooms. It also may be in some instances that educational theorists and researchers have a deeper understanding of the pedagogical concepts they advocate than do those who read an article or two, or attend a workshop, and then attempt to teach the ideas in their lessons with students. It seems ironic, however, that the gap between educational theory and practice also may result from the complexities of application of new knowledge in pedagogy. School and classroom curriculums change slowly; a change in any one part generally requires changes in other parts. The process approaches to writing instruction require complex implementation, and are not quickly or easily introduced into classrooms that have been traditionally structured with a focus on product-oriented writing instruction.

Applebee writes, "In the first flush of enthusiasm, process-oriented instruction was embraced simplistically and naively" (97). As a consequence, results in actual classrooms did not always match theorists' predictions or replicate results achieved by students in

experimental classrooms where the instruction was directed by an educational researcher. Thus, Applebee argues that professional leaders must develop a sophisticated, reconceptualized approach to process-oriented writing instruction that reflects "more reasoned and disciplined thinking" (97). He writes, "If we do not, we may find our colleagues abandoning process approaches entirely in favor of the traditional emphasis on the rules of good writing" (97).

Applebee's view of a reconceptualized approach to process-oriented writing instruction is based not only on a deeper understanding of writing processes, but also on an alternative model for instruction, which he developed with Judith A. Langer. Some of the features of this model are:

> Student ownership of the learning event. The instructional event must allow students room to make their own contribution to the activity as it evolves, giving them a sense of ownership of what they are doing. In writing instruction, this means that writing activities must serve real language functions (informing, persuading, telling a story, or the like) beyond the simple desire to please the teacher.
>
> Appropriateness of the instructional task. Tasks should build upon knowledge and skills the student already possess, but should be difficult enough to allow new learning to occur. . . .
>
> Shared responsibility. Tasks are solved jointly in the course of instructional interaction; the role of the teacher in this process needs to be more collaborative than evaluative. The teacher's task must be conceived as helping students toward new learning, rather than just as testing the adequacy of previous learning.

> Transfer of control. Over time, as students internalize new procedures and routines, they should take a greater responsibility for controlling the progress of the task. Some tasks will simply be completed independently; other will evolve into dialogues in which the teacher and pupil become equal partners in the problem-solving effort . . . . (110)

Implementing an instructional model with these features, according to Applebee, would create a more fully developed approach to process-oriented writing instruction. He writes:

> Given a model of instruction that incorporates these principles, a number of changes could be expected to follow in process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. Writing assignments would themselves be broadened to give scope for students' opinions and solutions rather than stressing material that has been presented and problems that have been solved in previous lessons. . . . Teachers' first and primary response to student writing would shift from evaluator of its quality or success to that of interested reader (and skilled editor), seeking to understand and clarify what the writer has to say. (111)

Applebee indicates that the changes he is suggesting would "require a fundamental shift in what counts as learning in American schools" (111).

In 1987, Langer and Applebee published How Writing Shapes Thinking (NCTE Research Report No. 22). Extending the ideas Applebee presented in the NSSE yearbook chapter discussed above, this professional association publication reflected a combination of two areas of instruction about which educational concern increased in the 1980's: first, emphasis on the teaching of thinking, and

second, writing across the curriculum. The study identifies and examines ways to use writing across the secondary school curriculum as a tool for fostering learning and developing the quality of students' thinking. Langer and Applebee make a case for the view that all teachers share responsibility for teaching students to think and to express their thoughts clearly in written language. In addition, Langer and Applebee present the perspective that the writing that students do will fundamentally shape their thinking and learning.

One of the aspects of process approaches to writing instruction which received scant attention throughout the years from 1957 to 1990 was the issue of how genre affected or altered the instructional process. The questions posed were: first, would a process approach for writing instruction have to be modified significantly for teaching the writing of different genres; and second, if so, what would those instructional process modifications be. In other words, when students are being taught to write fiction, is the instructional process different from when they are being taught to write non-fiction; and, if it is different, how is it different.

The same two questions may be posed with poetry writing as opposed to any other genre, fiction, non-fiction, or drama. One article which reported a research study on teaching poetry writing to children was that by Gerald G. Duffy, "Crucial Elements in the Teaching of Poetry Writing" (1973). Duffy's article appeared in The Language Arts in the Elementary School: A Forum for Focus (NCTE 1973), edited by King, Emans, and Cianciolo. This publication

presents thirty-seven articles which began as presentations "at the general sessions and sectional meetings of the National Conferences on the Language Arts of 1969 (Philadelphia) and 1970 (Saint Louis)" (xi). Although Duffy does not claim to present a process approach to poetry writing instruction, his instructional approach includes features that have come to be associated with process approaches. For example, he emphasizes the importance of "structuring the environment" (198), wherein the teacher serves as "an encourager of poetry writing" (199) and "manipulates the teaching environment . . . to achieve an atmosphere approximating that in which the poet works" (200). Duffy also emphasizes the importance of reading poetry to children and providing a significant "background of listening experiences" (202) before the writing begins. According to Duffy, the "objective of poetry writing is to help children become aware of their uniqueness through self-expression" (205). In discussing how to evaluate children's poetry writing, Duffy writes:

> . . . the "report card notion" of evaluation is likely to inhibit, rather than encourage, the achievement of the objective. Consequently, the teacher abandons traditional marking systems when teaching poetry writing. Instead, he keeps samples of each child's early poetry writing efforts and uses them as gauges against which future samples can be compared to determine individual improvement. (206)

Duffy's article emphasizes that traditional teaching of writing is likely to inhibit children's self-expression. It focuses on strategies to help children learn self-expression through poetry writing, and

suggests that the instructional process needs to be modified to accomplish the objective. However, the article does not clarify what process children go through as they learn to write poetry, nor is there any indication of how children might learn to evaluate their own poetry writing. Further, the article makes no specific reference to children's poems progressing through several drafts before a final version of the poem is created. As indicated previously, this article does not claim to present a process approach, but it does identify some of the process features which would later be organized by other theorists and researchers into a holistic view of what writers do when they write and what teachers must do to teach the process to students. Duffy's article is typical of the time period. It represents how teachers were encouraged to function in the classroom to accomplish specific objectives. The article also reflects its time period in that, during the early 1970's, there were many articles which encouraged creative writing and developing children's self-expression.

The question of genre was raised again in 1990, when Wendy Bishop published Released into Language: Options for Teaching Creative Writing. This NCTE publication examined the undergraduate writing workshop as a means for developing college students' understanding of and capabilities for creative writing. Bishop's workshop approach individualizes instruction and utilizes considerable student interaction, along with other instructional techniques, so that students are free to develop their language creativity, and consequently improve their writing, as real authors

are likely to do. One of Bishop's primary purposes is differentiating how the instructional process must vary to teach creative writing as opposed to expository writing.

As indicated in Chapter I, NCTE, from its beginnings, demonstrated its interest in improving writing instruction, in part by the articles published in its journals. However, it must be noted that articles on writing instruction were consistently fewer in number in the NCTE journals than articles on literature instruction for the first sixty years of the association's history. Two examples will serve as evidence of this publication trend. First, in the Annotated Index to Elementary English: 1924-1967 (NCTE 1968) by Walter J. Moore, there are 263 annotations of articles on composition categorized under six headings: Composing Process (37 annotations), Evaluation (31 annotations), Mechanics (31 annotations), Motivation (41 annotations), Programs (52 annotations), Letters and Letter Writing (24 annotations), and Creative Writing (50 annotations). Handwriting and Grammar, which sometimes have been the focus of so-called writing instruction at the elementary level, are treated separately in the Annotated Index to Elementary English: 1924-67 and, thus, are not included in the 263 annotations. This same NCTE publication lists over 700 annotations of articles and other items, such as bibliographies, related to the study of Children's Literature and over 300 annotations of articles on Reading. This one example indicates that articles on literature and reading outnumbered articles on composition in Elementary English during the years from 1924 to 1967 by a ratio greater than three to one.

A second example may be drawn from the Annotated Index to the English Journal: 1964-1970. In this NCTE publication, edited by Robert C. Harvey and Carole Masley Kirkton, there are 205 annotations of articles on composition, 42 annotations on reading, and 433 annotations on literature. Comparing the figures on composition and literature alone, it is evident that articles on literature outnumbered articles on composition in the English Journal during the years of 1964 to 1970 by a ratio greater than two to one. From these two examples, it is apparent that while NCTE was interested in composition instruction as a component of the English curriculum, the greater portion of journal space in these two journals during the stated time periods was devoted to reading and literature.

Conclusion

A review of the relevant research on professional associations, on the act of writing, and on the process approaches to writing instruction reveals a connection among these three topics that still are not fully understood. It is clear that the selected professional associations concerned with the teaching of English, particularly the National Council of Teachers of English, have also been concerned, over the years from 1957 to 1990, with improving professional knowledge about the act of writing and writing instruction. Perhaps the most striking comparison that may be drawn between the early and later years of this study is the following. When Braddock,

Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer published their Research in Written Composition in 1963, they identified 504 studies which focused on aspects of writing and writing instruction. In 1987, when Ericka Lindemann published her first edition of the Longman Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric 1984-85, she and the 151 contributing bibliographers cited over 3800 titles published during the 1984 and 1985 calendar years (Lindemann 1987, vii). The Longman Bibliography, intended for teachers and researchers, is "an annual classified listing of scholarship on written English and its teaching" (1987, vii). It covers listing for all levels of schooling, from elementary through graduate education.

In 1990, Lindemann published another bibliography for which she served as the managing editor, the CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric 1987. This bibliography published by the Conference on College Composition and Communication, a constituent group of NCTE, is also issued annually. The 1990 edition, covering publications on writing and writing instruction for the calendar year of 1987, contains over 1800 citations by 166 contributing bibliographers which focus "on work of interest to teachers and researchers in colleges and universities" (Lindemann 1990, vii).

These examples provide evidence of the increasing scholarship devoted to writing and writing instruction. Given the number of studies, it may be that no truly comprehensive review of research on written composition, similar to that of Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer, will ever be undertaken in the future. Instead, it is more likely that there will be a number of highly focused reviews of the

professional literature on particular aspects of writing or writing instruction, similar to that undertaken for this study, which will serve as an examination of the research base for selected topics.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

While reading for this study, the researcher looked for publications about the activities of various professional associations concerned with the teaching of writing. She also looked for publications about research on the act of writing and writing instruction. From the extensive number of the latter group, the researcher looked for those publications produced by the major professional associations, as well as publications about the associations' activities produced by independent publishers, which would shed light on the questions of the study.

After deciding early in the study to focus the research on the process of writing and writing instruction, the researcher soon discovered that there were several different perspectives on "process" from authorities in the field, especially as the term related both to the act of writing and writing instruction. Thus, the focus was refined to an examination of "the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction." As the reading continued, the researcher also searched for a frame of reference that would encompass and clarify the roles of the professional associations in their

contributions to the the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction.

Assumptions

This study is based on a number of assumptions which must be identified in order to clarify the parameters of the study. First, it is assumed that writing instruction is a significant element in English and language arts education at all levels. This assumption is neither a new one, nor is it held only by the researcher. Langer and Applebee in How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning (1987) state their "belief that the effective teaching of writing is an essential component in any successful school program" (3). Ernest L. Boyer, writing in High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America (1983) for The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, also indicated the expectation that schools will teach writing. He stated, "Teaching students to write clearly and effectively should be a central objective of the school" (91).

A second assumption of this study is that membership and participation in state, national, and international professional educational associations are valuable professional activities. It is through active, multi-level participation in professional associations that educators can both discover and create opportunities to continue the process of their education and professional development long after the completion of formal schooling in the university. The

corollary of this assumption from the perspective of the professional association is that the professional association provides significant and valuable services to its members and to the profession as a whole. It must be noted that, from the perspective of the professional association, the primary purpose of the association generally is to serve the profession, with an ultimate mission of improving the quality of human life. Consequently, serving members is either a secondary purpose, or a means for accomplishing the primary purpose and fulfilling the ultimate mission. In his book The Role of Trade Associations and Professional Business Societies in America, Joseph F. Bradley writes of the importance of professional associations and societies. Bradley uses the terms "associations" and "societies" interchangeably, but indicates that some professionals prefer the term "societies" because they believe it has a higher prestige value or status (11). Bradley writes:

> The prime function of a professional society is to provide machinery so that its members can serve humanity better. The community is served better when problems are more clearly defined, when research finds new or improved solutions to existing problems, when the members of a profession are better trained, and when ethical standards are raised. Mature professional societies can help their members achieve these goals by sponsoring national and regional meetings where members exchange ideas, by publishing a journal in which research is reported; by making recommendations to the professional schools for the improvement of curricula; and by having committees of their own members make suggestions for improving ethical standards. In other words, the primary responsibility of

> a professional society is not to its members but to mankind. (9)

Although it was Bradley's intention to write specifically about business and trade associations, his statement applies equally well to the professional associations of the academic community.

A third assumption of this study is that membership and participation in a variety of professional associations is highly valuable. Through these alliances, educators are more likely to be exposed to varying perspectives which may help them to understand their own work on a much broader base. Active participation in more than one professional association may lead to working with people who share more diverse views than one might find through involvement in only one association.

A fourth assumption is that when different professional associations choose to work collaboratively, there will be benefits for the active participants in the projects, as well as benefits for the members of the associations who only later read about the work or project in which the various associations were involved. In addition there may be benefits for the profession as a whole. In an article entitled "The Functions of the Professional Association," Robert K. Merton writing in The American Journal of Nursing (1958) discussed the importance of a professional association expressing dissatisfaction with the status quo of the profession and committing itself to pushing for higher standards and more articulated statements of purpose (3).

Research Questions

In conducting this study the researcher examined three research questions. The first was: How has writing instruction been conceptualized in journal articles and other publications of the selected professional associations, particularly those of the National Council of Teachers of English? Key historical issues implicit within that question included how the concept of process-oriented writing instruction was developed and when various process-oriented approaches to writing instruction began to appear in the professional literature? As a consequence of these questions, it was also important to consider, has professional understanding of writing instruction reached a new focus or a new level of development? Hillocks's research, reported in Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986) suggests that it has. Applebee and Langer and others have written about current problems with process writing instruction and have given indications of what might be done about them. This first research question and the related historical issues will be addressed in Chapter IV.

The second research question of this study was: How have specific major national and international professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars, which resulted in publications, contributed to the development of the process-oriented approaches to the teaching of writing? A related historical issue was which professional association and inter-association conferences

and seminars contributed to greater shared knowledge among professional leaders about process-oriented writing instruction as evidenced in publications resulting from such meetings. This research question and the related historical issue will be addressed in Chapter V.

The third major question of this study was: What is the current status of the roles of the professional associations in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction and what does this status suggest for the future? Related issues here included: How do the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction fit into a broader spectrum of on-going curricular development in American schools and what roles should the professional associations play in continuing the evolution of theory, research, and practice? This research question and the related issues will be addressed in Chapter VI.

Sources of Evidence

In searching for books, articles, monographs, position statements, and other publications pertaining to the activities of professional associations and to the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, the researcher conducted an ERIC search and consulted Education Index and the Current Index to Journals in Education.

The researcher also consulted a number of bibliographic sources, such as the Longman Bibliography of Composition and

Rhetoric 1984-85 (1987), the CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric 1987 (1990), the Annotated Index to Elementary English 1924-67 (1968), the Annotated Index to the English Journal 1964-70 (1972), The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing (3rd ed., 1991), and the bibliographies which appear annually in Research in the Teaching of English. In searching for related dissertations, the researcher completed a computer search of Dissertation Abstracts International.

The research was also aided by the extensive bibliographies in Research in Written Composition (1963) by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer; English in a Decade of Change (1968) by Michael Shugrue; Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974) by Arthur N. Applebee; Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986) by George Hillocks, Jr.; and How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning (1987) by Judith A. Langer and Arthur N. Applebee.

In some instances, the researcher was able to review original sources concerning a professional association activity, such as an inter-association conference report, and then was able to locate and review articles or commentaries, written from varying perspectives, about the activity by members of the various participating associations. One example of this is the Basic Issues Conference Series which took place from January to October of 1958. The original report, The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English, jointly approved by the participating associations and published by NCTE and MLA, is available in the ERIC System [ED 016 640]. Further

in

fo

S

M

E

Is

by

di

M

M

in

an

an

th

ori

co

Pa

Fu

the

An

in

his

Pre

Stu

information on the conferences from NCTE's perspective may be found in A Long Way Together: A Personal View of NCTE's First Sixty-Seven Years (1979) by J. N. Hook, while information from MLA's perspective is discussed in two books published by MLA: English in a Decade of Change (1968) by Michael F. Shugrue or in Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English (1964) by George Winchester Stone, Jr. The conference series is also discussed from an historical perspective in an article by Albert H. Marckwardt which appeared in the September 1967 issue of PMLA. Marckwardt was a past president of NCTE and was also very active in MLA at the time he published the article. Thus, one can develop an historical perspective on the importance of this conference series and is more likely to avoid bias than if the event were viewed from the perspective of only one participating association.

The researcher was also particularly fortunate in acquiring an original copy of Volume One of the Dartmouth Seminar Papers. The copy originally belonged to Dr. Merron Chorny, a Dartmouth Seminar participant. Dr. Chorny donated the volume in 1990 to the NCTE Fund for the Advancement of the Teaching of English, which offered the book for sale to the highest bidder in a silent auction held at the Annual Convention in November 1990.

During this study, important information was also discovered in sources that might be overlooked by some readers. Significant historical information can often be found in a book's foreword, preface, acknowledgements, or afterword. Particularly for this study, it was necessary to pay attention to authors' comments about

whom they wished to thank for funding or other support, for the impetus to produce their work, or for relationship of a publication to a professional association conference, seminar, or other activity. Considerable historical information concerning dates of events, participants, school or university affiliations, and relationships to other activities may be found in book prefaces or acknowledgements. These pieces of information by themselves may seem insignificant, but when taken together, a pattern may emerge which reflects long-term collaboration among individuals, institutions, and professional associations.

Analysis and Evaluation

In framing this study, the following definition of historical research from Borg and Gall's Educational Research: An Introduction (4th ed. 1983) served as a guide for data collection, analysis, and evaluation:

> Historical research involves the systematic search for documents and other sources that contain facts relating to the historian's questions about the past. By studying the past, the educational historian hopes to achieve better understanding of present institutions, practices, and problems in education. (800)

The major aims of this study relate to each of the last three items identified by Borg and Gall: institutions, practices, and problems. The primary aim was greater understanding of the roles that

associations have played in developing their recommended practices for writing instruction. The second aim was to develop a better understanding of professional associations as institutions that serve both their members and the profession as a whole through various activities and programs, and a third aim was improved understanding of how writing instruction has been conceptualized over time within the professional association literature.

An issue that must be considered, if this research is to be carried out in an objective and unbiased manner, is the researcher's own beliefs and predispositions. Because the researcher has been a member of a variety of professional associations in the past, including the Michigan Association of Speech Communication and the Michigan Reading Association, and continues to be a member of the National Council of Teachers of English, the International Reading Association, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the American Educational Research Association, the Michigan Council of Teachers of English, the Indiana Council of Teachers of English, and the Indiana Teachers of Writing, the researcher must cast a critical eye toward decisions made during the research. The problem is not so much what might be included, as what the researcher might choose to leave out--especially as the decision concerns professional association activities. The researcher looked especially at where professional associations may have succeeded in carrying out particular goals and objectives related to the research, as well as where the professional associations may have erred or failed--either by not doing enough or by doing the

wrong things as decisions were made and activities were carried out by professional association leaders.

Limitations of the Study

The study has been limited by the availability of information about the activities of the professional associations in the professional literature. While the researcher attempted to be both thorough and systematic in searching for related information, there may have been documents, reports, articles, and other publications which remained elusive either because of the researcher's own failings, or because the materials were not collected or published.

Another limitation concerned the nature and extent of the information that was published about some of the professional association and inter-association conferences. In some instances, after a conference was over, a conference director or convenor edited a publication which contained papers presented at the original conference, but neglected to record the names of all of the conference participants or presenters. and neglected to give more than a brief summary of extensive conversations and discussions that took place at the conference. Without detailed information, and, preferably information from a variety of participant perspectives, it is difficult to conduct historical research, interpret data, and draw substantive conclusions about conference proceedings or their significance to issues beyond the conference.

CHAPTER 4

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF WRITING INSTRUCTION

Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher will report and analyze the data related to the first research question of the study: How has writing instruction been conceptualized in journal articles and other publications of the selected professional associations, particularly those of the National Council of Teachers of English? In Chapter II, in the sections entitled "Research on the Act of Writing" and "Research on Writing Instruction," the researcher indicated that the process-oriented approaches to writing and writing instruction essentially began with the call for research on "the act of writing" in Research in Written Composition (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer 1963, 53). In addition, the research studies by Rohman and Wlecke (1964), Tovatt and Miller (1965; 1967), Emig (1971), and Graves (1973) were instrumental in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. However, it must be noted that while there was some interest during the early years, which are the focus of this study, in learning more about the act of writing, and in improving writing instruction, as advocated by NCTE leaders such as Alvina Treut Burrows (1959; 1961) and Ruth Strickland (1961), the process-

oriented approaches to writing instruction did not become a major research focus until the middle 1970's (Applebee 1986; Hillocks 1986).

Conceptualizations of Writing Instruction

There were a variety of approaches to writing instruction during the early years of the period which is the focus of this study. From 1957 to 1963, most of the approaches to writing instruction focused on the final written product Some of the approaches, which are reflected in the professional literature of that time, include the "grammar and mechanics first" perspective, the models method, the product-correctness approach, and the organizational focus. Writing in the Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1986), Arthur N. Applebee offered these comments about the use of models, the emphasis on grammar drills and exercises, and the importance of correctness as primary elements in writing instruction:

> The traditional approach to writing instruction in American schools has been prescriptive and product-centered. At the sentence level, instruction has emphasized correct usage and mechanics; at the text level, it has emphasized the traditional modes of discourse (narration, description, exposition, persuasion, and sometimes poetry). In this approach, instruction usually consists of analyzing classic examples of good form, learning the rules that govern those classic examples, and practicing following the rules (either in exercises of limited scope or by imitating the classic models). In turn, success in writing has been measured

> by the ability to incorporate those rules into one's own writing. Warriner's English Grammar and Composition is the archetypal example of this approach to the teaching of writing, and (in its many editions) it is the most widely used composition text today. (95)

These instructional approaches tend to overlap in actual classroom practice, but each perspective has had its proponents; in addition, publications exist in the professional literature which explain each approach, and advocate its use by teachers who want to improve the writing instruction they provide for their students. A few examples from the time period will provide an overview of how writing instruction has been conceptualized by those who were writing for NCTE's journals. In addition, examples will be drawn from sources apart from NCTE publications to indicate that the then current conceptualizations of writing instruction were not merely peculiar to articles appearing in NCTE journals.

In the first perspective of those previously mentioned, i.e., the theoretical approach that grammar instruction was the primary content of the English course and had to be taught before students could be asked to do any significant writing, writing instruction was based largely upon the contents of grammar handbooks, such as Warriner's English Grammar and Composition. The primary focus was (and, in some schools, still seems to be) on the completion of grammar, punctuation, and usage exercises and drills from handbooks. Teacher explanation of grammar information generally constituted the bulk of the direct instruction. Class time was often used for completion and correction of grammar exercises. In the

grammar and mechanics approach, there is little or no time devoted in class to actual writing. Writing is generally assigned during class, if at all, but is completed as homework outside of class time.

An Elementary English article which stressed the teaching of grammar appeared in December of 1959. In "Prefixes in Child Writing." James A. Fitzgerald stressed the importance of teaching prefixes and presented a list of prefixes which he believed most needed to be taught. The article demonstrates the continuing tendency to isolate instruction, to take it out of any significant or meaningful context, and to drill all children equally--including those who may have the concept well in mind. Fitzgerald apparently had conducted some successful lessons with children who needed this instruction and who could make immediate use of it in their writing. Thus, he recommended the practice to others.

In February 1958, The English Journal, NCTE's journal for secondary classroom teachers, published "Stimulating and Improving Writing in The Junior High School" by Eric W. Johnson of the Germantown Friends School in Philadelphia" Johnson writes:

> Most children would rather not write, let's admit it, for to write well requires work and thought; both are painful. I find that I get the best writing from my students when I give them a specific task of strictly limited length, often just one side of one page. (1)

Whether Johnson's views were shared by many classroom teachers or whether they were representative of views shared at that time by other members of the National Council of Teachers of English, one

can only speculate; but the article's publication indicates that an NCTE editor (and quite possibly some members of an editorial review board) believed the article of sufficient merit to be offered to the journal's readership. In addition, the article was believed of sufficient merit to be offered as "Writing Leaflet 7" in Writing (1958), a portfolio of English Journal article reprints prepared by a subcommittee of the NCTE Secondary Section.

Johnson goes on to give examples of assignments that he used in class and identified as successful. Johnson writes:

> Here are some assignments that have succeeded:
>
> Lessons on Precise Directions
> In a page or less write precise directions for drawing a diagram which you have designed. Draw the diagram.
>
> Example:
> Draw a rectangle at least four inches long lying on its long side. Inside the rectangle, at the center, draw a circle whose diameter will be about one-fifth the length of the rectangle. In the center of the circle place a very small X. (1)

Johnson's directions continue with additional explanation of how to draw the diagram and then he writes:

> I always give the example to the class before they try their hands at the exercise. The longer I teach, the more convinced I am that much teaching should be done before the homework is assigned, so that homework can be an exercise that the students know how to do and for which they understand the purpose. Too often I have dished out an assignment just before the bell, only to find the

> main results were confusion, dislike of English, and failure to learn. (1)

Johnson's comments are ostensibly based on sound pedagogical theory. Students generally need examples before being asked to carry out any activity or assignment on their own; and, when asked to write, students can benefit from a variety of instructional strategies, from examples to teacher explanations, from ideas on how to get started on a piece of writing, to suggestions on how to organize a whole paper.

However, there are two other issues in Johnson's statements that should be considered. First, he indicates that he had learned this principle on his own as he taught writing; it was not a part of the instruction he received when he was preparing to become a teacher. Second, one might wonder whether Johnson was making the best possible use of class time available for writing instruction. He describes his homework follow-up:

> When these diagram assignments come in and I have looked at them to screen out the disastrously poor ones, I ask each student to read his (back to the board) while a volunteer tries to follow the direction on the board, and the class observes (usually with surprisingly avid interest) where the directions are unclear, or when the volunteer has failed to follow them. (1)

Johnson's article reveals an attitude of doubt about his students' ability to write unless they are given very simple, concrete, and highly specific tasks. His surprise over their interest in seeing their classmates perform at the chalkboard also raises

questions about how well he knew his students, how he believed they might be motivated to learn to write, and whether he was concerned about "volunteers" who might be embarrassed in front of the rest of the class.

Eric W. Johnson may have received a good deal of encouragement to pursue this sort of class activity at his school. His principal, David Mallery, had written the following item in an English Journal article some seven and a half years earlier:

> As a teacher of eleventh-grade English, I have recently had evidence, of a kind that was astonishing to me, that there is a willingness and desire in some people of high school age to delve deeply and think profoundly and with real understanding into human situations in their own experience and in that of their classmates. Since the teacher in this case did little more than step aside, once this began to take hold, it would perhaps be best here just to describe briefly some of the things that happened. (1)

Mallery's article is also included in Writing (1958), the previously mentioned NCTE Secondary Section portfolio of English Journal reprints.

Actually as Mallery's article continues, there is a good deal in it to be praised. He provides useful strategies for helping students think through specific situations with an aim of improving their written compositions on topics related to the class discussions. The real question to be asked, however, concerns the negative attitudes both Mallery and Johnson hold toward their students. They are surprised when their students show interest in learning and

thinking through their compositions. This surprise may be taken as an indication that "avid interest" on the part of the students (Johnson 1) and students' efforts "to delve deeply and think profoundly" (Mallery 1) were rare classroom occurrences. If that is the case, then one might wonder about the nature of writing instruction that generally took place in that school setting.

In February 1958, another of the NCTE journals, Elementary English, published an article which reflects a combination of perspectives about writing instruction that existed at the time. "Writing Field Reports" by Louise Hovde Mortensen is very brief--about two-thirds of a page, but it is an example of how pedagogical perspectives become intertwined in actual classroom practice. In the article, the author suggests that students (she only mentions boys) could take field trips, and then write field reports similar to a field report model written in 1853. Mortensen presents this model as an example for study, and explains that it was written by a young army lieutenant from West Point during the days of the United States western expansion.

Mortensen further suggests that field reports, both those written by the young Army officers and those written by the students, could be used for interesting grammar study. After quoting from the 1853 field report about Mojave Indians meeting with West Point soldiers, who were on a survey expedition in the Southwestern United States, Mortensen first suggests that boys could study the report "for use of participles and dependent clauses . . . ." She also states that boys might be interested in diagramming

sentences from one of the report's paragraphs. Then, Mortensen writes, "Boy Scouts, Y.M.C.A. campers, and embryo scientists could have several English assignments in writing field reports" (122). There is no discussion regarding how this might be done in a regular classroom setting, or why it might be desirable.

Although the article title suggests that the instructional focus is writing, the article content reveals Mortensen's actual focus is the study of grammar. The implication is that boys will be interested in the content of these reports and thus, they will be interested in studying the grammar of the reports. An implicit assumption in this article is that studying the grammar of the original military field reports will lead to improvement in the students' writing. It may be that Mortensen and, perhaps other teachers at the time, genuinely believed that this sort of lesson constituted writing instruction.

The Mortensen article reflects two of the perspectives which appear to have been common at the time: first, the focus on grammar instruction as the primary content of the English course; and second, studying models of writing produced by others as a means for improving students' writing. Since Mortensen was a classroom teacher, her article seems to reflect some of the overlapping use of methodology that occurs in classroom practice when teachers try to use a variety of instructional perspectives.

Another significant method used in the teaching of writing was the presentation of literary models as examples for student writing. Using this method, the teacher guided the examination and discussion of selections (short stories, essays, poems, etc.) by well-

known, professional (and often deceased) authors. Students were given explanations of the rhetorical techniques used in these models, and then were assigned to write a similar piece. This perspective was implicit in the Mortensen (1958) article, although in that case, the writing models were produced by young soldiers, rather than well-known authors. Within this perspective, students were sometimes assigned to read models of a particular kind of writing, such as a narrative, a description, or a character sketch, and then try to write one of their own. When the pieces of writing were completed, the teacher evaluated them for the degree to which they adhered to the professional author's model. In addition, it is very likely that the papers were also evaluated for errors in mechanics, usage, sentence and paragraph structure, and organization.

Still another instructional focus was the emphasis on product correctness. This focus for instruction was found at all levels of schooling--from elementary classrooms through college. In this perspective, students were assigned particular kinds of writing, for example, by genre, topic, form, or some other aspect of composition. The writing was generally completed outside of class after some form of class presentation by the teacher. When the pieces of writing were completed, the teacher reviewed them primarily for errors in mechanics, usage, sentence and paragraph structure, and Organization. This form of evaluation of student writing is what Wallace Douglas characterized as "the error hunt." In a master's thesis, entitled "Composition in Elementary English," Helen G. Moyer, One of Wallace W. Douglas's students at Northwestern University,

examined all of the articles on composition appearing in Elementary English during three selected time periods, 1924-33, 1940-45, and 1951-60. In the foreword to Moyer's thesis, Douglas writes:

> . . . Moyer's study . . . establishes pretty firmly the continuity of the composition ethos of U. S. schools. First, there is a concentration on discovery and correction of "error." Second, there is an equal concentration on evaluation of "skills," of surface properties, an evaluation always done in terms of group norms, which are themselves defined by "research"-determined expectations of future needs on the part of children. Third, the purpose of composition remains constant: training to meet future social demands and conditions. Fourth, since the end of composition has remained constant, the changes of means . . . have been insignificant. (N. pag.)

In February 1958, Elementary English carried an article by Wallace C. Floyd entitled "Creative Writing: A Key to Mental Hygiene." In this article, Floyd describes a program of children's writing at his school in which children were encouraged to write about their "interests, hopes, and ambitions" (105) as well as about aspects of their home life. The real aim of the program was to assist teachers in understanding their students, rather than in improving the children's writing. Floyd concluded his article with this statement: "Creative writing is only one key to a child's state of mental health, but we have found it to be a very valuable one" (105).

Sometimes instruction for writing took an organizational focus. When teachers used this approach, students were instructed in such

topics as the development of a thesis statement, organization of an outline, development of a paragraph, and significance of transitional sentences. Chapter one of the MLA Handbook (1988) delineates this approach, although it provides a disclaimer that the approach is not the only way to begin and complete a writing assignment (1).

Often the writing instruction provided in the secondary classroom led to the assignment of a five-paragraph essay. Janet Emig, writing in The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971), in fact, found the five-paragraph essay identified so frequently in her research on American high school English classes that she coined the term the "Fifty-Star Theme" (97) to portray its nearly ubiquitous character in all fifty of the United States.

Students often were taught such writing terminology as "unity" and "coherence" (Warriner 1973, 395-401). In addition, they were taught to prepare a formal outline before they began writing a paper. An article from the April 1959 issue of Elementary English identifies the rationale and some of the characteristics inherent on this instructional perspective. Walter A. Watnuf, in an article entitled "Notetaking in Outline Form," discusses creating an outline as an organizing process that facilitates comprehension of oral and written language. He then delineates and explains the steps that are necessary to teach outlining to children.

The Warriner's English Grammar and Composition series of handbooks, first published for secondary schools in 1958, and identified by Arthur N. Applebee (1986) as "the most widely used Composition text today," (95) devotes a section to how to prepare an

outline for a writing assignment. The section begins, as do most sections in the entire Warriner series, with the statement of a rule printed in red: "Observe rules for form in making a topic outline" (414). Following this rule statement, the text offers this comment:

> Having grouped your ideas and put the groups in proper order, you are ready to make an outline--a plan for writing that shows at a glance the order, relationship, and relative importance of the ideas you will be writing about. (414)

The section on outlining includes a brief explanation of types of outlines and a set of directions for outline preparation. Included in the directions are the following statements:

> Place the title above the outline. It is not one of the topics within the outline itself.
>
> Number main headings with Roman numerals; letter the subtopics under each main heading with capital letters. Divisions of subtopics, in descending order of importance, are given numbers and letters as follows: Arabic numerals, small letters, Arabic numerals in parentheses, small letters in parentheses.
>
> Never allow a subtopic to stand alone; use two or more subtopics, or none at all. Subtopics are divisions of the topic about them, and a topic cannot be divided in fewer than two parts.
>
> All main topics should be parallel in form; each group of subtopics should be parallel in form. For example, if the first main topic is a noun, the other main topics must also be nouns; if the first subtopic under this main topic is an adjective, the corresponding subtopics must also be adjectives. (414-15)

The Warriner text completes the section on outlining by providing exercises which teachers may assign as class activities or homework. One of the exercises requires students to correct an outline presented in the text by applying the rules and directions listed above. While the information in the Warriner text may be interpreted as representative, and perhaps definitive, of the principles of outlining in formal standard written English, the more significant issue for writing instruction is whether the rules and directions given for outlining will actually help many students get started on a writing assignment. For many students, even at the secondary level, the directions are far too complex, and complicated with details which detract from getting ideas on paper.

One of the most striking aspects of Warriner's English Grammar and Composition series is that, although each text is presented in an outlined format, Warriner chose not to use the outline format so carefully delineated in his book. Instead he chose a simpler format: each chapter is numbered and each grammar or composition rule is lettered. Thus, the previously indicated rule on outlining is labeled "25d"--with 25 representing the twenty-fifth chapter in the book and "d" representing the rule as the fourth one listed in the twenty-fifth chapter. Given the extensive multiple-level subcategorization of topics explained in the Warriner texts, it is, perhaps, reflective of the potential problems involved in following a rigid outline format that caused Warriner to choose a

simpler, more straightforward form for presenting highly complex material.

This organizational model was often used as a framework for teaching students how to write a research paper. Instruction centered around learning a format for taking notes on index cards, organizing the cards, writing an outline, and then writing the paper. Warriner delineates the "Seven Steps in Writing A Research Paper" as follows:

1. Selecting and limiting the subject
2. Preparing a working bibliography
3. Preparing a preliminary outline
4. Reading and taking notes
5. Assembling notes and writing the final outline
6. Writing the first draft
7. Writing the final draft with footnotes and a final bibliography (474)

It seems ironic that some students, who may not have been able to think and write through this sort of linear process, may have learned to write their research papers in various drafts using a process approach that would be not be recognized until years later when educational researchers began studying children and adolescents in the act of composing.

While some may contend that students need to learn the specific instructional content involved in each of the aforementioned models, the issue is how the information, concepts, and procedures of each model will be applied in the context of actual writing, if students have limited opportunities to write in the classroom.

While these models were discussed in the professional literature during the period from 1957 to 1968 and appear to have been the dominant perspectives governing writing instruction, there were also those who during this same period advocated approaches to writing instruction which involved process features. A doctoral dissertation study by Scott E. McNabb, entitled "Revision Processes of Four Skilled College Writers" (1987) indicated that there were those who advocated teaching writing as a process as early as 1921. McNabb cites a 1921 NCTE English Journal article entitled "A Lesson from the Masters of Prose," which suggests the importance of understanding the process of writing from the perspective of professional writers who were considered masters of their craft. The implicit assumption is that students can be taught to write by studying the methods and procedures of great authors.

Among those who advocated approaches to writing instruction which involved process features in the 1950's and 60's were Alvina Treut Burrows and Ruth Strickland. Dr. Burrows was a member of the faculty at New York University and served a term as the Second Vice-President of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1967. She was one of those who represented NCTE at the Basic Issues Conference Series in 1958 and was co-author of one of NCTE's most successful publications for elementary classroom teachers, They All Want to Write.

Burrows was also the author of the first publication to examine Composition research separately from language and literature research. Teaching Composition (1959) was published by the

Department of Classroom Teachers, a special interest group of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), when AERA was still a constituent group of the National Education Association. A second publication, which examined composition research and for which Burrows was the editor and author of the Introduction, appeared in 1960. Children's Writing: Research in in Composition and Related Skills, was prepared by NCRE and published by NCTE, when NCRE was a constituent group of NCTE.

While Burrows does not discuss children's writing in the same process terminology as Donald Graves, Lucy McCormick Calkins, and Nancie Atwell would use in later years, her books and articles provide significant suggestions on how to initiate, encourage, and evaluate children's writing in the elementary classroom. In discussing children's writing process in the upper elementary classroom, she writes:

> Children read, discuss, sketch, plan, and write. Rough drafts are corrected individually in a conference with the teacher, which is the very essence of teaching. Reading the rough draft aloud and correcting it is only part of this meeting of minds; encouraging the struggling writer and affirming good points are also essentials of the conference. (7)

Burrows's reference to the teacher-student conference concerning a rough draft of writing in progress is an essential feature of the process approaches to writing instruction as they would be discussed in the 1970's and 80's. But, as Burrows emphasizes the importance of this individual conference and the opportunity it

presents for the teacher to praise the student's efforts, she also makes the following comment:

> Each child needs some special bit of approval: perhaps admiration for neat arrangement and accurate spelling, appreciation of correct punctuation, or praise of the clear statement of the idea and the vividness of expression. (7)

Some advocates of process writing instruction might argue that perhaps there needs to be less attention given to spelling, punctuation, and neat arrangement at this point in the child's writing development, and more attention given to Burrows's latter elements of "clear statement of the idea and the vividness of expression," i.e., to elements relating to content and use of language. At the time Burrows was writing, the professional literature simply had not begun to differentiate the prewriting and drafting phases from the revising and editing phases of the writing process, whereby one might attend to some elements of form and content separately.

Ruth Strickland, a Professor of Education at Indiana University at Bloomington and President of NCTE in 1960, was also one of the professional association leaders who advocated writing instruction for children which included features of a process approach. She writes:

> The elementary school child should be encouraged to do as much free, creative writing as he is willing to do. Unless this is to be kept for permanent use or enjoyment

> it is not corrected and put into final form but merely shared with the group through reading aloud by the author or the teacher. (1961, 68)

Strickland's references to "free, creative writing" and sharing the writing with other children are features of process approaches to writing instruction that would be advocated years later by Peter Elbow (1981), Ken Macrorie (1980), and others.

In Elementary English article in May of 1960, "Evaluating Children's Composition," Strickland delineates criteria which should be considered in evaluating children's writing. She indicates that creative writing and critical or utilitarian writing should not be evaluated in the same way. She suggests that there should be class discussion of the mechanics of sentence structure and organization and that this discussion will be more helpful to children than constant correction by the teacher. She also indicates that the teacher must help students learn to evaluate their own writing. Her suggestions foreshadow the descriptions of the teacher's role during writing instruction that would appear in the 1980's. Her comments about the appropriate means and procedures for instruction on mechanics are also a reflection of a perspective that would receive greater attention years later.

Strickland's article does not address process writing instruction as it has come to be understood more recently. It does not discuss stages or phases of writing and makes no comment about stages or phases that children go through as they write. It seems more appropriate to view Strickland's article as part of the evolutionary process of instructional development. Her suggestions

are directed to teachers regarding what they can do to improve writing instruction. While Strickland includes comments on classroom climate, basic information on how children learn language, appropriate strategies for teaching mechanics, and criteria for evaluating children's written products, she did not comment specifically on the process children go through as they learn to write.

In May of 1976, the National Conference on Research in English (NCRE) and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills (ERIC/RCS) published Help for the Teacher of Written Composition - K-9. Edited by Sara W. Lundsteen, this publication offered specific help for elementary and junior high classroom teachers. As the cry went up for more emphasis on writing instruction, most of the attention to improvement had been devoted to high schools. Consequently, elementary and junior high teachers who were unprepared or underprepared to teaching writing to children from their university teacher education programs needed help. This publication, developed from a research base to identify what was known about writing and writing instruction for children, was intended to provide that help. The chapters, written by Alvina Treut Burrows, James Fleming, Robert Calfee, Eileen Tway, and one co-authored by Burrows and Lundsteen, provide careful explanation of the research on children's writing. From that research, there are implications and ideas for classroom teachers to use as they are helping children learn to write.

A themed issue of The English Journal appeared in September 1979 entitled "English Since Sputnik". Editor Stephen N. Judy (Tchudi) gathered an array of articles which provide insight into the trends and issues in the teaching of English over a range of twenty years. Included is an article entitled: "From Sputnik to Dartmouth: Trends in the Teaching of Composition" by Robert P. Parker, Jr. "In the 1960's," Parker writes, "composition teaching, as usual, came in for the most sustained criticism" (34). Parker continues:

> During this decade teachers were plagued as always by the nagging thought that writing really cannot be taught. Perhaps this attitude is not surprising since, in schools, we seem to be much better at teaching pupils about things than we are at helping them learn how to do things; activities give us more difficulty than circumscribed "bodies" of "knowledge." Thus it is not surprising to find that the two most important trends in composition teaching centered on attempts to develop better curriculum content for teaching people about writing, always proceeding on the assumption that this organized knowledge would somehow be transformed into improved writing.
>
> The first trend involved a wide variety of attempts to relate systematic language study, particularly the new linguistic grammars, to the teaching of composition. The second involved the revival and revamping of rhetorical theory as an informing discipline for the teaching of composition. (34-35)

Parker's point about trends driving instruction, and determining what is emphasized in the classroom is especially significant because it is a phenomenon which may be observed not only in the 1960's and 70's, about which Parker writes, but also in our own time.

The current emphasis on whole language perspectives (Goodman 1986) and literacy education (Purves 1990) are trends that are determining how writing (and other aspects of English and language arts education) will be taught in classrooms at all levels. While these trends have significant instructional value and offer opportunities for exceptional teaching and learning, the concern discussed previously (See the section on "Research on Writing Instruction" in Chapter II), that trends advocated by educational theorists and researchers are often simplistically and naively implemented by classroom teachers who do not fully understand the theories or the research base and their corresponding instructional elements.

In December 1973, Donald Murray published "Why Teach Writing--And How?" in NCTE's English Journal. Focusing on writing instruction at the secondary level, Murray encourages teachers to use a process approach to improve writing instruction. This article was based on views that Murray had previously published in the NCTE regional affiliate publication, The Leaflet, published by the New England Association of Teachers of English. For example, Murray had published "Teach Writing as a Process, Not Product" in The Leaflet in the Fall of 1972. This article was reprinted in a collection of Murray's articles and essays Learning by Teaching which was published in 1982. Murray's advocacy of process writing instruction drew attention, perhaps because it was an alternative to the product-centered instruction that for so long had dominated writing instruction in American high schools. The fact that these

approaches were being advocated by a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist gave them credibility with teachers who were already questioning the effectiveness of product-centered instruction.

In February of 1976, Donald Graves, who was becoming known as an advocate of process writing instruction for elementary school children, gave "a talk on the writing process in Janet Emig's seminar at Rutgers" (Graves, 1984). During this talk a key idea came to him for the presentation that he was to give at the NCTE Spring Conference in Atlanta, Georgia the following month. Graves writes:

> It struck me that most teaching of writing is set up to make the writer dependent on the teacher. I find that many metaphors come to me in the midst of talks and if I am lucky, I can remember to use them in my writing. In this instance, I had a talk to give a month later in Atlanta, Georgia, at the National Language Arts meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English. I used the metaphor when I wrote th[e] article for the conference. (Graves 1984, 43)

The idea led not only to the presentation he mentions, but also to a controversial article that Graves would write, "Let's Get Rid of the Welfare Mess in the Teaching of Writing." After the article was published in Language Arts in September, 1976, Graves was criticized for his negative references to welfare. Graves later admitted that he had been wrong in how he had characterized welfare; but the article has particular significance for another reason: it was the first time that Graves referred to the writing conference as a significant feature of the writing process. Graves

would later write much more about the writing conference and various conferencing techniques that may be used with elementary children. The idea caught on and has been advocated for writing teachers at all levels of schooling. Donald Murray in his second edition of A Writer Teaches Writing (1985) discusses the conference pattern, techniques, and skills that he developed in more than 30,000 conferences with undergraduate and graduate students in the writing program at the University of New Hampshire.

In 1982 Donald Murray published Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching. Published by independent publisher Boynton/Cook, this work presented several of Murray's articles which advocate a process approach to writing instruction. Nearly all of the articles included in this book were originally published by NCTE, CCTE, or a state or province affiliate of those two national associations. The book is significant for this study because it provides a perspective for examining how conceptualizations of process writing instruction changed over the years from 1968 to 1982 for one process approach advocate. In the book's preface, Murray writes:

> I have apprenticed myself to two trades I can never learn: writing and teaching. These articles are not a record of what I have learned as much as they are a record of what I was learning through their writing. I discover what I'm beginning to know as it appears on the page. (Preface, N. pag.)

Murray's recognition that writing is itself a source of learning is a view shared by others who advocate process approaches to writing instruction. In the Middle: Writing, Reading, and Learning with Adolescents (1987) by Nancie Atwell is based on that premise. Atwell's book won the 1987 Modern Language Association Mina P. Shaughnessy Prize. It may be that winning that award (from an association that at one time did not value composition instruction and had little concern for English instruction below the college level) by itself indicates that many professional association leaders have developed new conceptualizations of writing instruction and place greater value on its role in both teaching and learning.

The perspective of writing as a source of learning was extended in an NCTE publication by Judith A. Langer and Arthur N. Applebee, How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning (1987). Langer and Applebee offer these statements:

> Our concern with the role of writing in learning is part of our broader concern about the nature of effective instruction. . . . (5)
>
> . . . our research examined the specific thinking and learning processes involved in various writing tasks, to learn whether writing in fact supports learning and, if so, to seek evidence of the different contributions that various types of writing activities can make to subject-area learning. (8)

Donald Murray's book gives testimony to the learning he acquired as a result of the writing he did over a period of fourteen years, and the research by Langer and Applebee provides support

for the practice of using process approaches to writing and learning in the classroom to develop students' learning and thinking.

Conclusion

It has been the researcher's intent in the foregoing discussion to identify conceptualizations of writing instruction and indicate how those conceptualizations changed over the years from 1957 to 1990. Additionally, there was a corresponding attempt to provide evidence from professional association publications, particularly those of NCTE, to demonstrate the associations' continuing interest and involvement in serving as a forum for developing professional knowledge and instructional perspectives on writing instruction. While the professional associations were not solely responsible for the changes that occurred in the conceptualizations of writing instruction, it appears that they contributed to those changing perspectives through the publications they produced on writing and writing instruction between 1957 and 1990.

CHAPTER 5

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION AND INTER-ASSOCIATION CONFERENCES

Introduction

During the years selected for this study, 1957 to 1990, in addition to the publication of hundreds of professional association books, journal articles, and monographs on writing and writing instruction, there were a number of major professional association and inter-association conferences at which some of the participants indicated a growing interest in the teaching of writing. In the early years, the focus was on improving instruction utilizing conceptualizations of writing instruction that were then current. Over time, as indicated in Chapter IV, the conceptualizations of writing instruction changed. These changes in the conceptualizations of writing instruction appear to have been influenced by a variety of factors, including the publication of trend-setting research, like that of Janet Emig (1971) and Donald Graves (1975), the publication of books and articles by established authors explaining their writing procedures and practices, like those by Donald Murray (1968, 1982, 1987, 1990), and the publications that resulted from several major national and international professional association and inter-

association conferences. These latter publications, including books, journal articles, monographs, position statements, and conference reports, were analyzed for information about roles that the professional associations, particularly NCTE, played in developing process approaches to writing instruction. The research question was: How have specific major national and international professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars, which resulted in publications, contributed to the development of the process-oriented approaches to the teaching of writing?

The professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars selected for analysis and evaluation were those which resulted in either one or more books or monographs, a series of journal articles, a position statement, or a conference report. These publications were analyzed and evaluated specifically for their contributions to professional knowledge about the process approaches to writing instruction and the roles that the professional associations played in developing that knowledge.

It is the researcher's contention that the publications resulting from a conference provide a significant perspective from which to examine the work and possible influence of that conference. In addition, the conference publications may provide important information about the roles played by professional associations (e.g., in organizing or conducting the conference) or by professional association leaders (e.g., in presenting trend-setting papers or speeches). In this chapter, the researcher, where appropriate, will

also discuss the major events and trends in education generally, and in writing instruction in particular, apart from and outside of professional association activities, which appear to have influenced the professional associations.

There appear to have been five separate time periods between 1957 and 1990, which may be differentiated by the professional association activities of each period and the concerns that were then prevalent and influential within the professional associations. The first time period extended from 1957 to 1963. This period began with the launching of Russia's Sputnik I, which set the stage for many of the educational trends and issues for several years, and ended with NCTE's publication of Research in Written Composition (1963) by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. The period was characterized by a new wave of educational reform with a cry to move "back to the basics," a focus on scientific and empirical research in the teaching of English, and an increased concern for the roles of the professional associations in the academic community.

The second period extended from 1964 to 1971. It began with an NCTE convention in Cleveland, attended by Boris Ford, who was at the time president of Great Britain's National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE). This period ended with NCTE's publication of The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971) by Janet Emig. This period was characterized by international cooperation among English teaching professional association leaders from the United States, Great Britain, and Canada, and a new

research focus on writing instruction, which emphasized studying writers (particularly students) in the act of writing.

The third period extended from 1972 to 1979, beginning with the NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education and ending with the Canadian Council of Teachers of English Conference on Learning to Write in 1979. This period was characterized by calls for new research models that would extend professional knowledge of writing instruction. The period ended with an international conference convened by the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, the 1979 CCTE Conference on Learning to Write, which attracted more than 1200 participants from around the world and from all levels of schooling, and which was devoted entirely to concerns about writing and writing instruction.

The fourth period extended from 1980 to 1987, beginning with the Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, held in Sydney, Australia, and ending with the 1987 English Coalition Conference. The period was characterized by continued international cooperation, greater cooperation among the American professional associations concerned with the teaching of English, and the beginnings of the acceptance of multiple paradigms for writing instruction operating simultaneously within the academic community.

The fifth, and last, period to be considered in this study extends from 1987 to, at least, 1990, the end of the study. This period begins with the NCTE publication of How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning (1987) by Judith Langer

and Arthur Applebee, and extends to (and perhaps beyond) the joint NCTE and MLA publication of What Is English? (1990) by Peter Elbow. This period has been characterized by a focus on a variety of instructional approaches which draw upon the process approaches to writing instruction that were developed in the preceding time periods. For example, various researchers and theorists have turned their attention to writing across the curriculum, literacy education, whole language perspectives, and the development of critical thinking through writing. During this time period, there also has been renewed interest in looking at the origin, roots, and history of various instructional perspectives, professional association activities, and the contributions of professional association leaders.

The sections which follow will examine the activities and trends of each of these time periods. Of particular concern will be how the professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars, and their resulting publications, contributed to changes in writing instruction perspectives, and how the professional associations participated in changes that were taking place in the larger educational community.

1957-63: A New Wave of Reform

In order to define and describe the historical context for this first time period, it is important to examine the event that set the stage for many of the educational trends in the United States for several years. On October 4, 1957, the Russians launched Sputnik.

Almost immediately after the launch of Sputnik I, schools were blamed for America's failure to be first in space and careful consideration was given to ways in which education might be improved. For a variety of opportunistic reasons, the launching of the first Sputnik became a significant point of reference in American education. Many authors, who were concerned with the teaching of English and some who would later indicate particular concern for the teaching of writing, have referred to Sputnik and discussed its significance for American education. Judy and Judy, in their book An Introduction to the Teaching of Writing (1981) offered these comments:

> The effect of the Russian launching of Sputnik on American education is legendary. When, in 1957, the Soviets were able to put their satellite into orbit ahead of a rival United States project, it was generally accepted that Russian technology, and by implication, Russian education, was superior to our own. No level of schooling and no academic discipline escaped the angry criticism that emerged when Americans discovered their educational/technological system was no longer Number One. (7)

Those who had been advocating particular educational reforms referred to the launching of Sputnik 1 as evidence that their plan was needed. Truly the event was of historical importance, but it was not the cause of the educational reform movement that was already taking shape within the minds and visions of professional association leaders. Arthur N. Applebee in Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974) writes about "A Crisis of

Confidence" in the 1940's and 50's when American schools were criticized from a variety of fronts. He writes:

> The final blow was Sputnik. Launched in the fall of 1957, it became a symbol of the failure of the schools and a milestone marking the end of one era and the beginning of another. It also provoked its own period of national soul-searching, summed up in Vice-Admiral H. G. Rickover's Education and Freedom (1958). "Life adjustment" and John Dewey were his scapegoats, engineers and "talented youth" his Chosen People, and high academic standards the road to salvation. (1974, 188-89)

J. N. Hook, writing in A Long Way Together (1979), also referred to the significance of the Russian Sputnik launch. He writes:

> The 1957 sputniks set off a surge of American concern for better schools, signaled first by the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 and followed by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, substantial increases in funding for the USOE, and much broader educational involvement--some helpful, some impedimental--of a host of government agencies. (194)

William A. Jenkins, writing in "The Educational Scene" in Elementary English in February 1958 commented on the importance of Sputnik:

> It should be added that the 1957 event that affected American education most deeply took place outside the United States--on a Russian plain, from which mankind's first earth satellite was sent into space on October 4.

> As a result, the last three months of the year were characterized by educational reassessment. State systems of education, local school systems, individual school buildings and faculties, colleges and universities began to take the first steps toward finding out where education has failed to prepare Americans for the space age and what needs to be done to correct the deficiencies.
>
> For example, New York State Education Commissioner James E. Allen is holding a series of meetings to "improve the state's schools." First meeting was held in November; the second, during the first week in December. "We will not be panicked into extra-special emphasis on science and math to the exclusion of other subjects," Dr. Allen said. The November meeting, held in Albany, considered year-round use of schools, techniques for discovering gifted children, and possible lengthening of the school day. The December meetings took up improvement in science, math, and vocational technical education. (129)

Applebee summarized the historical significance of the Sputnik event in Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974) when he wrote:

> Though Sputnik in 1957 crystallized public opinion and thus serves as a convenient benchmark for the beginning of reform, in fact the underlying reemphasis of academic achievement was already well underway. (189-90)

Applebee reiterates his point in a chapter endnote, writing that "Sputnik was only a symbol" (217). Frank G. Jennings shared this perspective and discussed it in "The Revolution in Education: It Didn't Start with Sputnik," an article in the September 16, 1967 issue of Saturday Review (10). Perhaps the greatest significance of Sputnik I for American education was that it provided a powerful

motive for examining all aspects of schooling to identify means for improving instruction at all levels.

As American educators reassessed how schools might be improved during the the late 1950's, they began to consider the value of examining educational systems in other countries, particularly the English-speaking countries. International travel, although still expensive then, was possible and had been increasing since the end of World War II. In 1957, Harold B. Allen, while serving as NCTE Second Vice President, suggested that NCTE leaders should consider an international conference with leading educators from other English-speaking countries. Such conferences had been held among teachers of English to speakers of other languages (the TESOL group) and Allen suggested that an international conference might also have significant value for teachers of the mother tongue. It appears that expenses for such a conference either could not be justified or simply were beyond the financial means of NCTE at the time. At any rate, such a conference, under the sponsorship of NCTE, was not held until 1965.

One of the significant historical events during this time period of 1957 to 1963 was the establishment of professional contacts between British and American educators through international study tours held during the summers. In large measure, leaders of the professional associations were responsible for establishing these contacts and for advocating the importance of international cooperation. Applebee writes:

> Initial contacts with British educators had begun during the fifties, first through NCTE-sponsored summer tours of England and later through a series of conferences on the problems of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). As early as 1957, Harold B. Allen, who had been deeply involved in TESOL programs in Egypt, suggested that a conference on the teaching of English as a native language might be fruitful. During the following years, a number of Council leaders visited British schools, a National Association of Teachers of English (NATE) was organized in Britain, and a representative of the British Ministry of Education toured the Project English study centers. (1974, 229)

These international contacts were important for extending professional knowledge about the teaching of all components of English. For classroom teachers and professional leaders to learn that English might be taught quite differently elsewhere in the world was a startling idea. However, it was not until the 1960's that the international contacts would have even greater impact on the teaching of English and the teaching of writing in the United States.

In 1958 on January 27-29, less than four months after the launch of Sputnik I, the Basic Issues Conference Series began. Although some of the conference participants indicated that Sputnik had been the impetus for their meetings, it is likely that the conference proposal had been written, submitted, and approved for funding, before the October 4, 1957 launch of the Russian satellite.

With a $25,000 grant from the Ford Foundation (Hook 182), a sizeable amount of money at that time, leaders from four national professional associations began a series of four meetings during 1958 at the Gould mansion in Dobbs Ferry, New York. The

associations involved were the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the Modern Language Association (MLA), the American Studies Association (ASA), and the College English Association (CEA). A complete list of conference participants is found in Appendix C.

After the initial conference in January, there were three more meetings of the Basic Issues Conference participants in 1958. They met again on April 11-13 and June 16-18, and then for a one-day wrap-up meeting on October 19. The conferences represented a new attitude of cooperation among the participating professional associations.

It appears that MLA originally proposed the conference series, but their expertise in elementary and secondary education was questioned by Ford Foundation representatives who were considering the proposal; consequently NCTE was asked to join the group. Later, the two associations were joined by the ASA and CEA (Hook 182).

The association leaders debated intensely and finally hammered out statements of what they considered to be the thirty-five basic issues of English and Language Arts education (Shugrue 1968; Hook 1979; Applebee 1974). The improvement of composition instruction was significant among the issues about which some of the conference participants expressed concern. Among the thirty-five basic issues, five are specifically devoted to writing instruction.

The conference meetings and discussions resulted in a sixteen-page document entitled, The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English (1959), published jointly by NCTE and MLA, and " . . . sent free to all members of the four organizations, to members of Congress, and to many other groups" (Hook 185). According to Hook, ". . . the document helped to get English included in federal funding under the National Defense Education Act" in 1964 (185). The document is especially notable for its focus on issues, rather than on directives for action. This focus was necessary because the associations tended to advocate quite different perspectives and it took the participants nearly the full year to reach consensus.

At the conferences and in the document, the participants initially raised the question of "What is 'English'?" The response to which the participants were finally able to agree and which appears in the document as the first basic issue is:

> We agree generally that English composition, language, and literature are within our province . . . . (7)

This tentatively worded response hints at the difficulties the participating associations faced in 1958 when they tried to define their professional field, but the statement identified what has since become the traditional tripod of English Education. Perhaps most significant of all is the placement of "English composition" first, with "language, and literature" listed as the second and third elements of the tripod. It is especially significant that "composition" was listed

first at a time when colleges and universities did not have the extensive writing programs which now exist.

Composition instruction was a significant concern for some of the conference participants representing NCTE (for example, Alvina Treut Burrows and John C. Gerber), but identifying composition as a curriculum component equal to language and literature was very likely a significant compromise on the part of the MLA representatives. MLA, from its very beginnings as a professional association in 1883, had defined English Education as the study of language and literature. MLA, in the years before the Basic Issues Conference Series, generally had identified composition as a utilitarian sub-component of the study of language. This concession on the part of MLA allowed for consideration of important issues related to composition instruction at the Basic Issues Conferences.

Of the five issues in the Basic Issues document devoted to writing instruction (Issues #12-#15 and #32), Issue #12 asked: "How should writing be taught?" The associations' representatives provided this response in the Basic Issues document:

> We have seen no reliable evidence that students are writing less well than comparable students wrote twenty, forty, or a hundred years ago. Nevertheless, few are satisfied with the present quality of student writing, and there is little agreement on how to attack this problem.
>
> Of what skills is the practical art of writing composed? Which of them can be taught most easily and more effectively at what levels? Can the teaching of these skills be distributed among the various educational levels in such a way that learning to write well becomes a

> purposeful, satisfying, sequential, and cumulative experience for the student?
>
> Should students be taught to "express themselves' or to "communicate"? Should their writing assignments be related to their reading, to their direct experience, or to both? How can both imaginative and factual writing be given their just share of emphasis? Should the writing exercises be closely linked to formal study of grammar and rhetoric? Is learning to write primarily a matter of learning to think? This issue bristles with difficulties. (9)

The questions posed by the conference participants have served over the years since 1958 to identify elements that may be included in a writing curriculum. The questions in Issue #12 also point to the serious matter of time considerations in school curriculums. Classroom teachers at all levels of schooling must constantly make decisions about what instruction and activities to provide for optimum benefit for students. Writing instruction is a prime example of this concern because of the intensive nature of good writing instruction and the competing demands on the teacher's time.

Another of the questions about writing instruction raised during The Basic Issues Conferences was "Can the teaching of composition be raised to the same level of academic respectability as the teaching of literature?" Basic Issue #32 offered this response:

> The teaching of composition is regarded as drudgery, is paid badly, and offers little opportunity for advancement in rank. Typically it is thought to be only a steppingstone to the teaching of literature. Teachers who share this attitude are not likely to inspire a love of English in their

> students. The morale of the freshman course is one of the most complex and important issues which confronts the profession. (12)

There is a continuing battle waged among English teachers over how composition instruction was, and is, perceived. Traditionally, composition instruction has been (and still is) a low-status position at the college and university level. The positions were (and are) usually filled by adjunct, contract, or temporary faculty; the terms vary according to the university. The teachers were (and are) poorly paid, and there was (and is) little or no job security or support for them. This perspective, which was a concern in 1958, remains a concern in the 1990's. A College English article by Mary Kupiec Cayton (1991) entitled, "Writing as Outsiders: Academic Discourse and Marginalized Faculty" documents the severity of this situation. Cayton writes:

> One-third of all teachers at the college or university level are now temporary or part-time faculty. We do fifteen percent of all the teaching in higher education today. (647)
>
> The litany of problems we face by now ought to be familiar. We are last hired and first fired. Because we are generally hired as cheap labor by the institution, we have heavy teaching loads, not only in numbers of students but also in courses we must teach for the first time . . . . We often receive our course assignments at the last minute, leaving us without sufficient preparation time. Many of us are dedicated teachers--why else would we stay in a profession where our work often earns no benefits and pays less than a living wage? (648)

> Because we are paid so little, we may have to look for extra work during summers or vacations. Because our institutions have no long-term investment in us, we usually lack support for research or travel. (648)

Cayton's article provides evidence that issues debated by professional leaders at the Basic Issues Conferences in 1958 were significant for the profession then and remain so in the 1990's.

The Basic Issues Conference Series was significant for three reasons. First, the issues raised in 1958 concerning composition instruction remain unresolved in the 1990's, and thus reflect the validity of the questions as they were asked by professional leaders at that time. Second, the variety of responses provided in the Basic Issues document represent philosophical and pedagogical perspectives still expressed by association leaders. Third, the extensive English programs of the 1960's were in large part a consequence of the Basic Issues Conference Series and the resulting Basic Issues in the Teaching of English document. Those programs, such as Project English, still represent curriculum areas in the teaching of English which need continuing attention from professional association leaders. Professional associations have a continuing responsibility to provide opportunities for the professional development of their members, including elementary and secondary classroom teachers.

Representing NCTE at the Basic Issues Conference Series, in addition to previously mentioned Alvina Treut Burrows of New York University, and John C. Gerber of the State University of Iowa, were Hardy R. Finch of Greenwich, Connecticut, who was the NCTE

Executive Committee Secondary Section Representative; Edward J. Gordon of the Germantown, Pennsylvania Friends School; Lennox Grey of Teachers College, Columbia University; Brice Harris of Pennsylvania State University; J. N. Hook, NCTE Executive Secretary; Helen Mackintosh of the United States Office of Education; Joseph Mersand of Jamaica, New York. Albert Marckwardt chaired the meetings. Thomas Clark Pollock also attended. According to J. N. Hook, Pollock and Marckwardt "were not identified by organization," (182) presumably because they had been active in both MLA and NCTE. Pollock was a past NCTE president and Marckwardt would become NCTE president in 1967. Of the other NCTE representatives, Gerber, Grey, Harris, Mackintosh, and Mersand were all either past or future NCTE presidents.

Another significant outcome of the Basic Issues Conference Series was articulated by J. N. Hook in A Long Way Together (1979):

> . . . despite the numerous, pointed disagreements among the participants, the conferences actually improved relationships among the organizations, especially MLA and NCTE. Mutual understanding and respect increased. NCTE learned that MLA members were not horribly and totally theoretical, impractical, and immovable; and MLA learned that not all children can or should follow a track leading to the same cultural destination. As a result, cooperation between the two organizations for the next decade or so became very close, and sometimes the songs sung by MLA and NCTE leaders were hardly distinguishable. The professional dedication of MLA Secretary John H. Fisher and Assistant Secretary Michael Shugrue led to close cooperation between the organizations throughout the sixties. (185)

Cooperation between and among the professional associations may be the most important outcome of an inter-association conference for advancing professional knowledge.

Another significant professional conference which was held in this time period is one not generally associated with the teaching of English. Held in September 1959 at Woods Hole on Cape Cod, and thereafter called the Woods Hole Conference, this major professional conference had significant impact on the educational profession as a whole. The conference, under the direction of Jerome Bruner of Harvard University, was called by the National Academy of Sciences and funded by The National Science Foundation, the United States Office of Education, the Air Force, and the Rand Corporation. The attendees were university professors from various disciplines, including the physical and biological sciences, mathematics, psychology, history, medicine, education, and cinematography. (A complete list of those attending the Woods Hole Conference is found in Appendix D.) The participants' primary goal was "to discuss how education in science might be improved in our primary and secondary schools" (Bruner vii).

The group met for ten days and their discussions focused on identifying the underlying structures and unifying concepts of the sciences so that scientific knowledge might be taught to students of any age. Jerome Bruner asserted that the ideas discussed at Woods Hole could ultimately be applied not only to the sciences, but to all areas and subjects of the curriculum.

The well-known publication resulting from the Woods Hole Conference was Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education (1960). The book firmly established the notion for many educators that an understanding of "process" and "underlying structure" may be the most important elements in learning any school subject.

The language Bruner used in the conference report became, for several years, the language that was used by other educators as they explained or described the instructional content and research goals in their own fields. Writing in the English Journal in April 1961, Ruth Strickland, then NCTE Past President, stated that Bruner's report "is as applicable to our teaching of English as it is to the teaching of science" (287). Margaret J. Early, David H. Russell, and James R. Squire echoed Bruner when they co-authored a chapter entitled "Evaluation and Implications" in Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the San Francisco Conference (1964). One of their comments about needed research was, "Only research related to some kind of overarching construct or conceptualization, of the process of education in English is likely to be of more than limited significance" (148). Early, Russell, and Squire also wrote that an educational research paradigm, proposed by N. L. Gage, reflected a trend in thinking about research by its "concern for the structure of the subject matter of English and the sequential process of teaching and learning" (148).

Strickland, Early, Russell, and Squire were not the only ones connected with the teaching of English who used the language of the Woods Hole Conference report as the basis for a conceptual

framework to think about the discipline of English. Albert Kitzhaber referred to Bruner specifically and used the language of The Process of Education to write about the teaching of English in his Dartmouth Seminar paper, "What Is English?" (1966). In one part of his paper, he focused on composition instruction and offered the following questions and comments:

> Is it possible to establish at least a plausible, if not a rigorously logical, sequence in writing instruction? When a student writes, he needs punctuation, spelling, usage, vocabulary, sentence structure, transitions, paragraphs, substance--and he needs them all at once. Are there central principles of rhetoric or logic that could be identified and taught early with simple applications, then, in a Brunerian spiral, repeatedly in later years with increasingly sophisticated applications? If not, how can the deadly repetition and aimless eddying so apparent today in the teaching of writing from one year to another be avoided? (22)

John H. Fischer from Teacher's College, Columbia, Henry Chauncey from Educational Testing Service, and John B. Carroll from Harvard University attended the Woods Hole Conference as representatives of education. John B. Carroll's connection with the conference is worthy of note because in later years, he would be involved in professional association and inter-association conferences which focused on the teaching of English.

It was during this time in the field of education that there was a greater focus on "sequence." One of the major questions raised during the previously discussed Basic Issues Conference series

foreshadowed the central concern at Woods Hole. Basic Issue #2 queried:

> Can basic programs in English be devised that are sequential and cumulative from the kindergarten through the graduate school? (7)

The Woods Hole participants certainly believed that a sequential and cumulative curriculum was possible for their science subject areas, and other educators accepted their premise. As a result of Bruner's The Process of Education (1960), there was considerable discussion among college and university educators about designing instruction around basic or universal principles, organizing those principles in a spiral manner, and developing instructional activities which lead to increasingly more difficult concepts. One might wonder if part of the reason for the apparent popularity of what Bruner and the other Woods Hole participants proposed was that it was just the sort of thinking that many university professors most enjoy about their work: an opportunity to think about the principles they consider most important in their subject areas and organize them so concisely and effectively that the concepts may be readily explained to others.

During the 1960's, specifically from early 1962 to late 1963, there were four closely related professional inter-association conferences, which directed professional attention to research that the participants believed was needed in the teaching of English. These four conferences came to be known by separate titles, but all four were considered Project English conferences because they received primary funding from the Cooperative Research Branch of

the United States Office of Education (USOE), a division of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Additional funding was provided by the universities which served as meeting sites. Since the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, the USOE had been providing substantial financial support for projects studying American education. The NDEA, itself, had been a part of the Congressional reaction to the launching of Russia's Sputnik I.

The first conference in this four conference series was the Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English. Held in 1962, from May 5 to 7, this conference was convened at the Carnegie Institute of Technology by Erwin R. Steinberg, Dean and Professor of English at the Margaret Morrison Carnegie College. Louise Rosenblatt, Professor of English at New York University, described this first conference in the series as "path-breaking" (Rosenblatt 1963, 2).

The conference report, prepared by Erwin Steinberg, is available in the ERIC sytem as Cooperative Research Monograph No. 11 (Contract #OE-30010). As with the other conferences in which NCTE was involved, information about the proceedings of this conference was published in NCTE's journals. College English (November 1962) and Elementary English (December 1962) each carried articles by Steinberg presenting information about the conference proceedings germane to the interests of their readership. (Steinberg's article for Elementary English was co-authored with William Jenkins, who was the editor of Elementary English at the

time.) Steinberg's conference report reflects the trends of the time period through its focus on the newly published research on the structural and transformational grammars. Some of the discussion at the conference centered around whether to teach grammar, what grammar to teach, how to teach grammar, and how to implement the grammar research findings in the elementary and secondary classroom.

Years later, writing in The Dynamics of Language Learning (1987), James R. Squire, who attended this conference, offered these comments about it:

> Only one of the participants [i.e., James Squire] in NCRE's Mid-Decade Seminar participated in the Project English Conference, but most were affected by the recommendations arising from the conference, since they defined for years the priorities used by the Cooperative Research Branch of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in allocating research funds.
>
> A summary of these deliberations by Erwin R. Steinberg (1963), the conference convener, reviewed the major concerns, most of which no longer guide thinking about research in English and reading.
>
> Surprisingly, in retrospect, the topic which elicited the greatest reaction in papers and in discussion twenty-five years ago was whether grammar should be taught, and if so, which grammar: traditional, structural, generative, or some synthesis of the three. By 1985 these issues remained unmentioned by conferees [i.e., conferees at the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar], if indeed they had not been resolved. (387)

Squire's comment that the concerns of the first Project English conference in 1962 no longer guided the thinking of professional leaders in 1985 seems especially pertinent for writing instruction. Between the 1962 Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English and the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar, both the instructional and research concerns for writing changed dramatically. The list of conferees in the 1962 conference report, prepared by Steinberg, reveals that those in attendance were predominantly college and university professors and research specialists from the United States Office of Education.

While the conference was not identified as an inter-association event, among those attending were leaders from several professional associations. The following is a partial listing to document the professional association affiliations of some of the conferees: John H. Fisher, then MLA Executive Secretary; Priscilla Tyler, who would become NCTE Second Vice President the following year in 1963: William A. Jenkins, then editor of Elementary English and who would become NCTE President in 1968; Walker Gibson, who would become NCTE President in 1972; James R. Squire, then NCTE Executive Secretary; Ruth Strickland, then an NCTE Past President; Margaret Early, who would become NCTE President in 1973.; Stephen A. Dunning, who would become NCTE President in 1974; and Wayne Booth, who was active in both NCTE and MLA. A complete list of those attending this conference is found in Appendix E.

It might be noted that at the time of this 1962 Project English Conference on Needed Research, J. N. Hook, the former NCTE

Executive Secretary, was serving in the United States Office of English as the first Coordinator of Project English. When Hook left his USOE post, he was succeeded by Erwin R. Steinberg, the general chair of the 1962 Conference on the Needed Research in the Teaching of English.

The 1962 Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English is primarily significant for this study for its lack of concern for writing instruction. The view that writing instruction developed out of, or as the result of, grammar study was common at that time, as previously indicated in Chapter II. Ruth G. Strickland challenged this view in the paper she prepared for and presented at the 1962 Conference on Needed Research. She wrote:

> Available research indicates very clearly that what the school teaches about grammar has little or no influence on either speech or writing. Is there something better that we might teach rather than hold tenaciously to what we are now teaching? Children are eager manipulators of language but are little concerned with the labels we attach to the elements they manipulate. (10)
>
> The teaching of writing bristles with unsolved problems. Writing needs to be recognized as a dialect of language, one which is similar to but different from oral language. Teachers know that many children can compose and dictate a story or report of far better quality than the ones they write. What are the limitations of physical capacity at various ages and among children at any age? What is the effect of early emphasis on spelling, punctuation, and handwriting on the quality of what is written? Do we load too much on the shoulders of children when they are not yet ready to handle simultaneously ideas, the composing of those ideas into sentences, and all the elements of form necessary to good writing? Is there a relationship between the quality of a

> child's writing and his physical limitations, his lack of clear understanding of content, his inability to visualize matters of form, and his lack of any vital interest in the process of writing? (12)

Strickland's comments appeared to go unheeded at the 1962 Conference on Needed Research, but in the next few years after this conference, the questions she asked would receive greater attention, while the view focusing on the implementation of grammar research would be challenged more rigorously. With the publication of additional studies, produced by several researchers operating independently around the United States, the focus in writing instruction would shift to a greater concern for writers (especially students) in the act of writing.

The second conference in the Project English series was the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English. Held on December 2-4, 1962, this conference was convened at Allerton Park, at the University of Illinois, and jointly sponsored by the university and the United States Office of Education. According to Michael Shugrue writing in English in a Decade of Change (1968), Erwin R. Steinberg called the conference "one of the major achievements of Project English" (39). This conference was attended by "eighty chairmen and other representatives of college and university departments of English who gathered in the library of the Allerton mansion near Monticello, Illinois" (Shugrue 39). A complete list of those attending this conference and their university affiliation is found in Appendix F.

Out of this conference came the development of the Association of Departments of English (ADE). According to Shugrue (1968), "The Allerton Conference demonstrated the most effective kind of federal support--from a federally-sponsored seminar emerged a self-supporting, responsible professional association" (40). While the conference had no direct interest or bearing on the teaching of composition, it is significant for this study for this reason: English departments at colleges and universities, at that time, were in the process of organizing themselves and developing a professional association identity. The establishment and organization of the department as a whole also involves the development of departmental areas, representing professional fields and instructional programs within the department, such as British Literature, American Literature, Linguistics, English Education, etc. This organizational framework had to develop before those who were concerned about the teaching of composition might make their case for their need to be represented as a departmental entity. Thus, now at many colleges and universities, one finds separate writing programs, often housed in the Department of English, as well as degrees or areas of specialization in the study of Composition. These organizational and administrative components only become possible when there is an overarching framework to encompass them. The establishment of the ADE both contributed to and validated the development of that framework for the colleges and universities who originally participated in its founding., as well as the colleges and universities that have since become ADE members.

ADE remains a subsidiary of the Modern Language Association to the present time and publishes the ADE Bulletin which frequently includes articles related to writing instruction and research. The ADE currently describes itself as "an association of departments of English, writing programs, and divisions of humanities." (This statement, required by the United States Postal Service as an association identifier, may be found in the front of each journal that uses the United States Postal Service for mailings to members.)

The third conference in the Project English series was the Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English. Convened in 1963, from February 27 to March 2, this seminar was held at New York University, and directed by Louise M. Rosenblatt, who prepared the conference report for the United States Office of Education. The seminar was funded primarily by the Cooperative Research Branch of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with additional support provided by New York University. A complete list of those attending and their university affiliation is found in Appendix G.

One of the significant aspects of this conference was the vigor of the discussion, again, regarding the teaching of grammar as a basis for improving writing instruction. At the time of this conference, less than one year after the 1962 Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English, the grammar research studies, which suggested new grammars (e.g., structural grammar, transformational grammar, etc.) as alternatives to traditional grammar, continued to receive considerable attention. As a result,

much of the discussion and debate at this conference concerned how these new grammars might be taught to improve students' writing. Conference participants disagreed over what grammar should be taught, and whether it should be taught at all.

A conference sub-committee consisting of John B. Carroll and W. Nelson Francis prepared a document entitled "A New Attack on the Effectiveness of the Teaching of Grammar in the Improvement of Writing." This document was the first of fourteen documents appended to Rosenblatt's conference report. In it, the authors stated their belief that the previous research studies, which indicated that grammar instruction did not improve students' writing, had been poorly designed, of too short duration to determine instructional effects, and had not focused on the appropriate aspects of grammar or composition instruction (Carroll and Francis 1963, 41). They advocated further grammar and composition research which would examine the fundamental relationships of the two areas.

In the conference report, Rosenblatt presents separate listings of research which the conference participants had identified as needed in the areas of linguistics and composition. In the section on linguistics there is emphasis on the need for more thorough research on the relationship between the teaching of grammar and writing (14).

Rosenblatt's comments on research in composition represent the views of other conference participants who believed that more specific attention was needed on composition itself. She writes:

> A number of the proposed studies center about, or are fundamental to, composition. Some of these would contribute to insight into what constitutes good writing in the twentieth century, or to the theoretical framework within which the various kinds and forms of expression are to be viewed. . . . Even those teachers who, through sound training and literary ability, are able to recognize a good piece of writing, to point out the qualities of good prose, often still do not understand the process that the writer has had to go through in arriving at a particular piece of good prose or a well-written paper. (15)

The following list of suggestions for composition research, reported by Rosenblatt, were offered by the conference participants during their discussions at the seminar:

1. A comprehensive study of modern expository prose style. An examination of the syntactic characteristics of good (factual as opposed to imaginative) modern prose as compared with syntactic characteristics of 18th or 19th century prose. This would have value in guiding current rhetorical theory and instruction.

2. (a) A study of the development of the English paragraph (especially in factual prose) from 1890 to the present. b) The same kind of historical study of the modern sentence.

3. The re-examination of the subject of rhetoric for the purpose of developing a sound modern rhetoric . . .

4. A descriptive study of the the process of theme-writing in good and poor theme writers:

    - How do students approach the task of theme-writing? How do they plan and organize their thoughts, if at all? How do they develop their plans?

- How do students draft themes? What kinds of rewriting do they do?

- Are there conscious elements of design in students' performance? E.g., do students consciously try to vary sentence patterns, worry about antecedents, work out from topic sentences?

- In what ways are students sensitive to the demands of the setting in which theme-writing occurs? . . .

5. Operational analysis of the production of competent pieces of writing. This would involve the kinds of processes which would precede the actual writing and which would come into play as the various versions of the composition suggested themselves. E.g., observing, gathering information, moving from facts to some generalizations, seeing similarities and differences or cause and effect--operations implied in the usual statements concerning themes having a main idea, or paragraphs being organized in one way or another or having a topic sentence.

6. Studies might be made of the ways in which competent writing is produced. For example, the conditions under which a selective process is set in motion for arriving at the subject, the attitude toward it, the effect to be produced upon a reader, the kind of personality or persons that the writer seeks to evoke, etc. Such research might include both case studies of individual students and large-scale analyses of student themes written under different conditions. Rough drafts and completed papers written during a term by an entire college freshman class might provide a useful body of data for such study. (16-17)

Rosenblatt's report of the research suggested by those in attendance at the 1963 Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of

English is remarkable for two reasons: first, for what it reveals about perceptions of needed research at the time of the conference, including research interests in studying the modern paragraph and the modern sentence (item #2 above); and second, for what it foreshadows about research that would be published beginning in 1964.

It is conceivable that some of those in attendance at this conference knew of research in progress around the country and wanted to show support for the work by emphasizing the need for such studies. A case in point is that of Paul L. Dressel, who was Director of the Office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University and who attended this conference. Dressel is likely to have known about the research in progress at the time at Michigan State University by Gordon Rohman and Albert Wlecke. Rohman and Wlecke's research on pre-writing, previously discussed in Chapter II, is closely related to the research suggestions in items #5 and #6 above. Rohman and Wlecke's research report for the United States Office of Education was completed in 1964; and in May 1965, Rohman published findings from their research in College Composition and Communication. Connections between the conference research report and the research in progress are difficult to document from the professional literature, but the timing indicates that the connections are likely to be more than mere coincidence.

Although the Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English was not identified as an inter-association conference,

among its participants were professional leaders from both MLA and NCTE (See Appendix G) including John H. Fisher, MLA Executive Secretary; Albert R. Kitzhaber, then NCTE Vice President and due to become NCTE President eight months later; and Walker Gibson, who would become NCTE President in 1972.

The fourth conference in the Project English series was the San Francisco Research Conference. In 1963, from November 25 to 27, this conference, officially called The Conference on Research Design and the Teaching of English, was held in conjunction with and prior to the NCTE Fall Convention. It was one of the pre-convention activities which had become a feature at NCTE Annual Fall Conventions by that time. A complete list of those participating this conference is found in Appendix H. This conference occurred within days of the assassination of President John Kennedy and David H. Russell alluded to the assassination in his opening remarks at the conference. The document resulting from this conference, Research Design and the Teaching of English (1964), was published by NCTE. Sponsored by the University of California-Berkeley and funded primarily by the USOE Cooperative Research Branch of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this conference was organized around five Study Groups which each examined an area of research in English. Those study groups were identified as follows:

1. Research in Teaching Language
2. Research in Teaching Literature
3. Research in Teaching Composition
4. Research in Teaching Reading

5. Research in Communication and Verbal Learning

Study Group 3, with its focus on the teaching of composition, represents one of the first times that participants at a professional conference studied composition as a distinct area of the English curriculum, and, further, recognized it as an area in need of specialized research. Other conferences had considered composition and alluded to its significance throughout the teaching of English as well as the rest of the curriculum, but composition generally had not been accorded the status of an instructional area worthy of separate consideration. Richard Braddock was selected to chair Study Group 3, probably as a result of his recently published Research in Written Composition (1963). For a list of the other conferees who participated in the Study Group on Composition, see Appendix H.

This professional association conference is specifically identified by George Hillocks in Research in Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986). Hillocks writes:

> One of the great bugaboos of research in composition two decades ago was the unreliability of ratings. Paul B. Diedrich, speaking at the 1963 conference of Research Design and the Teaching of English in San Francisco, stated "I honestly believe that almost all experiments concerning English composition that rely on essay grades have been conducted with tape measures printed on elastic." (100)

Hillocks's reference to the 1963 San Francisco Research Conference lends significance to the event by the mere fact that he mentions it in a major publication twenty-three years after it occurred. When

professional association and inter-association conferences result in documents that are available for later study, the conferences take on a long-term significance for the profession. In this case, Diedrich's expressed interest at this conference in the evaluation of writing ability would become a focus of his work at the Educational Testing Service and would lead to his book Measuring Growth in English (1974) published by NCTE, which would examine the topic of writing evaluation at greater length. Diederich's case serves to illustrate the point that professional association conference participation can lead to long-term projects and publications which ultimately benefit the profession by advancing professional knowledge on particular topics.

During the period from 1957 to 1963, one of the significant developments for the professional associations, particularly NCTE, was a dramatic increase in membership and journal subscribers. NCTE had set a goal of "Fifty by Sixty" (Hook 163), which meant 50,000 members and journal subscribers by 1960. According to J. N. Hook, NCTE surpassed its goal with 52,484 members and subscribers by May 1, 1959 and well over 60,000 in 1960 (179). It is quite possible that the membership increase was partly due to the increased interest in and concern for improving the schools as a result of Sputnik I.

1964-71: Toward a Writing Curriculum

The years from 1964 to 1971 may be differentiated as the second period of this study. During these years, there was a new emphasis on international cooperation, and an increased emphasis within the United States for research and curriculum development in the teaching of English generally, and the teaching of writing in particular.

In November 1964, the NCTE Annual Convention was held in Cleveland, Ohio. Boris Ford, then Chair of the British National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE), was invited to the Cleveland Convention and attended "as a special guest" (Hook 219). This visit led "to the three-day session at the Boston convention" the following year (Hook 219). Arthur Applebee, writing in Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974), indicates that it was remarks made by Ford (i.e., in Cleveland in 1964) which "led NCTE leaders to consider a joint meeting, which was arranged for the following year" (229). The professional literature indicates very little else about the significance of the 1964 Cleveland Convention, but the statements about Ford's visit are consistent in their indication that his attendance there led to the 1965 Boston International Conference.

In 1965, the NCTE Annual Convention was held in Boston. As part of the pre-convention activities, which had become common at NCTE Annual Conventions by that time, James R. Squire invited nine Britishers, six Canadians, and twenty-four Americans to meet

together for an international conference (Hook 191). A complete list of those attending the Boston International Conference is found in Appendix I.

This combined pre-convention activity and international conference would prove highly significant for the groundwork it would lay in matters of international cooperation According to J. N. Hook in A Long Way Together (1979), it is Squire who deserves significant credit for initiating plans for this conference and the famed Dartmouth Seminar, the international conference which would follow in 1966 (191).

A publication resulted from the Boston International Conference, entitled A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States (1966), edited by James R. Squire and published by NCTE. The publication is a collection of twenty-seven papers presented at the conference and several summaries of discussions that took place among the conference participants. Of the twenty-seven papers, three include information about the teaching of writing. The first article considers the relationships among writing, talking, listening, and reading with examples drawn from British schools (85). Entitled "Teaching Written and Oral English in Nonselective Secondary Schools," the article was written by William T. Spouge, who was Chair of the Department of English at the Mount Pleasant County Secondary School in York, England. Spouge was also Assistant Secretary of NATE at the time of the Boston International Conference.

The second article, "Teaching Oral and Written English in the United States," was written by J. N. Hook, a former NCTE Executive Secretary and Professor of English at the University of Illinois at the time. Hook presents an overview of the diverse approaches to writing instruction current in the United States in the early 1960's with references to the study of rhetoric, linguistics, semantics, creative writing, and reading and writing about literature (98).

The third article, "Teaching Writing in Canada," by Earl W. Buxton, Professor of English Education of the University of Alberta in Edmonton, examines some of the historical influences of education in Canada generally and of the teaching of writing in particular. He mentions each province's long-standing right to control its own educational system and policies, which has led to great diversity among the writing programs to be found in the ten Canadian provinces. Buxton then identifies objectives which the provincial writing programs appear to have in common, such as encouraging wide reading, increasing skill is using language, and learning about language (105).

In summarizing the discussion that took place at the Boston International Conference on the teaching of writing, Squire wrote:

> Discussion was based on a broad comparison of emphases in the teaching of writing in England, Canada, and the United States. In England, more emphasis seems to be placed on creative writing, with less attention to formal, analytical grammar. In the United States, emphasis is basically on exposition, with attention to language skills in the elementary schools shifted to organizational skill in the high schools. Canada is making a strong attempt to

> design unified English programs which greatly de-emphasize fragmented skills and analyses and which emphasize that writing grows from literary and personal experience. (107)

Squire's comments written in 1965, just after the Boston International Conference, highlight the instructional differences that initially would divide the Britishers and the Americans less than a year later, and then would lead to a new emphasis, during the late 1960's, on creative writing in American schools.

In the introduction to A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, Squire wrote about how the Boston Conference came to be:

> Like any important professional event, the International Conference on the Teaching of English held in Boston on November 24-28, 1965, had both antecedents and consequences. Sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English and the National Association for the Teaching of English of Great Britain, it was the first such conference to be organized. It involved some forty Englishmen, Americans, and Canadians interested in instruction in English from the primary school through graduate school. Its purpose was to compare and contrast the ends and means of instruction in our common language.
>
> The Boston meeting was an almost inevitable consequence of the contacts and professional relationships which had been developing for several years among leaders of English teaching in the several countries. For almost a decade, the NCTE has sponsored summer study tours for its members in Great Britain, tours which provide opportunity for teachers to study the teaching of English at Oxford or York and to meet some English teachers. During this period, also, a series of international conferences sponsored by national agencies

> in the United States and Britain concerned themselves with teaching English as a second language. Although the teaching and learning of the mother tongue received little attention, such meetings of linguists from several countries prompted a realization of our common purpose. (N. pag.)

The suggestion that had been made by Harold B. Allen in 1957, that NCTE should hold meetings with teachers of English from other countries, was now coming to be.

Of those who attended this first international conference in Boston in 1965, no less than twelve of them would meet again the following summer (in August 1966) at Dartmouth College for another international conference--a conference destined to be more famous for its impact on the English teaching profession. The contributions of the Boston International Conference were two-fold: first, it established professional relationships among the participants who would meet again in less than a year; and second, it led to funding for the Dartmouth Seminar by the Carnegie Corporation. According to James R. Squire in a panel presentation at the 1991 NCTE Spring Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana, funding for the Dartmouth Seminar was granted by a Carnegie Corporation representative during the proceedings of the Boston International Conference. The Carnegie Corporation funding was essential to the Dartmouth Seminar because of the costs of international travel and other expenses attendant to a conference lasting nearly a month.

It is ironic that the next international conference on the teaching of English came to be thought of as the first international conference. Officially titled, "The Anglo-American Seminar on the

Teaching and Learning of English," it took place at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire from August 20 to September 16, 1966. The conference came to be called the Dartmouth Seminar, or the Dartmouth Conference, or sometimes simply, Dartmouth.

Years later, in 1978, at the English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, James E. Miller, Jr., who was a Dartmouth Seminar participant, spoke of the importance of the Seminar:

> The Dartmouth Conference, like Sputnik a decade before, may be taken as one of the turning points in our profession, not necessarily because of its documented influence but because of its symbolic impact on the participants and the profession. (56)

The Dartmouth Conference was cosponsored by NCTE, MLA, and Great Britain's NATE. A number of publications resulted from this seminar. From the outset, according to James E. Miller, Jr., (1978) it was agreed that there would be two books after the conference, one British and one American. As a result of that agreement, the British book, Growth through English by John Dixon, and the American book, The Uses of English by Herbert Muller, were published in 1967. Muller's book is an expository and descriptive record of the conference proceedings with insights into the differing American and British perspectives on the teaching of English. The Dixon book does not deal with conference proceedings, but rather presents the perspective for English teaching advocated by Dixon and several of the Britishers in attendance at Dartmouth.

In addition, there were journal articles resulting from the seminar which focused on particular aspects of the conference discussions and proceedings. Among them were "The Dartmouth Seminar" by Albert H. Marckwardt which appeared in The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1967); "Postscript to Dartmouth--or Poles Apart" by E. Glyn Lewis which appeared in College English (1968); "Conference Report: The Dartmouth Seminar" by Wayne O'Neil which appeared in the Harvard Educational Review (1969); and "What Happened at Dartmouth?" by James E. Miller, Jr. which appeared in Use of English (1971). These articles present diverse perspectives about the events at the Dartmouth Seminar and they reveal the tensions, disagreements, and intense debates that took place among the Dartmouth participants--especially during the first week of the conference.

As a number of those writing about Dartmouth after the fact have indicated, the Americans began the conference believing that they were there to find an answer to the question, "What is English?" They believed they could identify a definable body of knowledge that would serve as a basis for elementary and secondary school curriculum development. Albert Kitzhaber's opening remarks at Dartmouth indicated this perspective (Kitzhaber 1966, 1). His Working Party Paper No. 1, so called because he was the first to speak, was entitled, "What is English?" James Britton was the first Britisher to speak at Dartmouth and it was his initial task to

serve as the Discussant of Kitzhaber's paper. After a few opening courtesies, Britton said:

> I want to make my first comment very clearly that it seems to me English is itself an element of a larger structure - a larger structure of education. I can see no possibility of defining English, or, if that is putting it too strongly, I can see no useful way of defining it without considering its place in the total structure. (1966, 2)

Britton went on to say that the question of "What is English?" needed to be rephrased. His "Response to Working Party Paper No. 1" continues:

> I strongly suggest that in order to avoid reification we need to rephrase the question and not say, "What is English?," but ask more simply, "What ought English teachers to be doing?" (1966, 7)

These comments by Britton set the tenor of much that would occur during the first week of the Dartmouth Conference. The Britishers and the Americans were in sharp disagreement. The conference participants were shocked to discover they disagreed so profoundly on fundamental issues of their professions and on the purposes of the conference.

It is, perhaps, a reflection of the state of composition at the time, that no study group at the Dartmouth Seminar was given or took upon itself the topic of composition as a part of the overarching conference question, "What is English?" Yet, in the various working groups, the topic came up and the working papers from the conference reflect some of the participants concern for writing

instruction. Before the Dartmouth Seminar, Frank Whitehead, a seminar participant, had written:

> Composition hangs round our neck like the albatross. It has long been a burden for both teachers and students, often the heaviest burden; but apparently there is no getting rid of it. (Muller 1967, 97)

It is revealing that Whitehead discusses composition in terms of a literary allusion to the classic poem "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner."

It might be noted additionally that the Dartmouth participants were, for the most part, professors of literature and language. One of the few Dartmouth participants from the United States associated at the time with the teaching of composition was Albert Kitzhaber. Kitzhaber had been President of NCTE in 1964, and according to Joseph Harris (1991), "his 1963 Themes, Theories, and Therapy was the first book-length study of composition teaching in American colleges" (635). It appears from the list of Dartmouth participants that more Britishers than Americans could lay claim to composition as part of their teaching assignments or experience. Consequently, it was the Britishers who talked about composition as a part of the growth model that would become familiar to the Americans at Dartmouth, and ultimately to all who would read Dixon's Growth through English (1967). Dixon's growth model emphasized the importance of personal experience as a resource for writing, and the importance of writing about personal experience as a means for personal and intellectual growth. According to Patricia Bizzell and

Bruce Herzberg in "A Brief History of Rhetoric and Composition" (1991):

> The Dartmouth Conference called for writing instruction that takes more notice of students' needs for self-expression as opposed to their adjustment to social demands. (5)

Bizzell and Herzberg also point out that Dartmouth contributed to increased interest in particular aspects of the process of writing. They write:

> . . . the conference helped spread the conviction that writing instruction should emphasize self-expressive uses of language, assisting students in shaping their ideas through writing. . . . the new Dartmouth-model writing course encouraged more interaction among teacher and students, more dramatic and collaborative activities. (4-5)

Thus, the Dartmouth Seminar became part of the evolution of writing instruction. The emphasis on self-expression as a significant component of learning to write became a feature of the process approaches to writing instruction.

In the "Foreword" to John Dixon's Growth through English, Albert H. Marckwardt wrote:

> The roster of participants at the conference [i.e., Dartmouth] reflected a definite attempt on the part of the planners towards broad representation. The various activities of the English classroom were all represented, if not in the core of the membership then in the consultants who were invited to join the group from time to time. There were teachers of literature, of composition, of

> language, of speech--often one or more of these were combined in a single person. Presumably the entire range of the teaching of English was under scrutiny, but school programmes received more attention than those of the college and university. (vii)

One might question Marckwardt's view of "broad representation" since the list of Dartmouth Seminar Participants (See Appendix K) indicates that, of those attending from the United States, there was only one high school teacher and no teachers from a public or private elementary school. The list seems to indicate that a few of the British participants were primary or secondary classroom teachers, but the participants at Dartmouth were, for the most part, college and university English professors. Although there were many benefits from the Dartmouth Seminar, this particular criticism of the lack of classroom teacher representation was a genuine flaw which must be considered as one reviews the material generated from the conference. (See Appendix K for a complete listing of the participants and consultants at the Dartmouth Seminar and their school affiliations or other employment at the time.)

In fairness to Markwardt, it perhaps should be said that his view of English was as an academic discipline based on a definable body of knowledge, and that if all of the content areas within the tripod of language, literature, and composition were represented at the seminar, then, in Markwardt's view, there was broad representation.

In considering the lack of adequate representation of American composition specialists at Dartmouth, one might ask why

conference planners had not invited someone like Richard Braddock or Richard Lloyd-Jones to attend Dartmouth? (Lowell Schoer was an Educational Psychologist and so might have been excluded since he was not an English teacher.) Their book Research in Written Composition had appeared in 1963 and the Dartmouth Seminar was in 1966. Braddock had been a participant in the previously discussed San Francisco Research Conference in 1963 and had chaired the study group on composition at that conference. It may have been that because Braddock and Lloyd-Jones were interested in composition, they were not considered for an invitation.

In Growth through English: A Report Based on the Dartmouth Seminar 1966, Dixon himself indicates in the "Author's Preface," ". . . I have stressed the consensus that emerged at Dartmouth." (xi). "Emerged" is the operative word here because there was a good deal that occurred during the Dartmouth Seminar, especially the first week, that indicated anything but consensus. The British perspective, reflected in Dixon's book, shocked some of the American participants and pleased others because it gave primary attention to the growth and development of the student.

There may be good reason to believe that Dixon was only using the Dartmouth Seminar as a basis for claiming consensus for what were essentially his own views. It appears that those who met at Dartmouth at the end of the summer in 1966 had considerable influence on one another's views, but to say that a truly significant consensus occurs among a diverse group of such highly educated specialists in a great variety of fields may not be a reality. A close

analysis of the publications that appeared after Dartmouth does not reveal as much consensus as has been claimed. Joseph Harris (1991) writing in College English in an article entitled "After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict in English," supports this contention. He writes:

> One finds in the papers and books that came out of the seminar not a unified sense of what English is and how it should be taught, but rather a sense of conflicts and tensions much like those that divide us now. Rather than read Dartmouth as the scene of a heroic shift in the theory and practice of teaching, then I want to look at it as a moment in which the conflicts that define English studies were dramatized with unusual clarity. (633)

In considering the significance of the Dartmouth Seminar for this study, it is the focus on self-expression and personal growth through writing that contributed to the evolution and development of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. According to Anne Ruggles Gere writing in the Eighty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (1986) "The American educators present at this conference were profoundly affected, and their consequent activity helped shape the expressive model of composition pedagogy" (41).

Another important outcome of the Dartmouth Seminar was the formation of the International Steering Committee (ISC) which continued to meet periodically for the next several years. Robert D. Eagleson, writing in the introduction to English in the Eighties (1982), offered these comments about the ISC:

> At that conference [Dartmouth] the International Steering Committee was established to consolidate the important gains of Dartmouth and to promote exchange not only among the member associations but also between all teachers of English. (ix)

When it was first formed, the ISC had only NCTE and NATE as members. Later, the English teaching associations of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand would be included. (Britton 1982, 1; Tchudi 1985, 1). Merron Chorny served as Chair of the ISC from 1972 to 1979, and Robert Eagleson was chair in 1980. The group continued to meet to plan conferences, and in 1983, it changed its name to the International Federation for the Teaching of English (IFTE). More will be discussed about the ISC and IFTE later in this chapter.

During this period of international cooperation, there also was cooperation among professional leaders within the United States. As a part of the Project English program, there was another major professional inter-association conference; but it was a conference with a focus unlike those convened previously. Held in 1966 from February 26 to March 1, and identified as "The Arts of Language Conference," this conference was significantly different from the previous Project English conferences in three respects. First, the conference focus was on the language arts programs of the elementary schools. The previous conferences had primarily focused their attention on the design and development of research to be carried out at the university level. Furthermore, the research

itself, in most instances, had a content, rather than a pedagogical, focus.

Second, elementary classroom teachers were among those invited to attend and participate in the Arts of Language conference. There were not many, and it certainly can be claimed that classroom teachers deserved far better representation, but there had been an attempt--in fact, a first attempt--to include elementary classroom teachers as participants in the conference proceedings. Prior to this time, that generally had not been done. A review of the participants of all of the conferences previously discussed in this study will show only a very few (less than a dozen) who were in any way identified with schools at either the elementary or secondary level. (See Appendices C through I.) In addition, of those who were identified with elementary or secondary schools, some were administrators rather than classroom teachers. The credit for including elementary classroom teachers in The Arts of Language Conference appears to go to the Conference Chair, Paul A. Olsen.

A third aspect in which this conference differed from those of the earlier time period was that it was identified as an inter-association conference by the professional association affiliation listing of the participants. At the previous Project English conferences, there was no identification of participants by professional association affiliation, with the possible exception of association executive secretaries. The participants at the earlier conferences were active members and professional leaders within several associations, including NCTE, MLA, CEA, and ADE, after it was

established; but, when they attended the previous Project English conferences, they were not there primarily to represent one of the associations. In most instances, at the previous Project English conferences, they were identified as researchers representing their own academic institutions

The Arts of Language conference, convened at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, had 58 invited participants. A complete listing of the conference participants is found in Appendix J. A resulting publication, The Arts of Language, was written by Paul A. Olson for the United States Office of Education, which had funded the gathering. This conference was especially influential in shaping many of the NDEA Institutes which followed, along with the development of elementary curriculum materials which flowed from the Nebraska Curriculum Study Center to elementary schools in the region and around the United States.

The significance of the Nebraska Curriculum Study Center for this study is best documented by comments made by Michael Shugrue in English in a Decade of Change (1968). In 1962, four years prior to the Arts of Language Conference, the Nebraska Center planned to develop extensive curriculum materials on composition. Shugrue writes:

> The Nebraska Center proposed to do work in seven areas related to composition: (1) composition and the usable portion of classical rhetoric; (2) composition and the possibility of a new rhetoric . . . ; (3) composition and its relation to structural and transformational grammar; (4) composition and close reading: the teaching of literature and its use as a rhetorical or structural model;

> (5) the construction of criteria and tests for the measurement of excellence in composition; (6) the analysis of levels of student maturity at which basic composition "habits" or "patterns of decision" are formed; and (7) the construction of criteria and tests for the correction of themes in the areas of syntax, logic, and persuasive strategy. (54-55)

While these seven areas of composition reflect the trends of the early 1960's as well as conceptualizations of writing instruction of that period, previously discussed in Chapter II of this study, the seven areas also were part of an educational trend-setting process. It should be noted that the Nebraska Study Center devoted attention to composition and improving composition instruction prior to the publication of the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, Schoer book (1963) which called for more research in each of the seven areas covered in the Nebraska proposal.

When the Arts of Language Conference was convened in 1966, the Nebraska Curriculum Study Center, directed initially by Paul A. Olson and later co-directed by Olson and Frank Rice, was already well-established and well-respected. Thus, the reputation of the Nebraska Center laid the foundation for the primary objective of the Arts of Language Conference: "The Conference . . . directed the attention of the English profession to the needs of the elementary teacher" (Shugrue 1968, 57). The Arts of Language Conference was an important milestone leading to a time when elementary, secondary, and college teachers might meet together to examine their mutual professional interests and the interrelated aspects of their daily work.

During this same time period, from 1964 to 1971, there was another extended series of conferences, which reflected significant cooperation among professional associations in the United States and which merits consideration in this study for its relevance to the development of writing instruction. This conference series was commonly referred to as the English Teacher Preparation Study (ETPS). The participating associations were NCTE, MLA, and NASDTEC, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. The document which finally resulted from this conference series was the Guidelines for the Preparation of English Teachers (1967) jointly published by NCTE and MLA. A review of the ETPS conferences will provide insight into their deliberation process and purposes, as well as provide a perspective on the importance of writing instruction at the time.

The English Teacher Preparation Study (ETPS) began in September 1965. The purpose of this conference series was to develop guidelines for colleges and universities regarding the preparation of English teachers. Michael F. Shugrue, then associated with the Modern Language Association as assistant secretary for English, commented extensively on this study in his book, English in a Decade of Change (1968). Shugrue writes:

> . . . with funds from the Cooperative Research Program, the MLA, NCTE, and NASDTEC launched the eighteen-month English Teacher Preparation Study (ETPS) in September 1965 under the direction of William B. Viall, Executive Secretary of NASDTEC. The project was the culmination of the dreams and plans of many English teachers, particularly of Autrey Nell Wiley, Eugene

> Slaughter, and Donald Tuttle. With James R. Squire as Chairman of the Advisory Board, the staff and board met for the first time in Denver early in September. The group agreed that the guidelines would be written for the teacher of English at any level and that the final document would emerge from successive drafts presented to groups of scholars, teachers, and administrators at dozens of association meetings, at four regional conferences, and at a national conference in January 1967. (107)

In October of 1965, the ETPS group met again; this time in New Orleans. Shugrue writes:

> Thirty chairmen of college departments of English and of Education attending the South Central MLA meeting in New Orleans reviewed the first draft in October.
>
> Obviously heavily influenced by the ISCPET [Illinois Statewide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers] qualifications statement and by the recommendations of the NCTE and of the Commission on English, draft one was politely but skeptically received. (Shugrue 1968, 107)

In 1965 during November, the ETPS group met again. At this meeting:

> A revised second draft, less a piecing together of previous documents and more a statement in its own right, was presented to seventy teachers and scholars in Boston in November at the first two-day regional conference on teacher preparation standards in English. (Shugrue 107)

During 1966, the ETPS conference series continued. According to Shugrue, the group held regional meetings in Salt Lake City, Utah (January), in Iowa City, Iowa (May) and in Charlotte, North Carolina

(October). Although this series of conferences seemed to drag on, the participants were nearing the final stage of their work. Nelson Francis, Professor of English at Brown University and an ETPS conference participant, called the ETPS "the oldest continuous floating conference in America" (Shugrue 107). Francis's comment, of course, was a paraphrase of a line spoken by Nathan Detroit in Frank Loesser's Guys and Dolls, a popular Broadway and movie musical at the time. As the conferences continued around the country, drafts of the Guidelines for the Preparation of English Teachers were receiving approval from the various members of the group and association representatives.

In 1967, on January 26-28, the final meeting of the ETPS series was set to take place. The purpose was to refine the "Guidelines" into their final form. This three-day meeting in Chicago would prove to be a memorable one for many, if not all, of the conference participants--for those who were able to attend and for those who were prevented from arriving by a Midwest blizzard which was national news for nearly a week.

After this eighteen-month English Teacher Preparation Study series of conferences and meetings, MLA and NCTE endorsed and published Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English. The Guidelines also appeared in the MLA and NCTE journals in early fall 1967.

In 1976, NCTE published a revision of "A Statement of the Preparation of Teachers of English and the Language Arts." This

document was the work of the NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification.

In 1986, NCTE published a third revision of Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts. This revision was also the work of the NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification. In discussing the preparation of English teachers for writing instruction, the document recommends :

> Teachers of English language arts need to know the following:
>
> the processes and elements involved in the acts of composing in oral and written forms (e.g., considerations of the subject, purpose, audience, point-of-view, mode, tone, and style).
>
> Research on composing processes has contributed many new insights to the profession in recent years. Both elementary and secondary prospective teachers of English language arts need to become versed in this body of research. Prospective elementary teachers must understand that rich oral language experiences, which often lead to writing, are important in the early grades. All teachers must know that much practice with expressive language (oral conversations and writing with one's self as the primary audience) is important, leading to writing with various purposes in a wide variety of forms for many different audiences. Learning about and practicing various aspects of composing processes--prewriting, writing, revising, editing, and evaluating--is crucial to achieving the knowledge required to teach those processes well.

The guidelines published in 1986 represent a substantial change in the conceptualization of writing instruction and in what pre-service

teachers should be taught to make them effective classroom teachers. The focus on process-oriented approaches to writing instruction had not been included in the earlier documents published in 1967 and 1976. Further, the acceptance of the guidelines by NCATE as a part of the teacher education accreditation procedure is likely to mean that more colleges and universities will be incorporating process-oriented approaches to writing instruction into their master course syllabi for undergraduate elementary and secondary education programs. Further, the development of the process approaches to writing instruction have had their effect at all levels of schooling, and the effect of the NCTE Guidelines is likely to increase as more schools, colleges, and universities conform their courses to the recommendations of the NCTE Guidelines.

Throughout this time period, the profession saw not only greater professional association cooperation at home through conferences like the ETPS, but also continued international cooperation. In August 1967, just one year after the Dartmouth Seminar, the Vancouver Conference of 1967, was convened in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. This was still another international inter-association conference. Writing in English in a Decade of Change (1968), Michael Shugrue said of it:

> The Vancouver Conference of 1967 brought together teachers from Australia, Canada, England, and the United States to talk about the English curriculum and to learn about the teaching of English from one another. (78-79)

In some respects this conference served as a follow-up to the Dartmouth Seminar, but a primary focus of the conference was to provide support to the Canadians as they officially established their own national association.

> In August 1967, the Canadian centennial year, Vancouver hosted an International Conference on the Teaching of English, with Merron Chorny of the University of Alberta in charge; about 725 Canadian, U. S., British, Australian, and New Zealand teachers attended. At that conference, after about two years of planning (led by Chorny, a long-time active NCTE member, and with Squire in an advisory role), a national Canadian Council of Teachers of English was organized. (Hook 219)

This international inter-association conference was important for the support the English teaching associations gave to the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, and it reflected growing international cooperation among the professional associations and their leaders from more countries with the addition of Australia and New Zealand to the list.

In 1970, what came to be called the Second International Conference on the Teaching of English, was held in York, England. While there is little information available in the professional literature about the proceedings of this conference, there are numerous references to it in connection with other conferences which preceded and followed it. In English in the Eighties (1982), Robert D. Eagleson referred to it as the "Second International Conference" with the implication that the Dartmouth Conference had

been the first international conference. Eagleson, like most others who have written about the Dartmouth Seminar and the 1980 Conference in Sydney, Australia, ignored the International Conference on the Teaching of English which had taken place in Boston in 1965 and the Vancouver Conference of 1967.

In his introduction to English in the Eighties (1982), Eagleson also has at least one other technical error in the information he provides. He writes:

> As a result on the initiative of CCTE, NATE, and NCTE the First International Conference was held at Dartmouth USA in 1966 to enable a more thorough investigation of the perspectives and practices of each country for the benefit of all. (ix)

As indicated above, it is a matter of record that the Canadian Council of Teachers of English (CCTE) did not exist in 1966 and was not founded until August 1967, eleven months after the conclusion of the Dartmouth Seminar.

The Second International Conference on the Teaching of English which took place in York, England in 1970 may be significant only for its reflection of the continued international cooperation among the English teaching professional association leaders which had begun in the 1960's.

This period ended with the publication of Janet Emig's The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971) by NCTE. Sponsored by the NCTE Committee on Research, this highly significant report, previously discussed in Chapters II and IV, presented trend-setting

research and advanced professional knowledge of the act of writing in two respects: first, in its use of the case study method as a means of eliciting data; and second, in its focus on students in the act of composing. Published as No. 13 in a series of NCTE Research Reports, the book was acknowledged by Earl W. Buxton, Chair of the NCTE Committee on Research in 1971, as "an expedition into new territory" (v). The book truly marked the end of a period and opened the way for a new research focus on writing instruction.

The years between 1964 and 1971 reflected a period of dramatic change. Moving from a time when nearly all approaches to writing instruction were product-oriented to a time when the newer approaches conceptualized both writing and writing instruction as processes which could be taught at all levels of schooling, the professional association activities of the period led to advances in professional knowledge about writing and writing instruction.

1972-79: New Research and Writing Conferences

During the years from 1972 to 1979, the third period which may be differentiated for this study, there was a call for researchers in English education to utilize the new research models, especially those that had been productive in other academic fields, to advance professional knowledge about the teaching of English in general, and the teaching of writing in particular. In addition, the first conferences devoted entirely to writing instruction and research were held: the Buffalo Conference on Researching

Composing in 1975 and the CCTE Conference on Learning to Write held in Canada in 1979.

Initiating this new period was the 1972 NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education, held in Minneapolis, Minnesota. According to Julie Jensen in The Dynamics of Language Learning, (1987, 55) there were sixty participants at this conference. A partial list of those attending this seminar, developed from information available in the ERIC system, is found in Appendix L. Looking back at the 1972 Minnesota Seminar thirteen years later, Jensen wrote about the significance of the 1972 meeting. She made the following comments in a paper presented at the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar:

> From the diverse roles of the papers' authors--anthropologist, psychometrist, philosopher, technologist, and English educator--we built interdisciplinary bridges, as has been suggested at this conference, and we learned that the very definition of research differs according to one's professional vantage point. We also learned about available perspectives on research, and about extending the boundaries of research in English education. More than one conferee observed that it wasn't the papers at all that became our content; it was the people there--their actions, their opinions, the effect of their responses on one another. I expect the same at this seminar [i.e., the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar]. (55)

Thus, one sees a role of the professional association in action. As professional associations serve to gather their members for dialogue, the substance of their discussions often becomes their own individual and collective work. The nature of what they will do in

the future is likely to change as a result of their having met and talked. The nature of their talk changes as a result of the individual works produced prior to their meeting.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the 1972 NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education was the challenge it offered in the paper presented by Carol Talbert, entitled "Anthropological Research Models" (1973). Talbert offered the argument that the field of the teaching of English needed new research models to advance professional knowledge, especially knowledge of writing instruction. She discussed research models that had been used successfully in other areas of academic research and that might be productive in examining areas of English instruction. In her conference presentation and in a journal article which appeared later in Research in the Teaching of English (1973), Talbert advocated an anthropological research model which stressed:

> fewer statistics and more personal involvement, fewer rigid conceptual forms for investigating educational processes, and greater willingness to consider cultural factors that influence behavior in educational settings. (Rosenbaum 153)

As previously indicated in Chapter II, Talbert was not alone in suggesting the need for alternative forms of research in studying the teaching of English, nor was she the first. Braddock, et al., had specifically advocated use of both the longitudinal study and the case study for research in composition in 1963 (31-32). They

indicated that these two methods had been used successfully in other research fields and might prove enlightening in composition research as well. With the mounting evidence of the values of alternative research models from other fields and the increasing interest in studying writing in elementary and secondary classrooms, the stage was set for utilization of new research models. Perhaps Talbert's paper at the 1972 NCTE Minnesota Research Seminar in English Education and its subsequent publication in Research in the Teaching of English (1973) came at the right time to encourage or remind researchers that there were other research models available to them. Furthermore, some of those other research models, such as ethnographic research, might better serve their research needs as they studied children or adolescents writing in the classroom.

Another conference held during this time period was the English Curriculum Under Fire Conference at the University of Chicago in 1978. Directed by George Hillocks, Jr., this conference was significant primarily for its confrontational theme addressing criticisms that had been leveled against English programs at all levels of schooling around the country. It was probably a small conference; there are only limited records about it in the resulting professional literature. But one significant publication emerged which offers the perspectives of professional leaders who had been active in the field English education in significant roles, and who would continue to be influential for the next few years as well. The publication resulting from this conference was The English

Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? (1982), edited by George Hillocks, Jr. Since this publication, unlike most others examined for this study, offers only limited information about conference participants and presenters, no precise conclusions about attendance or participation may be drawn to characterize the conference. A partial listing of those attending the conference appears in Appendix N.

Among the speakers whose papers from the conference appear in The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? (1982) are the following: George Hillocks, Jr., Wayne C. Booth, James R. Squire, E. D. Hirsch, Jr., James E. Miller, Jr., and Bruno Bettelheim. Each of these men had roles influencing the field of English education and several had played significant roles within the professional associations. Wayne Booth had been a participant at the Dartmouth Seminar (See Appendix K) and had been active in both MLA and NCTE for several years (See Appendix U). George Hillocks, Jr. was gaining a national reputation based on his professional publications of books and articles. James R. Squire had long served the profession as an author of numerous books and journal articles for MLA and NCTE; he had edited many more books which had focused on critical issues in English education; and he had served NCTE as its Executive Secretary for nearly eight years from 1960 to 1967. James E. Miller, Jr. was a Past President of NCTE, a trustee of the NCTE Research Foundation, a past editor of NCTE's College English, and the author of several books on American Literature. Bruno Bettelheim had been a professor of psychology

and psychiatry at the University of Chicago and had won both a National Book Award and a National Book Critic's Circle Award for The Uses of Enchantment in 1977. There were other speakers at the English Curriculum Under Fire Conference who chose not to make their papers available for the resulting publication. Among them were Janet Emig and David Thorburn. Hillocks indicates that both had been featured speakers.

From the introduction to The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? (1982), we also know that part of the conference was structured around discussion groups and the leaders of these groups are identified. Among the Discussion Leaders were Walter Petty, Marjorie Farmer, and Stephen N. Judy (Tchudi), all active NCTE leaders. Farmer was NCTE President at the time and Judy (Tchudi) was then the editor of English Journal. For a complete listing of the discussion leaders, see Appendix N.

Of the papers presented at the conference and published in The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? (1982), the most significant for this study is "The Collision of the Basics Movement with Current Research in Writing and Language" by James R. Squire. Squire's article addresses how the cry for more basic instruction in writing and language had negatively affected the quality of writing instruction. He indicates the numbers of states that had either already implemented competency testing programs or were considering such programs at the time of the conference in 1978. He further indicates that, "Rather than expand the child's experiences in using language in diverse ways, school programs

have tended to limit the uses and thus the possibilities for growth" (32). To affect meaningful change and to improve writing instruction, Squire suggests teachers "need to distinguish between skills to be taught for mastery and processes to be taught for growth" (34). Squire's suggestion is an attempt to assimilate two models for instruction that were then current: the mastery learning model which developed out of the back-to-basics movement and which had value for teaching skills, and the growth model which had developed out of the Dartmouth Seminar and John Dixon's Growth through English (1967), which offered a means for children to develop their powers for self-expression and, consequently, to achieve personal growth through language experience. Squire also stresses the importance of learning that can take place "before, during, and after the act of composing" (35).

Had Janet Emig's paper from this conference been made available through publication, it might have presented a perspective for viewing a process approach to writing instruction at the time of the English Curriculum Under Fire Conference. However, since her paper was not available, no further conclusions about it may be drawn.

The focus of the English Curriculum Under Fire Conference was primarily intended to counter the back-to-the-basics movement. Wayne Booth's article, "Rhetoric, Mere Rhetoric, and Reality: Or, My Basics Are More Basic Than Your Basics" addresses the perspective that there is no "single conception of what the basics might be" (13). Consequently, Booth suggests that teachers and leaders in the

profession must discover a common ground to educate themselves and their various publics about the basics of education (14). Booth writes:

> Our task is thus both to discover whatever is really basic to education and to find ways of talking about it that will show why what we care about doing is what the public really wants done. (14)

Booth's suggestions are relevant for all areas of education, and they must be considered by those who want to affect change in writing instruction. The approaches for writing instruction, whether they are process-oriented approaches or some assimilation of various models, must address the various elements that parents and the public at large want taught, and professional leaders must learn to explain how the models do, as Booth says, "what the public wants done" (14).

One of the new developments during this time period was the mounting of professional conferences devoted entirely to writing and the teaching of writing. The first of these was the Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing held in the Fall of 1975 at the State University of New York at Buffalo (SUNY-Buffalo). This conference was funded primarily by the NCTE Research Foundation.

A publication resulting from papers presented at this conference was Research on Composing: Points of Departure (1978), edited by Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell and published by NCTE. Major speaker at this conference included James Britton, Janet Emig, Walter Petty, and Donald M. Murray, all of whom revised their

conference papers for publication in the Research on Composing: Points of Departure (1978) book. It is uncertain why the State University of New York at Buffalo chose in 1975 to mount a conference devoted to "researching composing," but there is an interesting connection. Donald Graves had completed his dissertation on composing processes in 1973 at the State University of New York at Buffalo and Walter Petty and Charles Cooper both had been on his doctoral committee. The success of his dissertation in the NCTE competition for the Promising Researcher Award may have led one of these professors (or, perhaps, another professor at SUNY-Buffalo) to write the proposal seeking conference funding from the NCTE Research Foundation.

In May 1979, the 12th Annual Conference of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English (CCTE) was held at Carleton University in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. CCTE leaders began planning for this conference in December 1977 when the CCTE Executive Committee accepted a " . . . proposal to mount an international conference on the theme of 'Learning to Write'" (Freedman and Pringle 1980, ix).

Two books resulted from this conference. The first was Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition (1980), edited by Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle. The second was Learning to Write: First Language/Second Language--Selected Papers from the 1979 CCTE Conference, Ottawa, Canada, edited by Aviva Freedman, Ian Pringle, Janice Yalden.

Writing in the Preface to the first of these books, Freedman and Pringle explain the origins and development of conference plans

over the two year period preceding the event and identify what they consider the conference's outstanding feature:

> Thanks to the generous enthusiasm of the key speakers who we approached first, and the scholars on five continents who responded to our subsequent calls for papers and workshops; thanks too to the many organizations, detailed below, which helped to fund the conference we planned, the 1979 CCTE conference became something which seemed, to many of those who attended, one of the most important international conferences in English education since the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966.
>
> No book can hope to give more than a hint of the excitement generated on the campus of Carleton University as the 1250 delegates to the conference listened to each other's presentations and then argued, challenged, discussed, explained, and argued further, throughout the conference: in the lecture halls and seminar rooms following the presentations, on the University quadrangle in the warm May sun, in bars far into the night. (ix)

The 1979 CCTE Conference on Learning to Write was the first international conference devoted entirely to writing instruction. The conference presentations addressed a variety of issues, including writing as product versus writing as process, the teaching of writing skills versus the development of writing abilities, and the use of writing for learning and knowing (Candlin 1983, ix).

Major speakers at the conference included Merron Chorny, who gave the opening address; Janet Emig, Sam Watson, Jr., Michael Polanyi, H. A. Gleason, James Kinneavy, James Britton, Richard Young, Donald Murray, Ann Berthoff, E. P. J. Corbett, Robert Root,

Marilyn Sternglass, Janice Hays, Donald Graves, Lee Odell, Nancy Martin, James R. Squire, and Ross Winterowd.

While the 1979 CCTE Conference on Learning to Write was not identified at the time as an inter-association conference and it did not receive funding from any English teaching professional association other than the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, it is clear from the preceding list of speakers that the English teaching associations from Great Britain and the United States were well represented in spirit, if not in fact.

The duration of the conference (three days) and the number of speakers (more than 40) and the number in attendance (over 1200 delegates) permitted the presentation of a multiplicity of theoretical and pedagogical perspectives on the teaching of writing. The process approaches to writing instruction were among the many which received attention. Among those addressing the process approaches to writing instruction in their conference papers (i.e., the papers published in the previously identified books which appeared after the conference) were James Britton, Donald Graves, Donald Murray, and Janet Emig.

Perhaps the most significant of these papers was James Britton's "Shaping at the Point of Utterance" (1980; 1983). In this paper, Britton discusses the importance of the shaping of thought at the point when it is spontaneously spoken or committed to paper. He argues that good writers rely on this element of their writing process to pull them along as they write. Britton indicates that this is a powerful feature that good spoken and written language have in

common. He also argues that a writer who is unable to do this is not necessarily helped by "successive draft making" (62). Britton's ideas expressed in this paper accomplished an effect similar to the effect he created when he spoke as the first discussant at the Dartmouth Seminar. His ideas were unlike those of anyone who spoke before him and they caused others to rethink their own perspectives on writing instruction. Britton was a key player at Dartmouth and he took that role again at the 1979 CCTE Conference on Learning to Write.

With the achievement of an international conference devoted entirely to writing, the stage was set for an explosion of research, publications, and more professional conferences which would make possible further development of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. The professional associations would continue to support what they had begun and the field was ready to explore more new territory.

1980-87: Cooperation at Home and Abroad

During the fourth period which may be differentiated for this study, from 1980 to 1987, there was continued international cooperation evidenced by two international inter-association conferences, and the founding of IFTE, the International Federation for the Teaching of English. In addition, there was new domestic cooperation among the English teaching professional associations in the United States, especially MLA and NCTE. A theoretical

summation that may be made of this period is that the English teaching profession began to recognize multiple paradigms for writing instruction operating simultaneously in the academic community. The period begins with the Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, held in 1980 in Sydney, Australia; and it ends with the 1987 English Coalition Conference.

During August of 1980, what came to be called The Third International Conference on the Teaching of English, was held in Sydney, Australia. This international inter-association conference involved delegates from NCTE, NATE, CCTE, and AATE with more than 800 participants from ten countries. The conference resulted in the publication of two books. The first was Donald Graves in Australia: "Children Want to Write" (1981), edited by R. D. Walshe who was Publications Editor for the Primary English Teaching Association (PETA) in Australia. This book contains a series of articles by several authors, including Donald Graves, Donald Murray, Lucy McCormick Calkins, Susan Sowers, Barbara Kamler, Mary Ellen Giacobbe, and Judith E. Egan--all focused on process approaches to writing instruction.

The second book was English in the Eighties (1982), published by AATE and edited by Robert Donn Eagleson. This book provides a series of papers presented at the conference from members of the English teaching community around the globe, including Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and the United States. The topics included are writing assessment, writing project assessment, children's literature, multicultural education, and language learning.

Notable among the articles included in English in the Eighties are those on composition by Donald Graves, Betty Jane Wagner, and John Dixon and Leslie Stratta. Betty Jane Wagner's article entitled "A Valid Way to Assess the Effects of a Writing Project," states: "One of the most widely publicized and generously funded phenomena across the United States at the present time are programs for teachers to improve writing instruction" (51). Wagner was referring to several National Writing Projects, such as the Bay Area Writing Project, the New Jersey Writing Project, the Nebraska Writing Project, and the Chicago Area Writing Project, which she co-directed with Steven Zemelman. While an examination of the National Writing Projects is outside the boundaries of this study, it is important to recognize the highly significant role they played in bringing the teaching of writing to national and, as evidenced by this paper presented in Australia, international attention. The various National Writing Projects became prominent during this time period and thousands of teachers have participated in their writing workshops. For the most part, the workshops used a process approach to writing instruction and encouraged teachers to apply the process model in their own classrooms. In the article, Wagner describes an assessment model that she and Zemelman had developed for evaluating such writing projects and validating their effects to maintain state level funding. The article attests to the widespread presence and influence of the National Writing Projects during the late 1970's. That influence grew during the 1980's and has extended into the 1990's.

The article by Donald Graves included in English in the Eighties (1982) is the address that he gave as a major speaker at the Third International Conference on August 19, 1980 in Sydney, "Patterns of Child Control of the Writing Process." He addressed an audience of about 500 conference participants. The article has been reprinted a number of times in other publications including Donald Graves in Australia: "Children Want to Write" (1981).

R. D. Walshe has written that Graves was invited to be a principal speaker at the Third International Conference because the Primary English Teaching Association (PETA) had "discerned a great upswing of interest since 1978 in the teaching of writing, in all English-speaking countries, but most of all in the United States" (Walshe 1981, 6).

This conference was resulted in the formation of the New Zealand Association for the Teaching of English (NZATE). In the "Introduction" to English in the Eighties (1982), Eagleson writes:

> At the conference a special meeting was arranged for the New Zealand delegates and they decided to proceed to the formation of a New Zealand Association for the Teaching of English. (x)

When the International Steering Committee (ISC), which had been established shortly after the Dartmouth Seminar, met at the Third International Conference, the association representatives decided to make plans for a Fourth International Conference, and the Canadian Council of Teachers of English "accepted responsibility for

organizing" it (x). That decision resulted in the Montreal Seminar on Direction in Research held in 1983.

Meeting in Montreal, Canada, at the Montreal Seminar on Direction in Research, the ISC made important decisions regarding its future. There had been talk in the past about the need for an international organization for English teachers, but none had come to be. The Montreal Seminar, however, changed that. This seminar led to the founding of the International Federation of Teachers of English (IFTE) (Tchudi, 1985).

In the preface to Language, Schooling, and Society (1985), Stephen Tchudi writes:

> The International Federation for the Teaching of English (IFTE) was founded in Montreal, Canada in May of 1983, but it has a much longer history. Shortly after the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English, held at Dartmouth College in 1966, a group calling itself the International Steering Committee (ISC) was formed to continue the work begun at Dartmouth. The ISC subsequently held conferences in York, England (1970) and Sydney, Australia (1980) and expanded its membership beyond the National Council of Teachers of English (U.S.A.) and the National Association for the Teaching of English (U.K.) to include the English teaching organizations of Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. (1)

Tchudi reports that the 1983 meeting in Montreal was significant for a variety of decisions that the International Steering Committee executive board made regarding the future of the ISC. First, the board changed the name of the group to the International Federation for the Teaching of English (1). This name was thought to

be more representative of what the group had become. The IFTE board, then, Tchudi continues:

> created a plan for more frequent meetings and conferences. Among the suggestions offered was that of IFTE "pre-conferences," held immediately preceding the national meetings of member organizations, on the assumptions that many people interested might more easily obtain funding for two meetings than one. A "test" seminar held in Montreal in conjunction with the conference of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English was highly successful. (1)

The Montreal seminar also resulted in the publication of English Teachers at Work: Ideas and Strategies from Five Countries, edited by Stephen Tchudi, et al. This publication contains articles and papers all written by classroom teachers.

In discussing writing instruction, the teachers seemed to favor process approaches to writing instruction, but they also indicated the practical, day-to-day difficulties and complexities of teaching writing to children and adolescents. They underscored the learning through teaching that occurred for them in their work with elementary and secondary students.

While the researcher could find no written evidence to support this claim, it appears likely that the Montreal Seminar also resulted in the publication of English Teaching: An International Exchange, (1984) edited by James Britton, et al. The book cover indicates that the work was prepared on the behalf of the International Federation

for the Teaching of English and in a brief note in the Foreword, Britton writes:

> All royalties from this publication will go to the International Federation for the Teaching of English in support of further international activities on the part of the member associations. (N. pag.)

The book contains several articles which advocate process approaches to the teaching of writing. Among them are "Real Writing, Real Writers: A Question of Choice" by Anne Baker, "Talking about Writing" by Phil Cormack, and "Instructional Scaffolding: Reading and Writing as Natural Language Activities" by Arthur N. Applebee and Judith A. Langer.

In 1984, from November 11 to 14, the Seminar on Language, Schooling, and Society was held at Michigan State University, in East Lansing, Michigan. This seminar, convened by the International Federation for the Teaching of English, was "the first seminar to be held under the IFTE name . . ." (Tchudi, 1).

The primary publication resulting from this seminar was Language, Schooling, and Society (1985), edited for IFTE by Stephen N. Tchudi. As the publication title and the seminar theme designation suggest, the range of topics taken up at the seminar was impressive, and the comments focused on composition demonstrated that professional understanding of the act of writing and writing instruction had reached new levels. In his opening address at the Seminar, Anthony Adams, a British participant, who also had been a participant at the Dartmouth Seminar, argued for his view of the

basics. He said: "It is the arts that should be seen as the new 'basics' of our time" (19). Robert Pattison focused on literacy education, which would become more widely considered throughout the 1980's, and he argued for a different definition of literacy than had been considered in the past. He argued that literacy is not merely the skills of reading and writing (42), as it often was defined, but rather "a complex of relationships between various areas of the nervous system used for talking, seeing, moving, remembering, suppressing, analyzing" (44). Participants at the 1984 IFTE Seminar have indicated to the researcher that Pattison's definition of literacy was controversial at the meeting because other participants held different views, and defined literacy variously as it relates to an array of reading and writing perspectives and instructional concerns.

One of the most important outcomes of the 1984 IFTE Seminar was the varied perspectives it gave voice to through its publication of the conference proceedings. Among these perspectives were: Pattison's controversial views of literacy, the emphasis on teaching critical thinking through talking and writing, the integration of the subject matter of English, and the importance of getting beyond the views developed at the Dartmouth Seminar. The 1984 IFTE Seminar may not have the importance of the Dartmouth Seminar in the long run, but the variety of perspectives it considered represented the trends that were current at the time and that have been further examined and expanded since 1984.

In 1985 the Mid-Decade Seminar on the Teaching of Reading and English was called by the National Conference on Research in English (NCRE). This professional association conference had the character of an inter-association conference, in that the participants were active members in a variety of professional associations. Many of the participants were, at the time and continue to be, actively involved in NCTE, IRA, and/or AERA. Among them were Julie Jensen, Alan C. Purves, Judith A. Langer, Robert J. Tierney, David Dillon, P. David Pearson, Jerome C. Harste, Jane Hansen, Arthur N. Applebee, Roselmina Indrisano, and Miles Myers. See Appendix R for a complete listing of those attending the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar.

The conference was organized and arranged by James R. Squire, who also served as conference chair. The participants, thirty-two in number, were there by invitation only, and the purpose of the gathering was "to explore the future direction of research in English and reading" (xi). According to Squire in The Dynamics of Language Learning (1987):

> For three days, thirty researchers--some new to the field, some well-established--examined learning, teaching, and the complex interplay of skills, processes, and classroom conditions that influences the development of children's competence in reading, writing, and the related language arts. (xi)

Topics considered in papers presented at the conference which are related to this study include: "Interrelating the Processes of Reading

and Writing, Composing and Comprehending," "Texts with Different Structures and Different Content: Implications for Teaching Comprehension and Composition," "Oral Language: Its Relation to Writing, Reading, and Response to Literature" (v-vi). The primary significance of the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar for this study was that it reflected an acceptance on the part of major researchers from around the United States that the process approaches to writing instruction were to be examined more broadly for their connections and interrelationships with the processes of reading and oral language.

In 1987, from July 6 to July 26, a Conference of the Coalition of English Language Associations was held on the Wye Plantation at the Aspen Institute on Maryland's Eastern shore. The conference has come to be called the English Coalition Conference. In Wye's rural setting, a group of sixty participants met for twenty-one consecutive days of meetings, discussions, lectures, reports, and demonstrations to explore the issue of "What is English?" (Lloyd-Jones and Lunsford, 1989).

The origin of the English Coalition Conference, the explanation of how it came to be, was best stated by Richard Lloyd-Jones and Andrea Lunsford in The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language (1989):

> The Coalition Conference grew from seeds planted by representatives of eight professional associations concerned with teaching English in the United States. The officers and staff members of six of these organizations

> . . . met for the first time at the 1982 MLA convention to discuss subjects of general interest. (xvii-xviii)

The significance of the English Coalition Conference for this study is the spirit of cooperation reflected in that statement. The Coalition Conference represents a mutual effort on the part of eight professional associations with diverse memberships to work together to achieve goals which will serve their members and which have the potential to advance the profession.

It is perhaps too soon to be certain, but the English Coalition Conference appears to have been the kind of event that may have significant impact on the profession in the United States. It has been compared and contrasted with the Dartmouth Conference of 1966. It is unlikely that the Coalition Conference will ever take on the stature of the deliberations of Dartmouth, if for no other reason than Dartmouth was an international inter-association conference, while the English Coalition Conference was a national gathering of associations from the United States. (It is true that MLA is an international association, but its representation at the Coalition Conference was from the United States only.) The publications resulting from the English Coalition Conference may take their place in the professional literature as books that are widely read, assigned in college graduate courses for a few years, and discussed widely by members of the English teaching profession. But pressures to remain current in one's professional field will force looking at new publications as they appear in the 1990's and moving beyond whatever the English Coalition had to offer.

Among the participants were English and Language Arts teachers from kindergarten through college. This involvement of classroom teachers was a significant feature of this conference and the elementary teachers particularly contributed to the conference as a whole. In the "Prologue" to Stories to Grow On: Demonstrations of Language Learning in K-8 Classrooms, John C. Maxwell documented this influence of the Elementary strand, consisting of elementary classroom teachers and language arts specialists:

> What was remarkable and different about the 1987 meeting was first, the substantial cadre of elementary teachers and language arts specialists who attended . . . . Second was the presence of a large cadre of practicing teachers in the elementary and secondary schools. Nearly a third of the participants in 1987 were "from the firing line," as some of them were inclined to say. . . .
>
> The second notable phenomenon at the 1987 meeting was the profound influence exerted on the secondary and college groups by the cadre of elementary school teachers and college specialists in the language arts. This Elementary Section, to call it that, was a body of fifteen individuals who met each day and quickly developed a clear vision of the kind of schooling needed for children today and tomorrow. For part of each day at the conference, these fifteen also worked with groups of secondary and college teachers and thus had a major effect on the flow of thinking about education at those levels. High school and college teachers were greatly interested in the views of the elementary teachers and specialists. By the midpoint of the conference, a number of collegians articulated their own, perhaps subordinated, perception that students learn best when they are involved in shaping the goals, the contexts, and the methods of their own instruction. Considerable time was spent in secondary and college groups pondering the appropriateness of learner-centered, integrated, and

> interactive models of instruction at all levels of education. (xii-xiii)

As of December 1990, three major publications had resulted from the 1987 English Coalition Conference: 1.) Stories to Grow On: Demonstrations of Language Learning in K-8 Classrooms, edited by Julie Jensen (1988); 2.) The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language, edited by Richard Lloyd-Jones and Andrea A. Lunsford (1989); and 3.) What Is English? by Peter Elbow (1990).

Of these three publications, the first, Stories to Grow On: Demonstrations of Language Learning in K-8 Classrooms (1988) was a product of the Elementary Strand of the English Coalition Conference. It is important to recognize that even the title of Jensen's book suggests that it is based on the growth model advocated by John Dixon at the Dartmouth Seminar and that is defined and explained in his Growth through English (1967). But Jensen's book extends the growth model and provides a frame of reference based on stories for language learning and literacy development in contemporary elementary classrooms. Perhaps, it is a result of the stories in the book told by elementary classroom teachers and language arts specialists that the book takes on a pragmatic quality. The stories describe classroom events and lessons in which diversity, interaction, critical and creative thinking, and personal growth are the goals.

The other two books, The English Coalition Conference Report (1989) and What Is English? (1990), examine and reflect the

deliberations and discussions of all strands of the conference. Lloyd-Jones and Lunsford report the conference proceedings and present the resolutions developed during the discussions. Elbow reflects on the conference deliberations and discussions and presents his own perspective of the events as they illuminate the question, What is English? The opening question of the Dartmouth Seminar looms forth again. Elbow took more than two years after the English Coalition Conference to review his notes and other pertinent materials produced before, during, and after the conference before completing his summation and reflections on the significance of the event. One of his major summations is that the question which went unanswered at Dartmouth remains unanswered after the English Coalition Conference and that the question itself reflects where the field of English and Language Arts Education is now. He writes:

> What is English?" The title is not intended as a question I can answer with my book, not a slow lob that I can try to hit for a home run. The title <u>is</u> my answer, my summing up, my picture of the profession. This book is trying to paint a picture of a profession that cannot define what it is. I don't mean this as scandal, and I don't take our not knowing as the most important news from the English Coalition Conference (if it was news). Yes, it might be more comfortable and convenient if we knew just what English studies is, but this very absence of comfort and convenience in the profession is probably a good thing. (v)

In comparing Elbow's comments with those of James Britton in his opening commentary at Dartmouth, one may note the similarity of

the approach that the question, "What is English?," simply cannot be answered.

In addition to the three books, there were articles published in state level NCTE affiliate newsletters about the conference. For example, the March 1988 issue of the Massachusetts English Teacher, carried an article by Peter Elbow entitled "A Remarkable Consensus" in which Elbow pays tribute to the agreement in perspectives that emerged from the Coalition Conference. In another article entitled "Democracy Through Language" in the same newsletter, Angela Dorenkamp, another English Coalition Conference participant, discusses some of the procedures and processes of the conference and explains how the conference participants discovered the theme of their meeting, "Democracy Through Language," on the last day of the gathering.

The major publications, specifically the books by Jensen, Lloyd-Jones and Lunsford, and Elbow, which resulted from this conference, all supported the idea Dorenkamp suggests. The primary aim of the conference was to gather professional leaders together democratically to examine the key issues of the profession. In fulfilling this aim, the conference also provided an opportunity for the professional associations to play one of their major roles: to bring professional leaders together for dialogue and discussion.

1987-90 and Beyond: Trends and Issues

The fifth period which may be differentiated for this study extends from 1987 to, at least, 1990, the end of the study. During the years since the English Coalition Conference, researchers and theorists have turned their attention to new issues and interests including a renewed focus on writing across the curriculum, a broader concern for literacy education, an emphasis on the importance of teaching critical thinking, and development of whole language perspectives. There have been a variety of publications on each of these topics from the professional associations. Among them are Langer and Applebee's How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning (1987) which deals with both writing across the curriculum and the use of writing to develop critical thinking. (For additional discussion of the significance of Langer and Applebee's work for this study, see Chapters II and IV.) Langer and Applebee's research is notable for its extension of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction to process approaches to instruction.

Addressing the topic of literacy education is Alan C. Purves's book The Scribal Society: An Essay on Literacy and Schooling in the Information Age (1990). Purves first examines broad changes that have taken place in the society as a whole which he believes have changed how language is perceived and used, and then indicates the consequent implications for literacy education. Purves discusses writing extensively as a part of literacy education in various sections

of his book, and comments on the need to eliminate norm-referenced tests in schools in favor of domain-referenced tests. Purves writes:

> . . . it is clear that students must be tested on their competence to produce texts and discourse; the test must require the students to write something. Experience shows that it is not enough for a student to write a single composition in a period of some 20 minutes to be judged competent. That is but one kind of writing. The students should be required to write a variety of types of text, from the pragmatic to the reflective and argumentative. Their texts should be scored by trained raters for the degree to which they demonstrate the range of competences.
>
> The approach to testing that I propose is expensive, I realize, but not out of reach. Its most important result would be that the norm-referenced test so overused today would no longer be used. (111)

Purves's views of testing generally, and of the testing of writing in particular, are based on his belief that tests are necessary, and they must reflect the total curriculum; further, the curriculum must represent the needs of society. Purves advocates a significant broadening of the base of what is taught in many schools in relation to writing and reading to prepare children for what he calls the scribal society, a society that depends on huge volumes of written information, on knowledge of various textual forms, and on the human capability to interpret both the information and the forms in which it appears.

Another perspective which has received significant attention in recent years is the whole language perspective. There have been numerous publications advocating it and identifying appropriate means for classroom implementation, but one publication that attempts most simply to explain the perspective and its concepts is Ken Goodman's What's Whole in Whole Language (1986). Intended as a guide for both parents and teachers, this book presents Goodman's view of the fundamental concepts of language learning and development. He acknowledges that the term has been variously defined, and indicates that whole language approaches are based on a view of language development as a "holistic personal-social achievement" (26). Within his comments about writing, Goodman refers to the work of Donald Graves, Donald Murray, and Lucy McCormick Calkins, and advocates a process approach to writing instruction as consistent with whole language instruction (50).

During this time period, there also has been renewed interest in the origin, roots, and historical development of instructional perspectives, professional association activities, and the contributions of professional association leaders. Two new publications from NCTE provide evidence of this interest. An article by Joseph Harris appearing in the October 1991 College English, entitled "After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict" examines several interrelated and interdependent events in the teaching of writing. He refers to the conflicts that surfaced among the British and American participants at the Dartmouth Seminar in 1966 and

explains how these conflicts have continued and serve to represent different perspectives within the field.

In addition, a new NCTE book entitled Missing Chapters: Ten Pioneering Women in NCTE and English Education (1991), edited by Jeanne Marcum Gerlach and Virginia R. Monseau, examines the significant contributions of ten women who were professional leaders and who served NCTE as president between 1929 and 1960. Gerlach and Monseau present articles by various authors about Rewey Belle Inglis, Ruth Mary Weeks, Stella Stewart Center, Dora V. Smith, Angela M. Broening, Marion C. Sheridan, Lou LaBrant, Luella B. Cook, Helen K. Macintosh, and Ruth Strickland.

The previously identified interests and issues that have been taken up by various educational theorists and researchers are essentially beyond the scope of this study, but it may be said that interest in the process approaches to writing instruction, as those approaches have evolved over the years which are the focus of this study, has contributed to current concerns and interests in these other topics, e.g., literacy education, whole language perspectives, writing across the curriculum, etc. Each of the current topics appear to take a broader view of English and Language Arts education. Instead of focusing only on writing, the theorists and researchers are looking at a variety of interdependent relationships among reading and writing, writing and speaking, literacy and schooling, instruction and evaluation, etc., with additional consideration devoted to the cognitive and affective aspects of learning and teaching these interrelated areas of the English curriculum.

CHAPTER 6

CURRENT STATUS OF THE ROLES OF THE PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN DEVELOPING THE PROCESS-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION

The third major research question of this study was: What is the current status of the roles of the professional associations in developing the process-oriented approaches for writing instruction and what does this status suggest for the future? Related issues included: How do the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction fit into a broader spectrum of on-going curricular development in American schools and what roles should the professional associations play in continuing the evolution of writing instruction theory, research, and practice? As professional knowledge about writing instruction has evolved, the answers to these questions have become highly political. When writing instruction was perceived as wholly within the domain of the English teacher, there was little thought given to where writing instruction belonged in a total school curriculum. The only issue then was where writing instruction belonged in the English curriculum with respect to instruction in the other areas of English, such as language, literature, or grammar. But as the process-oriented

approaches to writing instruction evolved, the concept of writing to learn was acknowledged as a means for teaching content in other curriculum areas besides English. Consequently, educators across the curriculum became interested in and concerned about writing instruction across the curriculum. Further, as the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction received more attention in the professional journals and at professional conferences, educators, administrators, and curriculum specialists at all levels of schooling have become interested and involved in determining the role of writing instruction in the total curriculum.

Arthur N. Applebee examined the question of how the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction have given rise to new interest in a process approach to instruction. In "Problems of Process Approaches: Toward a Reconceptualization of Process Instruction" (1986), he made the following statements:

> As process-oriented writing instruction has become more widely accepted, our research and practical knowledge have also deepened to the point where it is timely to stand back and assess the weaknesses as well as the strengths of process approaches. (97)

> Most instruction is based on the simple assumption that we can specify a curriculum by studying what experts do and teaching our students to do likewise. (Both product-centered and process-oriented approaches to writing instruction share this assumption; they differ primarily in their definitions of what aspect of expert behavior should be studied and how best to organized the teaching that must follow. (106)

> I have argued so far that process-oriented approaches have been based on misconceptualizations of both parts of the assumption: they have misinterpreted what the experts do and have failed to consider how processes might best be taught. I think the most critical task facing both research and practice in the teaching of writing is to develop more adequate conceptualizations of both of these aspects of writing instruction. (106)

In elaborating his perspective of the necessary components of a reconceptualization of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, Applebee identifies where the process-oriented approaches fit in the larger picture of education. He writes:

> Reconceptualizing the nature of writing processes will carry us halfway to a reconceptualization of process instruction; the remainder of the journey will require a reconceptualization of the nature of instruction itself. (107)

As indicated in Chapter II, there is a gap between educational theory and educational practice. Because of the complexities of implementing institutional change, classroom practice always lags behind the professional knowledge that develops from theoretical inquiry and research. While Applebee's view may be an important step forward in understanding how process-oriented approaches to writing instruction might be improved, the "reconceptualization of the nature of instruction itself" (107) will take even longer to implement into educational practice because it requires significant changes in the institutions, the schools, themselves.

The next part of the question, what roles should the professional associations play in continuing the evolution in theory, research, and practice, is fraught with even more difficulties. However, it is the researcher's contention that in the past ten years the professional associations, particularly NCTE, have acted in important ways to play their roles. Since 1980, the National Council of Teachers of English has taken four actions, apart from those previously discussed in this study, to disseminate information about writing and writing instruction and to encourage excellence in writing instruction. The first of these actions came in 1980 when NCTE published a brochure entitled "How to Help Your Child Become a Better Writer: Suggestions for Parents." This brochure was printed in a tri-fold format and provided information concerning what parents might do at home to encourage writing and how they might assist in encouraging writing programs at school. A particularly significant aspect about this brochure is that it was published in both English and Spanish in order to reach a wider audience of parents. The brochures were provided free to teachers who attended NCTE conferences and conventions in the early 1980's and they continue to be available by mail from NCTE through its annual catalog at a cost of $7.00 per 100 copies. In the 1980's, NCTE state affiliates that wanted to distribute the brochures at their state conferences generally could get them in quantity free from NCTE. The brochures were distributed widely by NCTE to members of state boards of education and to legislators.

While the impact of such a document is difficult to evaluate, one might speculate that such documents are important in a society that wants condensed information which may be read quickly with a focus on a few key ideas. The NCTE brochures offered those characteristics. For the teachers who received them free at NCTE conferences and conventions, there was the possibility of using them (and perhaps, ordering more) to stimulate the interest of other teachers when they returned to their own school systems For this study, the brochure represents one kind of activity that NCTE utilized which would disseminate professional knowledge about writing and writing instruction to a wider audience beyond its own members.

Another NCTE brochure appeared in 1984 entitled "Incentives of Excellence." This four-fold brochure was a part of NCTE's Excellence in English program and one of its recommendations was "Find ways to reduce the size of classes in which composition is taught" (N. pag.). The brochure provides a rationale for this recommendation and indicates the time required per week for an English teacher to correct writing papers. These brochures were also distributed free of charge at NCTE conferences in 1984. In 1985, the NCTE Commission on Composition published a brochure entitled "Teaching Composition: A Position Statement." Like the other brochures, these too were available free of charge at NCTE conferences and continue to be available in quanity by mail through the NCTE annual catalog.

More recently, at the 1990 NCTE Annual Convention, the association took another action relative to the conditions and

importance of writing instruction. It passed a resolution concerning the reduction of class size. This new class size recommendation established NCTE's official position that there should be not more than twenty students in each English class. The significance of this resolution is that it provides a new rationale to encourage change. The previous NCTE recommendation, of twenty-five students per English class, had stood for nearly fifty years. The new resolution is particularly important for writing instruction and is crucial to the time constraints posed in the classroom if the teacher implements a process-oriented approach to writing instruction. This new resolution may be perceived as a trend-setting act. Given the large class sizes in many school systems, it is unlikely that there will be many schools anywhere in the United States that will have English class sizes of twenty students for many years to come, but the resolution provides information and a rationale in writing that professional leaders at all levels of schooling may use to work toward smaller class sizes for the next several years. After passing this resolution, NCTE published a brochure, "Lost in the Crowd: A Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload," (1990) to assist in disseminating its official position statement.

Publishing brochures or passing resolutions may seem to be small acts for disseminating information or encouraging change, but they are two opportunities open to professional associations beyond the usual professional publications, such as journals and newsletters, that they send regularly to their members. Through systematic distribution of brochures to classroom teachers other than members,

to parents, to state boards of education, and to legislators, the association will reach people who otherwise would not know of the information. Conference resolutions also may reach extended audiences, beyond association membership, through media publication, especially if the resolution is either controversial or trend-setting.

Currently, NCTE continues to conduct the Achievement Awards in Writing Program which it began in 1958. In 1991 the 34th Annual Program involved some 4000 students from all fifty states, Washington, D. C., and from American schools abroad. The program is for high school juniors who must submit two writing samples. The samples are evaluated by high school and college English teachers who serve as judges at the state level through the NCTE state affiliates. Names of winners from each state are published each year in the NCTE Achievement in Writing Awards Program booklet. The 1991 program was supported by grants from the Maurice R. Robinson Fund and the New York Times Company Foundation. Through this program, NCTE continues to demonstrate its interest in supporting effective writing instruction programs in American high schools.

It is also important to note that NCTE has not been alone over the past ten years in its attempts to develop professional knowledge of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. During the 1980's the International Reading Association (IRA) also published articles in its journals which focused on process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, especially as those approaches might be

utilized with process approaches to reading instruction. Some examples are: "Development of Beginning Writing Skills through a Total School Program" by Susan J. Kostelny; and "Topic Selection in Writing: A Precarious but Practical Balancing Act" by Joyce W. Lee, which appeared in The Reading Teacher in November 1987; "Improving a Fourth Grader's Reading and Writing: Three Principles" by Jo Ann Wong-Kam and Kathryn Au, and "Expository Writing Program: Making Connections Between Reading and Writing" by Taffy E. Raphael, Becky W. Kirschner, and Carol Sue Englert, which appeared in The Reading Teacher in April 1988. A good many other articles from IRA publications might be cited as further examples because IRA became a strong supporter of the process-oriented approaches to both reading and writing instruction in the middle to late 1980's.

Another association which has supported and contributed to the development and dissemination of professional knowledge about the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction is the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). In its journal Educational Leadership, ASCD has published several articles which present the rationale and pedagogy of process in writing instruction. Among them are: "Reinvigorating Learning through Writing" by Gordon M. Pradl and John S. Mayher in February 1985; and "Teaching Writing as Learning and Process" by David Bartholomae in April 1986. ASCD also devoted an issue of its publication Curriculum Update (December 1986) to writing instruction. Entitled "The Tug-of-War Is On Between Writing

Approaches: Emphasis on Process Challenges the Five-Paragraph Essay," the publication presents the rationale for process-oriented writing instruction and contrasts it with a traditional product-centered approach. Although the articles are brief, they include information on process approach features, explanation of how the process emphasis represents a new approach to learning, and a list of resources for educators who wish further information.

In addition to publishing articles about process approaches to writing instruction in its journals, ASCD cooperated with NCTE and NWP in 1984 in sponsoring and producing "Teachers Teaching Writing," a series of six videotapes which explain and demonstrate a process approach to writing instruction. This cooperative venture was funded under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and was intended for pre-service and practicing teachers, and administrators. The tapes and the accompanying discussion guide include background information about the National Writing Project (NWP) and utilize the NWP's inservice model for effective process writing instruction. The videotapes may be purchased or rented inexpensively and offer a viable option for local writing inservice programs, even for small school systems. The videotapes are an example of an effective means both for using modern technology for teacher education and inservice, and for the professional association cooperation that might be developed more widely to serve the profession as a whole.

In considering the highly political answers to the research question and related issues identified at the beginning of this

chapter, it is important also to examine the highly political nature of professional associations. The politics of professional associations are due, in part, to requirements for gaining promotion and tenure in the American college and university system. The politics of professional associations also are affected by the need to gain recognition and funding for major educational research projects. Researchers usually must be known in their own fields, or be associated with those who are, to garner government and corporate foundation funding.

The relationship that develops between professional associations and their members who teach in colleges and universities continues because of its symbiotic nature; each group needs the other to survive and prosper. It is obvious, perhaps, why the association needs the members. But why do the members need the association? In the academic community among college and university professors, the answer may seem obvious to the initiated, but it is less than obvious to outsiders. Although outsiders may perceive trips to conferences and conventions much as they think of their own vacations, for many in the academic community, survival and prosperity are determined in part by the degree of their participation in a variety of professional associations. The level and the frequency of participation is often rewarded in the academic areas of research and service. For example, the assistant professor who maintains a moderate level of service within a few professional associations and becomes highly active in association, college or university research is more likely to be promoted and given monetary rewards than the assistant professor who does not engage

in these service and research activities. By becoming well-known through publications of research in national professional association journals, a professor creates and maintains personal marketability. One's marketability in academia often depends, quite simply, on how well one is known nationally for quality research. If one university is unwilling to provide the monetary reward, the faculty member may bargain with other universities when positions are available. As a consequence of these conditions of employment, professors need the professional associations to publish their research.

In examining the current status of professional roles in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, and the related issues, it is also important to consider that the professional associations often are not acknowledged for their achievements in advancing professional knowledge. The work of professional associations, for the most part, is carried out by volunteers. In many (if not most) instances, the volunteers are highly capable individuals, usually university professors, with significant expertise in particular areas, and they give of their time and expertise to the activities of the professional associations generally with full knowledge that they will not receive remuneration from the association. In some instances, professional associations may provide meals, hotel, transportation costs, and token stipends to the volunteers who carry out portions of the association's work, but there is seldom any other payment of any kind to those who serve on the many professional association

committees or executive boards. Most of the time the association members must pay these costs for themselves for the privilege of serving on the committee. Thus, some members may not recognize what the association has done for them, or for the profession as a whole, because it may seem to them that it is more a matter of what they have done for the association and for the profession, or in a less egotistical view, it is what other professional leaders have contributed to the association and the profession.

In order for the professional associations, particularly NCTE, to continue the development and evolution of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, they must continue to do what they have done in the past: they must publish books, journal articles, monographs, and position statements; they must produce films and videotapes; they must encourage discussion and dialogue among professional leaders in the field of writing instruction by promoting conference sessions on writing; and they must continue to provide support or garner corporate support for professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars similar to the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966 and the English Coalition Conference of 1987; they further must publish the proceedings of such conferences and seminars so that the presentations and discussions held at such conferences may be evaluated over time by the profession as a whole. Part of the value of a conference like the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966 is that we may look back at the books and journal articles that resulted from it and evaluate them from the perspective of twenty-five years of further developments in theory,

research, and practice in writing instruction, as well as in the other areas of English teaching considered at Dartmouth.

In addition to continuing to do what they have done, professional associations, particularly NCTE, have begun to take active political roles in reaching out to teachers who are not members, to parents, to state boards of education, to legislators, and to professional leaders in other associations concerned with the teaching of English generally, and the teaching of writing in particular. In the past, professional association political activity often has been discussed in terms of being either "reactive" or "proactive." These terms have been used to describe the timing of a professional association's political activities. If an association acted after situations or conditions were discussed in the media, or after proposed legislation was nearing a vote, their activities were considered "reactive." However, if the association identified a situation or condition and brought it to media attention for publicity, or if association leaders worked with legislators to initiate legislation, then the association was considered "proactive." In addition to being proactive, professional association leaders have begun to look beyond their immediate situations to develop political strategies that will serve their members, the profession, and the society as a whole. This perspective will be explained and elaborated in Chapter VII in the section on "Recommendations for the Professional Associations."

Educational practice evolves slowly over time. While there may be great advances in the professional literature, it often takes

considerable time before one begins to see those ideas used in actual classrooms. In many classrooms, educational practices are still based on the early models of writing instruction discussed in Chapter II of this study (the grammar and mechanics first model, the product correctness model, the organization model, etc.). This appears to be the result of a number of factors, but certainly included are: a lack of inadequate inservice programs for teachers to help them change the way they teach, and the relatively small number of K-12 teachers who are members of associations like NCTE or its state affiliates. Some of the professional associations have begun programs to reach more teachers by providing inservice opportunities, such as the NCTE, ASCD, NWP videotape series described previously. As professional associations explore the options available to them by utilizing modern technology that is becoming more affordable and adaptable, they are able to offer viable options for reaching teachers who would be unlikely to join a professional association or attend an association conference.

CHAPTER 7

REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Because the United States has faced various waves of educational reform, there has been emphasis on different aspects of the curriculum at different times. During both the 1960's and the 1980's, there were calls for improving writing instruction. When the NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition commissioned the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, Schoer study of research on written composition in 1960 which led to the publication of Research in Written Composition in 1963, the committee was responding to calls for improvement in writing instruction. They decided that the best response at the time was to discover what research says about written composition. The Braddock book provided the best response that could be determined at that time, and it served the profession well for twenty-three years.

In the 1980's, the United States faced another educational reform movement that began with the publication of A Nation at Risk (1983). That document called for a variety of educational reforms including a longer school day, a longer school year, more attention to the education of the academically talented, and computer literacy for

all students. For two years, the educational community in the United States saw a new report almost monthly. By the end of 1984, there had been twenty-two such reports published. One of the most influential, previously cited in Chapter II, was Ernest L. Boyer's High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America (1983). Boyer's report identified literacy as "the essential tool" (85) of human life. He wrote, "The first curriculum priority is language" (85) and he further stated, "Teaching students to write clearly and effectively should be a central objective of the school" (91). Statements such as these in the professional literature provide evidence that there been recurrent interest in writing and writing instruction during many periods of our history. Even from the most casual overview, one can discover that curricular interest sometimes is focused on reading, sometimes on math and science, and sometimes on writing. It is evident from the two instances, which are cited as pertinent to this study, the focus has been on writing during two periods of the years which are the focus of this study.

The process approaches evolved into more elaborated forms as the professional associations published trend-setting research like that of Janet Emig (1971) and Donald Graves (1975); as they published books and journal articles discussing various researchers', theorists', and classroom teachers' perspectives on writing instruction; and as they held or supported conferences and seminars like the Basic Issues Conference Series of 1958, the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966, and the English Coalition Conference of 1987. As explained in Chapter V, each of these conferences, as a part of their

discussions and deliberations, considered various approaches to writing instruction or models for classroom implementation of writing instruction. The research and publications alluded to here are discussed in detail in Chapter IV and the professional association conferences and seminars are discussed in detail in Chapter V.

In "Problems in Process Approaches: Toward a Reconceptualization of Process Instruction" (1986), Arthur N. Applebee stated that the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction arose "as a radical response to an overemphasis on the final written product" (96). The emphasis on the final written product has been previously documented in this study in Chapter IV. It may be that the process-oriented approaches received considerable attention, at first, simply because they were new or different, especially when one considers that the subject of composition instruction is not one that had been known for its innovative pedagogy.

As one considers the professional association recommendations for writing over the years of this study, it is important to consider whether the recommendations for writing instruction in the recent professional association publications reflect any differences or changes from the recommendations for writing instruction in earlier publications from these associations. The review of literature in Chapter II covers a span of thirty-five years, from 1957 to 1991 inclusively, and it reflects that professional association publications, particularly those of NCTE, have reflected differences over that time period in the recommendations they made for writing instruction.

As indicated in Chapter II, the professional associations, particularly NCTE and NCRE, have published various reports of trend-setting research. In addition to those studies previously identified and discussed in Chapter II, there is the thirteen-year longitudinal study conducted by Walter Loban from 1952 to 1965. Loban's research, though in part outside the delimitations of this study, deserves mention because its completion and publication was a landmark event in English and language arts education. His study was published in two parts by NCTE. The first part of the study initiated the NCTE Research Report Series as Research Report #1, entitled The Language of Elementary School Children: A Study of the Use and Control of Language and the Relations among Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Listening (1963). The second part of Loban's study was published as NCTE Research Report No. 18, entitled Language Development: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (1976). It is the only study in the field of the teaching of English that followed the same children through their entire thirteen years of schooling, from kindergarten to grade twelve. The time period is a remarkable achievement in itself, but it also must be noted that of the 338 subjects with which Loban began in 1952, 211 eighteen-year-olds remained in the study in 1965. For the purposes of this study, one of Loban's findings is particularly pertinent. He writes:

> It is of special note that those superior in oral language in kindergarten and grade one before they learned to read and write are the very ones who excel in reading and writing by the time they are in grade six. Our data show

> a positive relationship of success among the language arts. (1976, 71)

It is the significance of oral language as a key element in the development in reading and writing that is important for its relationship to this study.

The process-oriented approaches to writing instruction have, as one of their significant features, considerable discussion and interaction among students and with the teacher as a means for improving writing. If, as it appears from Loban's study, oral language is a key element for developing reading and writing, then the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction would seem to have particular value in the elementary school. That, of course, has been the contention of both Donald Graves (1983), and Lucy McCormick Calkins (1986), and other researchers and theorists for some time. It is the researcher's contention that the process-oriented approaches are important for writing instruction at all levels of schooling. As students at any level learn to examine their own writing processes, they are more likely to improve their writing performance.

Reflections

The teaching of English, over the years, has been characterized by terminology that reflects conceptual or philosophical opposition: freedom and discipline (Commission on English 1965); tradition and reform (Applebee 1974); and, consensus and dissent (Farmer 1986).

The teaching of writing, over time, also has been characterized by terms of conceptual or philosophical opposition: the value of critical writing versus creative writing, the importance of exposition versus narrative, and the competing concerns of product-oriented instruction versus process-oriented instruction.

When professional associations are considered over time, they also reflect discernible patterns of conceptual or philosophical opposition. These patterns include conflict and cooperation as well as separation and collaboration. The patterns may be cyclical and can reflect political maneuvering for power and prestige among the associations followed by a period of peaceful co-existence.

Many of the professional associations identified in this study have long-standing, historical relationships which reflect those cyclical patterns. While the relationships are created and affected by a variety of factors, the patterns themselves affect the functions of the associations, especially in the goals they seek to achieve, projects they seek to establish, and political agendas they seek to implement.

If one examines the "Professional Association Chronology" found in Appendix B, one can see some of the historical relationships which exist among the professional associations named in this study. For example, the International Reading Association began as an association because a group of NCTE members, who were dissatisfied with NCTE's literature approaches to reading instruction in contrast to the skills orientations, left NCTE to form their own group. Initially, in 1947, that group called itself the International Council

for the Improvement of Reading Instruction. Later, they changed their name to the International Reading Association (Hook 150-51).

A similar situation prevailed decades earlier with speech teachers who were NCTE members, but who were dissatisfied with NCTE's lack of attention to public speaking and oral language. A group of them left in 1914 to begin the complicated history of what eventually became several separate professional associations which are interested in various aspects of speech: public speaking, theatre, hearing, and oral communication. Among the associations which grew from the 1914 split with NCTE are the Speech Communication Association, the American Speech and Hearing Association, and the Educational Theatre Association.

A different type of example is that of the founding of NCRE by C. C. Certain in 1932 (Hook 88). In the beginning, NCRE's interests were primarily for research concerning the elementary schools, but later that interest expanded to include all levels of schooling. NCRE remained a part of NCTE for many years, but NCTE, in later years, was uninterested and financially unable to support the research of interest to NCRE members. Consequently, NCRE left NCTE and developed its own research agenda and conferences. The associations have remained friendly and some of the NCRE leaders (e.g., James R. Squire and Arthur N. Applebee) have also held leadership positions in NCTE

Because of these historical relationships, it has been difficult, at times, for the professional associations to collaborate on projects in which they might have a mutual interest. But association

relationships are determined and affected by several variables and there have been times, as evidenced in this study, when the associations have put aside their differences to meet, hold inter-association conferences, and to collaborate on projects of various types. One of the most significant factors which seems almost always to draw associations together is the availability of corporate or federal funding. Such was the case in the late 1950's and early 1960's when money was made available for educational research after the launch of Sputnik I.

From the time of the Basic Issues Conference Series through the years of Project English, professional leaders from several associations worked together to plan and convene conferences, to discuss and conduct research, to develop and test curriculum materials, and to write and promote teacher preparation guidelines. With all of the cooperation and collaboration, however, each association still seemed to retain a separate and individual identity along with philosophical and pedagogical perspectives that determined a political agenda. Consequently, the inter-association conferences and seminars never seemed to reach the consensus that could have unified professional efforts in education generally, and in writing instruction in particular, and could have advanced the profession to new paradigms.

Thomas Kuhn's work on scientific paradigm revolutions has been cited by many English and language arts education theorists and researchers as equally applicable to paradigm revolutions in

their own fields. Donovan and McClelland refer to Kuhn's work in Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition (1980). They write:

> A paradigm holds sway in a profession when most of its members share the same values, recognize the same problems, and agree on similar solutions. But in time, unexplained violations of the model, or anomalies, may subvert the paradigm; questions are raised which have no meaning in the old paradigm. Practitioners must then seek new answers, which lead toward the development of another paradigm. Sometimes several paradigms compete for supremacy over a discipline until one emerges preeminent. (x)

When Donovan and McClelland edited Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition (1980), the contributors to the book demonstrated that there were eight separate views of writing instruction that could be clearly differentiated in their philosophical bases and approaches to instruction. Among these are "Writing as Process," the "Prose Models Approach," the "Experiential Approach," etc. (See Chapter II.) It should be noted that while the "Writing as Process" approach and the "Experiential Approach" have elements in common, their implementation in the classroom may be different. When the question is raised regarding which of the various approaches should take preeminence, or which approach represents the current paradigm, the discussion leads to debate over the relative merits of each approach. Thus far, in the 1990's, the question remains unresolved.

In developing a paradigm for writing instruction, there is likely to be continuing debate and conflict among professional

leaders in English and language arts because they do not share the same values; neither do they recognize the same problems, nor agree on similar solutions. Rather than one paradigm gaining preeminence, the researcher believes it much more likely that we will continue to see a multiplicity of competing paradigms. Each will have its advocates, and at the same time there probably will be those who look for the universal qualities of each paradigm in an attempt to distill the essence, take the best each has to offer, and present a unified theory for writing instruction.

One of the articles which has provided a perspective for viewing a developing paradigm is that by Constance Weaver, "Parallels Between New Paradigms in Science and in Reading and Literary Theories: An Essay Review," (1985) published in NCTE's Research in the Teaching of English. Weaver's article may be perceived as an extension of Kuhn's work. She explores areas as diverse as quantum physics, chemistry, biology, reading, and literature to draw parallels between the paradigms that have been discussed in these various fields. As a result of her research, she identifies "concepts basic to the 'new' paradigm" (299). Weaver writes:

> There are several tenets that seem basic to the emerging paradigm, including the following:
>
> 1. The universe is not fundamentally a mechanism, but an organism.
> 2. The basic nature of reality is process.
> 3. One of the most basic processes is transaction, through which entities are endlessly defined and redefined.

Weaver's article draws parallels between the emerging paradigms in multiple areas of science and the new paradigms in reading and literary theory. Whether these same parallels may be drawn for writing instruction is open to question, but it appears that the three characteristics listed above have some application for writing instruction. To elaborate, as we have seen the development of the conceptualizations of writing instructions evolve, process has become a central feature. The mechanisms or mechanics of language, if the change of term may be allowed, such as spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and usage, have at times dominated writing instruction to the exclusion of everything else. Further, looking at item three on Weaver's list, a part of the writing process is the multiple transactions between the writer and the writing, the language and the thought, and the words and the meaning. Since these ideas are being adapted rather freely, it is highly questionable whether the paradigm is as universal as one might want to believe. Weaver's ideas merit further consideration and study by others who are knowledgeable in a variety of academic areas.

It is the researcher's contention that Weaver's efforts are part of a larger, long-standing movement which, since the Woods Hole Conference in 1959 and the resulting publication of Bruner's The Process of Education (1961), has focused attention on the concept of process with the intent of making that concept the central, dominant feature of the new paradigms in all areas of education and at all levels of schooling. The researcher would like to believe that is an appropriate perspective because it lends substantial credibility to the

process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, but it seems to be an overstatement and an overgeneralization at this point in time. It seems more reasonable for now to focus on the importance of the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction as a significant and effective means for individualizing writing instruction in classroom settings at all levels of schooling. If there is a universal process paradigm which defines and illuminates writing instruction, and other areas of education, it is likely to become evident in the next few years.

With or without one instructional paradigm, the great disparity between the professional literature about writing instruction and what actually occurs in many classrooms around the United States continues to be a concern. In her article "Empty Echoes of Dartmouth: Dissonance between the Rhetoric and the Reality," Sharon Hamilton-Wieler (1988) writes that the "paradigm shift described in the rhetoric of [our] journals . . . is simply not a day-to-day reality in the majority of classrooms" (31). It is Hamilton-Wieler's contention that the talk of a paradigm shift to the process-approaches simply did not, and does not, exist in the majority of classrooms that she had observed. Hamilton-Weiler's point is well taken; there has been no shift to a single paradigm, not in the colleges and universities and not in the elementary and secondary schools to which Hamilton-Wieler refers. Furthermore, it is the researcher's contention that the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966 did not result in just one paradigm.

The participants at the Dartmouth Seminar were deeply divided in their philosophical and pedagogical perspectives at the beginning and during the first week of the conference; and the consensus that emerged after three weeks was as much a political statement as it was an educational one. The Dartmouth Seminar had been funded by the Carnegie Corporation and the participants needed to justify their work to show that Carnegie's money was well spent. During the second two weeks of the Dartmouth Seminar, the participants focused on resolving some of their differences and agreeing to disagree on others. Consequently, the previously identified publications that resulted from Dartmouth reflect the tensions and differences among the participants' philosophical and pedagogical perspectives as much as they reflect consensus. Joseph Harris (1991) supports the view that the Dartmouth Seminar served to highlight the tensions and diversity of perspectives in all areas of the teaching of English.

It is the researcher's contention that as professional leaders have turned their attention in the past ten years to new topics in English and Language Arts education, they have been trying to utilize the process approaches to writing instruction to develop a process approach to instruction. Purves's The Scribal Society (1990), Langer and Applebee's How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning (1987), and Ken Goodman's What's Whole in Whole Language? (1986) all support the process approaches to writing instruction, and they share features of effective process instruction. They all emphasize the importance of:

content over form; student-student interaction as well as teacher-student interaction throughout instruction; discussion as a means to explore ideas, to clarify inquiry, to share information, and to resolve difficulties; and the use of writing for extending learning and critical thinking. They all also, in these particular books, de-emphasize the use of standardized tests, traditional textbooks, and product-centered writing instruction. They encourage teachers to share and use a wide variety of literature with students at all levels of schooling in order to develop thinking and background knowledge for their application throughout the curriculum. These features are found in the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction and serve as a basis for developing process approaches to instruction in the teaching of English and the Language Arts.

As one considers the books identified in the foregoing discussion, and the wealth of books, journal articles, and monographs previously identified in this study, one might ask, "Is there any further value or significance of the professional literature that is produced by the professional associations?" There is one additional area wherein the professional literature has considerable value. The best of the professional literature tends to become texts for study in both graduate and undergraduate courses in colleges and universities. Thus, pre-service teachers and some experienced teachers are introduced to the most current theories and research for improving their educational practice. As the professional literature is used in university courses, particularly at the graduate level, it is subjected to further scrutiny for its contribution to the

professional field. The best books and articles will remain on required and recommended reading lists for many years, while the poorer ones generally will be replaced with more current publications. Through this process, the best of the professional association publications reach an audience beyond their subscribers and serve the profession as a whole.

Recommendations for the Professional Associations

One of the greatest benefits that professional associations have to offer their members is collegiality. Nancy McHugh (1990) speaks of the importance of collegiality in Peter Elbow's What Is English? in an article entitled, "Changes in the Teaching Conditions between 1957 and 1987":

> Collegiality--we did not use that word in 1957, but we had more of the reality of it then than now. Partly it was a massive effort to compete with Russia postsputnik [sic], and the upgrading that began in math and science filtered down to English. NDEA institutes got teachers together, empowered them, and impelled them to share. Schools worked as teams of people to upgrade instruction. It was a national commitment, and everyone participated to some degree. Teachers taught behind closed doors, and there was no "coaching" (or little), but there was sharing. Today there is little sharing. (69)

A feeling of collegiality seems to be significant in that it is often identified by those who attend a professional association conference for the first time as one of the primary reasons why they enjoyed their first conference experience. For example, in the

Spring 1990 issue of Indiana English, Pamela K. Gasway, who "teaches seventh and eighth grade English at the Indiana State University School in Terre Haute," (2) wrote of her first professional conference experience and had this to say:

> After lunch, I attended sessions. Talk about gaining a sense of teaching as a profession! I heard teachers talk about their classrooms with enthusiasm. Imagine that! . . . In these sessions I heard teachers confront problems similar to those I was confronting as a student teacher, but they were confronting these universal problems with enthusiasm, creativity, and knowledge and passing on suggestions and ideas that had worked for them. I found the people attending the conference to be extremely personable. For some reason that struck me as odd. But . . . they weren't the teachers I usually found in the lounge concentrating on their problems. They were supportive professionals. (13)

Yet for some who attend conferences only once, it may be the lack of a feeling of collegiality that is a reason why they choose never to attend again. This is only speculation, of course, because we generally do not hear from these people.

Among college and university professors, collegiality takes on another aspect at professional association meetings and conferences. In the words of Arthur W. Biddle and Toby Fulwiler (1989), professional association collegiality creates the "joy of shared scholarship" (17). They write:

> We relish those moments at national conventions when we can discuss our critical interpretations and textual discoveries with like-minded experts who will fully

> recognize and applaud the fruits of our monastic endeavors. (17)

In their article entitled "The Community of Scholars in Our Own Backyard," (1989), Biddle and Fulwiler write of the scholarship of college and university professors who work alone for long periods of time to research and write in their specialty areas:

> Surrounded by piles of books, note cards, yellow pads, and floppy disks, we communicate our interpretations only with the computers on which we are writing, sharing our sense of discovery, for the time being, with ourselves alone. We know that few in our own departments will either understand or appreciate our new hypotheses, insights, discoveries, for they know little about the authors, works, or periods themselves. Later this year at the MLA convention, or two years hence in the pages of PMLA, we will locate appropriate audiences for our findings. (17)

Biddle and Fulwiler write from the perspective of professors of English, but their view, more than likely, applies to professors in other departments as well. Since opportunities for collegiality and sharing of scholarship are among the benefits that many teachers and professors seek at conferences, it is important for the professional associations to find ways and means to extend those opportunities and promote them as a benefit of membership. If McHugh's assessment is accurate, and the researcher believes it is, perhaps collegiality is a benefit that professional associations can best provide--especially for teachers and professors who do not or cannot find these experiences in their own schools, colleges, and universities. One of the outcomes of conferences is the interactions

that take place between and among professionals. Consequently, it is recommended that professional associations establish specific goals and conference activities related to providing for greater interaction and collegiality among their members. In the past, NCTE has had sessions called "Coffee and Conversation" which were examples of what is suggested here. More sessions like those in the future would provide opportunities for collegial experiences.

In conducting the data collection for this study, the researcher occasionally encountered difficulties in obtaining needed or desired information, especially about activities, discussions, and participants at some to the professional association and inter-association conferences examined in Chapter V. In some instances, the information apparently was never recorded in the professional literature, e.g., a list of participants for the 1979 CCTE Conference on Learning to Write. In other instances, the information was recorded in summary form by one conference participant, e.g., the reports of activities and discussions at the Project English Conferences in 1960's. In the latter case, it was difficult to draw conclusions about the accuracy of the record in representing views expressed at the conferences. Consequently, the researcher recommends that, in the future, professional leaders who convene and chair professional association and inter-association conferences plan, in advance of the conference, for the kinds of records that need to be made of names of participants, and of conference presentations and activities and for the kinds of publications that will result from the conference. In addition, during the conference, arrangements should be made

for writing the follow-up reports, books, and/or journal articles. Preferably, the writing should be done by a limited number of participants and the participants should be selected as representative of either the constituent groups at the conference, or the perspectives expressed during the proceedings, or both. While thorough records are important, the researcher, however, is not suggesting that complete records of group discussions be kept because the participants must feel free to participate openly without fear that their every word is being recorded for posterity.

The researcher believes that over the years that the professional associations have been holding the conferences and seminars discussed in this study, the publications have improved. The English Coalition Conference of 1987 provided an excellent model for publishing information about about conference proceedings by producing three separate books which are significantly different from one another and which reflect varying perspectives of conference activities and discussions. Another acceptable model is to allow as many participants as possible to write individual papers for publication. These could be papers presented at the conference, or position papers written either before and/or after the conference. This model permits the publication of a diversity of perspectives which might not be evident from a summary report by one author. Following models such as these would enable others, not in attendance at these conferences, to review the materials for their own professional development.

In Chapter VI of this study, the researcher suggested the desirability of professional associations becoming politically proactive. In addition, professional association leaders must begin to look beyond their immediate situations to develop political strategies that will serve their members, the profession, and the society as a whole. Professional associations need to set prioritized short and long-term goals, as identified for other educational organizations in the doctoral dissertation study by Douglas Ward (1973) and in the resulting NEA/MEA publication based on his research. It is clear that some goals might be established which could be accomplished in one to five years, for example the publication of books or other materials on particular topics, while other goals, such as a plan for continuing professional development for classroom teachers would require a much longer time period for design and implementation.

It is the researcher's belief that political activity requires that professional association leaders are responsive to human needs, articulate in defining issues and concerns, and visionary in developing programs that address future needs. Wayne Booth's comments, cited previously in Chapter V in connection with information regarding the 1978 English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, bear repeating:

> Our task is thus both to discover whatever is really basic to education and to find ways of talking about it that will show why what we care about doing is what the public really wants done. (14)

Booth's perspective underscores the need for professional association leaders who are responsive to human needs and articulate about professional issues and concerns. For professional leaders to be visionary in developing programs that address future needs, Booth's suggestion "to discover whatever is really basic to education" (14) seems pertinent as well. In discovering what is basic to education, it also may be necessary to determine what is basic to human life. As these determinations are made, it is possible to identify programs which contribute to the fabric of society and the quality of human life.

When one makes lists of activities and goals for professional associations, it is easy to set unrealistic expectations. Consequently, the researcher has attempted to identify only those recommendations which seem reasonably within reach. In making these recommendations, the researcher is predisposed to believe that, in improving professional associations, it is not necessary to acquire or spend greater sums of money; rather, it is of greatest importance to make better use of the economic and human resources already available.

Recommendations for Further Research

As the researcher reviewed the professional literature and conducted the data collection for this study, it was striking to discover how little research exists on professional associations, especially professional associations concerned with the teaching of

English in general, and the teaching of writing in particular. Except for a considerable number of studies, especially doctoral dissetations, which have collected information on professional association membership, usually to determine if membership is a significant variable for some other situation or condition, there is very little research information available on the roles, activities, impact, or influence of professional associations. Consequently, the first recommendation is for further research on the roles and influence of the professional associations, and especially on the effectiveness of the particular activities in which the associations are already engaged. Among the many questions that might be asked, the following are representative: What professional association activities do current members most value? What is the impact of the professional association publication programs? Do members read the journal articles? If so, what do they read? Do non-members read the articles by borrowing the journals from their school library? If so, what do they read? Do classroom teachers make use of journal information and perspectives in their teaching? If so, how do they do that? After reading an article, do they recommend it to others? What is the impact of the professional association conferences? How do conference attendees decide what sessions they will attend? Should conference programs provide more information about sessions? What do conference attendees believe they have learned from attending particular conference sessions? When members attend conferences, what do they most like and dislike about the conference experience?

NCTE and other professional association archives might prove to be a significant resource for providing data about professional association activities and projects in which the associations have been involved. The archives also might be useful for identifying the contributions made by particular professional leaders in the past. Researchers might examine this material to determine if any of it would be useful to the profession as a whole if it were more widely available through the professional literature, such as in journal articles and books, or if particular documents were included in a database, such as the ERIC system.

In addition to research on the impact and effectiveness of professional association roles and activities, there is also a need for more research to identify and examine the perspectives of the considerable number of classroom teachers at elementary and secondary levels who never join a professional association, as well as those who join for a year or two but do not renew their memberships thereafter. These teachers represent the vast majority in the education profession and they are the ones whom professional associations most need to reach. Research is needed to identify the primary concerns of these teachers and to assess what professional associations might do to encourage their membership and participation, and to provide for their continuing professional development.

In 1963, Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer, in Research in Written Composition, indicated a need for more research on "what is involved in the act of writing" (53) and over the past twenty-eight

years, research has given us new responses to that question. Some of the professional associations, particularly NCTE and NCRE, have been, and continue to be, at the forefront in calling for, supporting, and publishing research on writing instruction. It is through their efforts that there have been significant contributions to the professional literature on the process approaches to writing instruction. In addition, the research has led to the evolution of the process approaches to writing instruction.

To extend what Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer proposed in 1963, the field is now in need of research that clarifies what is involved in the act of composing in different genres. It would be useful to know how the writing process for creating fiction may be differentiated from the writing process for creating non-fiction. Significant research might be generated around questions such as, "Does the writer of narrative, of novels or short stories, traverse the same process as the writer of exposition, of essays, or journal articles?" Another area of research interest might be the writing of poetry. For example, one might ask: What writing processes are most effective for creating the metaphors and imagery of poetry? A determination of how genre affects process would be important to writing teachers.

Traditionally, research has failed to value teacher observation as a source of professional knowledge unless the data were statistically verified. Sandra Stotsky (1988), in writing about the work of Emig and Graves, has indicated that they fail to distinguish between research observations and research findings. The

researcher agrees that the two need to be differentiated, but it has long been a failing of educational research not to grant credibility to teacher observations. Ethnographic research, however, attempts to record researchers observations along with extensive descriptions of the context in which the observations occur so that others also may determine the validity of the observations. Process writing instruction research might be conducted to determine what, if any, differences there are between observations recorded by teachers and observations recorded by researchers working in the same classrooms, at the same time, and with the same students.

Another important area is the need for more research on the pedagogy of writing instruction, especially in how pre-service teacher education students and in-service teachers can be taught to teach writing more effectively. What methods are most effective for encouraging teachers to try more diverse methods and utilize process approaches with their own students when they return to the classroom? Teacher educators could benefit from studies of this nature.

Another important area in which research is needed concerns the impact of the National Writing Projects. While the National Writing Projects are outside the boundaries of this study, their importance and widespread influence were mentioned in Chapter V. Studies of the projects might examine the following questions: How were the projects established? How were they funded? How have their projects and workshops been conducted? The National Writing Projects have now operated for a sufficient time that some studies of

them might be conducted from an historical perspective. Research questions might address how have the National Writing Projects changed, evolved, succeeded? Further research might seek to identify what roles, if any, members of the professional associations, such as NCTE, MLA, or AERA, have played in the formation and development of the various National Writing Projects. Who were the key players who functioned to initiate the writing projects?

Finally, the field still needs an objective, even-handed review of research on writing and writing instruction that has been conducted since the publication of the Braddock report in 1963. Hillocks's book was supposed to be this sort of review, but his emphasis on experimental research overlooked (or, perhaps, deliberately ignored) important research that provided insights into the process-oriented approaches to writing and writing instruction. Perhaps, the research review needs to be done by someone, who is knowledgeable about writing research, but who is not involved in other writing research projects.

Conclusion

As one examines the roles played by the professional associations, particularly NCTE and the other associations concerned with the teaching of English, in developing the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction, it is evident that the professional associations have had an impact in advancing professional knowledge about the process approaches to writing instruction. We

have come a long way from what we knew about writing and writing instruction at the time of the Basic Issues Conference Series in 1958 and the publication of Research in Written Composition by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer in 1963. But, as indicated earlier in this chapter in the section entitled "Recommendations for the Professional Associations," there is still much more that the associations might do in identifying and developing means for helping teachers implement the process approaches to writing instruction in their classrooms. Because the product-centered approaches to writing instruction were dominant for so long in American education, teachers need assistance in moving away from the traditional instructional patterns that focused attention on the final written product with little or no concern for how the product was created.

The evidence cited in this study indicates that conceptualizations of writing instruction have changed over the years from 1957 to 1990. Professional association publications, such as books, journal articles, monographs, position statements, and brochures, have all contributed to the current conceptualizations of process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. Professional knowledge about writing and writing instruction has evolved over the years partly through the interaction among professional leaders operating within the frameworks of activities created through the work of the professional associations. National and international professional association and inter-association conferences and seminars have had an impact in the development of professional

knowledge about the process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. As a result of that impact, professional knowledge continues to evolve.

The recurrent interaction at conferences, followed by independent writing of articles, books, monographs, and other publications, followed by further interaction at later conferences, has resulted in a multiplicity of publications, which have served both to develop and disseminate professional knowledge about writing and writing instruction. The dissemination is, perhaps, obvious; but the development of concepts may also be traced from professional association publication to publication, and conference to conference. It appears that one of the greatest benefits provided by the professional associations has come from interaction and discussion among professional leaders, followed by writing and then further discussion of the writing through a series of meetings. It seems reasonable to suggest that this pattern of recurrent interaction and writing needs to be a continued focus of professional association activities and programs.

The success of the pattern of recurrent interaction and writing may also be an indication of what needs to go on in classrooms at all levels of schooling to develop and extend students' knowledge and to improve their writing performance. If recurrent patterns of dialogue and writing among professional association leaders can advance professional knowledge, it seems likely that similar patterns can also benefit students by advancing their knowledge in areas of communication most critical to their survival and prosperity.

As professional associations exist to serve their members and the profession as a whole, they also exist to serve humanity through the improvement of classroom instruction. The professional associations' contribution to the development of the process approaches to writing instruction is a significant example of how the professional associations may serve each of these groups. Association members and the profession as a whole benefit from the development of professional knowledge available to them in professional publications. Humanity as a whole benefits from the improvement of classroom practice.

Professional associations have made an important contribution to the development of professional knowledge, and now they must face the challenge of contributing further to improvement of classroom practice. Their greatest successes occur when they are inclusive rather than exclusive, when they are cooperative rather than confrontational, and when they are responsive rather than reactive.

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

American Society of Association Executives and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Principles of Association Management. Washington, D.C.: ASAE and CCUS, 1975.

Applebee, Arthur N. "Problems in Process Approaches: Toward Reconceptualization of Process Instruction." The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Eds. A. Petrosky and D. Bartholomae. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

---. Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History. Urbana: NCTE, 1974.

Basic Issues Conference Committee. The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English. Champaign: NCTE, 1958. Rpt. in PMLA 74 (September 1959): 1-12.

Bartholomae, David. "Teaching Writing as Learning and Process." Educational Leadership 44 (April 1986): 4-8.

Bauck, James Maurice. "A Comparative Study of Effective and Typical Middle Level Principals." DAI 45 (1984): 1248.

Biddle, Arthur W. and Toby Fulwiler. "The Community of Scholars in Our Own Backyard." ADE Bulletin 93 (Fall 1989): 17-21.

Bingham, Richard D., Brett W. Hawkins, John P. Frendreis, and Mary P. Le Blanc. Professional Associations and Municipal Innovation. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1981.

Bishop, Wendy. Released into Language: Options for Teaching Creative Writing. Urbana: NCTE, 1990.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Composing Processes: An Overview." The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Eds. Anthony R. Petrosky and David Bartholomae. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing (Third Edition). Boston: St. Martin's, 1991.

Booth, Wayne C. "Rhetoric, Mere Rhetoric, and Reality: Or, My Basics Are More Basic Than Your Basics." The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? Ed. George Hillocks, Jr. Urbana: NCTE, 1982.

Borg, Walter R., and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research: An Introduction. 4th ed. New York: Longman, 1983.

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper, 1983.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. Research in Written Composition. Champaign.: NCTE, 1963.

Bradley, Joseph F. The Role of Trade Associations and Professional Business Societies in America. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1965.

Britton, James. "The Composing Processes and the Functions of Writing." Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.

---. "Response to Working Party Paper 1." Working Papers of the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English at Dartmouth College (Dartmouth Seminar). Hanover, NH. August 20 to September 16, 1966. ERIC ED 082 200

---. "Shaping at the Point of Utterance." Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle. Conway, AR: U of Central Arkansas, 1980. 61-65. Rpt. in Learning to Write: First Language/ Second Language: Selected Papers from the 1979 CCTE Conference, Ottawa, Canada. Eds. Aviva Freedman,

Ian Pringle, and Janice Yalden. New York: Longman, 1983. 13-19.

---, ed. English Teaching: An International Exchange. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1984.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. New York: Vintage, 1960.

Buckingham, Betty Jo. "The Role of Professional Associations in the Development of School Librarians in Iowa." DAI 39 (1978): 7032.

Bunge, Nancy. Finding the Words: Interviews with Writers Who Teach. Athens, OH: U of Ohio/Swallow P, 1984.

Burrows, Alvina Treut. "Research Then and Now." Help for the Teacher of Written Composition-K-9: New Directions in Research. Ed. Sara W. Lundsteen. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC, 1976.

Burrows, Alvina T. What Research Says to the Teacher: Teaching Composition. Washington: Department of Classroom Teachers, American Educational Research Association, NEA, 1959.

Burrows, Alvina Treut, Doris C. Jackson, and Dorothy O. Saunders. They All Want To Write. 4th ed. Hamden, CT: Shoe String, 1984.

Burrows, Alvina T., Margaret B. Parke, Neal R. Edmund, John J. DeBoer, Thomas D. Horn, Virgil E. Herrick, and Ruth G. Strickland. Children's Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills. Champaign: NCTE, 1961. ERIC ED 090 546.

Buxton, Earl W. "Research Report No. 13." The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. By Janet Emig. Urbana: NCTE, 1971. v-vi.

---. "Teaching Writing in Canada." A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. Ed. James R. Squire. Champaign: NCTE, 1966. 100-06.

California State Department of Education. Handbook for Planning an Effective Writing Program: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve. Sacramento: CA Department of Educ., 1986.

Calkins, Lucy McCormick. The Art of Teaching Writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1986.

Candlin, Christopher N. "Preface." Learning to Write: First Language/ Second Language: Selected Papers from the 1979 CCTE Conference, Ottawa, Canada. Eds. Aviva Freedman, Ian Pringle, and Janice Yalden. New York: Longman, 1983. ix-xii.

Carroll, John B. and W. Nelson Francis. "A New Attack on the Effectiveness of the Teaching of Grammar in the Improvement of Writing." Conference Document No. 1 appended to Report of the Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English. New York: New York U and Washington, D.C.: Cooperative Research Branch of the USOE, 1963.

Cashdan, Asher, ed. Literacy: Teaching and Learning Language Skills. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Cayton, Mary Kupiec. "Writing as Outsiders: Academic Discourse and Marginalized Faculty." College English 53 (1991): 647-60.

Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell, eds. Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.

Diederich, Paul B. Measuring Growth in English. Urbana, NCTE, 1974.

---. "Model 1 for Measurement of Growth in Writing." Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English. Conference Report prepared by Louise Rosenblatt. Project #G-009. Washington, D.C.: Cooperative Research Branch of the USOE, 1963.

Dixon, John. Growth through English: A Report Based on the Dartmouth Seminar 1966. London: Oxford UP for NATE, 1967.

Donovan, Timothy, and Ben McClelland, eds. Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition. Urbana: NCTE, 1980.

Dorenkamp, Angela. "Democracy through Language." Massachusetts English Teacher (March 1968): 1, 8.

Douglas, Wallace W. Foreword. "Composition in Elementary English: 1924-33, 1940-45, 1951-60." By Helen G. Moyer (Master's Thesis). Evanston: Northwestern U, 1970.

Duffy, Gerald G. "Crucial Elements in the Teaching of Poetry Writing." The Language Arts in the Elementary School: A Forum for Focus. Eds. Martha L. King, Robert Emans, and Patricia J. Cianciolo. Urbana: NCTE, 1973.

Eagleson, Robert D. English in the Eighties. Sydney: AATE, 1982.

Early, Margaret J., David H. Russell, and James R. Squire. "Evaluation and Implications." Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the San Francisco Conference. Champaign: NCTE, 1964. 145-51.

Elbow, Peter. "A Remarkable Consensus." Massachusetts English Teacher (March 1968): 1, 6-7.

---. What Is English? New York: MLA; Urbana: NCTE, 1990.

---. Writing Without Teachers. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

---. Writing With Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process. New York: Oxford UP, 1981.

Emig, Janet. The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. Research Report No. 13. Urbana: NCTE, 1971.

---. "Hand, Eye, Brain: Some 'Basics' in the Writing Process." Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: NCTE, 1978

Farmer, Marjorie, ed. Consensus and Dissent: Teaching English Past, Present, and Future. Urbana: NCTE, 1986.

Fitzgerald, James A. "Prefixes in Child Writing." Elementary English 36 (December 1959): 576-80.

Floyd, Wallace C. "Creative Writing: A Key to Mental Hygiene." Elementary English 35 (February 1958): 104-05.

Frederick, Anthony, S.M. and Committee. Annotated Index to the English Journal 1944-1963. Champaign: NCTE, 1964.

Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition Theory in the Eighties: Axiological Consensus and Paradigmatic Diversity." College Composition and Communication 41 (December 1990): 409-29.

Gasway, Pamela K. "NCTE Conferences: A Continuing Perspective." Indiana English 13 (Spring 1990): 12-15.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. "Teaching Writing: The Major Theories," in The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Eds. Anthony R. Petrosky and David Bartholomae. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

Gibaldi, Joseph and Walter S. Achtert. MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers. 3rd ed. New York: MLA, 1988.

Glatthorn, Allan A. "Demystifying the Teaching of Writing." Language Arts 59 (October 1982): 722-25.

Goodman, Ken. What's Whole in Whole Language? Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1986.

Graves, Donald H. "Balance the Basics: Let Them Write." (Ford Report) New York: Ford Foundation, February 1978. Rpt. in A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs. New York: Exeter, 1984.

---. Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based Upon An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children. Diss. State U of New York-Buffalo, 1973. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1974. 74-8375.

---. "Children's Writing: Research Directions and Hypotheses Based Upon an Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven-Year-Old Children." DAI 34 (1973): 6255. State U of New York at Buffalo.

---. "An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children." Research in the Teaching of English 9 (Winter 1975): 227-41.

---. "Patterns of Child Control of the Writing Process." Donald Graves in Australia: Children Want to Write. Ed. R. D. Walshe. Rozelle, New South Wales: PETA, 1981.

---. A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs. Exeter: Heinemann, 1984.

---. "Sex Differences in Children's Writing." Elementary English 50 (October 1973): 1101-1106. Rpt. in A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs. Exeter: Heinemann, 1984.

---. Writing: Teachers & Children at Work. Exeter: Heinemann, 1983.

Hamilton-Wieler, Sharon. "Empty Echoes of Dartmouth: Dissonance between the Rhetoric and the Reality." The Writing Instructor 8 (Fall 1988): 29-41.

Harris, Joseph. "After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict in English." College English 53 (October 1991): 631-46.

Harvey, Robert C. and Carole Masley Kirkton. Annotated Index to the English Journal: First Supplement: 1964-1970. Urbana: NCTE and ERIC, 1972.

Hillocks, George, Jr., ed. The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? Urbana: NCTE, 1982.

---. Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC, 1986.

Hook, J. N. A Long Way Together: A Personal View of NCTE's First Sixty-Seven Years. Urbana: NCTE, 1979.

---. "Teaching Oral and Written English in the United States." A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. Ed. James R. Squire. Champaign: NCTE, 1966. 95-99.

Jenkins, William A. "The Educational Scene," Elementary English 35 (February, 1958) 2: 129-32.

Jennings, Frank G. "The Revolution in Education: It Didn't Start with Sputnik." Saturday Review, September 16, 1967.

Jenson, Julie M. "Commentary." The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading and English. Ed. James R. Squire. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC, 1987. 55-60.

---, ed. Stories to Grow On: Demonstrations of Language Learning in K-8 Classrooms. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1989.

Judy, Stephen N. Teaching English: Reflections on the State of the Art. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden, 1979.

---. "Editor's Page: English Since Sputnik." The English Journal 68 (September 1979): 7.

Judy, Stephen N. and Susan J. Judy. An Introduction to the Teaching of Writing. New York: Wiley, 1981.

King, David C. and Sharon Flitterman-King. "The Tug-of-War Is On Between Writing Approaches: Emphasis on Process Challenges the Five-Paragraph Essay." ASCD Curriculum Update (December 1986): 1-8.

Kitzhaber, Albert. "What Is English?" Dartmouth Seminar Working Party Paper No.1. Working Papers of the Dartmouth Seminar. ERIC ED 082 201.

Kostelny, Susan J. "Development of Beginning Writing Skills through a Total School Program." The Reading Teacher 41 (November 1987): 156-59.

LaForce, Beth Ann. "A Study of First-Year Teachers' Conceptual Understandings, Values, and Implementations of Integrated Language Arts." Diss. Michigan State U, 1988. DAI 50 (1988): 864.

Langer, Judith A. "Research on Written Composition: A Response to Hillocks' Report." Research in the Teaching of English 22 (February 1988): 89.

Langer, Judith A. and Arthur N. Applebee. How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning. Urbana: NCTE, 1987.

Lee, Joyce W. "Topic Selection in Writing: A Precarious But Practical Balancing Act." The Reading Teacher 41 (November 1987): 180-84.

Lewis, E. Glyn. "Postscript to Dartmouth--or Poles Apart." College English 29 (1968): 426-34.

Lewis, Norma A. "Instructional Leadership Styles of Effective Elementary School Principals in Texas." DAI 45/03A (1984): 709.

Lindemann, Erika, ed. CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric 1987. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

---, ed. CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric 1988. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.

---, ed. Longman Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric 1984-1985. New York: Longman, 1987.

Lloyd-Jones, Richard and Andrea A. Lunsford. The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language. Urbana and New York: NCTE and MLA, 1989.

Loban, Walter. Language Development: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve. NCTE Research Report No. 18. Urbana: NCTE, 1976.

---. The Language of Elementary School Children: A Study of the Use and Control of Language and the Relations among Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Listening. NCTE Research Report No. 1. Urbana: NCTE, 1963.

Lundsteen, Sara W., ed. Help for the Teacher of Written Composition-K-9: New Directions in Research. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC/RCS, 1976.

Macrorie, Ken. Telling Writing. 3rd ed. Rochelle Park: Hayden, 1980.

Marckwardt, Albert H. "The Dartmouth Seminar." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 51 (April 1967): 101-06.

Marckwardt, Albert H. "From the Basic Issues Conference to the Dartmouth Seminar-- Perspectives on the Teaching of English." PMLA 82 (September 1967): 8-13. ERIC ED 016 683.

McNabb, Scott Earl. " Revision Processes of Four Skilled College Writers." DAI 48 (1988): 3042-A.

McHugh, Nancy. "Changes in the Teaching Conditions between 1957 and 1987." What Is English? by Peter Elbow. New York and Urbana: MLA and NCTE, 1990.

Merritt, John. "What's Wrong with Teaching Reading?" in Literacy: Teaching and Learning Language Skills. Ed. Asher Cashdan. Oxford: Basil Blackwell,1986.

Merton, Robert K. "The Functions of the Professional Association." The American Journal of Nursing (January 1958): 3.

Miller, James E., Jr. "What Happened at Dartmouth." Use of English 23 (1971): 99-109.

Moore, Walter J., ed. Annotated Index to Elementary English: 1924-1967. Champaign: NCTE, 1968.

Mortensen, Louise Hovde. "Writing Field Reports." Elementary English 35 (February 1958): 122.

Moyer, Helen G. "Composition in Elementary English." English and the 70's: Part III. Ed. Wallace W. Douglas. Evanston: Northwestern U English Curriculum Study Center, 1970.

Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of English: Guidelines for the Teaching of English from the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College. New York: Holt, 1967.

Murray, Donald M. The Craft of Revision. Fort Worth: Holt, 1991.

---. "Internal Revision: A Process of Discovery." Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.

---. Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching. Exeter, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1982.

---. "Teach Writing as a Process, Not Product." The Leaflet. (Fall 1972): 12. New England Association of Teachers of English.

---. "Why Teach Writing--And How?" English Journal 62 (December 1973): 1234-1237.

---. Write Before Writing. Study prepared at the University of New Hampshire, Arlington, Virginia: ERIC, 1978. ERIC ED 157 094

---. A Writer Teaches Writing: A Practical Method for Teaching Composition. Boston: Houghton, 1968.

---. Write to Learn. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, 1987.

---. Write to Learn. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, 1990.

---. "The Writing Process," in Allen Berger and Blanche Hope Smith, Eds. Language Activities: Classroom Practices in Teaching English, 1973-74. Urbana: NCTE, 1973.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1983.

National Council of Teachers of English. Achievement Awards in Writing, 1991. Ed. Sandra E. Gibbs. Urbana: NCTE, 1991.

---. The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English. Champaign: NCTE, 1959. ED 016 640

---. Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts. Urbana: NCTE, 1986.

---. Program for the 66th Annual Convention. Chicago. November 25-27, 1976. Urbana: NCTE, 1976.

---. Program for the 70th Annual Convention. Cincinnati. November 21-26, 1980. Urbana: NCTE, 1981.

---. Program for the 71st Annual Convention. Boston. November 20-25, 1981. Urbana: NCTE, 1981.

---. Program for the 72nd Annual Convention. Washington, D.C. November 19-24, 1982. Urbana: NCTE, 1982.

---. Program for the 73rd Annual Convention. Denver. November 18-23, 1983. Urbana: NCTE, 1983.

---. Program for the 74th Annual Convention. Detroit: November 16-21, 1984. Urbana: NCTE, 1984.

---. Program for the 75th Annual Convention. Philadelphia. November 22-27, 1985. Urbana: NCTE, 1985.

---. Program for the 76th Annual Convention. San Antonio. November 21-26, 1986. Urbana: NCTE, 1986.

---. Program for the 77th Annual Convention. Los Angeles. November 20-25, 1987.Urbana: NCTE, 1987

---. Program for the 78th Annual Convention. St. Louis. November 18-23, 1988. Urbana: NCTE, 1988.

---. Program for the 79th Annual Convention. Baltimore. November 17-22, 1989. Urbana: NCTE. 1989.

---. Program for the 80th Annual Convention. Atlanta, November 16-21, 1990. Urbana: NCTE, 1990.

Olson, Paul A., ed. The Arts of Language: Needed Curricula and Curriculum Development of Institutes in the English Language Arts: Language, Literature, Composition, Speech and Reading. Report of a Project English Conference held at the University of Nebraska, February 26-March 1, 1966. Contract Number 3-6-061764-0568. Lincoln: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, 1966. ERIC ED 011 974

O'Neil, Wayne. "Conference Report: The Dartmouth Seminar." Harvard Educational Review 39 (1969): 359-65.

Parker, Robert P., Jr. "From Sputnik to Dartmouth: Trends in the Teaching of Composition." The English Journal 68 (September 1979): 32-37.

Petrosky, Anthony and David Bartholomae, eds. The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

Pradl, Gordon M. and John S. Mayher. "Reinvigorating Learning through Writing." Educational Leadership 42 (February 1985): 4-8.

Purves, Alan C. The Scribal Society: An Essay on Literacy and Schooling in the Information Age. New York: Longman, 1990.

Raphael, Taffy E., Becky W. Kirschner, and Carol Sue Englert. "Expository Writing Program: Making Connections Between Reading and Writing." The Reading Teacher 41 (April 1988): 790-95.

Rodrigues, Raymond J. "Moving Away from Writing-Process Worship." English Journal 74 (September 1985): 24-27.

Rohman, D. Gordon, and Alfred O. Wlecke. "Pre-Writing: The Construction and Application of Models for Concept Formation in Writing." U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cooperative Research Branch Project No. 2174. East Lansing: Michigan State U, 1964. ERIC ED 001 273

Rohman. D. Gordon. "Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process." College Composition and Communication 26 (May 1965): 106-22. Rpt. in Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Composition: Processing, Distancing, and Modeling. Eds. Miles Myers and James Gray. Urbana: NCTE, 1983.

Rollins, David John. "The Importance of Various Roles and Benefits of Professional Associations as Perceived by Members and Managers." DAI 44 (1983): 537.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. "The New Research." Research in the Teaching of English 7 (Fall 1973): 145-59.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English: Report of Seminar Proceedings. Project #G-009. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1963.

Russell, David H., Margaret J. Early, and Edmund Farrell. Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the San Francisco Conference. Champaign: NCTE, 1964.

Shugrue, Michael F. English in a Decade of Change. New York: Western, 1968.

Spouge, William T. "Teaching Oral and Written English in Nonselective Secondary Schools." A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. Ed. James R. Squire. Champaign: NCTE, 1966. 83-94.

Squire, James R. "The Collision of the Basics Movement with Current Research in Writing and Language." The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? Ed. George Hillocks, Jr. Urbana: NCTE, 1982. 29-37.

---. "The Relation of College English Departments in Relation to Other Groups Interested in the Teaching of English," in Proceedings of The Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English. Ed. Richard Wasson. Washington, D.C: USOE, 1963.

---. "Retrospect and Prospect." The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading and English. Ed. James R. Squire. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC, 1987.

---. "The Teaching of Writing and Composition in Today's Schools." Elementary English (January 1964): 3-14.

---, ed. A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. Champaign: NCTE, 1966.

---, ed. The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading and English. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC, 1987.

Steinberg, Erwin R. "Needed Research in the Teaching of English." College English 2 (November 1962): 150-54.

---. Needed Research in the Teaching of English. Proceedings of a Project English Research Conference held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, May 5-7, 1962. Cooperative Research Monograph No. 11. Washington, D. C.: U. S. GPO , 1963. ERIC ED 020 154.

Steinberg, Erwin R. and William A. Jenkins. "Needed Research in the Teaching of the Elementary School Language Arts." Elementary English 39 (December 1962): 790-93.

Stone, George Winchester, Jr. Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English. New York: Holt, 1964.

Stotsky, Sandra. "Commentary on Research in Written Composition: A Response to Hillocks' Report." Research in the Teaching of English 22 (February 1988): 89-99.

Strickland, Ruth G. "Evaluating Children's Composition." Elementary English 37 (May 1960): 321-30.

---. "Evaluating Children's Composition" in Children's Writing: Research in Composition and Related Skills. Champaign: NCRE and NCTE, 1961. 64-73.

---. "Some Important Research Gaps in the Teaching of Elementary School Language Arts." Needed Research in the Teaching of English: Proceedings of a Project English Research Conference--May 5-7, 1962. Conference Report prepared by Erwin R. Steinberg. Cooperative Research Monograph No. 11. OE-30010. Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1962. ERIC TE 000 192.

Talbert, Carol. "Anthropological Research Models." Research in the Teaching of English 7 (Fall 1973): 190-211.

Tchudi, Stephen N. Language, Schooling, and Society. Upper Montclair: Boynton, 1985.

---. English Teachers at Work: Ideas and Strategies from Five Countries. Upper Montclair: Boynton, 1986.

Tovatt, Anthony L. "Oral-Aural-Visual Stimuli for Teaching Composition." English Journal 54 (March 1965): 191-95.

Tovatt, Anthony L. and Ebert L. Miller. Oral-Aural-Visual Stimuli Approach to Teaching Written Composition to 9th Grade Students. Final Report for Project No. 5-03892-12-1, Contract No. OE-3-10-120. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. Muncie, Indiana: Ball State U, 1967.

---. "The Sound of Writing." Research in the Teaching of English 1 (Fall 1967): 176-89.

Van Bruggen, John. "Factors Affecting Regularity of the Flow of Words During Written Composition." Diss. U of Chicago, 1945. Synopsis in Journal of Experimental Education 15 (December 1946): 133-55.

Walshe, R. D., ed. Donald Graves in Australia: Children Want to Write. Rozelle, New South Wales: PETA, 1981.

Ward, William Douglas. Local Associations Eye Instruction and Professional Development. N.p.: National Education Association and Michigan Education Association, 1974.

---. The Role of Teacher Organizations in Professional Development and Instructional Improvement as Perceived by Selected Teacher Organization Leaders. Diss. Michigan State U, 1973. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1973.

Warriner, John, Joseph Mersand, Helen Townsend, and Francis Griffith. English Grammar and Composition (Fifth Course). New York: Harcourt, 1973.

Wasson, Richard. Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English, December 2-4, 1962. Urbana: U of Illinois, 1962. ERIC ED 003 425

Watnuf, Walter A. "Notetaking in Outline Form." Elementary English 36 (April 1959): 244-47.

Weaver, Constance. "Parallels between New Paradigms in Science and in Reading and Literary Theories: An Essay Review." Research in the Teaching of English 19 (October 1985): 298-316.

Wong-Kam, Jo Ann and Kathryn H. Au. "Improving a 4th Grader's Reading and Writing: Three Principles." The Reading Teacher 41: (April 1988): 768-72.

WORKS CONSULTED

WORKS CONSULTED

Allen, Harold B. "The 'New English' Anew." NASSP Bulletin 51 (April 1967): 18.

Alloway, E., J. Carroll, J. Emig, B. King, I. Marcotrigiano, J. Smith, and W. Spicer. "The New Jersey Writing Project." New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers U, The Educational Testing Program Service, and Nineteen New Jersey Public School Districts, 1979. ERIC ED 178 943.

Applebee, Arthur N. Writing in the Secondary School: English and the Content Areas. NCTE Research Report No. 21. Urbana: NCTE, 1981.

Applebee, Arthur, Judith Langer, & I.V. S. Mullis. Writing: Trends Across the Decade, 1974-1984. National Assessment of Educational Progress (Report No. 15-W-01) Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1986a.

---. The Writing Report Card: Writing Achievement in American Schools. National Assessment of Educational Progress. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1986b.

Bateman, Donald R. and Frank J. Zidonis. The Effect of a Study of Transformational Grammar on the Writing of Ninth and Tenth Graders. Champaign: NCTE, 1966.

Berthoff, Ann E. Forming/Thinking/Writing. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden, 1978.

Britton, James. Language and Learning. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1970.

---. "Writing to Learn and Learning to Write," in The Humanity of English. Urbana: NCTE, 1972.

Britton, James, Tony Burgess, Nancy Martin, Alex McLeod, and Harold Rosen. The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18). Macmillan Education, 1975.

Britton, James. "The Composing Processes and the Functions of Writing." Research on Composing: Points of Departure, eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.

Brown, Jean E. "Helping Students Discover a Process for Writing: A 'Blooming" Art." English Quarterly 16 (Winter 1984): 47-53.

Brozick, James R. "New Perspectives on Composition: A Review of Literature." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 12 (1978): 83-92.

Burgess, C., et al. Understanding Children Writing. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1973. ERIC ED 078 432

Carlsen, G. Robert. "NCTE Counciletter: A Handful of Reflections." English Journal 53 (May 1964): 373-75.

Carlsen, G. Robert and James Crow. "Project English Curriculum Centers." English Journal 56 (October 1967): 986-993.

Carlsen, G. Robert. "The Way of the Spirit and the Way of the Mind." Elementary English 40 (February 1963): 142-147, 167.

Clapp, Ouida H., ed. Classroom Practices in Teaching English, 1975-76: On Righting Writing. Urbana: NCTE, 1975.

Clark, Walter H. Jr. "On Teaching Composition," The Journal of Aesthetic Education 10 (1976): 107-114.

Clay, Marie M. What Did I Write? London: Heinemann, 1975.

Clegg, A. B., ed. The Excitement of Writing. London: Chatto & Windus, 1964.

Committee on Writing Standards of the National Council of Teachers of English. Standards for Basic Skills Writing Programs. Urbana: NCTE, 1979.

Crosby, Muriel. "English: New Dimensions and New Demands." Elementary English 43 (April 1966): 327-332. Presidential address - Boston NCTE: 1965.

Duke, Charles R. "The Student-Centered Conference and the Writing Process." English Journal 64 (December 1975): 44-47.

Edmund, Neal. "Writing in the Intermediate Grades." Elementary English 36 (November 1959): 491-501.

Emig, Janet. "On Teaching Composition: Some Hypotheses as Definitions." Research in the Teaching of English 1:2: 127-135.

Flowers, Joanne. "Reminiscences: Post Sputnik." The English Journal 68 (September 1979): 60-62.

Flynt, Ralph C. M. "The U. S. Office of Education Looks at Project English." PMLA 78 (September 1963).

Fox, D. & Charles Suhor. "Limitations of Free Writing." English Journal 75 (1986): 34-36.

Freedman, Sarah Warshauer, Anne Haas Dyson, Linda Flower, and Wallace Chafe. Research in Writing: Past, Present, and Future. Berkeley: University of California, and Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon University, 1987.

Gerber, John C. "The 1962 Summer Institutes of the Commission on English: Their Achievement and Promise." PMLA 78 (September 1963).

---. "The Chairman and His Department." ADE Bulletin, October 1967.

Geuder, Patricia A., et al, eds. They Really Taught Us How To Write. Urbana: NCTE, 1974.

Glass, Mary Lee. "Sputnik to Proposition 13: Exploding the Myths." English Journal 68 (September 1979): 23-27.

Grommon, Alfred H. "NCTE Counciletter: Is the Present Structure of the NCTE Adequate for Today and Tomorrow?" The English Journal 58 (Apr. 1969): 595-601.

---. "Once More--What Is English?" Elementary English 44 (March 1967): 279-282, 300.

---. "A History of the Preparation of Teachers of English." English Journal 57 (April 1968).

Haley-James, Shirley. Perspectives on Writing in Grades 1-8. Urbana: NCTE, 1981.

Harris, Brice. "Act Well Your Part." Elementary English 36 (January 1959): 3-11.

Haven, Julia M. and Arno Jewett. "NDEA Extended to English: Institutes, Supervision, and Materials." Elementary English 41 (November 1964): 793-795.

Hillocks, George Jr. Observing and Writing. Urbana: NCTE, 1975.

Holbrook, David. English for Maturity. London: Cambridge UP, 1961.

Horton, Susan R. Thinking Through Writing. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1982.

Kantor, Kenneth J. "The Revolution A Decade Later: Confessions of An Aging Romantic." English Journal 68 (September 1979): 28-31.

King, Martha L. "Research in Composition: A Need for Theory." Research in the Teaching of English 12 (1978), 193-202.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. "NCTE Presidential Address." Elementary English 42 (Feb. 1965): 107-114. Presidential address of 1964.

---. "The Government and English Teaching: A Retrospective View." College Composition and Communication, October 1967.

Koziol, Stephen Jr. "Research Roundup: NCTE Research Landmarks During the Past Twenty Years." English Journal 68 (September 1979): 95-98.

Kuykendall, Carol. "EJ Reviews: Teaching Materials. Two Decades After Sputnik." English Journal 68 (September 1979): 83-86.

Lloyd-Jones, Richard. "Review of The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field. College Composition and Communication 40 (February 1989): 98-100.

---. "NCTE Counciletter: The Council's Committee Structure." English Journal 57 (April 1968): 581-82.

Martin, Marvin. "Children Can Become Better Writers." Elementary English 41 (January 1964): 53-55.

Maxwell, John. "Readiness for New Curriculum Materials." English Journal 56 (December 1967)

May, Frank B. "Composition and 'The New Grammar'" Elementary English 44 (November 1967): 762-764, 767.

Meckel, Henry C. "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature," Handbook of Research on Teaching. Ed. N. L. Gage. A Project of the AERA, NEA. Chicago: Rand, 1963.

McNamara, J. "Teaching the Process of Writing," College English 34 (February 1973): 661-65.

Miller, James E., Jr. "ADE and the English Coalition." Bulletin of the Association of Departments of English 79 (Fall 1985): 16-19.

Moffett, James. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton, 1968, 1983.

---. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum Grades K-6. Boston: Houghton, 1973.

Moffett, James and Betty Jane Wagner. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum Grades K-8. Boston: Houghton, 1983.

Monat, Jonathan. "The Importance of Selected Professional Association Activities as Perceived by Engineers and Scientists." DAI 33 (1972): 3817-A.

NCTE Commission on Composition. "Teaching Composition: A Position Statement." Urbana: NCTE, 1983.

O'Donnell, Bernard. "ERIC/RCS Report: ERIC at NCTE." English Journal 68 (September 1979): 101-104.

Parke, Margaret B. "Composition in Primary Grades." Elementary English 36 (February 1959): 107-121.

Pearce, Jonathan. "Influence of Education Journals on the Classroom Practice of California Public High School Heads." DAI 42 (1981): 3830-A.

Perl, Sondra. "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers." Research in the Teaching of English 13 (1979): 317-336.

Robison, Robert Allen. "Role of Professional Associations as Perceived by Trade and Industrial Teachers." DAI 40 (1979): 5026.

Scardamalia, Marlene and Carl Bereiter. "Research on Written Composition." Handbook of Research on Teaching. 3rd ed. Ed. Merlin C. Wittrock. A Project of the American Educational Research Association. New York: Macmillan, 1986.

SLATE Steering Committee. Report on the NCTE Policy Statement on the Teaching of Composition. SLATE 10 (March-April 1985).

Smith, Dora V. "Re-establishing Guidelines for the English Curriculum." Dora V. Smith: Selected Essays. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Smith, Frank. "Myths of Writing." Language Arts 58 (1981): 792-798.

Sobelman, Marilyn and Martha J. Bell. "Perspectives on The English Journal: Curriculum Concerns and the EJ Reader." English Journal 68 (September 1979): 89-93.

Sommers, Nancy L. "The Need for Theory in Composition Research." College Composition and Communication 31 (1979): 46-49.

Squire, James R. "The Teaching of Writing and Composition in Today's Schools." Elementary English 41 (January 1964): 3-14.

Squire, James, and associates. The National Interest and the Teaching of English. Report of the Committee on National Interest of the National Council of Teachers of English. Urbana: NCTE, 1962.

---. The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English. Report of the Committee on National Interest of the National Council of Teachers of English. Champaign: NCTE, 1964.

Squire, James R. and Roger K. Applebee. Teaching English in the United Kingdom. Champaign: NCTE, 1969.

Squire, James, ed. The Teaching of English: The 76th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1977.

Stotsky, Sandra. "A Comparison of the Two Theories about Development in Written Language: Implications for Pedagogy and Research." In Comprehending Oral and Written Language. Eds. R. Horowitz and S. J. Samuels. Orlando: Academic, 1987.

Strom, Ingrid M. "Summary of Investigations Relating to the English Language Arts in Secondary Education: 1962-63." English Journal 53 (February 1964): 110-135.

---. "Summary of Investigations Relating to the English Language Arts in Secondary Education: 1963-64." English Journal 54 (March 1965): 238-255.

Strong, Blondell McDonald. "The Relationships of Socioeconomic Background, Occupational Characteristics and Educational Attainment to the Professional Activities of Medical School Librarians." DAI 44 (1983): 3531.

Stuck, Herman R. "The Myth about Initial Conjunctions." English Journal 54 (January 1965): 42-44.

Tiedt, Iris M. Individualizing Writing in the Elementary Classroom. Urbana: ERIC/RCS and NCTE, 1975.

Turbill, Jan, ed. No Better Way To Teach Writing. Rozelle, New South Wales, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association, 1982

Wagner, Betty Jane. "A Valid Way to Assess the Effects of a Writing Project," English in the Eighties. Ed. Robert D. Eagleson. Sydney: AATE, 1982.

Walker, B. B. "An Analysis of Six Basic Approaches to Teaching Freshman Composition." DAI 35 (1975): 5069-A.

Whitehead, Frank. The Disappearing Dais: A Study of the Principles and Practices of English Teaching. London: Chatto & Windus, 1966.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBR
3129301055964

THESIS
V.2

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 01055 9650

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
c:\clrc\datedue.pm3-p.1

AN HISTORICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ROLES OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN DEVELOPING THE PROCESS-ORIENTED APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION

VOLUME II

By

Mary Ellen Van Camp

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1992

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

A. Major Professional Association and Inter-Association Conferences
B. Professional Association Chronology
C. Basic Issues Conference Series - 1958
D. Woods Hole Conference - 1959
E. Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English - 1962
F. Allerton Park Conference - 1962
G. Research Development Seminar - 1963
H. San Francisco Research Conference - 1963
I. Boston International Conference - 1965
J. Arts of Language Conference - 1966
K. Dartmouth Seminar - 1966
L. The NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education - 1972
M. Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing - 1975
N. English Curriculum Under Fire Conference - 1978
O. CCTE Conference on Learning to Write - 1979
P. Third International Conference -1980
Q. IFTE Seminar- 1984
R. NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar - 1985
S. English Coalition Conference - 1987
T. Cumulative List of Conference Participants
U. Selected Professional Association Leaders
V. Selected Publications Resulting from Professional Association and Inter-Association Conferences

APPENDIX A

Major Professional Association and Inter-Association Conferences

1. **Basic Issues Conference Series**
   January 27-29; April 11-13; June 16-18; and October 19,1958
   Dobbs Ferry, New York.
   Chair: Albert Marckwardt
   Participating Associations: NCTE, MLA, ASA, and CEA
   Financial support from the participating associations and the Ford Foundation
   Resulting Document: The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English

2. **Woods Hole Conference**
   September 1959 (a ten-day meeting)
   Woods Hole, Cape Cod
   Chair: Jerome Bruner, Harvard University
   A professional conference primarily focused on elementary and secondary science instruction, but which ultimately had influence on other curriculum content areas as well.
   Resulting Document: The Process of Education by Jerome Bruner.

3. **Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English**
   May 5-7, 1962
   Carnegie Institute of Technology
   Conference Director: Erwin Steinberg
   Resulting Document: Needed Research in the Teaching of English, prepared by Erwin Steinberg.

4. **Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English** This conference led to development of the ADE.
   December 2-4, 1962
   Allerton Park, Monticello, Illinois
   Chair: Robert W. Rogers, University of Illinois
   Resulting Document: Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English, prepared by Robert W. Rogers.

5. **Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English**
   February 27 - March 2, 1963
   New York University
   Seminar Director: Louise M. Rosenblatt , New York University
   Resulting Document: Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English: A Report of the Seminar Proceedings, prepared by Louise M. Rosenblatt.

6. **San Francisco Conference on Research in English**
   November 25-27, 1963
   Chair: Erwin R. Steinberg
   Location: San Francisco, California
   Resulting Document: Research Design and the Teaching of English (NCTE, 1964), prepared by Erwin R. Steinberg

7. **English Teacher Preparation Study Conference Series**
   1965-1967
   Convened for several meetings over an eighteen-month period in various cities around the United States
   Participating Associations: NCTE, MLA, and NASDTEC
   Resulting Document: Guidelines for the Preparation of English Teachers, which was jointly and separately published by NCTE and MLA

8. Boston International Conference on the Teaching of English

November 24-28, 1965
Chair: James R. Squire
Boston, Massachusetts
James R. Squire arranged for a three-day international conference with 43 participants from Great Britain, Canada, and the United States as part of the pre-convention activities of the 1965 NCTE Annual Convention.
Resulting Book: A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, NCTE, 1966.

9. The Arts of Language Conference

February 26 - March 1, 1966
Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Financial support from the USOE
Resulting Document:
The Arts of Language: Needed Curricula and Curriculum Development For Institutes in The English Language Arts: Language, Literature, Composition, Speech and Reading. Ed. Paul A. Olson [ED 011 974]

10. The Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English (popularly called the Dartmouth Seminar or Dartmouth Conference)

August 20 - September 16, 1966
Chair: James Squire
Location: Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire
Participating associations: NCTE, MLA, & NATE
Financial support by the Carnegie Corporation
Resulting publications: Growth through English (Dixon), The Uses of English (Muller), and a number of journal articles.

11. The Vancouver Conference of 1967

This International Conference on the Teaching of English officially established the Canadian Council of Teachers of English (CCTE).

Participating Associations: NCTE, NATE, MLA, and AATE

12. The 1972 Minnesota NCTE Seminar on Research in English Education -

Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota

November 1972 (Exact dates unavailable in the resulting documents)

Resulting Documents: Series of articles in RTE 7: (Fall 1973): 144-289 and a series of videotapes of the conference in progress.

13. Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing

State University of New York at Buffalo on two weekends in the fall of 1975. Sponsored by the NCTE Research Foundation and the SUNY English Education Research Colloquium of the Department of Instruction.

Conference Chairs: Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell

Resulting Publication: Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. by Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell (NCTE, 1978)

14. The English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

University of Chicago

Sponsored by the University of Chicago Department of Education, the Illinois Humanities Council, and several publishing companies. Resulting Publication: The English Curriculum Under Fire: What are the Real Basics?, Ed. George Hillocks, Jr. (NCTE, 1982)

15. CCTE Conference on Learning to Write

CCTE's 12th Annual Conference
May, 1979
This was an international conference.
Resulting Documents: 1) Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle (CCTE, 1980).
2) Learning to Write: First Language/Second Language--Selected Papers from the 1979 CCTE Conference, Ottawa, Canada. Eds. Aviva Freedman, Ian Pringle and Janice Yalden, Longman, 1983.

16. Third International Conference on the Teaching of English

August 19-29,1980
Sydney, Australia
Resulting Documents:
1) English in the Eighties. Ed. Robert Donn Eagleson. (AATE, 1982)
2) Donald Graves in Australia: Children Want to Write Ed. R. D. Walshe (PETA, 1981)

17. Montreal Seminar on Direction in Research

1983
Montreal, Canada
This seminar led to the founding of IFTE.

18. IFTE Seminar on Language, Schooling, and Society

November 11-14, 1984
Michigan State University, East Lansing
Resulting Document: Language, Schooling, and Society Ed. Stephen N. Tchudi for IFTE (Boynton/Cook 1985)

19. The NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar

1985

Held in Chicago.

Resulting Publications: 1) The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading And English, Ed. James R. Squire. Contributors include: Judith A. Langer, Miles Myers, Arthur N. Applebee, Edmund J. Farrell, Julie Jensen, Alan C. Purves and P. David Pearson. ERIC/RCS and NCRE, 1987.

2) Discussions at the Mid-Decade Seminar on the Teaching of Reading and English, Ed. James R. Squire. NCTE, 1985. ERIC ED 274 967

20. Conference of the Coalition of English Language Associations

July 6-26, 1987

Held in Maryland at the Wye Plantation.

Resulting Publications:

1) Stories to Grow On, edited by Julie Jensen. (1989)

2) The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language, edited by Richard Lloyd-Jones and Andrea A. Lunsford. (NCTE and MLA 1989)

3) What is English? by Peter Elbow (NCTE and MLA 1990)

APPENDIX B

Professional Association Chronology

1883 - Founding of the Modern Language Association of America

1901 - Founding of the New England Association of Teachers of English

1907 - Fred Newton Scott becomes the twenty-fourth President of MLA.

1911 - December 1-2: Founding of NCTE in Chicago
Fred Newton Scott becomes NCTE President
Emma J. Breck becomes NCTE First Vice President
T. C. Mitchill becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1912 - January: First issue of The English Journal

1912 - Second Annual NCTE Convention held in Chicago
Fred Newton Scott re-elected as NCTE President.
(Scott was NCTE's only two-term president.)
Grace Shepherd becomes NCTE First Vice President
Ernest Noyes becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1913 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Franklin T. Baker becomes NCTE President.
C. W. Kent becomes NCTE First Vice President
V. C. Coulter becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1914 - March 20: North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools Convention in Chicago
Fred Newton Scott becomes NCACSS President

1914 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
E. H. Kemper McComb becomes NCTE President.
Edwin M. Hopkins becomes NCTE First Vice President
Emma J. Breck becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1914 - Speech teachers break away from NCTE to form the National Association for Academic Teachers of Public Speaking (This group's name eventually became the Speech Communication Association.)

1915 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Edwin M. Hopkins becomes NCTE President.
E. M. Fairley becomes NCTE First Vice President
Cornelia S. Hulst becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1916 - NCTE Annual Convention in New York
Allan Abbott becomes NCTE President.
Calvin L. Lewis becomes NCTE First Vice President
Clarence Stratton becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1917 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Edwin L Miller becomes NCTE President.
J. M Thomas becomes NCTE First Vice President
Mary B. Fontaine becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1918 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
J. M. Thomas becomes NCTE President.
Samuel Thurber becomes NCTE First Vice President
Claudia E. Crumpton becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1919 - NCTE Annual Convention in Boston
James F. Hosic becomes NCTE President.
W. S. Hinchman becomes NCTE First Vice President
Olive Ely Hart becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1920 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
H. G. Paul becomes NCTE President.
T. W. Gosling becomes NCTE First Vice President
Mary Percival becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1921 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Charles R. Gaston becomes NCTE President.
Mary Hargrave becomes NCTE First Vice President
Emma J. Breck becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1922 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chattanooga
J. W. Searson becomes NCTE President.
O. B. Sperlin becomes NCTE First Vice President
A. C. Hall becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1923 - NCTE Annual Convention in Detroit
Thomas C. Blaisdell becomes NCTE President.
Essie Chamberlain becomes NCTE First Vice President
Walter Barnes becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1924 - NCTE Annual Convention in St. Louis
T. W. Gosling becomes NCTE President.
Alice L. Marsh becomes NCTE First Vice President
Orton Lowe becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1925 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Sterling A. Leonard becomes NCTE President
Dudley Miles becomes NCTE First Vice President
Elizabeth N. Baker becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1926 - NCTE Annual Convention in Philadelphia
Dudley Miles becomes NCTE President.
Sophia Camenisch becomes NCTE First Vice President
Walter Barnes becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1927 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Charles Carpenter Fries becomes NCTE President.
M. Aline Bright becomes NCTE First Vice President
Stella S. Center becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1928 - NCTE Annual Convention in Baltimore
Rewey Belle Inglis becomes NCTE President (first woman)
Max J. Herzberg becomes NCTE First Vice President
Marquis E. Shattuck becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1929 - NCTE Annual Convention in Kansas City
Ruth Mary Weeks becomes NCTE President.
O. B. Sperlin becomes NCTE First Vice President
H. B. Owens becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1930 - NCTE Annual Convention in Cleveland

Rollo L. Lyman becomes NCTE President.
G. W. Norvell becomes NCTE First Vice President
Mabel C. Hermans becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1931 - NCTE Annual Convention in Milwaukee
Stella S. Center becomes NCTE President.
Oscar J. Campbell becomes NCTE First Vice President
Frances R. Dearborn becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1932 - Founding of the National Conference on Research in English (NCRE) by C. C. Certain. The group originally focused its attention on elementary schools.

1932 - NCTE Annual Convention in Memphis
Walter Barnes becomes NCTE President
Ruth A. Barns becomes NCTE First Vice President
Robert C. Pooley becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1933 - NCTE Annual Convention in Detroit
Oscar J. Campbell becomes NCTE President.
Dora V. Smith becomes NCTE First Vice President
Roscoe E. Parker becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1934 - NCTE Annual Convention in Washington
Charles S. Thomas becomes NCTE President.
Dora V. Smith becomes NCTE First Vice President
Holland D. Roberts becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1935 - NCTE Annual Convention in Indianapolis
Dora V. Smith becomes NCTE President.
Max J. Herzberg becomes NCTE First Vice President
Ward H. Green becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1936 - NCTE Annual Convention in Boston
Holland D. Roberts becomes NCTE President.
Marquis E. Shattuck becomes NCTE First Vice President
Mabel Goddard becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1937 - NCTE Annual Convention in Buffalo
Marquis E. Shattuck becomes NCTE President.
Essie Chamberlain becomes NCTE First Vice President
E. A Cross becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1938 - NCTE Annual Convention in St Louis
Essie Chamberlain becomes NCTE President.
E. A. Cross becomes NCTE First Vice President
Angela M. Broening becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1939 - NCTE Annual Convention in New York
E. A. Cross becomes NCTE President.
Robert C. Pooley becomes NCTE First Vice President
Helene W. Hartley becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1940 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Robert C. Pooley becomes NCTE President.
John J. DeBoer becomes NCTE First Vice President
Jeannette E. Maltby becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1941 - NCTE Annual Convention in Atlanta
John J. DeBoer becomes NCTE President.
Max J. Herzberg becomes NCTE First Vice President
Marion Sheridan becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1942 - NCTE Annual Convention was canceled because of World War II travel restrictions. A Directors Meeting was held in Chicago.
John J. DeBoer becomes editor of Elementary English Review.
Max J. Herzberg becomes NCTE President.
Angela M. Broening becomes NCTE First Vice President
Lennox Grey becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1943 - NCTE Annual Convention was not held.
A Business Meeting was held in New York
Angela M. Broening becomes NCTE President.
Harold A. Anderson becomes NCTE First Vice President
Amanda M. Ellis becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1944 - NCTE Annual Convention in Columbus
Harold A. Anderson becomes NCTE President.
Helene W. Hartley becomes NCTE First Vice President
Mark Neville becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1945 - NCTE Annual Convention in Minneapolis
Helene W. Hartley becomes NCTE President.
Ward H. Green becomes NCTE First Vice President
Harry A. Domincovich becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1946 - NCTE Annual Convention in Atlantic City
Porter G. Perrin becomes NCTE President.
Thomas C. Pollock becomes NCTE First Vice President
Harlen M. Adams becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1947 - Founding of International Council for the Improvement of Reading Instruction (ICIRI) at Temple University in Philadelphia. This council would later change its name to the International Reading Association (IRA).

1947 - NCTE Annual Convention in San Francisco
Thomas C. Pollock becomes NCTE President.
Marion C. Sheridan becomes NCTE First Vice President
Lucia B. Mirrielees becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1948 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Marion C. Sheridan becomes NCTE President.
Mark Neville becomes NCTE First Vice President
Luella B. Cook becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1949 - April 1-2: Conference on College Freshman English sponsored by NCTE in Chicago. This meeting led to the founding of CCCC as a constituent group of NCTE

1949 - November: NCTE Annual Convention in Buffalo
Mark Neville becomes NCTE President.
Paul Farmer becomes NCTE First Vice President
Edna Sterling becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1950 - CCCC begins publishing College Composition and Communication
Charles W. Roberts serves as the first editor.

1950 - NCTE Annual Convention in MIlwaukee
Paul Farmer becomes NCTE President.
Lennox Grey becomes NCTE First Vice President

Ruth G. Strickland becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1951 - NCTE Annual Convention in Cincinnati
Lennox Grey becomes NCTE President.
Harlen M. Adams becomes NCTE First Vice President
Helen K. Mackintosh becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1952 - NCTE Annual Convention in Boston
Harlen M. Adams becomes NCTE President.
Lou LaBrant becomes NCTE First Vice President
Blanche Trezevant becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1953 - NCTE Annual Convention in Los Angeles
Lou LaBrant becomes NCTE President.
John C. Gerber becomes NCTE First Vice President
Joseph Mersand becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1954 - NCTE Annual Convention in Detroit
John C. Gerber becomes NCTE President.
Luella B. Cook becomes NCTE First Vice President
David Russell becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1955 - William S. Gray becomes the first IRA President.

1955 - NCTE Annual Convention in New York
Luella B. Cook becomes NCTE President.
Helen K. Mackintosh becomes NCTE First Vice President
Jerome W. Archer becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1956 - IRA Annual Convention in Chicago (first IRA Convention)
Nancy Larrick becomes IRA President

1956 - NCTE Annual Convention in St. Louis
Helen K. Mackintosh becomes NCTE President.
Brice Harris becomes NCTE First Vice President
Harold B. Allen becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1957 - IRA Annual Convention in New York
Albert J. Harris becomes IRA President

1957 - October 4 - Russians launch Sputnik I

1957 - November 28-30: NCTE Annual Convention in Minneapolis
Brice Harris becomes NCTE President.
Joseph Mersand becomes NCTE First Vice President
Helen F. Olson becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1958 - January-October: Basic Issues Conference Series

1958 - National Defense Education Act

1958 - IRA Annual Convention in Milwaukee
George D. Spache becomes IRA President

1958 - Publication of H. G. Rickover's Education and Freedom.

1958 - November 27-29: NCTE Annual Convention in Pittsburgh
Joseph Mersand becomes NCTE President.
Ruth G. Strickland becomes NCTE First Vice President
G. Robert Carlsen becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1959 - IRA Annual Convention in Toronto
A. Sterl Artley becomes IRA President

1959 - September: Woods Hole Conference on the Teaching of Science

1959 - Publication of James B. Conant's The American High School Today

1959 - NCTE Annual Convention in Denver
Ruth G. Strickland becomes NCTE President.
Harold B. Allen becomes NCTE First Vice President
Hardy Finch becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1960 - NCTE established the NCTE Research Foundation

1960 - IRA Annual Convention in New York
Mary C. Austin becomes IRA President

1960 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Harold B. Allen becomes NCTE President.
G. Robert Carlsen becomes NCTE First Vice President
Donald R. Tuttle becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1961 - Establishment of Project English

1961 - IRA Annual Convention in St. Louis
William D. Sheldon becomes IRA President

1961 - NCTE Annual Convention in Philadelphia
G. Robert Carlsen becomes NCTE President.
David H. Russell becomes NCTE First Vice President
Richard Corbin becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1962 - IRA Annual Convention in San Francisco
Morton Botel becomes IRA President

1962 - May 5-7: Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English, convened at the Carnegie Institute of Technology

1962 - December 2-4: Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English. This conference led to the founding of the Association of Departments of English.

1962 - NCTE Research Foundation seeks proposals for projects to fund.

1962 - NCTE Annual Convention in Miami Beach
David H. Russell becomes NCTE President.
Albert R. Kitzhabel becomes NCTE First Vice President
Priscilla Tyler becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1963 - February 27-March 2: Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English, held at New York University

1963 - March 28-30: Conference on English Education at Indiana University

1963 - NCTE Research Foundation funds its first three projects.

1963 - April 4: Beginning of NATE in Great Britain at meeting of regional council representatives called by Denys Thompson.
Boris Ford becomes the first NATE Chair.

1963 - IRA Annual Convention in Miami Beach

Nila Banton Smith becomes IRA President

1963 - Publication of Research in Written Composition written by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones,and Lowell Schoer.

1963 - September: Official founding of NATE in Great Britain

1963 - November 25-27: San Francisco Research Conference

1963 - NCTE Annual Convention in San Francisco
Albert Kitzhaber becomes NCTE President.
Richard Corbin becomes NCTE First Vice President
Muriel Crosby becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1964 - The National Defence Education Act was Amended.

1964 - April 2-4: Conference on English Education at the University of Illinois

1964 - Publication of Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the 1963 San Francisco Conference

1964 - IRA Annual Convention in Philadelphia
Theodore Clymer becomes IRA President

1964 - November: NCTE Annual Convention in Cleveland
Boris Ford, NATE Chair, attends
Richard Corbin becomes NCTE President
Muriel Crosby becomes NCTE First Vice President
James H. Mason becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1965 - Elementary and Secondary Education Act

1965 - IRA Annual Convention in Detroit
Dorothy K. Bracken becomes IRA President

1965 - NATE Conference in London
Muriel Crosby attends as a representative of NCTE.
Crosby was NCTE First Vice President at the time.

1965 - Publication of Gordon Rohman's "Pre-writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process" in College Composition and Communication.

1965 - October: another ETPS meeting

1965 - November 24-28: International Conference on the Teaching of English - Boston

1965 - November: NCTE Annual Convention in Boston
Muriel Crosby becomes NCTE President.
Albert H. Marckwardt becomes NCTE First Vice President
Dwight L. Burton becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1966 - February 26-March 1: The Arts of Language Conference at the University of Nebraska

1966 - IRA Annual Convention in Dallas
Mildred A. Dawson becomes IRA President

1966 - Publication of Proceedings of The Arts of Language Conference, edited by Paul A. Olson

1966 - First IRA World Congress in Paris

1966 - August 20 and September 16: The Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English at Dartmouth College. This conference became commonly known as the Dartmouth Seminar.

1966 - Publication of A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, edited by James R. Squire.

1966 - October: Charlotte, North Carolina, another regional English Teacher Preparation Study conference.

1966 - NCTE Annual Convention in Houston
Albert H. Marckwardt becomes NCTE President.
Alfred H. Grommon becomes NCTE First Vice President
Alvina Treut Burrows becomes NCTE Second Vice President

1967 - January 26-28: 3 day English Teacher Preparation Study meeting in Chicago

1967 - IRA Annual Convention in Seattle
H. Alan Robinson becomes IRA President

1967 - NCTE begins publishing Research in the Teaching of English

1967 - Publication of Herbert J. Muller's The Uses of English: Guidelines for the Teaching of English from the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College

1967 - The Vancouver Conference of 1967
Founding of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English

1967 - NCTE Annual Convention in Honolulu
Alfred H. Grommon becomes NCTE President
William A. Jenkins becomes NCTE President Elect
(change in terminology this year from First Vice President)
Robert E. Shafer becomes NCTE Vice President

1968 - Publication of Donald Murray's A Writer Teaches Writing.

1968 - Publication of Michael Shugrue's English in a Decade of Change

1968 - IRA Annual Convention in Boston
Leo C. Fay becomes IRA President

1968 - Second IRA World Congress in Copenhagen

1968 - NCTE Annual Convention in Milwaukee
William A. Jenkins becomes NCTE President.
James E. Miller, Jr. becomes NCTE President Elect
Margaret Early becomes NCTE Vice President

1969 - NCTE's Conference on English Education begins publishing English Education

1969 - IRA Annual Convention in Kansas City

Helen Huus becomes IRA President

1969 - NCTE Annual Convention in Washington
James E. Miller, Jr. becomes NCTE President.
Robert A. Bennett becomes NCTE President Elect
Dorothy Davidson becomes NCTE Vice President

1970 - International Conference on the Teaching of English in York, England

1970 - NCTE Annual Convention in Atlanta
Robert A. Bennett becomes NCTE President.
Virginia M. Reid becomes NCTE President Elect
Edward Jenkinson becomes NCTE Vice President

1970 - International Conference on the Teaching of English in York, England

1970 - IRA Annual Convention in Anaheim
Donald L. Cleland becomes IRA President

1970 - Third IRA World Congress in Sydney

1971 - Publication of Janet Emig's The Composing Process of Twelfth Graders.

1971 - IRA Annual Convention in Atlantic City
Theodore L. Harris becomes IRA President

1971 - NCTE Annual Convention in Las Vegas
Virginia M. Reid becomes NCTE President.
Walker Gibson becomes NCTE President Elect
James Lape becomes NCTE Vice President

1972 - Publication of Donald Murray's article, "Teach Writing as a Process, Not Product" in The Leaflet, the New England Association of Teachers of English newsletter.

1972 - IRA Annual Convention in Detroit
William K. Durr becomes IRA President

1972 - Fourth IRA World Congress in Buenos Aires

1972 - November: NCTE Seminar on Research in English Education (The 1972 Minnesota NCTE Seminar on Research in English Education) - an invitational conference limited to sixty participants. Resulting Documents: Series of articles in RTE 7 (Fall 1973): 144-289 and a series of videotapes of the conference in progress.

1972 - November 23-25: NCTE Annual Convention in Minneapolis
Walker Gibson becomes NCTE President
Margaret Early becomes NCTE President Elect
Edward R. Fagan becomes NCTE Vice President

1973 - IRA Annual Convention in Denver
Millard H. Black becomes IRA President

1973 - NCTE Annual Convention in Philadelphia
Margaret Early becomes NCTE President
Stephen Dunning becomes NCTE President Elect
Imogene Springer becomes NCTE Vice President

1973 - Publication of Donald Murray's "Why Teaching Writing--And How?" in The English Journal (December)

1974 - Publication of Arthur N. Applebee's Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History

1974 - March: First Annual Conference on the Language Arts at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Conference participants included James R. Squire, Janet Emig, and Donald Graves.

1974 - IRA Annual Convention in New Orleans
Constance M. McCullough becomes IRA President

1974 - Fifth IRA World Congress in Vienna

1974 - NCTE Annual Convention in New Orleans
Stephen Dunning becomes NCTE President.
Charlotte Huck becomes NCTE President Elect
Charlotte Brooks becomes NCTE Vice President

1975 - Fall: SUNY-Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing

1975 - IRA Annual Convention in New York
Thomas C. Barrett becomes IRA President

1975 - Publication of Donald Graves' "An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children" in the Research in the Teaching of English 9: 227-241.

1975 - NCTE Annual Convention in San Diego
Charlotte Huck becomes NCTE President.
Charlotte Brooks becomes NCTE President Elect
Marjorie Farmer becomes NCTE Vice President
(This was the first time in NCTE's history that the Presidential team consisted entirely of women.)

1976 - IRA Annual Convention in Anaheim
Walter H. MacGinitie becomes IRA President

1976 - Sixth IRA World Congress in Singapore

1976 - NCTE Annual Convention in Chicago
Charlotte Brooks becomes NCTE President.
Marjorie Farmer becomes NCTE President Elect
Yetta Goodman becomes NCTE Vice President

1977 - IRA Annual Convention in Miami Beach
William Eller becomes IRA President

1977 - NCTE Annual Convention in New York
Marjorie Farmer becomes NCTE President.
Yetta Goodman becomes NCTE President Elect
Alan Purves becomes NCTE Vice President

1978 - IRA Annual Convention in Houston
Dorothy S. Strickland becomes IRA President

1978 - Seventh IRA World Congress in Hamburg

1978 - NCTE Annual Convention in Kansas City
Yetta Goodman becomes NCTE President.
Alan Purves becomes NCTE President Elect

Robert Squires becomes NCTE Vice President

1979 - Publication of a themed issue of the English Journal "English Since Sputnik," edited by Stephen Tchudi

1979 - IRA Annual Convention in Atlanta
Roger C. Farr becomes IRA President

1979 - May: Twelfth Annual Conference of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, held at Carleton University in Ottawa-An international conference on the theme, "Learning to Write."

1979 - Publication of J. N. Hook's A Long Way Together: A Personal View of NCTE's First Sixty-Seven Years

1979 - NCTE Annual Convention in San Francisco
Alan Purves becomes NCTE President.
Robert Squires becomes NCTE President Elect
John Warren Stewig becomes NCTE Vice President

1980 - IRA Annual Convention in St. Louis
Olive S. Niles becomes IRA President

1980 - Third International Conference on the Teaching of English

1980 - Eighth IRA World Congress in Manila

1980 - NCTE Annual Convention in Cincinnati
Robert Squires becomes NCTE President.
John Warren Stewig becomes NCTE President Elect
William Irmscher becomes NCTE Vice President

1981 - Publication of Donald Graves in Australia: Children Want to Write, edited by R. D. Walshe (PETA)

1981 - IRA Annual Convention in New Orleans
Kenneth S. Goodman becomes IRA President

1981 - NCTE Annual Convention in Boston
John Warren Stewig becomes NCTE President.
William Irmscher becomes NCTE President Elect

Stephen Tchudi becomes NCTE Vice President

1982 - Publication of English in the Eighties edited by Robert Donn Eagleson.

1982 - IRA Annual Convention in Chicago
Jack Cassidy becomes IRA President

1982 - Publication of Donald Murray's Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching. (Boynton/Cook)

1982 - Ninth IRA World Congress in Dublin

1982 - NCTE Annual Convention in Washington
William Irmscher becomes NCTE President
Stephen Tchudi becomes NCTE President Elect
Sheila Fitzgerald becomes NCTE Vice President

1982 - MLA Annual Convention
Wayne Booth becomes MLA President

1983 - May 2-6: IRA Annual Convention in Anaheim
Ira E. Aaron becomes IRA President

1983 - Seminar on Directions in Research - Montreal, Canada

1983 - NCTE Annual Convention in Denver
Stephen N. Tchudi becomes NCTE President
Sheila M. Fitzgerald becomes NCTE President Elect
Richard Lloyd-Jones becomes NCTE Vice President

1984 -May 6-10: IRA Annual Convention in Atlanta
Bernice E. Cullinan becomes IRA President

1984 - IFTE Seminar on Language, Schooling, and Society
Held at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

1984 - Publication of A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs by Donald Graves

1984 - Publication of English Teaching: An International Exchange edited by James Britton for IFTE

1984 - Tenth IRA World Congress in Hong Kong

1984 - NCTE Annual Convention in Detroit
Sheila Fitzgerald becomes NCTE President.
Richard Lloyd-Jones becomes NCTE President Elect
Nancy McHugh becomes NCTE Vice President

1985 - May 5-9: IRA Annual Convention in New Orleans
John C. Manning becomes IRA President

1985 - NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar in Chicago
James R. Squire served as Director of the Seminar.

1985 - Publication: Language, Schooling, and Society edited by Stephen N. Tchudi for IFTE

1985 - NCTE Annual Convention in Philadelphia
Richard Lloyd-Jones becomes NCTE President.
Nancy McHugh becomes NCTE President Elect
Julie Jensen becomes NCTE Vice President

1986 - Publication of Literacy: Teaching and Learning Language Skills, edited by Asher Cashdan and published by Basil Blackwell, Ltd.

1986 - April 13-17: IRA Annual Convention in Philadelphia
Roselmina Indrisano beomes IRA President

1986 - May: International Federation for the Teaching of English Conference in Ottawa, Canada

1986 - Publication of English Teachers at Work: Ideas and Strategies from Five Countries, edited by Stephen N. Tchudi (Boynton/Cook)

1986 - Publication of George Hillocks's Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching. (NCRE/ERIC)

1986 - Publication of Arthur Applebee's "Problems in Process Approaches: Toward a Reconceptualization of Process

Instruction" in The Teaching of Writing: Eighty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Eds. A. Petrosky and D. Bartholomae

1986 - Eleventh IRA World Congress in London

1986 - NCTE Annual Convention in San Antonio
Nancy McHugh becomes NCTE President.
Julie Jensen becomes NCTE President Elect
Janet Emig becomes NCTE Vice President

1987 - Publication of The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading And English, edited by James R. Squire. This book was the publication resulting from the 1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar.

1987 - May 3-7: IRA Annual Convention in Anaheim
Phyllis J. Adams becomes IRA President

1987 - July 6-26: Conference of the Coalition of English Language Associations

1987 - Publication of Judith A. Langer and Arthur N. Applebee's How Writing Shapes Thinking (NCTE Research Report No. 22).

1987 - NCTE Annual Convention in Los Angeles
Julie Jensen becomes NCTE President.
Janet Emig becomes NCTE President Elect
Ruth Cline becomes NCTE Vice President

1988 - Publication of Stories to Grow On, edited by Julie Jensen.

1988 - NCTE Annual Convention in St. Louis
Janet Emig becomes NCTE President.
Ruth Cline becomes NCTE President Elect
Shirley Haley-James becomes NCTE Vice President

1989 - Publication of The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language. Eds. Richard Lloyd-Jones and Andrea A. Lunsford.

1989 - NCTE Annual Convention in Baltimore
Ruth Cline becomes NCTE President.
Shirley Haley-James becomes NCTE President Elect
James Davis becomes NCTE Vice President

1990 - NCTE Annual Convention in Atlanta
Shirley Haley-James becomes NCTE President
James Davis becomes NCTE President Elect
Jesse Perry becomes NCTE Vice President
NCTE constituent group Conference for Secondary School English Department Chairmen (CSSEDC) changes its name to Conference on English Leadership (CEL).

1990 - Publication of What is English? by Peter Elbow, a publication resulting from the English Coalition Conference

1990 - Publication of The Scribal Society: An Essay on Literacy and Schooling in the Information Age by Alan Purves

1991 - Publication of Missing Chapters: Ten Pioneering Women in NCTE and English Education, edited by Jeanne M. Gerlach and Virginia R. Monseau

Appendix C

Basic Issues Conference Series

Dobbs Ferry, New York
January, April, June, and October, 1958

Michael Shugrue (1968) and George Winchester Stone, Jr. (1964) have both written that there were 28 participants at this series of conferences. The group met under the auspices of the American Studies Association, the College English Association, the Modern Language Association of America, and the National Council of Teachers of English. There were three three-day conferences held during 1958: on January 27-29, April 11-13, and June 16-18. A final meeting on October 19 review a draft of this report. The conference series was supported by a $25,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. (Stone 6).

Participants

Chair: Albert Marckwardt, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Dorothy Bethurum, Connecticut College for Women

Alvina Treut Burrows, Professor, Elementary Education, New York U

William Charvat, Ohio State U

Hennig Cohen, Executive Secretary, American Studies Association, U of Pennsylvania

Carvel Collins, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

William Cornog, Superintendent, New Trier High School, Winnetka, Illinois

G. Bruce Dearing, College of Arts and Sciences, U of Delaware

John S. Diekhoff, Cleveland College, Western Reserve U

Hardy R. Finch, Chair, English Department, Greenwich High School, Greenwich, Connecticut

John C. Gerber, State U of Iowa

Maxwell H. Goldberg, Executive Director, CEA, U of Massachusetts

Edward J. Gordon, Germantown Friends School, Pennsylvania

Lennox Grey, Teachers College, Columbia U

Brice Harris, President, NCTE, Pennsylvania State U

J. N. Hook, Executive Secretary, NCTE; U of Illinois

Maynard Mack, Yale U

Helen K. Mackintosh, Chief, Elementary Schools Section, USOE

Joseph Mersand, Chair, English Department, Jamaica High School

William R. Parker, Indiana U

Thomas Clark Pollock, Washington Square College, New York U

Henry W. Sams, President, CEA; U of Chicago

Hallett D. Smith, California Institute of Technology

Henry Nash Smith, U of California at Berkeley

George Winchester Stone, Jr., Executive Secretary, MLA; New York U

Willard Thorp, President, ASA; Princeton U

Autrey Nell Wiley, Texas Woman's U

James A. Work, Indiana U, Lafayette, Indiana

Attending for NCTE were

Alvina Treut Burrows, New York U

Hardy R. Finch, NCTE Executive Committee Secondary Section Representative, Greenwich, Connecticut

John C. Gerber, State U of Iowa

Edward J. Gordon, Friends School, Germantown, Pennsylvania

Lennox Grey, Teachers College, Columbia U

Brice Harris, Pennsylvania State U

J. N. Hook, NCTE Executive Secretary

Helen Mackintosh, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Joseph Mersand, Jamaica High School, Jamaica, New York

Note:

Of these, Mersand, Mackintosh, Harris, Grey, and Gerber were either past or future NCTE Presidents. Pollock and Marckwardt "were not identified by organization" (Hook 182) presumably because they had been active in both MLA and NCTE, but Pollock was a past NCTE president and Marckwardt would become NCTE president in 1967.

APPENDIX D

Woods Hole Conference on the Process of Education

September 1959

Director of the Conference

Jerome S. Bruner, Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Participants

Carl Allendoerfer, U of Washington

Richard Alpert, Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Edward Begle, Yale

John Blum, Yale

C. Ray Carpenter, Pennsylvania State U

John B. Carroll, Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Henry Chauncey, ETS

Donald Cole, Phillips Exeter Academy

Lee Cronbach, U of Illinois

Gilbert Finlay, U of Illinois

John H. Fischer, Teachers College, Columbia U

John Flory, Eastman Kodak Company

Francis L. Friedman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Robert M. Gagne, Princeton

Ralph Gerard, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

H. Bentley Glass, Johns Hopkins

Arnold Grobman, American Institute of Biological Sciences

Thomas S. Hall, Washington U

Bärbel Inhelder, Institut Rousseau, Geneva

John F. Latimer, George Washington U

George A. Miller, Harvard

Robert S. Morison, Rockefeller Foundation

David L. Page, U of Illinois

Richard Pieters, Phillips Academy, Andover

William C. H. Prentice, Swarthmore College

Paul C. Rosenbloom, U of Minnesota

Kenneth W. Spence, State U of Iowa

H. Burr Steinbach, U of Chicago

Donald Taylor, Yale

Herbert E. Vaughan, U of Illinois

Randall M. Whaley, Purdue, Lafayette, Indiana

Don Williams, U of Kansas City

Jerrold Zacharias, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

APPENDIX E

Conference on Needed Research in the Teaching of English

A Project English Research Conference
May 5-7, 1962
Carnegie Institute of Technology

Conferees

Harry A. Becker, Norwalk, Connecticut Public Schools

Max Bogart, New Jersey Department of Education, Trenton

Wayne Booth, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana

Sue M. Brett, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Dwight L. Burton, Florida State U, Tallahassee

William H. Cornog, New Trier High School, Winnetka, Illinois

Richard A. Dershimer, Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg

Paul B. Diederich, ETS, Princeton, New Jersey

John S. Diekhoff, Western Reserve U, Cleveland, Ohio

Stephen A. Dunning, Duke U, Durham, North Carolina

Margaret J. Early, Syracuse U, New York

Walter Eddington, New York State Department of Education, Albany

John H. Fisher, Indiana U, Bloomington; MLA

John C. Flanagan, American Institute for Research, Pittsburgh

Robert L. Foose, Westfield, New Jersey High School

Garlie A. Forehand, U of Chicago

W. Nelson Francis, Brown U, Providence, Rhode Island

Ann Funk, Pennsylvania State U, U Park

Walker Gibson, New York U, New York, New York.

Lillian L. Gore, USOE, Washington, D. C.,

Elizabeth Graf, Pittsburgh Board of Public Education

James R. Green, Indiana, Pennsylvania State College

Jean H. Hagstrum, Northwestern U, Evanston, Illinois

Robert B. Heilman, U of Washington, Seattle

George H. Henry, U of Delaware, Newark

J. N. Hook, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Francis A. J. Ianni, USOE, Washington, D. C.

William A. Jenkins, U of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Arno Jewett, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Albert C. Koob, National Catholic Education Association, Washington, D. C.

Mary H. Mahar, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Bernard J. McCormick, Taylor Allderdice High School, Pittsburgh

Elizabeth A. McDonald, Linden School, Pittsburgh

Agnes R. McElwee, Pennsylvania State U, U Park

W. J. McKeachie, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

James E. Miller, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Chester L. Neudling, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Paul A. Olson, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Walter R. Reitman, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh

Floyd Rinker, Commission on English, Boston

Robert W. Rogers, U of Illinois, Urbana

John R. Searles, U of Wisconsin, Madison

Robert C. Slack, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh

James R. Squire, U of Illinois; NCTE Executive Secretary

Erwin R. Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh

Ruth S. Stickle, East Leyden High School, Franklin Park, Illinois

Ruth G. Strickland, U of Indiana, Bloomington

Kathryn Territo, Waterford School, Oaklyn, New Jersey

Priscilla Tyler, Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Appendix F

Allerton Park Conference

The Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English Allerton Park, Monticello, Illinois December 2-4, 1962

Conference Chair

Robert W. Rogers, U of Illinois

Participants

William P. Albrecht, U of Kansas

Jerome Archer, Marquette U

Dudley Bailey, U of Nebraska

Orville Baker, Northern Illinois U

C. L. Barber, Indiana U

Morton Berman, Boston U

S. N. Bogorad, U of Vermont

Wayne Booth, U of Chicago

Fredson Bowers, U of Virginia

Howard O. Brogan, U of Massachusetts

Dwight Burton, Florida State U

John Williams Clark, U of Minnesota

C. L. Cline, U of Texas

Russell Cosper, Purdue, Lafayette, Indiana

Sherwood Cummings, U of South Dakota

Hugh Dick, U of California

Karl W. Dykema, Youngstown U

William Ekstrom, U of Louisville

Claude Faulkner, U of Arkansas

John Fisher, MLA

Richard Fogle, Tulane U

George H. Ford, U of Rochester

Nick Aaron Ford, Morgan State College

Gerhard Friedrich, Orange State College

John Gerrietts, Loyola U, Chicago

John Gerber, U of Iowa

Hugh M. Gloster, Hampton Institute

Robert Gorrell, U of Nevada

Lennox Grey, Teachers College, Columbia

Frederick L. Gwynn, Trinity College, Hartford

Jean Hagstrum, Northwestern U

Robert Heilman, U of Washington

King Hendricks, Utah State U

J. N. Hook, Coordinator, Project English

John Hove, U of North Dakota

William B. Hunter, U of Idaho

Lewis Leary, Columbia

John McKiernan, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul

James McMillan, U of Alabama

Maurice McNamee, St. Louis U

Albert H. Marckwardt, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Harold C. Martin, Harvard

John L. Melton, John Carroll U

James E. Miller, U of Chicago

Charles Murphy, U of Maryland

J. D. A. Ogilvy, U of Colorado

Kenneth Oliver, Occidental College

Collice Portnoff, Arizona State U

Charles A. Ray, North Carolina College

Warner Rice, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Townsend Rich, New York State Teachers College, Albany

Elizabeth Rusk, Michigan State U, East Lansing

David H. Russell, U of California

Alvan Ryan, U of Notre Dame

Lawrence Ryan, Stanford

William M. Sale, Cornell

Henry Sams, Pennsylvania State U

W. B. Schneider, Southern Illinois U

Mark Schorer, U of California

Joseph Schiffman, Dickinson College

Herbert Schueller, Wayne State U

Donald A. Sears, Skidmore College

Rinaldo Simonini, Longwood College

Sister Mary Chrysostom, Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee

Sister Mary Sylvia, Mt. St. Joseph Teachers College, Buffalo

Joseph Slater, Colgate U

Eugene Slaughter, Southeastern State College, Oklahoma

George Smock, Indiana State Teachers College

James Squire, NCTE Executive Secretary

Erwin Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology

A. Wilber Stevens, Idaho State College

Edward Stone, Ohio U, Athens

George Winchester Stone, MLA

Denham Sutcliffe, Kenyon College

Kester Svendsen, U of Oregon

Ivan Taylor, Howard U

William Templeman, U of Southern California

F. G. Townsend, Florida State U

Arlin Turner, Duke U

Donald R. Tuttle, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

William S. Ward, U of Kentucky

Helen C. White, U of Wisconsin

Autrey Nell Wiley, Texas Woman's U

Cecil Williams, Texas Christian U

Austin Wright, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Appendix G

Research Development Seminar

The Research Development Seminar
in the Teaching of English
New York University
February 27-March 2, 1963

Director of the Seminar

Louise M. Rosenblatt Professor of English Education, New York U

Participants

R. Darrell Bock, Associate Professor of Psychology, U of North Carolina

John B. Carroll, Director of the Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Harvard U, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Paul B. Diederich, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Paul L. Dressel, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State U, East Lansing

John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary, MLA; Professor of English, New York U

W. Nelson Francis, Professor of Linguistics and English, Brown U

Norman Frederiksen, Director, Test Development Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Walker Gibson, Professor of English, New York U

Edward Gordon, Director of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program, Yale U

Clarence W. Hach, Chair, English Department, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois

Albert Kitzhaber, Director, Oregon Curriculum Study Center, Project English, U of Oregon

Harold C. Martin, Director, Committee on General Education, Harvard U, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Erwin R. Steinberg, Dean and Professsor of English, Carnegie Institute of Technology

APPENDIX H

The San Francisco Research Conference

Conference on Research Design and the Teaching of English
San Francisco, California
November 25-27, 1963

Participants

Group 1: Research in Teaching Language

Garlie Forehand (Group Leader), Carnegie Institute of Technology

Walter Petty (Group Recorder), Sacramento State College

Russell Cosper, Purdue, Lafayette, Indiana

Naomi Chase, U of Minnesota

Eldonna Everetts, U of Nebraska

Morris Finder, Western Washington State College

Paul R. Hanna, Stanford

Albert Marckwardt, Princeton

Harold E. Mitzel, Pennsylvania State U

William McColly, U of Wisconsin

Neil Postman, New York U

Marjorie Smiley, Hunter College of the City of New York

Ruth G. Strickland, Indiana U, Bloomington

Frank J. Zidonis, Ohio State U

Group 2: Research in Teaching Literature

William H. Evans (Group Leader), U of Illinois

Patrick J. Groff (Group Recorder), San Diego State College

Edwin A. Peel, U of Birmingham

G. L. Anderson, MLA

Jerome W. Archer, Arizona State U

John A. Brownell, Claremont Graduate School

Bruce Harkness, Southern Illinois U

Helen Huus,U of Pennsylvania

John E. Jordon, U of California

Elliott Landau, U of Utah

Lewis Leary, Columbia

Henry C. Meckel, San Jose State College

Norine Odland, U of Minnesota

Robert W. Rogers, U of Illinois

Louise M. Rosenblatt, New York U

Kester Svendsen, U of Oregon

Erwin R. Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology

James R. Wilson, San Francisco State College

Group 3: Research in Teaching Composition

Richard Braddock (Group Leader), U of Iowa

Robert L. Wright (Group Recorder), Michigan State U, East Lansing

Alvina Treut Burrows, New York U

Paul B. Diederich, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Edna Furness, Nebraska State College, Kearney

N. L. Gage, Stanford U

Robert M. Gorrell, U of Nevada

Arno Jewett, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Silvy Kraus, U of Oregon

Edwin H. Sauer, Chicago Teachers College South

Ingrid Strom, Indiana U, Bloomington

Anthony Tovatt, Ball State U, Muncie, Indiana

Hazel Browne Williams, U of Missouri, Kansas City

Group 4: Research in Teaching Reading

Theodore Clymer (Group Leader), U of Minnesota

William D. Sheldon (Group Recorder), Syracuse

Chester W. Harris, U of Wisconsin

David Reed, U of California

Dolores Durkin, Teachers College, Columbia

Donald Durrell, Boston U

Leo Fay, Indiana U

Henry R. Fea, U of Washington

Oscar M. Haugh, U of Kansas

Jack A. Holmes, U of California

Thomas Horn, U of Texas

William Iverson, Stanford

Helen M. Robinson, U of Chicago

Robert E. Shafer, Teachers College, Columbia

Group 5: Research in Communication and Verbal Learning

John B. Carroll (Group Leader), Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Leo J. Postman (Consultant), U of California

Theodore L. Harris (Group Recorder), U of Wisconsin

John DeBoer, U of Illinois

William E. Hoth, Wayne State U, Detroit

Marie Hughes, U of Arizona

Arnold Lazarus, Purdue U, Lafayette, Indiana

Walter H. MacGinitie, Teachers College, Columbia

Mary Regan, U of California

Hilda Taba, San Francisco State College

Joseph Thomson, U of Illinois

Francis Shoemaker, Teachers College, Columbia

Bernice Wolfson, U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

APPENDIX I

Boston International Conference

International Conference on the Teaching of English
Boston, Massachusetts
November 24-28, 1965

Conference Leaders

Co-Chairs: James R. Squire, Executive Secretary, NCTE; Professor of English, U of Illinois, Urbana

Robert F. Hogan, Associate Executive Secretary, NCTE

Local Chair: M. Agnella Gunn, Professor of Education, U of Connecticut

Recorder: Tim E. Moreland, Jr., Staff Assistant, NCTE

Editorial Assistant: Jonathan Corbin, Staff Assistant, NCTE

Participants

George Cameron Allen, Staff Inspector for English, Curzon State House, London, England

George L. Anderson, Associate Executive Secretary, MLA; Associate Professor of English, New York U

Ronald J. Baker, Head, Department of English, Simon Frazer U, Vancouver, British Columbia

Elizabeth Bennett, Berkeley High School, Berkeley, California

William H. Brown, Chair, Department of English, Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts.

Earl W. Buxton, Professor of English Education, U of Alberta, Edmonton

Frederic G. Cassidy, Professor of English, U of Wisconsin, Madison

Merron Chorny, Assistant Professor of English Education, U of Alberta, Calgary

Richard Corbin, President, NCTE; Chair, Department of English, Hunter College High School, New York, New York

Muriel Crosby, First Vice President, NCTE; Assistant Superintendent for Educational Programs, Wilmington, Delaware

Leonard F. Dean, Chair, Department of English, U of Illinois, Urbana

Paul B. Diederich, Director of Research in English, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Marion Edman, Professor of Education, Detroit

Charles A. Ferguson, Director, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.

John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary, MLA; Professor of English, New York U

Winston Healy, Jr., Department of English, Punahou Academy, Honolulu, Hawaii

Richard Hoggart, Director, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, U of Birmingham, England

J. N. Hook, Professor of English, U of Illinois, Urbana

Francis A. J. Ianni, Acting Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Research, USOE, Washington, D. C.

Esmor Jones, Honorary Secretary, NATE; Department of English, Ashmead School, Reading, England

Lewis Leary, Professor of English, Columbia U, New York; Consultant in English, USOE

James A. MacNeill, Instructor in English Education, U of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon

Albert H. Marckwardt, Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton

Sybil Marshall, Lecturer in Primary Education, U of Sheffield, England

Henry C. Meckel, Professor of English and Education, San Jose State College, San Jose California

Joseph Mersand, Chair, Department of English, Jamaica High School, New York, New York

Harold M. Nason, Director of Education, Nova Scotia Department of Education, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Philip G. Penner, Associate Professor of English Education, U of British Columbia, Vancouver

John F. Povey, Professor of English, U of California at Los Angeles,

Randolph Quirk, Professor of English Language, U College, London, England

William T. Spouge, Assistant Secretary, NATE; Chair, Department of English, Mount Pleasant County Secondary School, York, England

Ralph C. Staiger, Executive Secretary, IRA; Professor of Education, U of Delaware, Newark

Ruth G. Strickland, Research Professor of Education, Indiana U, Bloomington

Denys Thompson, Editor, The Use of English; Vice Chair, NATE, Yeovil, England

Howard P. Vincent, Professor of English, Kent State U, Kent, Ohio

Frank Whitehead, Chair, NATE; Senior Lecturer in English and Education, U of Sheffield, Sheffield, England

Andrew Wilkinson, Lecturer in Education, U of Birmingham, Birmingham, England

Miriam E. Wilt, Professor of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Temple U, Philadelphia

Appendix J

The Arts of Language Conference

February 26-March 1, 1966
Nebraska Curriculum Development Center
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Director of the Conference

Paul A. Olson, Professor, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Participants

Composition Committee

Dudley Bailey, English Department, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Enola Borgh, U of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Sue Cromartie, English Curriculum Study Center, U of Georgia, Athens

Barbara Hartsig, California State College, Fullerton

Joe McVicker Hunt, Department of Psychology, U of Illinois, Urbana

Albert Kitzhaber, Chair, English Curriculum Study Center, Oregon U, Eugene

Dorothy Saunders, Third Grade Teacher, Brookmont School, Washington, D. C.

Carrie Stegall, Holliday, Texas

Nell Thompson, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Esther Westendorf, Curriculum Center, Wantagh Public Schools, Wantagh, New York

Language Committee

Robert L. Allen, Teachers College, Columbia, New York, New York

John Carroll, Department of Education, Harvard

Sheryl Davidson, Bedford Elementary School, Westport, Connecticut

G. Thomas Fairclough, Chair, Department of English, Midwestern U, Wichita Falls, Texas

Richard Hodges, School of Education, U of Chicago

Jack Kittell, U of Washington, College of Education, Seattle

Raven McDavid, English Department, U of Chicago

Laura O'Banion, Winnetka School System, Winnetka, Illinois

Edith Orris, Green Gables School, Palo Alto, California

Owen Thomas, English Department, Indiana U, Bloomington

Literature Committee

Miriam Bryan, Educational Testing Service, Princeton U, New Jersey

Stanley Felver, Chair, Department of English, Chico State College, Chico, California

Ned Hedges, English Department, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Doris Young Kuhn, Lafayette, Indiana

Bruce Mickleburgh, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Edith Patterson, Supervising Teacher for the Elementary Language Arts, Wilmington Public Schools, Delaware

Virginia Reid, Oakland School System, Oakland, California

Mark Taylor, School of Library Science, U of Southern California, Los Angeles

Eileen Tway, U of Chicago Laboratory School

Reading Committee

Dolores Durkin, Chicago

Jack Holmes, Department of Educational Psychology, U of California, Berkeley

Lowell Hovis, Ravenna Elementary School, Seattle

William Iverson, Stanford U, Stanford, California

Carl A. Lefevre, Wonder Lake, Illinois

Donald Rasmussen, Miquon School, Miquon, Pennsylvania

Robert Ruddell, Chair, Department of Education, U of California, Berkeley

Rose Sabaroff, Harvard U, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Sam Sebesta, Curriculum Center, U of Nebraska, Lincoln

Henry Sustakowski, State U College, Buffalo, New York

Kay Torrant, Newton Schools, Newton, Massachusetts

Priscilla Tyler, U of Illinois, Champaign

Rosemary Wilson, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Speech Committee

Audrianna Allen, Central Office, Seattle Public School System, Seattle

Kenneth Brown, Department of Speech Education, School of Speech, Northwestern U, Evanston, Illinois

William Buys, Chair, Western Michigan U, Kalamazoo

Pearl Faulk,Advisor of Elementary Speech, Board of Education Offices, Tulsa Public Schools, Oklahoma

Dorothy Higginbotham, Department of Speech, Southern Illinois U, Carbondale

Robert J. Kibler, Psychological Research Center, Southern Illinois U, Carbondale

Marcella Oberle, Department of Speech, Los Angeles State College, California

Ann Thurman, Advisor of Creative Drama, Evanston Public Schools, Evanston, Illinois

Representatives of the Professional Organizations who served as Observers at the Conference

Association of Departments of English
Janet Emig

Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board
Floyd Rinker

International Reading Association
Leo Fay

U. S. Office ofEducation
Eugene Slaughter
Sue Brett

Modern Language Association
John Fisher
Michael Shugrue

National Council of Teachers of English

Robert F. Hogan
Eldonna Evertts

Speech Association of America

According to the conference report, no officers from SAA were able to attend due to previous commitments.

Appendix K

The Dartmouth Seminar

The Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English August 20-September 16, 1966 Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire

Participants

David Abercrombie, Head, Phonetics Department, Edinburgh U

Anthony Lloyd Evan Adams, Head, English Department, Churchfields Comprehensive School, England

George Cameron Allen, Professor of Education, U of Sussex

J. Jeffery Auer, Chair and Professor, Department of Speech and Theatre, Indiana U

Douglas Barnes, Lecturer in Education, Leeds U

Wayne C. Booth, Dean of the College and George M. Pullman Professor of English, U of Chicago.

James Nimmo Britton, Reader in Education and Head of the English Department, U of London Institute of Education

Frederic G. Cassidy, Professor of English, U of Wisconsin

Merron Chorny, Assistant Professor of English Education, U of Calgary

Bernice Marks Christenson, Curriculum Supervisor, Elementary English, Los Angeles City Schools

Benjamin Demott, Professor of English and Chair of the English Department, Amherst College.

John Dixon, Senior Lecturer in English, Bretton Hall College of Education

Wallace W. Douglas, Professor of English and Education, Director of English Curriculum Study Center, Northwestern U

Arthur M. Eastman, Professor of English, U of Michigan

John Hurt Fisher, Executive Secretary, MLA, and Professor of English, New York U

Boris Ford, Dean of the School of Educational Studies, U of Sussex

W. Nelson Francis, Professor of Linguistics and English, Brown U

Alfred H. Grommon, Professor of Education and English, Stanford U

Denys W. Harding, Professor of Psychology, U of London

Barbara Hardy, Professor of English Language and Literature and Head of the Department, Royal Holloway College, U of London

David Holbrook, Author

Arthur E. Jensen, Professor of English, Dartmouth

Esmor A. R. Jones, Honorary Secretary, NATE, and Head of English Department, Ashmead School

Albert R. Kitzhaber, Professor of English, U of Oregon

Robert J. Lacampagne, Director of Special Projects and Achievement Awards, NCTE.

Albert L. Lavin, Supervisor of English, and Teacher of Advanced Placement English and Humanities, Tamalpais High School District

Evan Glyn Lewis, H.M. Staff Inspector, Department of Education and Science, London

Walter Loban, Associate Professor of Education, U of California at Berkeley

David D. Mackay, Nuffield Research Fellow, U College, London

Albert H. Marckwardt, Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton

James E. Miller, Jr., Professor of English, U of Chicago

James P. Moffett, Research Associate in English, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Herbert J. Muller, Distinguished Service Professor of English and Government, Indiana U

Charles Muscatine, Professor of English, U of California, Berkeley

Paul A. Olson, Professor of English, Nebraska U

Wayne A. O'Neil, Associate Professor of Education and Linguistics, Harvard

William Wallace Robson, Fellow of Lincoln College, U of Oxford

Connie Rosen, Lecturer in Education, Goldsmiths College, U of London

Harold Rosen, Lecturer in Education and the Teaching of English, U of London Institute of Education

John M. Sinclair, Professor of Modern English Language, The U of Birmingham

James R. Squire, Executive Secretary, NCTE, and Professor of English, U of Illinois

Barbara M. H. Strang, Professor of English Language and General Linguistics, U of Newcastle upon Tyne

Geoffry Summerfield, Lecturer in Education and English, U of York, and English Teacher, Park Grove Secondary Modern School

Denys H. Thompson, Editor, The Use of English

Frank Whitehead, Senior Lecturer in English, U of Sheffield Institute of Education

Reed Whittemore, Professor of English, Carleton College

Miriam E. Wilt, Professor of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Temple U

Consultants

Basil Bernard Bernstein, Reader in the Sociology of Education, U of London Institute of Education

Peter J. Caws, Chair, Department of Philosophy, Hunter College of the City U of New York

Richard Corbin, Chair, English Dept., Hunter College High School

Muriel Crosby, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Programs, Wilmington, Delaware

Eldonna L. Everetts, Associate Professor of Education, U of Illinois and Assistant Executive Secretary, NCTE

Joshua A. Fishman, Research Professor of Social Sciences, Yeshiva U

Robin S. Harris, Principal, Innis College and Professor of Higher Education, U of Toronto

Patrick D. Hazard, Chair, English Department, Beaver College

Robert F. Hogan, Associate Executive Secretary, NCTE

Frank McTeague, Head of English Department, Mimico High School, Toronto

John J. Marcatante, Chair of English Department, Astonia Junior High School, Queens

Susan Meyer Markle, Professor of Psychology, Bureau of Instructional Resources, U of Illinois, Chicago

Sybil Marshall, Lecturer in Primary Education, Institute of Education, U of Sheffield

Walter H. Miner, East High School, Cheyenne, Wyoming

Walter J. Ong, S.J., Professor English, Saint Louis U

Harley W. Parker, Head of Design, Royal Ontario Museum, U of Toronto

Henry Dan Piper, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Southern Illinois U

Alan C. Purves, Associate Examiner in the Humanities, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Dorothy O. Saunders, Brookmont Elementary School, Bethesda, Maryland

Michael F. Shugrue, Assistant Secretary for English, MLA

William Work, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America

Appendix L

NCTE Minnesota Seminar

The NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education
St. Paul, Minnesota
1972

This partial list of participants was developed from the articles on the conference in Research in the Teaching of English and materials available in the ERIC system.

Participants

Alan Purves

James Britton

Charles Cooper

Harry S. Broudy

James R. Squire

Julie M. Jensen

Richard Braddock

Robert Calfee

Appendix M

Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing

State University of New York at Buffalo
1975

The following partial list of participants was developed from the publication which resulted from the conference. A complete list of the conference participants was unavailable in the professional literature.

Participants

Loren S. Barritt

James Britton

Charles R. Cooper

Cynthia Courts

Gabriel M. Della-Piana

Janet Emig

Barry M. Kroll

Phillip Lopate

Donald M. Murray

Lee Odell

Walter T. Petty

John Schultz

Richard E. Young

Appendix N

The English Curriculum Under Fire Conference

University of Chicago
1978

Featured Speakers

George Hillocks, Jr., Departments of Education and English, U of Chicago

Wayne C. Booth, Professor of English, U of Chicago

James R. Squire, Senior Vice President, Ginn and Company

Bruno Bettelheim, Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Psychiatry, U of Chicago

E. D Hirsch, Jr., U of Virginia, Past Department Chair, and Past Director of Composition

James E. Miller, Jr., Professor, U of Chicago

Janet Emig, Professor, Rutgers

David Thorburn, Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Discussion Group Leaders

Marguerite Bougere

Majorie Farmer

Stephen N. Judy (Tchudi)

Michael Marsden

John C. Mellon

Lee Odell

Roy C. O'Donnell

Walter Petty

Joseph M. Williams

Larry Johannessen

Michael Smith

A complete list of those attending the conference is not available in the resulting publication.

Appendix O

CCTE Conference on Learning to Write

Ottawa, Canada
1979

The following partial list of participants was developed from information in two professional association publications resulting from this conference: Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition (CCTE, 1980), edited by Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle; and Learning to Write: First Language/Second Language (CCTE, 1983), edited by Aviva Freedman, Ian Pringle, and Janice Yalden. The list of participants includes only the names of those who published papers in these volumes. A complete list of the conference participants is unavailable in the professional literature.

Participants

James Britton

Carl Bereiter

Marlene Scardamalia

H. G. Widdowson

Donald H. Graves

Andrew Wilkinson

Daniel R. Kirby

Kenneth J. Kantor

Robert B. Kaplan

Patrick T. Kameen

Stephen P. Witte

Bruce Bennett

Nancy Martin

John Dixon

James R. Squire

W. Ross Winterrowd

Keith Johnson

Ann Raimes

Merron Chorny

Janet Emig

Sam Watson, jr.

H. A Gleason

Richard Young

Donald M. Murray

Ann E. Berthoff

Edward P. J. Corbett

Stephen L. Harris

Douglas R. Butturff

Nancy I. Sommers

Robert L. Root

Marilyn S. Sternglass

Susan Miller

Michael Clark

Richard W. Bailey

Richard T. Brengle

Edward L. Smith

Janice N. Hays

Aviva Freedman

Ian Pringle

Appendix P

Third International Conference on the Teaching of English

Sydney, Australia
August 1980

Officers of the International Steering Committee

Chair: Robert Donn Eagleson

Association Representatives

Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE)

Robert Donn Eagleson

Roslyn Arnold

Canadian Council of Teachers of English (CCTE)

Merron Chorny

Ian Pringle

National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE)

Anthony Adams

John Watts

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)

Robert Hogan

Jonathan Swift

Editor: James Britton

Partial List of Delegates

Mike Angelotti, (USA)

Roslyn Arnold (Aust)

Garth Boomer (Aust)

Jill Borthwick (Aust)

James Britton (UK)

Merron Chorny (Can)

Frances Christie (Aust)

John Dixon, J. (UK)

Robert Eagleson (Aust)

Ken Goodman (USA)

Yetta Goodman (USA)

Kay Gore (USA)

Donald Graves (USA)

Robert Hogan (USA)

Don Holdaway (Aust)

Barbara Kamler (Aust)

Geraldine LaRocque (USA)

James Moffett (USA)

Ian Pringle (Can)

Harold Rosen (UK)

Sheila Schwartz (USA)

Robert Shafer (USA)

Margaret Spencer(UK)

Leslie Stratta (UK)

Rosalind Strong (Aust)

Geoffrey Summerfield (UK)

Jonathan Swift (USA)

Nancy Thompson (USA)

Betty Wagner (USA)

R. D. Walshe (Aust)

Ken Watson (Aust)

A complete list of the more than 800 delegates to this conference may be found in English in the Eighties, edited by Robert D. Eagleson (1982) and published by the Australian Association for the Teaching of English.

APPENDIX Q

IFTE Seminar

The International Federation for the Teaching of English
Seminar on Language, Schooling, and Society
November 11-14, 1984
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Participants

Anthony Adams, Cambridge U, Cambridge, England

Peter Adams, Meningie Area School, Meningie, South Australia

Richard Adler, U of Montana, Missoula

Richard Bailey, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Jenifer Banks, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Allen Berger, U of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Deanne Bogdan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto

Garth Boomer, Curriculum Development Centre, Dickson, ACT, Australia

Jill Borthwick, U of Queensland, St. Lucia, Queensland, Australia

Robert Boynton, Boynton/Cook Publishers, Sharon, Connecticut

Roger Bresnahan, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Syd Butler, U of British Columbia, Vancouver

Brian Cambourne, U of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia

Merron Chorny, U of Calgary, Alberta

L. Jane Christensen, NCTE, Urbana, Illinois

Frances Christie, Deaken U, Victoria, Australia

Mary Louise Chubb, Souderton Area High School., Perkasis, Pennsylvania

Patricia Cianciolo, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Richard Coe, Simon Fraser U, Burnaby, British Columbia

John Collerson, MacArthur Institute of Higher Education, New South Wales, Australia

Richard Corballis, U of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

Patrick L. Courts, State U College, Fredonia, New York

Harvey Daniels, National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois

Francine Danis, Our Lady of the Lake U, San Antonio

Pat D'Arcy, Malmesbury, Wiltshire, England

D. F. Davis, Monash U, Clayton, Victoria, Australia

James Davis, Grant Wood Education Agency, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Patrick X. Dias, McGill U, Montreal, Quebec

David Dillon, U of Alberta, Edmonton

Collette B. Dilworth, Eastern Carolina U, Greenville

John Dinan, Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant

John Dixon, London, England

Janice Dressel, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Charles Duke, Utah State U, Logan

David England, Louisiana State U, Baton Rouge

Edward Fagan, Pennsylvania State U, State College, Pennsylvania

Sheila Fitzgerald, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Thomas Franke, Lansing Community College, Michigan

Peter Fries, Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant

Donald Gallehr, George Mason U, Fairfax, Virginia

Richard Gebhardt, Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio

Heather Goodenough, South Australian College of Advanced Education,

Warwick Goodenough, South Australian College of Advanced Education,

Kenneth Goodman, U of Arizona, Tucson

Yetta Goodman, U of Arizona, Tucson,

Elizabeth Gordon, U of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

James Gray, U of California, Berkeley

Claudia Haines, Carleton U, Ottawa, Ontario

Sharon Hamilton-Wieler, U of London, England

Jean Handscombe, Board of Education, Borough of York, Ontario

Richard Handscombe, York U, Toronto, Ontario

John Harker, U of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia

Mary K. Healy, U of California, Berkeley

John Hutchins, Australian Association for the Teaching of English

Helen Jackman, New Zealand

Angela Jaggar, New York U, New York

Julie Jensen, U of Texas, Austin

Fred Johnson, Papanui High School, Christchurch, New Zealand

Nancy Johnson, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Charlotte Jones, St. Mary's College, Raleigh, North Carolina

Barbara Kamler, Reverina College of Advanced Education, New South Wales, Australia

Kenneth Kantor, U of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

Betsy B. Kaufman, Queens College, Flushing, New York

Julie Kniskern, Glenwood School, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Nancy Lester, The Write Company, New York, New York

Jay B. Ludwig, Michigan State U, East Lansing

William Lutz, Rutgers U, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Ken Macrorie, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Mary Maguire, McGill U, Montreal, Quebec

Lucinda Martin, Maple Valley High School, Vermontville, Michigan

Nancy Martin, London, England

John Maxwell, NCTE Executive Secretary

John Mayher, New York U, New York, New York

Scott McNabb, Grand Rapids Junior College, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Frank McTeague, Board of Education, Borough of York, Ontario

Joseph O. Milner, Wake Forest U, Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Diana Mitchell, J. W. Sexton HS, Lansing, Michigan

James Moffett, Mariposa, California

Judith Newman, Halifax, Nova Scotia

James Ney, Arizona State U, Tempe

John E. Oster, U of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

Margaret Parish, U of North Carolina at Wilmington, North Carolina

Robert P. Parker, Jr., Rutgers U, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Robert Pattison, Long Island U, Southampton, New York

Helen Poole, Nutley High School, Nutley, New Jersey

Charmaine Pountney, Auckland Girls Grammar School, Auckland, New Zealand

Gordon Pradl, New York U, New York, New York

Ian Pringle, Carleton U, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Robert Probst, Georgia State U, Atlanta

Elody Rathgen, Christchurch Girls HS, Christchurch, New Zealand

Jay Robinson, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Harold Rosen, U of London, England

Lois Rosen, U of Michigan, Flint,

Louise Rosenblatt, Emeritus, New York U

Ronald Santor, California State U, Sacramento

Faith Schullstrom, Guilderland, New York, Public Schools

Robert Shafer, Arizona State U, Tempe

Derrick Sharp, Uplands, Swansea, Wales

Diane Shugert, Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Connecticut

John Simmons, Florida State U, Tallahassee

Robert Small, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia

Mark Smith, Northern Michigan U, Marquette

Vernon Smith, Indiana U, Bloomington

Sydney Smyth, Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh, Scotland

James R. Squire, Ginn and Company, Boston, Massachusetts

Robert Squires, Oneonta High School, Oneonta, New York

James Stalker, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Susan Steffel, Maple Valley High School, Vermontville, Michigan

Peter Stillman, Boynton/Cook Publishers, Deansboro, New York

Rosalind Strong, Intensive Language and Reception Centre, New South Wales,

William Strong, College of Education, Utah State U, Logan, Utah

Wendy Sutton, U of British Columbia, Vancouver

Jonathan Swift, Stevenson HS, Livonia, Michigan

Betty Swiggett, Hampton City Schools, Hampton, Virginia

Stephen Tchudi, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Susan J. Tchudi, Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant

Sharon Thomas, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Nancy Thompson, U of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

William Warden, U of Toronto Schools, Ontario

Kenneth Watson, U of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

Ken Weir, North Staffordshire Polytechnic, Stoke-on-Trent, England

Natalie White, Garland, Texas

James Wilsford, Orange School District 5, Orangeburg, South Carolina

Marilyn Wilson, Michigan State U, East Lansing

Stuart Wilson, J. W. Sexton High School, Lansing, Michigan

Denny Wolfe, Old Dominion U, Norfolk, Virginia

Claire Woods, Education Department of South Australia, Stirling

Seymour Yesner, Brookline Public Schools, Brookline, Massachusetts

Driek Zirinsky, Boise State U, Idaho

Appendix R

1985 NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar

Chicago

This list is from The Dynamics of Language Learning, edited by James Squire, pgs. xiii and xiv.

Participants

Arthur N. Applebee, Associate Professor, School of Education, Stanford

Rita S. Brause, Professor of Education, Fordham U at Lincoln Center

Bertram C. Bruce, Division Scientist, BBN Laboratories, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Robert C. Calfee, Professor, School of Education, Stanford U

Johanna DeStefano, Professor of Education, Ohio State U

David K. Dickinson, Assistant Professor, Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study, Tufts U

David Dillon, Associate Professor, Elementary Education, U of Alberta

Dolores Durkin, Professor of Education, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Robert Dykstra, Professor of Education, U of Minnesota

Edmund Farrell, Professor of English Education, U of Texas at Austin

Bryant Fillion, Professor of Education, Fordham U at Lincoln Center

James Flood, Professor of Education, San Diego State U

Lawrence T. Frase, Technical Staff, AT &T Bell Laboratories, Summit, New Jersey

John T. Guthrie, Director, Center of Educational Research and Development, The U of Maryland

Robert Gundlach, Director of Writing Program, Northwestern U (Chair of Arrangements)

Jane Hansen, Associate Professor of Education, U of New Hampshire

Jerome C. Harste, Professor, Language Education, Indiana U

Roselmina Indrisano, Professor of Education, Boston U

Julie M. Jensen, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, U of Texas at Austin

Peter Johnston, Assistant Professor, Reading Department, State U of New York at Albany

Stephen B. Kucer, Assistant Professor of Education, U of Southern California

Judith A. Langer, Associate Professor, School of Education, Stanford

Geraldine E. LaRocque, Professor of English and U Liaison for Teacher Education, U of Northern Iowa

Diane Lapp, Professor of Education, San Diego State U (contributing author)

Miles Myers, Administrative Director, National Writing Program, U of California at Berkeley

P. David Pearson, Professor of Education, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Alan C. Purves, Professor of Education and Director of the Center for the Study of Literacy, State U of New York at Albany

Diane Lemonnier Schallert, Associate Professor of Education, U of Texas at Austin

M. Trika Smith-Burke, Professor of Education Psychology, New York U

James R. Squire, Senior Vice President (retired) Silver Burdett & Ginn (Director of the Seminar)

Robert J. Tierney, Associate Professor of Education, Ohio State U

Merlin C. Wittrock, Professor of Education, U of California at Los Angeles

Appendix S

English Coalition Conference

Wye Plantation, Aspen Institute, Maryland
July 6-24, 1987

The following abbreviations are used in identifying the participants' strand membership or representation:

E = Elementary S = Secondary C = College

Participants Representing NCTE

Gwendolyn Alexander, (S), Calvin Coolidge High School, Washington, D.C.

Carol Avery, (E), Nathan C. Schaeffer Elementary School, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Rosalinda Barrera, (E), New Mexico State U at Las Cruces

Rudine Sims Bishop, (E), Ohio State U

Craig Bowman, (S), Alameda Junior High School, Lakewood , Colorado

Nancy Broz, (S),William H. Allen III Middle School, Moorestown, NJ

Frederick R. Burton, (E), Barrington Elementary School, Columbus, OH

Donna Carrara, (E), Montclair Kimberly Academy, Montclair, NJ

Candy Carter, (S), Tahoe Truckee High School, Truckee, CA

Jane Christensen, (S), Deputy Executive Director, NCTE

Janet Emig (S), Rutgers

Jeffrey Golub (S) Shorecrest High School, Seattle

Janie Hydrick (E), MacArthur Elementary School, Mesa, Arizona

Julie M. Jensen, (E) U of Texas at Austin

Larry Johannessen, (S), Lyons Township High School, LaGrange, IL

Mary Krogness, (E), Shaker Heights Elementary School, Ohio

Richard Lloyd-Jones, (S), U of Iowa

Joe Lostracco (C), Austin Community College

Mary M. Kitagawa, (E), Richey Elementary School, Tucson, Arizona

Nancy McHugh, (S) Grant High School, VanNuys, California

Vera E. Milz,(E), Way Elementary School, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Diane T. Orchard (E), Lapeer Community Schools, Michigan

John C. Maxwell, (E), Executive Director, NCTE

George B. Shea, (S), Belleville West High School, Belleville, Illinois

Susan Stires (E), Boothbay Region Junior High School, Boothbay Harbor, Maine

Peggy Swoger, (S), Mountain Brook Junior High School, Birmingham, Alabama

William Teale, (E), U of Texas at San Antonio (NCTE)

Joseph I. Tsujimoto, (S), Punahou School, Honolulu, Hawaii

Brooke Workman, (S), West High School, Iowa City, Iowa

Representation Unknown

Betsy S. Hilbert (C) Miami Dade Community College, Forida

Participants Representing MLA

Paul B. Armstrong, (C), U of Oregon

Wayne Booth, (S), U of Chicago

John G. Bordie, (C), U of Texas at Austin

Katherine Cummings, (C), U of Washington

Richard Dunn, (C), U of Washington

Peter Elbow (C) U of Massachusetts at Amherst

Phyllis Franklin (C), Executive Director, MLA

Andrea Lunsford, (C), Ohio State U

Kathleen A. McCormick, (C), Carnegie-Mellon U

Nellie McKay, (C), U of Wisconsin

Robert Scholes (C), Brown U

Gregory L. Ulmer, (C), U of Florida (MLA)

Gary F. Waller, (C), Carnegie-Mellow U (MLA)

Jerry W. Ward, Jr., (C), Tougaloo College

Participants Representing CLA

Marie Buncombe, (C), Brooklyn College

Eleanor Q. Tignor, (C), LaGuardia Community College

Participants Representing ADE

Robert Denham (S), Director, ADE

Carole Edmonds (C), Kellogg Community College, Michigan

Alice Gasque (C) U of South Dakota

Charles Harris, (C), Illinois State U

Joan Hartman (C), College of Staten Island

Participants Representing CEA

Angela G. Dorenkamp, (C), Assumption College

John Joyce, (C), Nazareth College of Rochester

Participants Representing CCCC

Michael Halloran (C), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Jane E. Peterson (C), Richland Community College

Rosentene B. Purnell, (C), California State U

Participants Representing CEE

Bruce C. Appleby, (C), Southern Illinois U, Carbondale

Faith Schullstrom, (E), Guilderland Central School District, New York

Participants Representing CSSEDC

Tom Jones (S), Wyoming Valley West High School, Plymouth, Pennsylvania

Appendix T

Cumulative List of Conference Participants

This appendix is a cumulative list of the delegates, participants, and consultants attending the major national and international association and inter-association conferences identified throughout this study. The list makes it possible to identify which participants at any one conference also participated in additional conferences identified in this study.

David Abercrombie
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Anthony Lloyd Evan Adams
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Peter Adams
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard Adler
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William P. Albrecht
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Gwendolyn Alexander
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Audrianna Allen
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

George Cameron Allen
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Robert L. Allen
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

George L. Anderson
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

Michael Angelotti
Third International Conference, 1980

Arthur N. Applebee
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Bruce C. Appleby
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Jerome W. Archer
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Paul B. Armstrong
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Roslyn Arnold
Third International Conference, 1980

J. Jeffery Auer
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Carol Avery
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Dudley Bailey
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Richard W. Bailey
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Orville Baker

Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Ronald J. Baker
Boston International Conference, 1965

Jenifer Banks
IFTE Seminar, 1984

C. L. Barber
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Douglas Barnes
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Rosalinda Barrerra
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Thomas Barrett
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Loren S. Barritt
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Harry A. Becker
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Bruce Bennett
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Elizabeth Bennett
Boston International Conference, 1965

Carl Bereiter
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Allen Berger
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Morton Berman
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Basil Bernard Bernstein

Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Ann E. Berthoff
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Dorothy Bethurum
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Bruno Bettelheim
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Rudine Sims Bishop
English Coalition Conference, 1987

R. Darrell Bock
Research Development Seminar,1963

Max Bogart
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Deanne Bogdan
IFTE Seminar, 1984

S. N. Bogorad
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Garth Boomer
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Third International Conference, 1980

Wayne Booth
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Dartmouth Conference, 1966
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John G. Bordie
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Enola Borgh
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Jill

Fre

Ma

Cra

Rob

Ric

Rita

Ricl

Rog

Sue

Jam

How

Jill Borthwick
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Fredson Bowers
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Marguerite Bougere
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Craig Bowman
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Robert Boynton
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard Braddock
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Rita S. Brause
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Richard T. Brengle
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Roger Bresnahan
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Sue M. Brett
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

James Nimmo Britton
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980

Howard O. Brogan

Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Harry S. Broudy
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Kenneth Brown
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

William H. Brown
Boston International Conference, 1965

John A. Brownell
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Nancy Broz
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Bertram C. Bruce
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Miriam Bryan
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marie Buncombe
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Alvina Treut Burrows
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Dwight L. Burton
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Frederick R. Burton
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Syd Butler
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Douglas R. Butturff

CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

William Buys
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Earl W. Buxton
Boston International Conference, 1965

Robert C. Calfee
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Brian Cambourne
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Donna Carrara
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John B. Carroll
Woods Hole Conference, 1959
Research Development Seminar,1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Candy Carter
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Frederic G. Cassidy
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Peter J. Caws
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

William Charvat
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Naomi Chase
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Merron Chorny
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

L. Jane Christensen
IFTE Seminar, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Bernice Marks Christenson
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Francis Christie
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Third International Conference, 1980

Sister Mary Chrysostom
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Mary Louise Chubb
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Patricia Cianciolo
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John Williams Clark
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Michael Clark
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

C. L. Cline
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Theodore Clymer
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Richard Coe
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Hennig Cohen
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

John Collerson
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Carvel Collins
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Charles R. Cooper
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Richard Corballis
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Edward P. J. Corbett
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Jonathan Corbin
Boston International Conference, 1965

Richard Corbin
International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

William Cornog
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Russell Cosper
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Cynthia Courts
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Patrick L. Courts
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Sue Cromartie

Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Muriel Crosby
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Katherine Cummings
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sherwood Cummings
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Harvey Daniels
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Francine Danis
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Pat D'Arcy
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Sheryl Davidson
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

D. F. Davis
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James Davis
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Leonard F. Dean
Boston International Conference, 1965

G. Bruce Dearing
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

John DeBoer
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Gabriel M. Della-Piana
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Benjamin DeMott
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Robert Denham
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Richard A. Dershimer
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Johanna DeStefano
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Thomas Devine
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Patrick X. Dias
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Hugh Dick
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

David K. Dickinson
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Paul B. Diederich
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Research Development Seminar,1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

John S. Diekhoff
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

David Dillon
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Collette B. Dilworth
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John Dinan
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John Dixon
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Angela G. Dorenkamp
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Wallace W. Douglas
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Janice Dressel
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Paul L. Dressel
Research Development Seminar,1963

Charles Duke
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard Dunn
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Stephen A. Dunning
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Dolores Durkin
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Donald Durrell
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Karl W. Dykema
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert Dykstra
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Robert D. Eagleson
Third International Conference, 1980

Margaret J. Early
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Arthur M. Eastman
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Walter Eddington
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Marion Edman
Boston International Conference, 1965

Carole Edmonds
English Coalition Conference, 1987

William Ekstrom
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Peter Elbow
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Janet Emig
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
English Coalition Conference, 1987

David England
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William H. Evans
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Eldonna L. Everetts
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Edward Fagan
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William Fagan
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

G. Thomas Fairclough
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marjorie Farmer
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Edmund Farrell
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Pearl Faulk
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Claude Faulkner
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Leo Fay
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Henry R. Fea
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Stanley Felver
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Charles A. Ferguson
Boston International Conference, 1965

Bryant Fillion

NCRE Seminar, 1985

Hardy R. Finch
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Morris Finder
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jeremy D. Finn
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

John Hurt Fisher
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Research Development Seminar,1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Joshua A. Fishman
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Sheila Fitzgerald
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John C. Flanagan
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

James Flood
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Richard Fogle
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert L. Foose
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Boris Ford
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

George H. Ford
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Nick Aaron Ford
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Garlie Forehand
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

W. Nelson Francis
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Research Development Seminar,1963
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Thomas Franke
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Phyllis Franklin
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Lawrence T. Frase
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Norman Frederiksen
Research Development Seminar,1963

Aviva Freedman
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Gerhard Friedrich
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Peter Fries
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Ann Funk
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Edna Furness
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

N. L. Gage
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Donald Gallehr
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Alice Gasque
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Richard Gebhardt
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John Gerrietts
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

John C. Gerber
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Walker Gibson
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Research Development Seminar,1963

H. A. Gleason
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Hugh M. Gloster
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Maxwell H. Goldberg
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Jeffrey Golub
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Heather Goodenough
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Warwick Goodenough
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kenneth S. Goodman
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Yetta Goodman
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Edward J. Gordon
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Research Development Seminar, 1963

Elizabeth Gordon
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kay Gore
Third International Conference, 1980

Lillian L. Gore
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Robert M. Gorrell
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Elizabeth Graf
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Donald Graves
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980

Michael F. Graves
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

James Gray
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James R. Green
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Lennox Grey,
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Patrick J. Groff
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Alfred H. Grommon
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Doris Gunderson
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Robert Gundlach
NCRE Seminar, 1985

M. Agnella Gunn
Boston International Conference, 1965

John T. Guthrie
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Frederick L. Gwynn
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Clarence W. Hach
Research Development Seminar,1963

Jean Hagstrum
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Claudia Haines
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Michael Halloran
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sharon Hamilton-Wieler
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Jean Handscombe
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard Handscombe

IFTE Seminar, 1984

Paul R. Hanna
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jane Hansen
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Gunnar Hansson
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Denys W. Harding
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Barbara Hardy
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

John Harker
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Bruce Harkness
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Brice Harris
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Charles Harris
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Chester W. Harris
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Robin S. Harris
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Stephen L. Harris
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Theodore L. Harris
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jerome C. Harste

NCRE Seminar, 1985

Joan Hartman
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Barbara Hartsig
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Oscar M. Haugh
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Janice N. Hays
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Patrick D. Hazard
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Mary K. Healy
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Winston Healy, Jr.
Boston International Conference, 1965

Ned Hedges
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert Heilman
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

King Hendricks
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

George H. Henry
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Dorothy Higginbotham
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Betsy S. Hilbert
English Coalition Conference, 1987

George Hillocks, Jr.
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

E. D. Hirsch, Jr.
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Richard Hodges
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

James Hoetker
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Robert F. Hogan
Boston International Conference, 1965
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
Third International Conference, 1980

Richard Hoggart
Boston International Conference, 1965

David Holbrook
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Don Holdaway
Third International Conference, 1980

Jack A. Holmes
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

J. N. Hook
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Boston International Conference, 1965

Thomas Horn
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

William E. Hoth
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

John Hove
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Lowell Hovis
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marie Hughes
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Joe McVicker Hunt
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

William B. Hunter
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

John Hutchins
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Helen Huus
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Janie Hydrick
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Francis A. J. Ianni
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Boston International Conference, 1965

Roselmina Indrisano
NCRE Seminar, 1985

William Iverson
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Helen Jackman
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Angela Jaggar
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William A. Jenkins
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Arthur E. Jensen
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Julie Jensen
Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCRE Seminar, 1985
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Arno Jewett
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Larry Johannessen
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Fred Johnson
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Keith Johnson
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Kenneth Johnson
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Nancy Johnson
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Peter Johnston
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Charlotte Jones
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Esmor A. R. Jones
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Tom Jones
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John E. Jordan
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

John Joyce
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Patrick T. Kameen
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Barbara Kamler
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Third International Conference, 1980

Kenneth Kantor
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Robert B. Kaplan
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Betsy B. Kaufman
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Alan Kay
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Stanley Kegler
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Robert J. Kibler
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Martha King
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

James L. Kinneavy
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Daniel R. Kirby
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Mary M. Kitagawa
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Jack Kittell
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Albert R. Kitzhaber
Research Development Seminar,1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Julie Kniskern
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Albert C. Koob
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Silvy Kraus
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Mary Krogness
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Barry M. Kroll
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Stephen B. Kucer
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Doris Young Kuhn
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert J. Lacampagne
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Elliott Landau
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Judith A. Langer
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Diane Lapp
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Geraldine E. LaRocque
Third International Conference, 1980
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Albert L. Lavin
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Arnold Lazarus
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Lewis Leary
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

Carl A. Lefevre
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Nancy Lester
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Evan Glyn Lewis
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Richard Lloyd-Jones
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Walter Loban
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Phillip Lopate
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Joe Lostracco
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Jay B. Ludwig
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Andrea Lunsford
English Coalition Conference, 1987

William Lutz
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Walter H. MacGinitie
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Maynard Mack
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

David D. Mackay
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Helen K. Mackintosh
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

James A. MacNeill
Boston International Conference, 1965

Ken Macrorie
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Mary Maguire
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Mary H. Mahar
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

John J. Marcatante
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Albert H. Marckwardt
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Michael Marsden
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Susan Meyer Markle
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Sybil Marshall
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Harold C. Martin
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Research Development Seminar,1963

Lucinda Martin
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Nancy Martin
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John Maxwell
IFTE Seminar, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John Mayher
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William McColly
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Bernard J. McCormick
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Kathleen A. McCormick
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Raven McDavid
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Elizabeth A. McDonald
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Agnes R. McElwee
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Nancy McHugh
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Nellie McKay
English Coalition Conference, 1987

W. J. McKeachie
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

John McKiernan
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

James McMillan
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Scott McNabb
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Maurice McNamee
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Frank McTeague
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Henry C. Meckel
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

John C. Mellon
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

John L. Melton
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Joseph Mersand
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Boston International Conference, 1965

Bruce Mickleburgh
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

James E. Miller, Jr.
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Susan Miller
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Joseph O. Milner
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Vera E. Milz
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Walter H. Miner
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Diana Mitchell
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Harold E. Mitzel
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

James P. Moffett
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Tim E. Moreland, Jr.
Boston International Conference, 1965

Herbert J. Muller
Dartmouth Seminar Participant

Charles Murphy
Allerton Park Conference

Donald M. Murray
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Charles Muscatine
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Miles Myers
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Harold M. Nason
Boston International Conference, 1965

Chester L. Neudling
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Judith Newman
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James Ney
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Laura O'Banion
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marcella Oberle
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Lee Odell
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Norine Odland
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Roy C. O'Donnell
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

J. D. A. Ogilvy
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Kenneth Oliver
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Paul A. Olson
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Wayne A. O'Neil
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Walter J. Ong
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Diane T. Orchard
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Edith Orris
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

John E. Oster
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Margaret Parish
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Harley W. Parker
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Robert P. Parker, Jr.

IFTE Seminar, 1984

William R. Parker
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Edith Patterson
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert Pattison
IFTE Seminar, 1984

P. David Pearson
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Edwin A. Peel
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Philip G. Penner
Boston International Conference, 1965

Jane E. Peterson
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Walter Petty
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Eugene Piché
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Henry Dan Piper
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Thomas Clark Pollock,
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Helen Poole
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Collice Portnoff

Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Leo J. Postman
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Neil Postman
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Charmaine Pountney
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John F. Povey
Boston International Conference, 1965

Gordon Pradl
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Ian Pringle
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Robert Probst
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Rosentene B. Purnell
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Alan C. Purves
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Randolph Quirk
Boston International Conference, 1965

Ann Raimes
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Donald Rasmussen
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Elody Rathgen
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Charles A. Ray
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

David Reed
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Virginia Reid
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Mary Regan
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Walter R. Reitman
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Warner Rice
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Townsend Rich
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Floyd Rinker
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Helen M. Robinson
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jay Robinson
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William Wallace Robson
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Robert W. Rogers
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Robert L. Root
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Connie Rosen
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Harold Rosen
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Lois Rosen
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Peter S. Rosenbaum
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Louise Rosenblatt
Research Development Seminar,1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Robert Ruddell
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Elizabeth Rusk
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

David H. Russell
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Alvan Ryan
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Lawrence Ryan
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Rose Sabaroff
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

William M. Sale
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Henry W. Sams
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Ronald Santor
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Dorothy O. Saunders
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Marlene Scardamalia
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Diane Lemonnier Schallert
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Joseph Schiffman
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

W. B. Schneider
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert Scholes
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Mark Schorer
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Herbert Schueller
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Faith Schullstrom
IFTE Seminar, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John Schultz

Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Sheila Schwartz
Third International Conference, 1980

John R. Searles
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Donald A. Sears
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Sam Sebesta
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert Shafer
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Bernard Shapiro
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Derrick Sharp
IFTE Seminar, 1984

George B. Shea
English Coalition Conference, 1987

William D. Sheldon
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Francis Shoemaker
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Diane Shugert
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Michael F. Shugrue
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

John Simmons

IFTE Seminar, 1984

Rinaldo Simonini
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Herbert Simons
Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

John M. Sinclair
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Robert C. Slack
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Joseph Slater
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Eugene Slaughter
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert Small
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Marjorie Smiley
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Edward L. Smith
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Hallett D. Smith
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Henry Nash Smith
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Mark Smith
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Michael Smith
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Vernon Smith
IFTE Seminar, 1984

M. Trika Smith-Burke
NCRE Seminar, 1985

George Smock
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Sydney Smyth
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Nancy I. Sommers
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Margaret Spencer
Third International Conference, 1980

William T. Spouge
Boston International Conference, 1965

James R. Squire
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant,1966
Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Robert Squires
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Ralph C. Staiger
Boston International Conference, 1965

James Stalker
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Susan Steffel
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Carrie Stegall
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Erwin R. Steinberg
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Research Development Seminar,1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Marilyn S. Sternglass
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

A. Wilber Stevens
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Ruth S. Stickle
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Peter Stillman
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Susan Stires
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Edward Stone
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

George Winchester Stone, Jr.
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Barbara M. H. Strang
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Leslie Stratta
Third International Conference, 1980

Ruth G. Strickland
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

Ingrid Strom
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Rosalind Strong
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William Strong
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Geoffry Summerfield
Dartmouth Seminar Participant,1966
Third International Conference, 1980

Henry Sustakowski
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Denham Sutcliffe
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Wendy Sutton
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kester Svendsen
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jonathan Swift
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Betty Swiggett
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Peggy Swoger
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sister Mary Sylvia
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Hilda Taba
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Carol Talbert
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Ivan Taylor
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Mark Taylor
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Stephen Tchudi
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Susan J. Tchudi
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William Teale
English Coalition Conference, 1987

William Templeman
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Kathryn Territo
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Sharon Thomas
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Owen Thomas
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Denys H. Thompson
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Nancy Thompson
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Nell Thompson
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Joseph Thomson
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

David Thorburn
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Willard Thorp
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Ann Thurman
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert J. Tierney
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Eleanor Q. Tignor
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Kay Torrant
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Anthony Tovatt
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

F. G. Townsend
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Joseph I Tsujimoto
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Jaap Tuinman
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Arlin Turner

Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Donald R. Tuttle
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Eileen Tway
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Priscilla Tyler
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Gregory L. Ulmer
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Howard P. Vincent
Boston International Conference, 1965

Betty Jane Wagner
Third International Conference, 1980

Gary F. Waller
English Coalition Conference, 1987

R. D. Walshe
Third International Conference, 1980

Jerry W. Ward, Jr.
English Coalition Conference, 1987

William S. Ward
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

William Warden
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kenneth Watson
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Sam Watson, Jr.
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

John Watts
Third International Conference, 1980

Ken Weir
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Esther Westendorf
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Helen C. White
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Natalie White
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Frank Whitehead
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

Reed Whittemore
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

H. G. Widdowson
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Autrey Nell Wiley
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Andrew Wilkinson
Boston International Conference, 1965
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Cecil Williams
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Hazel Browne Williams
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Joseph M. Williams
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Sloan Williams
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

James Wilsford
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James R. Wilson
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Marilyn Wilson
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Rosemary Wilson
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Stuart Wilson
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Miriam E. Wilt
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Participant, 1966

W. Ross Winterowd
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Stephen P. Witte
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Merlin C. Wittrock
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Denny Wolfe
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Bernice Wolfson
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Claire Woods
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James A. Work

Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

William Work
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Brooke Workman
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Austin Wright
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert L. Wright
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Seymour Yesner
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard E. Young
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Frank J. Zidonis
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Driek Zirinsky
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Appendix U

Selected Professional Association Leaders

This appendix includes parenthetical identification of school, college, university, or other employment affiliation of the person named as it was presented in the professional journals or other professional association literature utilized for this study. Also included are listings of the person's involvement with particular professional associations, such as professional association offices or leadership positions, journal editorships, or participation in the national conferences or the national and international inter-association conferences identified throughout this study. The dates listed are those available in the professional literature which pertains to the data of this study. The purpose of this appendix is to provide additional information about the professional association leaders who participated in the national, international, and inter-association conferences identified in this study, as well as those who have played significant leadership roles in the professional associations since their beginnings. The list is selective, rather than comprehensive, and is intended as a source of information for others who wish to pursue historical research on the work of the professional associations or their leaders.

David Abercrombie (Head of the Phonetics Department, U of Edinburgh, 1966)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Anthony Lloyd Evan Adams (Head of the English Department, Churchfields Comprehensive School, Birmingham, England, 1966; Cambridge U, Cambridge, England, 1984)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NATE Association Representative, International Steering Committee, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Peter Adams (Meningie Area School, Meningie, South Australia, 1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard Adler (U of Montana, Missoula, Montana,1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William P. Albrecht (Professor, U of Kansas)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Gwendolyn Alexander (Calvin Coolidge High School, Washington, D.C., 1987)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Audrianna Allen (Central Office, Seattle Public School System, Seattle, Washington, 1966)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Charles Allen (Baltimore City Public Schools)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, Ex officio, CSSEDC Representative, 1986

George Cameron Allen (Professor of Education, U of Sussex, England; Her Majesty's Staff Inspector for English, Department of Education and Science, London, England)
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Harold B. Allen (Professor, U of Minnesota)
NCTE President, 1960-61
NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1969
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1973

Robert L. Allen (Teachers College, Columbia U, New York, New York)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

George L. Anderson
MLA Associate Executive Secretary, 1965
Associate Professor of English, New York U, 1965
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

Michael Angelotti (College of Education, U of Oklahoma)
Third International Conference, 1980
CEE Executive Committee Recording Secretary, 1988

Arthur N. Applebee (Associate Professor, School of Education, Stanford U, 1985; Professor, School of Education, U of New York at Albany)
Associate Director of ERIC/RCS at NCTE, 1979
Author of Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History (1974)
Author of The Child's Concept of Story: Ages Two to Seventeen
Author of Writing in the Secondary School: English and the Content Areas
NCTE Commission on the History of the Council
Co-author of The Writing Report Card: Writing Achievements in American Schools (1986)
Co-Author of How Writing Shapes Thinking (1987)
Co-editor of NCTE journal, Research in the Teaching of English
President, National Conference on Research in English

Bruce C. Appleby (Professor, Southern Illinois U)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Jerome W. Archer (Professor, Marquette U; Professor, Arizona State U, 1963)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Paul B. Armstrong (U of Oregon)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Roslyn Arnold
Conference Director, Third International Conference, 1980
AATE Association Representative, International Steering Committee, 1980
Visiting Professor, Department of English, Michigan State U, East Lansing, 1991

J. Jeffery Auer (Chair and Professor, Department of Speech and Theater, Indiana U)
Editor of Speech Monographs
President, SAA
Author of Introduction to Research in Speech
Author of Psychology of Communication
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Carol S. Avery (Classroom Teacher, Schaeffer Elementary School, Lancaster, Pennsylvania)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Dudley Bailey (Professor, English Department, U of Nebraska, Lincoln)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Chair, CCCC, 1968

Richard W. Bailey (U of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1979, 1984)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Orville Baker (Professor, Northern Illinois U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Ronald J. Baker (Head, Department of English, Simon Frazer U, Vancouver, British Columbia)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Jenifer Banks (Michigan State U, East Lansing, Michigan,1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

C. L. Barber (Professor, Indiana U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Douglas Barnes (Lecturer in Education, Leeds U, 1966)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Chair of NATE, 1967-68

Rosalinda Barrera (New Mexico State U at Las Cruces)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Thomas C. Barrett (U of Wisconsin)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

Loren S. Barritt (Professor of Education, U of Michigan)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

James D. Barry (Loyola U, Chicago)
Chair, CCCC, 1973

David Bartholomae (U of Pittsburgh)
1981 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "The Study of Error" (College Composition and Communication, February 1979)
Co-Chair, NSSE Committee on the Teaching of Writing, 1986
Chair, CCCC, 1988

Thomas L. Barton
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

Richard Beach (U of Minnesota)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1985

Richard S. Beal (Boston U)
Chair, CCCC, 1965

Harry A. Becker (Norwalk, Connecticut Public Schools)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Bruce Bennett (U of Western Australia, Perth)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Elizabeth Bennett (Berkeley High School, Berkeley, California)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Carl Bereiter (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Canada)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Allen Berger (U of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Morton Berman (Boston U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Basil Bernard Bernstein (Reader in the Sociology of Education, U of London Institute of Education)
Author of Class, Codes & Control, 1971
Dartmouth Seminar consultant, 1966

Ann E. Berthoff
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Dorothy Bethurum (Professor, Connecticut College for Women, 1958)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Bruno Bettelheim
Author of The Uses of Enchantment
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Rudine Sims Bishop (Professor, Ohio State U, Columbus)
Author of Substance and Shadow (1982)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Bill Bissell (Harris Elementary School, Las Vegas)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Patricia Bizzell (English Department, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts)
Editorial Board, College Composition and Communication

Nathan S. Blount (U of Wisconsin)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

R. Darrell Bock (Associate Professor of Psychology)
Research Development Seminar, 1963

Max Bogart (New Jersey Department of Education, 1962)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Deanne Bogdan (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario, Canada)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Author of "From the Inside Out: On First Teaching Women's Literature and Feminist Criticism," ADE Bulletin 94 (Winter 1989): 4-11.

S. N. Bogorad (U of Vermont)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Sandra Bone (Jonesboro, Arkansas)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Garth Boomer (Curriculum Development Centre, Dickson, Australia)
Third International Conference, 1980
Author of "The English Teacher, Research and Change: 1966-1980," in English in the Eighties (1982)
Author of Fair Dinkum Teaching and Learning
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Wayne C. Booth (Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, 1961-1962; Professor of English, U of Chicago, 1962-on)
Author of The Rhetoric of Fiction (1961)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1966
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference , 1978
Author of Critical Understanding (1979)
Author of "Rhetoric, Mere Rhetoric, and Reality: Or, My Basics Are More Basic Than Your Basics." The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? Ed. George Hillocks, Jr. (1982)
English Coalition Conference , 1987
Author of The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction (1988)
Author of Foreword for The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language (1989)

John G. Bordie (U of Texas at Austin)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Enola Borgh (U of Wisconsin, Milwaukee)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

John R. Bormuth (U of Chicago)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

Jill Borthwick (U of Queensland, St. Lucia, Queensland, Australia)
Third International Conference , 1980
IFTE Seminar , 1984

Morton Botel
IRA President, 1962-63

Fredson Bowers (U of Virginia)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Francis E. Bowman (Duke U)
Chair, CCCC, 1962

Marguerite Bougere
Group Discussion Leader, English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Craig Bowman (Alameda Junior High School, Lakewood, Colorado)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Francis E. Bowman (Duke U)
Editor, NCTE journal College Composition and Communication 1956-58

Robert Boynton (Boynton/Cook Publishers, Sharon, Connecticut)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Committee on Publishers and English Teachers, 1988-89

Dorothy K. Bracken
IRA President, 1965-66

Richard Braddock (Professor, U of Iowa)
Chair, NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
Co-author of Research in Written Composition, 1963
Group Leader, San Francisco Research Conference , 1963
Chair, CCCC, 1967
Editor of Research in the Teaching of English 1967-72
First winner of the Richard Braddock Award, in 1975, for "The Frequency and Placement of Topic Sentences in Expository Prose" (RTE Winter 1974). The award was named in his honor.

Rita S. Brause (Professor of Education, Fordham U at Lincoln Center)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Richard T. Brengle (U of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Roger Bresnahan (Michigan State U, East Lansing, Michigan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Sue M. Brett (U. S. Office of Education)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Author of "The Federal View of Behavioral Objectives," in On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English (1970)

James Nimmo Britton (Professor of Education, U of London Institute of Education)
Visiting Professor at the U of British Columbia, 1965

Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Visiting Professor at the U of Calgary, 1969
Author of Language and Learning, 1970
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1977
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference , 1980
Author of "English Teaching: Prospect and Retrospect" in English in the Eighties, 1982
RTE Editorial Board, 1988-89

Howard O. Brogan (U of Massachusetts)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert Brooke
1988 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Underlife and Writing Instruction" (CCC, May 1987)

Charlotte Brooks
NCTE President, 1976-77
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1985

Jean E. Brown (Saginaw Valley State U, Saginaw, Michigan)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986
NCTE/SLATE Steering Committee on Social and Political Concerns, 1990

Kenneth Brown (Department of Speech Education, School of Speech, Northwestern U)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Rexford Brown (Education Commission of the States)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1985

William H. Brown (Chair, Department of English, Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts)
Boston International Conference, 1965

John A. Brownell (Claremont Graduate School)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Nancy Broz (William H. Allen III Middle School, Moorestown, NJ)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Bertram C. Bruce
NCRE Seminar, 1985
RTE Editorial Board, 1988-89

Jerome Bruner (Harvard U)
Director, Woods Hole Conference, 1959
Author of The Process of Education (1960)
Questionnaire respondent for Janet Emig's research (1964) leading to The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders

Miriam Bryan (Educational Testing Service, Princeton U, Princeton, New Jersey)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marie Buncombe (Brooklyn College)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Alvina Treut Burrows (Professor of Elementary Education, New York U)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Chair, NCRE Committee on Research in Children's Writing
Results of the committee's work were published in Elementary English in 1960-61.
NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
Special Consultant in Elementary Education for the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, Schoer study of written composition (1962-63)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
NCTE Second Vice-President, 1966-67
Co-author of They All Want to Write, 1939, 1952, 1964, 1984
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1971

Forrest Burt (Texas A & M U)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certiification, 1986 (Ex officio, CCCC Representative)

Dwight L. Burton (Professor, Florida State U)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Author of Literature Study in the High Schools, 1959, 1964
Editor of English Journal, 1955-1964
Chair of CEE, 1966
NCTE Second Vice-President, 1965-1966
Program Chair for the 1966 NCTE Annual Convention (Houston)
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1970

Frederick R. Burton (Barringon Elementary School, Columbus, Ohio, 1987)
Principal, Granby Elementary School, Worthington, Ohio, 1990
English Coalition Conference, 1987
NCTE Commission on Curriculum
NCTE Elementary Programs and School Practices Committee
NCTE Language Arts Editorial Board

Syd Butler (U of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Douglas R. Butturff
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

William Buys (Chair, Western Michigan U, Kalamazoo)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Earl William Buxton (Professor of English Education, U of Alberta, Edmonton)
Boston International Conference, 1965
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
Consultant Reader of manuscript prior to publication and
Author of foreword to Janet Emig's The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders

Margueritte J. Caldwell
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

Robert C. Calfee (Professor of Education, Stanford U)
Member of Research in the Teaching of English Editorial Board, 1988-89

Brian Cambourne (U of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Linda Carey
1987 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision" (College Composition and Communication, February 1986)

G. Robert Carlsen
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1970

Donna Carrara (Montclair Kimberly Academy, Montclair, New Jersey)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John B. Carroll (Professor, Department of Education, Harvard U; Director, Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Harvard U)
Woods Hole Conference, 1959
Research Development Seminar, 1963
Group Leader, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Questionnaire respondent for Janet Emig's research leading to The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders, 1964
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Candy Carter (Tahoe Truckee High School, Truckee, California)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Member of NCTE Standing Committee on Affiliates, 1988-89

Frederic G. Cassidy (Professor of English, U of Wisconsin-Madison)
Boston International Conference, 1965
Editor of Dictionary of American Regional English
Author of A Method for Collecting Dialect
Author of Dictionary of Jamaican English
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1986

Peter J. Caws (Chair, Department of Philosophy, Hunter College, City U of New York)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Bonnie Chambers (Bowling Green State U)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Miriam T. Chaplin (Rutgers U)
Chair, CCCC, 1987

William Charvat (Ohio State U)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Naomi Chase (Professor, U of Minnesota)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Member of the CEE Conference Program Committee, 1965-66

Carol Chomsky
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1971

Merron Chorny (Assistant Professor of English Education, U of Calgary, 1966; Professor of English Education, U of Calgary)
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Chair, NCTE Standing Committee on the Formation of a Canadian Council of Teachers of English. Chorny's work led to the founding of CCTE in 1967.
Chair, International Steering Committee, 1972-79
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Author of Teacher as Researcher, 1988

L. Jane Christensen
NCTE Associate Executive Secretary
IFTE Seminar, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Bernice Marks Christenson (Curriculum Supervisor, Elementary English, Los Angeles City Schools)
Chair, NCTE Committee to Develop Dialect Recordings for Elementary Schools, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Francis Christie
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Author of "Language and Schooling," in Language, Schooling, and Society 1985

Sister Mary Chrysostom (Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Mary Louise Chubb (Souderton Area High School, Perkasis, Pennsylvania)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Patricia Cianciolo (Professor of Teacher Education, Michigan State U, East Lansing)
Co-editor of The Language Arts in the Elementary Schools: A Forum for Focus (NCTE 1973)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Chair, IRA Subcommittee on the IRA Children's Book Award, 1987-88
Author of Picture Books for Children
Author of Illustrations in Children's Books

John Williams Clark (U of Minnesota)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Michael Clark
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Marie M. Clay
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1979

Donald L. Cleland
IRA Executive Secretary-Treasurer, 1956-57
IRA President, 1970-71

C. L. Cline (U of Texas)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Ruth K. J. Cline
NCTE President, 1989-90

Theodore Clymer (U of Minnesota)
Group Leader, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
IRA President, 1964-65

Richard Coe (Simon Fraser U, Burnaby, British Columbia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Hennig Cohen (U of Pennsylvania)
Executive Secretary, American Studies Association
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

John Collerson (MacArthur Institute of Higher Education, New South Wales, Australia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Carvel Collins (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Robert J. Conners
1982 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse" (College Composition and Communication, December 1981)

Charles R. Cooper (State U of New York at Buffalo)
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research in English Education, 1972
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
Co-editor of Research on Composing: Points of Departure (NCTE, 1978)

Richard Corballis (U of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Edward P. J. Corbett (English Department, Ohio State U)
Chair, CCCC, 1971
Editor, College Composition and Communication, 1974-79
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1986

Jonathan Corbin
NCTE Staff Assistant, 1965
Boston International Conference, 1965

Richard Corbin (Chair, Department of English, Hunter College High School, New York, New York)
NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
NCTE President, 1964-65
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

James Corder
Winner of the 1976 Richard Braddock Award for "What I Learned in School" (College Composition and Communication, December 1975)

William Cornog (Superintendent, New Trier High School)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Russell Cosper (Purdue U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Cynthia Courts (State U College, Fredonia, New York)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Patrick L. Courts (State U College, Fredonia, New York)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Roy Cowden (U of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
Identified by Janet Emig as one of her own teachers of composition and one of those to whom she dedicated her NCTE Composing Processes book

Sue Cromartie (English Curriculum Study Center, U of Georgia, Athens)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Muriel Crosby (Assistant Superintendent for Educational Programs, Wilmington, Delaware)
Boston International Conference, 1965
NCTE President, 1965-66
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1969
NCTE Commission on the History of the Council

Katherine Cummings (U of Washington)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sherwood Cummings (U of South Dakota)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Frank D'Angelo (Arizona State U)
1977 Co-winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "The Search for Intelligible Structure in the Teaching of Composition," (College Composition and Communication, May 1976)
Chair, CCCC, 1980

Harvey Daniels (National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Francine Danis (Our Lady of the Lake U, San Antonio, Texas)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Pat D'Arcy (Malmesbury, Wiltshire, England)
Co-editor of What's Going On: Language/Learning Episodes in British and American Classrooms, Grades 4-13. (Boynton/Cook, 1982)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Sheryl Davidson (Bedford Elementary School, Westport, Connecticut)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

D. F. Davis (Monash U, Clayton, Victoria, Australia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James E. Davis (Professor and Chair, Department of English, Ohio U)
Chair, NCTE Standing Committee Against Censorship, 1989
NCTE Vice President, 1989-90
NCTE President Elect, 1990-91
NCTE President, 1991-92

James S. Davis (Grant Wood Education Agency, Cedar Rapids, Iowa)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Commission on Composition, 1988-91

Marianna W. Davis (Benedict College)
Chair, CCCC, 1976

Vivian I. Davis (Bishop College, 1978; Tarrant County Junior College, Ft. Worth, Texas, 1986)
Chair, CCCC, 1978
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Leonard F. Dean (Chair, Department of English, U of Illinois-Urbana)
Boston International Conference, 1965

G. Bruce Dearing (College of Arts and Sciences, U of Delaware)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

John DeBoer (Professor, U of Illinois)
NCTE President, 1941-42
Editor of Elementary English Review, 1942-1947
(Journal name changed in 1947.)
Editor of Elementary English, 1947-1961
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Gabriel M. Della-Piana (Professor of Educational Psychology, U of Utah)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Benjamin Demott (Professor and Chair, Department of English, Amherst College)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Robert Denham
Director, ADE
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Richard A. Dershimer (Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Johanna DeStefano (Professor, Ohio State U)
IRA/NCTE Committee on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction, 1979-82
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Patrick X. Dias (McGill U, Montreal, Quebec)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Hugh Dick (U of California)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

David K. Dickinson (Assistant Professor, Tufts U)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Paul B. Diederich (Director of Research in English, Educational Testing Service)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Research Development Seminar, 1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
Author of Measuring Growth in English (1974)

John S. Diekhoff (Western Reserve U, Cleveland, Ohio)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

David Dillon (Associate Professor, Elementary Education, U of Alberta)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCRE Seminar, 1985
Editor of Language Arts

Collette B. Dilworth, Jr. (Eastern Carolina U, Greenville, NC)

IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

John Dinan (Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John Dixon (Senior Lecturer in English, Bretton Hall College of Education, England)
Author of Growth through English
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Margaret Donaldson
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1983

Angela G. Dorenkamp (Assumption College)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Wallace W. Douglas (Professor of English and Education, Northwestern U; Director, Northwestern U Curriculum Study Center in English, 1966)
MLA English Materials Center Committee
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Chair, CCCC, 1969

Janice Dressel (Assistant Professor, Michigan State U, East Lansing; Assistant Professor, Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant, 1990)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Committee on Professional Writing Networks for Teachers and Supervisors, 1988-1990

Paul L. Dressel (Director, Office of Institutional Research Michigan State U)
Research Development Seminar, 1963

Charles Duke (Department of Secondary Education, Utah State U; Dean, College of Education and Human Services, Clarion U, Pennsylvania, 1990)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
CEE Executive Board and Committee
Chair, CEE Commission on Transition to Teaching
Chair, NCTE Standing Committee on Affiliates

Richard Dunn (U of Washington)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Stephen A. Dunning (Duke U, Durham, NC, 1962; Professor, U of Michigan, 1964)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
NCTE President, 1974-75

Dolores Durkin (Professor of Education, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Teachers College, Columbia U, 1963)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Donald Durrell (Boston U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Karl W. Dykema (Youngstown U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert Dykstra (Professor of Education, U of Minnesota)
NCTE Committee on Publications, 1971
President, National Conference on Research in English, 1985
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Anne Haas Dyson (U of Georgia, 1985; U of California, Berkeley, 1988)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1985
NCTE Committee on Composition, 1988

Robert Donn Eagleson (Associate Professor, U of Sydney, 1980)
Chair, International Steering Committee, 1980
President, AATE, 1976-80
Editor of English in the Eighties (AATE, 1982)

Margaret J. Early (Syracuse U, 1962)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
NCTE President, 1973-74
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1980
U of Florida, 1985
NSSE Board of Directors, 1985-86
NSSE Committee on the Teaching of Writing, 1985-86
IRA Subcommittee on Citations of Merit and Service Awards, 1987-88

Arthur M. Eastman (Professor of English, U of Michigan)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

Walter Eddington (New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Lisa Ede
1985 Co-Winner (with Andrea Lunsford) of the Richard Braddock Award for "Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy" (College Composition and Communication, May 1984)

Marion Edman (Professor of Education, Wayne State U, Detroit, MI)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Carole Edmonds (Kellogg Community College, Battle Creek, MI)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
ADE Francis Andrew March Award, 1988

Elliot W. Eisner (Professor, Stanford U)
NSSE Board of Directors, 1985-86

William Ekstrom (U of Louisville)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Peter Elbow (U of Massachusetts, Amherst)
Author of Writing with Power
Author of Writing Without Teachers (1973)
Author of Embracing Contraries (1986)
1986 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "The Shifting Relationships between Speech and Writing' (College Composition and Communication, October 1985)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Author of What Is English? (1990)

Roberts Emans
Co-editor of The Language Arts in the Elementary Schools: A Forum for Focus (NCTE 1973)

Janet Emig (Professor, Rutgers U)
ADE Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Author of The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (NCTE, 1971)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
Featured Speaker, English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Author of "The Tacit Tradition: The Inevitability of a Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Writing Research." Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle. (CCTE, 1980)
Author of "Writing as a Mode of Learning," College Composition and Communication 28:122-27
English Coalition Conference, 1987
NCTE President 1988-89

David England (Louisiana State U, Baton Rouge)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William H. Evans (U of Illinois)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Eldonna L. Everetts
NCTE Associate Executive Secretary, 1965-69
NCTE Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Edward Fagan (Pennsylvania State U)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

G. Thomas Fairclough (Chair, Department of English, Midwestern U, Wichita Falls, Texas)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marjorie N. Farmer
NCTE President, 1977-78
Discussion Group Leader, English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1981
Editor of Consensus and Dissent: Teaching English Past, Present, and Future (1986)

Edmund J. Farrell (Professor, U of California, Berkeley, 1965-66
Professor of English Education, U of Texas at Austin)
Member of the CEE Conference Program Committee, 1965-66
NCTE Deputy Executive Director, 1970-78
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1982
NCTE Standing Committee on Testing and Evaluation, 1988-91

Pearl Faulk (Elementary Speech Advisor, Board of Education Offices, Tulsa Public Schools, Oklahoma)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Claude Faulkner (U of Arkansas)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Leo C. Fay (Professor, Indiana U, Bloomington)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
IRA Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966
IRA President, 1968-69

Henry R. Fea (Professor, U of Washington)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Stanley Felver (Chair, Department of English, Chico State College, Chico, California)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Charles A. Ferguson (Director, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D. C.)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Bryant Fillion (Professor of Education, Fordham U at Lincoln Center)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Hardy R. Finch (Chair, English Department, Greenwich High School)
NCTE Executive Committee Secondary Section Representative, 1957-58
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
NCTE Second Vice President, 1959-60

Morris Finder (Professor, Western Washington State College)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

John Hurt Fisher (Professor of English, U of Tennessee; Professor of English, New York U, 1945-55, 1962-72; Professor of English, Duke U, 1955-60; Professor of English, Indiana U, 1960-62)
MLA Assistant Secretary, 1949-51
MLA Treasurer, 1952-55
MLA Executive Secretary, 1963-71
Editor, PMLA
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Research Development Seminar, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
MLA Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Initiated the MLA Newsletter
Initiated the MLA Abstracts
Co-author of The College Teaching of English

Joshua A. Fishman (U Research Professor of Social Sciences, Yeshiva U)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Sheila Fitzgerald (Professor of Teacher Education, Michigan State U, East Lansing)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE President 1985-86

John C. Flanagan (American Institute for Research, Pittsburgh)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

James Flood (Professor of Education, San Diego State U)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Linda Flower
1987 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision" (College Composition and Communication, February 1986)
1989 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning" (College Composition and Communication, May 1988)

Richard Fogle (Tulane U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert L. Foose (Westfield High School, Westfield, New Jersey)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Boris Ford (Dean, School of Educational Studies, U of Sussex)
First Chair of NATE
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

George H. Ford (U of Rochester)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Nick Aaron Ford (Morgan State College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Garlie Forehand (Carnegie Institute of Technology)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Group Leader, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

W. Nelson Francis (Professor of Linguistics and English, Brown U)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Chair, NCTE Commission on Language, 1962
Research Development Seminar, 1963
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Thomas Franke (Professor of English, Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Phyllis Franklin
MLA Executive Director
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Lawrence T. Frase (AT&T Bell Laboratories, Summit, New Jersey)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Norman Frederiksen (Director, Test Development Division, Educational Testing Service)
Research Development Seminar, 1963

Aviva Freedman
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Ronald E. Freeman (U of California, Los Angeles)
Chair, CCCC, 1970

Gerhard Friedrich (Orange State College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Peter H. Fries (Professor of English, Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Chair, NCTE Assembly on English as a Second Language, 1988
NCTE Commission on Reading, 1986-89

Toby Fulwiler (U of Vermont, Burlington)
NCTE Commission on Composition, 1988

Ann Funk (Pennsylvania State U, U Park)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Edna Furness (Nebraska State College, Kearney)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

N. L. Gage (Stanford U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Editor, Handbook of Research on Teaching, 1963

Donald Gallehr (Northern Virginia Writing Project, George Mason U, Fairfax, Virginia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Language Across the Curriculum Committee, 1988

Alice Gasque (U of South Dakota)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Paula J. Gaus (Ridgefield, Connecticut)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Richard C. Gebhardt (Professor, Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio, 1984; Bowling Green U, 1990)
1978 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Balancing Theory with Practice in the Training of Writing Teachers" (College Composition and Communication, May 1977)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Editor, College Composition and Communication, 1987-present

John Gerrietts (Professor, Loyola U, Chicago)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

John C. Gerber (Professor, U of Iowa)
NCTE President, 1954-55
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
ADE Francis Andrew March Award, 1984

Walker Gibson (Professor of English, New York U)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Research Development Seminar, 1963
U of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1971
NCTE Committee on Publications, 1971
NCTE President, 1972-73

Candida Gillis (Michigan State U)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

H. A Gleason
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Hugh M. Gloster (Hampton Institute)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Maxwell H. Goldberg (U of Massachusetts)
CEA Executive Director
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Jeffrey Golub (Classroom Teacher, Shorecrest High School, Seattle, Washington)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
NCTE Representative At Large, 1988-89

Heather Goodenough (South Australian College of Advanced Education)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Warwick Goodenough (South Australian College of Advanced Education)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John I. Goodlad (U of Washington)
NSSE Board of Directors, 1985-87

Kenneth S. Goodman (Professor, U of Arizona)
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1975
Third International Conference, 1980
IRA President, 1981-82
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Author of <u>What's Whole in Whole Language</u>
NCTE Elementary Section Committee, 1988-91

Yetta Goodman (Professor, U of Arizona)
NCTE President, 1978-79
Co-Chair, IRA/NCTE Committee on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction, 1979-82
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Commission on Reading, 1988-91

Edward J. Gordon (Director, Master of Arts in Teaching Program, Yale U)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Research Development Seminar, 1963

Elizabeth Gordon (U of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kay Gore
Third International Seminar, 1980

Lillian L. Gore
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Robert M. Gorrell (Professor, U of Nevada)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Chair, CCCC, 1964

Elizabeth Graf (Pittsburgh Board of Public Education)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Donald Graves (Professor, U of New Hampshire; Director, Writer Process Laboratory, U of New Hampshire)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Featured Speaker, Third International Conference, 1980
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1982
Author of Writing: Teachers and Children at Work
Author of A Researcher Learns to Write (1984)
NCTE Standing Committee on Research (and1989 liason to NCRE for this committee)

Donald Gray (Indiana U)
Editor of College English, 1978-85

James Gray (U of California, Berkeley)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William S. Gray
IRA President, 1955-56 (IRA's first president)

James R. Green (Indiana, Pennsylvania State College)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Jerome Green
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

Lennox Grey (Teachers College, Columbia U)
NCTE President, 1951-52
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Patrick J. Groff (Professor, School of Teacher Education, San Diego State U
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Alfred H. Grommon (Professor of Education and English, Stanford)
Vice Chair of CEE Executive Committee, 1965-66
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NCTE President, 1967-68
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1976

Doris V. Gunderson (USOE, 1971)
Associate Chair, NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

Robert Gundlach
NCRE Seminar, 1985

M. Agnella Gunn (Professor of Education, U of Connecticut)
Local Chair, Boston International Conference, 1965

John T. Guthrie (Director, Center of Education Research and Development, U of Maryland)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Frederick L. Gwynn (U of Virginia, 1955-60; Trinity College, Hartford, 1962)
Editor of College English 1955-1960
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Christina Haas
1989 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Rhetorical Reading Strategies and the Construction of Meaning" (CCC, May 1988)

Clarence W. Hach (Chair, English Department, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois)
Research Development Seminar, 1963

Jean Hagstrum (Professor, Northwestern U)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Claudia Haines (Carleton U, Ottawa, Ontario)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Maxine Hairston (U of Texas at Austin)
Chair, CCCC, 1985

Michael Halloran (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sharon Hamilton-Wieler (U of London, England)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Jean Handscombe (Board of Education, Borough of York, Ontario)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Richard Handscombe (York U, Toronto, Ontario, Canada)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Paul R. Hanna (Stanford U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jane Hansen (Associate Professor of Education, U of New Hampshire)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Denys W. Harding (Professor of Psychology, U of London)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Ulrich H. Hardt (Portland State U, Oregon)
Chair, NCTE Committee on Resolutions, 1985
Chair, IRA Committee on Resolutions, 1988

Barbara Hardy (Professor of English Language and Literature and Head of the Department, Royal Holloway College, U of London)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

John Harker (U of Victoria, British Columbia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Bruce Harkness (Southern Illinois U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Albert J. Harris
IRA President, 1957-58

Brice Harris
NCTE President, 1957-58
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Charles Harris (Illinois State U)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Chester W. Harris (Illinois State U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Joseph Harris
1990 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing" (College Composition and Communication, February 1989)

Robin S. Harris (Principal, Innis College, 1966; Professor of Higher Education, U of Toronto, 1966)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Stephen L. Harris
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Theodore L. Harris (U of Wisconsin)
Group Recorder, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
IRA President, 1971-72

Jerome C. Harste (Professor of Reading, Indiana U, Bloomington)
Co-Author of Language Stories & Literacy Lessons
NCRE Seminar, 1985
IRA Board of Directors, 1987-90
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1987 (co-winner)

Joan Hartman (College of Staten Island)
English Coalition Conference, 1987)

Barbara Hartsig (California State College, Fullerton, California)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

W. Wilbur Hatfield
NCTE Secretary-Treasurer
Editor of College English, 1939-55

Oscar M. Haugh (Professor, U of Kansas)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

John R. Hayes
1987 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision" (College Composition and Communication, February 1986)

Janice N. Hays
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Patrick D. Hazard (Chair, English Department, Beaver College)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Mary K. Healy
Co-editor of English Education
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Winston Healy, Jr. (Department of English, Punahou Academy, Honolulu, Hawaii)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Sandra Heartman (Littleton Public Schools, Colorado)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Shirley Brice Heath (Professor, Stanford)
Author of Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms (1983)
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1985

Ned Hedges (English Department, U of Nebraska, Lincoln)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert Heilman (Professor, U of Washington)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

King Hendricks (Professor, Utah State U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

George H. Henry (U of Delaware, Newark)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
CEE Program Planning Committee, 1964

Mary P. Hiatt
1979 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "The Feminine Style: Theory and Fact" (College Composition and Communication, October 1978)

Dorothy Higginbotham (Department of Speech, Southern Illinois U, Carbondale)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Betsy S. Hilbert (Miami Dade Community College)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

James L. Hill (Albany State College)
Chair, CCCC, 1982

George Hillocks, Jr. (Department of Education and English, U of Chicago)
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
Editor of English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are the Real Basics? (NCTE, 1982)
Author of "English Programs under Fire." The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are the Real Basics? (NCTE, 1982)
Author of Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching (1986)
Editorial Board, College Composition and Communication

Theodore Hipple (U of Tennessee)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certiification, Ex officio, CEE Representative, 1986

G. Melvin Hipps
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

E. D. Hirsch, Jr.
Author of Cultural Literacy
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
Author of "Some Principles of Composition from Grade School to Grad School." The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are the Real Basics? (NCTE, 1982)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Richard Hodges (School of Education, U of Chicago)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

James Hoetker (U of Illinois)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

Robert F. Hogan
NCTE Associate Executive Secretary
Boston International Conference, 1965
NCTE Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
NCTE Executive Secretary, 1968-1977

Third International Conference, 1980
NCTE Executive Director, 1977-1981
NCTE Executive Committee Award, 1980

Richard Hoggart (Director, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, U of Birmingham, England)
Boston International Conference, 1965

David Holbrook
Author of The Secret Places (1965)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Don Holdaway
Author of The Foundations of Literacy
Third International Conference, 1980

Alan M. Hollingsworth (Professor of English, Michigan State U)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

Jack A. Holmes (Department of Educational Psychology, U of California, Berkeley)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

J. N. Hook (Professor of English, U of Illinois-Urbana)
NCTE Executive Secretary, 1953-60
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Conference on Needed Research 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
CEE Program Planning Committee, 1963-64
Boston International Conference, 1965
NCTE Executive Committee Award, 1971

Thomas Horn (Chair, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, U of Texas, Austin)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

William E. Hoth (Chair, Department of Secondary English, Speech, and Foreign Languages Wayne State U, Detroit)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

John Hove (Professor, U of North Dakota)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Lowell Hovis (Ravenna Elementary School, Seattle, Washington)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Charlotte Huck (Professor, The Ohio State U, Columbus)
NCTE President, 1975-76
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1987

Marie Hughes (U of Arizona)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Joe McVicker Hunt (Department of Psychology, U of Illinois, Urbana)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

William B. Hunter (Professor, U of Idaho)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

John Hutchins (Education Department, South Australia)
Third International Conference, 1980
Treasurer, AATE, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Helen Huus (Professor, U of Pennsylvania, 1963; Professor, U of Missouri, Kansas City)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
IRA President 1969-70

Janie Hydrick (Classroom Teacher, MacArthur Elementary School, Mesa, Arizona)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Chair, NCTE Elementary Section Steering Committee, 1988-89
CEE Commission on Minority Educators and Minority Education
NCTE/NCATE Folio Reviewer

Francis A. J. Ianni (Acting Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Research, USOE)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Roselmina Indrisano (Professor, Boston U)
IRA/NCTE Committee on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction, 1979-82
IRA President 1986-87

William F. Irmscher (U of Washington)
Editor, College Composition and Communication 1965-73
Chair, CCCC, 1979
NCTE President, 1982-83

William Iverson (Professor, Stanford U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Helen Jackman (New Zealand)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Angela Jaggar (Professor, New York U)
IRA/NCTE Committee on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction, 1979-82
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Co-editor, Observing the Language Learner (IRA and NCTE, 1985)

Shirley Haley-James (Georgia State U)
Chair, NCTE Committee on Written Composition in the Elementary Schools, 1979
NCTE President

William A. Jenkins (U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
NCTE President, 1968-69
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1976

Arthur E. Jensen (Professor of English, Dartmouth U)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Julie Jensen (Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, U of Texas at Austin)
NCTE Minnesota Seminar on Research, 1972

IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCRE Seminar, 1985
Editor of Language Arts, 1976-83
NCTE Editorial Board
English Coalition Conference, 1987
NCTE President, 1987-88
Editor of Stories to Grow On: Demonstrations of Language Learning in K-8 Classrooms, 1989

Arno Jewett (USOE)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Larry Johannessen (Assistant Professor of English and Education, St. Xavier College, Illinois)
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Writing Program Coordinator, St. Xavier College, Illinois
NCTE Committee to Study Teacher-Peer Evaluation
Author of Designing and Sequencing Prewriting Activities

Fred Johnson (Papanui High School, Christchurch, New Zealand)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Keith Johnson (Centre for Applied Language Studies, U of Reading)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Nancy Johnson (Michigan State U, East Lansing)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Peter Johnston (Assistant Professor, Reading Department, State U of New York, Albany)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Charlotte Jones (St. Mary's College, Raleigh, North Carolina)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Esmor A. R. Jones (Head, Department of English, Ashmead School, Reading, England)
Honorary Secretary, NATE
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Tom Jones (Wyoming Valley West High School, Plymouth, Pennsylvania)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John E. Jordan (U of California)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

John Joyce (Nazareth College of Rochester)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Barbara Kamler (Reverina College of Advanced Education, New South Wales, Australia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Third International Conference, 1980

Patrick T. Kameen (U of Louisville)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Kenneth Kantor (U of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1979, 1984; Department of Curriculum & Instruction, National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois, 1988)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Chair, NCTE Committee on Research, 1985
CEE Executive Committee, 1987-1990

Robert B. Kaplan (U of Southern California)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Betsy B. Kaufman (Queens College, Flushing, New York)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Stanley B. Kegler (U of Minnesota)
Program Chair, Conference on English Education, held at the U of Illinois, April 2-4, 1964
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

Robert J. Kibler (Psychological Research Center, Southern Illinois U, Carbondale)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Martha L. King (Professor, Ohio State U)
Co-editor of The Language Arts in the Elementary School: A Forum for Focus (NCTE 1973)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1985

James L. Kinneavy (U of Texas at Austin)
Author of A Theory of Discourse (1971)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Daniel R. Kirby (U of Georgia)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Mary M. Kitagawa (Richey Elementary School. Tucson, Arizona)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Jack Kittell (U of Washington, College of Education, Seattle)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Albert R. Kitzhaber (Director, English Curriculum Study Center, Project English, U of Oregon, Eugene)
Research Development Seminar, 1963
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NCTE President

Julie Kniskern (Glenwood School, Winnipeg, Manitoba)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Albert C. Koob (National Catholic Education Association, Washington, D. C.)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Silvy Kraus (U of Oregon)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Janice V. Kristo (Hampden, Maine)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Mary Krogness (Shaker Heights Elementary School, Shaker Heights, Ohio)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Barry M. Kroll (Assistant Professor of English, Iowa State U)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Stephen B. Kucer (Assistant Professor of Education, U of Southern California)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Doris Young Kuhn (Lafayette, Indiana)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert J. Lacampagne
Director of Special Projects and Achievement Awards, NCTE
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Elliott Landau (U of Utah)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Judith A. Langer (State U of New York at Albany)
NCRE Seminar, 1985
Co-Author of How Writing Shapes Thinking, 1987
Co-editor, Research in the Teaching of English

Diane Lapp (Professor of Education, San Diego State U)
NCRE Seminar, 1985 (contributing author)

Geraldine E. LaRocque (Teachers College, Columbia U)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
Third International Conference, 1980
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Nancy Larrick
IRA President 1956-57

Richard L Larson (Herbert H. Lehman College-City U of New York)
Chair, CCCC, 1974
Chair, NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976
Editor, College Composition and Communication, 1980-86

Albert L. Lavin (Supervisor of English, and Teacher of Advanced Placement English and Humanities, Tamalpais High School District)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Arnold Lazarus
(Director, Teacher Education in English, Purdue U, Lafayette, Indiana)
Director, Project English at Purdue
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Lewis Leary (Professor of English, Columbia U; Consultant in English, USOE)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

Carl A. Lefevre (Wonder Lake, Illinois)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Glen Leggett (U of Washington)
Chair, CCCC, 1960

Nancy Lester (The Write Company, New York, New York)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Evan Glyn Lewis (H. M. Staff Inspector, Department of Education and Science, London, 1966)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
U of Wales, 1971
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

Richard Lloyd-Jones (Professor of English, U of Iowa)
Chair, Conference on College Composition and Communication
Director, ADE
Chair, MLA Division on the Teaching of Writing
Co-Designer of Primary Trait Scoring
Co-Author of Research in Written Composition (1963)
Chair, CCCC, 1977
NCTE Committee on Research, 1985
NCTE President, 1985-86
English Coalition Conference, 1987

ADE Francis Andrew March Award, 1987
Manuscript Reviewer for MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, 2nd. and 3rd. eds. (1984 and 1988)
Co-Editor of The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language (NCTE, 1989)

Walter Loban (Professor of Education at the U of California, Berkeley)
NCTE Secondary Section Committee
NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English (1967)
Author of The Language of Elementary School Children (NCTE, 1963)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Author of "The Green Pastures of English," in The Humanity of English (NCTE, 1972)
Author of Language Development: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve (NCTE, 1976)

Phillip Lopate (Writer and Supervisor of the Writing Team at P. S. 75 in New York City, 1975)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975

Joe Lostracco (Professor of English, Austin Community College, Texas)
CCCC Executive Committee
English Coalition Conference, 1987
NCTE Committee on the Fund to Support and Advance the Teaching of English, 1988-89

Jay B. Ludwig (Professor of English, Michigan State U, East Lansing)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Andrea A. Lunsford (Professor, The Ohio State U, Columbus)
Co-Author of Essays in Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse
Co-Author of Four Worlds of Writing
1985 Co-Winner (with Lisa Ede) of the Richard Braddock Award for "Audience Adressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy" (College Composition and Communication, May 1984)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Co-Editor of The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language (1989)
Chair, CCCC, 1989

William Lutz (Rutgers U)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Chair, NCTE Committee on Public Doublespeak
Manuscript Reviewer for the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, 3rd ed. (1988)

Walter H. MacGinitie (Teachers College, Columbia U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
IRA President, 1976-77

Maynard Mack (Professor, Yale U)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

David D. Mackay (Nuffield Research Fellow, U College, London)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Helen K. Mackintosh (Chief, Elementary Schools Section, USOE)
NCTE President, 1956-57
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

James A. MacNeill (Instructor in English Education, U of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Ken Macrorie (Western Michigan U)
Author of Telling Writing
Author of A Vulnerable Teacher
Editor, College Composition and Communication 1962-64
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Mary Maguire (McGill U, Montreal, Quebec, Canada)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Mary H. Mahar (USOE, Washington, D.C.)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

John J. Marcatante (Chair, English Department, Astonia Junior High School, Queens)

Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Albert H. Marckwardt (Professor of English, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
Director of the Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NCTE First Vice-President, 1965-66
NCTE President, 1966-67
Author of "The Dartmouth Seminar," NASSP Bulletin 51 (April 1967): 104-105.
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1972

Susan Meyer Markle (Professor of Psychology, Bureau of Instructional Resources, U of Illinois, Chicago)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Michael Marsden
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Kristine E. Marshall
Tampa, Florida
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986

Sybil Marshall (Lecturer in Primary Education, U of Sheffield, England)
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Harold C. Martin (Director, Committee on General Education, Harvard U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Research Development Seminar, 1963
Questionnaire respondent for Janet Emig's research (1964) leading to The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders

Lucinda Martin (Classroom Teacher, Maple Valley High School, Vermontville, MI)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Nancy Martin (U of Surrey, England)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Author of Mostly About Writing: Selected Essays by Nancy Martin (1983)
Editor of Writing Across the Curriculum (1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Co-editor of The Word for Teaching is Learning: Essays for James Britton (© NATE 1988)

James Hocker Mason (Professor of English, Indiana State U)
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1979

Glenn Matott
1977 Co-winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "In Search of a Philosopical Context for Teaching Composition" (College Composition and Communication, February 1976)

John Maxwell
NCTE Executive Director
IFTE Seminar, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

John S. Mayher
NCTE Editorial Board, 1983
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William McColly (U of Wisconsin)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Bernard J. McCormick (Taylor Allderdice High School, Pittsburgh)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Kathleen A. McCormick (Carnegie-Mellon U)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Michael McCready (Louisiana Tech U)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certiification, 1986

Raven I. McDavid (English Department, U of Chicago)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1969

Elizabeth A. McDonald (Linden School, Pittsburgh)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Agnes R. McElwee (Pennsylvania State U, U Park)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Nancy McHugh (Los Angeles Unified School District, California)
NCTE President
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Nellie McKay (U of Wisconsin)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

W. J. McKeachie (Professor, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

John McKiernan (College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

James McMillan (U of Alabama)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Scott McNabb (Grand Rapids Community College, Grand Rapids, Michigan; U of Iowa)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Maurice McNamee (St. Louis U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Elisabeth McPherson (Forest Park Community College)
Chair, CCCC, 1972

Donald McQuade (U of California, Berkeley)
Chair, CCCC, 1991

Frank McTeague
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Henry C. Meckel (Professor of English and Education, San Jose State College)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965

John C. Mellon (Harvard Graduate School of Education)
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

John L. Melton (Professor, John Carroll U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Joseph Mersand (Chair, Department of English, Jamaica High School, New York)
NCTE President, 1958-59
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Boston International Conference, 1965
Co-author of Warriner's English Grammar and Composition (1973)
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1979

Bruce Mickleburgh (Toronto, Ontario, Canada)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

James E. Miller, Jr. (U of Chicago; U of Nebraska)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Editor of College English, 1960-66
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
NCTE President Elect, 1968-69
NCTE President, 1969-70
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1975
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Joseph W. Miller (Moorhead State College
Associate Chair, NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition,

Susan Miller
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Joseph O. Milner (Wake Forest U, Winston-Salem, North Carolina)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Vera E. Milz (Classroom Teacher, Way Elementary School, Bloomfield Hills School District, Michigan)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Walter H. Miner (East High School, Cheyenne, Wyoming)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Diana Mitchell (Classroom Teacher, J. W. Sexton High School, Lansing, Michigan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Harold E. Mitzel (Pennsylvania State U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

James P. Moffett
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Third International Conference, 1980
Author of "On Language Learning," in English in the Eighties (1982)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Tim E. Moreland, Jr.
NCTE Staff Assistant
Recorder, Boston International Conference, 1965

Herbert J. Muller (Indiana U)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Author of The Uses of English (1967)

Charles Murphy (Professor, U of Maryland)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Donald M. Murray (Professor of English, U of New Hampshire)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
Author of A Writer Teaches Writing (1st ed. 1968; 2nd ed. 1985)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Author of Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching (1982)
CCCC Executive Committee, 1985-88

Charles Muscatine (Professor of English, U of California, Berkeley)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Miles Myers
NCRE Seminar, 1985
NCTE Selection Committee for Russell Research Award, 1988
NCTE Executive Director, 1990

Harold M. Nason (Director of Education, Nova Scotia Department of Education, Halifax)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Chester L. Neudling (U. S. Office of Education)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Judith Newman (Halifax, Nova Scotia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

James Ney (Arizona State U, Tempe)
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Laura O'Banion (Winnetka School System, Winnetka, Illinois)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Marcella Oberle (Department of Speech, Los Angeles State College)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Lee Odell (Associate Professor, State U of New York at Albany, 1975; Professor of Language and Literature, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York, 1979)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
Co-editor of Research on Composing: Points of Departure (NCTE1978)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
1980 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Teachers of Composition and Needed Research in Discourse Theory" (College Composition and Communication, February 1979)
Chair of CCCC, 1986

Norine Odland (Professor, U of Minnesota)

San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Consulting Editor, Research in the Teaching of English, 1973

Roy C. O'Donnell (Florida State U, 1971; Department of Language Education, U of Georgia, Athens, 1988)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
Editor of Research in the Teaching of English 1978-1983
CEE Executive Committee, 1985-88

J. D. A. Ogilvy (U of Colorado)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Richard Ohmann (Wesleyan U)
Editor of College English, 1966-78

Kenneth Oliver (Professor, Occidental College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Paul A. Olson (U of Nebraska, Lincoln)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Author of The Arts of Language
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Wayne A. O'Neil (Associate Professor of Education and Linguistics, Harvard U)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Walter J. Ong (Professor of English, Saint Louis U)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Diane T. Orchard (Elementary Classroom Teacher, Lapeer Community Schools, Lapeer, Michigan)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Edith Orris (Green Gables School, Palo Alto, California)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

John E. Oster (U of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Margaret Parish (U of North Carolina at Wilmington)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Harley W. Parker (Head of Design, Royal Ontario Museum, U of Toronto)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Robert P. Parker, Jr. (Rutgers U, New Brunswick, New Jersey)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William R. Parker (Professor, Indiana U)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

A. Harry Passow (Teachers College, Columbia U)
NSSE Board of Directors, 1985-88

Edith Patterson (Supervising Teacher for the Elementary Language Arts, Wilmington Public Schools, Delaware)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert Pattison (Long Island U, Southampton, New York)
Author of On Literacy, 1982
IFTE Seminar, 1984

P. David Pearson (Professor of Education, U of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)
Co-director, Center for the Study of Reading, U of Illinois)
NCRE Seminar, 1985
IRA Board of Directors, 1985-88

Edwin A. Peel (U of Birmingham, 1963)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Philip G. Penner (Associate Professor of English Education, U of British Columbia)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Jane E. Peterson (Richland Community College)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Chair, CCCC, 1990

Anthony R. Petrosky (U of Pittsburgh)

Co-Chair, NSSE Committee on the Teaching of Writing 1985-86

Walter Petty (Sacramento State College, 1963; Professor, State U of New York at Buffalo, 1971)
Group Recorder, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
English Curriculum Under Fire Curriculum, 1978
Co-author of Experiences in Language
Member (probably the chair) of Donald Graves's doctoral committee

Henry Dan Piper (Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Southern Illinois U)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Thomas Clark Pollock (Washington Square College, New York U)
NCTE First Vice President, 1946-47
NCTE President, 1947-48
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Helen Poole (Nutley High School, Nutley, New Jersey)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Carol A. Pope (U of Houston, 1986; North Carolina State U, 1988)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certiification, 1986
CEE Nominating Committee, 1988

Collice Portnoff (Arizona State U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Leo J. Postman (U of California)
Consultant, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Neil Postman (New York U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Co-author of Teaching as a Subversive Activity

Charmaine Pountney (Auckland Girls Grammar School, Auckland, New Zealand)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

John F. Povey (Professor of English, U of California-Los Angeles)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Gordon M. Pradl
Editor of Prospect and Retrospect: Selected Essays of James Britton, 1982
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Co-editor, English Education

Ian Pringle (Carleton U, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Chair, IFTE 1984-86
Convenor, IFTE Conference, Ottawa, Canada, May 1986

Robert Probst (Georgia State U, Atlanta, Georgia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Rosentene B. Purnell (California State U-Northridge)
Chair, CCCC, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Alan C. Purves (U of Illinois, 1971; Professor of Education, State U of New York at Albany; Director of the Center for the Study of Literacy, SUNY-Albany)
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
Editor, Research in the Teaching of English, 1973-78
NCTE President, 1979-80
NCRE Seminar, 1985
Author of The Scribal Society (1990)

Randolph Quirk (Professor of English Language, U College, London)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Ann Raimes (Hunter College, City U of New York)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Donald Rasmussen (Miquon School, Miquon, Pennsylvania)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Elody Rathgen (Christchurch Girls High School, Christchurch, New Zealand)
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Charles A. Ray (North Carolina College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

James C. Raymond (U of Alabama)
Editor of College English, 1985-90

David Reed (U of California)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Virginia M. Reid (Oakland School System, Oakland, California)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
NCTE President, 1971-72
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1977

Mary Regan (U of California)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Walter R. Reitman (Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh)
Conference on Needed Research , 1962

Warner Rice (Professor, U of Michigan)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Townsend Rich (New York State Teachers College, Albany)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Mildred E. Riling (Southeastern State College, Oklahoma, 1971)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

Floyd Rinker
Executive Director, Commission on English, College Entrance Examination Board
Conference on Needed Research , 1962
CEEB Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Charles W. Roberts (U of Illinois)

Editor, College Composition and Communication, 1950-52

Helen M. Robinson (U of Chicago)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jay Robinson (U of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William Wallace Robson (Fellow of Lincoln College, U of Oxford)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Robert W. Rogers (U of Illinois)
Conference on Needed Research 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Robert L. Root (Professor, Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Connie Rosen (Lecturer in Education, Goldsmiths College, U of London, 1966)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Harold Rosen (U of London, London, England, 1966)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Third International Conference, 1980
Author of "Multicultural Education and the English Teacher," in English in the Eighties (1982)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Lois Rosen (U of Michigan, Flint)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Louise Rosenblatt (Professor of English Education, New York U)
Author of Literature as Exploration (1938)
Director, Research Development Seminar, 1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1973
Author of The Reader, the Text, and the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work (1978)
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1980

IFTE Seminar, 1984

Robert Ruddell (Chair, Department of Education, U of California, Berkeley)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Elizabeth Rusk (Professor, Michigan State U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

David H. Russell (Professor, U of California)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
NCTE President, 1962-63
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Alvan Ryan (U of Notre Dame, Indiana)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Lawrence Ryan (Professor, Stanford U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Rose Sabaroff (Harvard U)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

William M. Sale (Professor, Cornell U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Henry W. Sams (Professor, Pennsylvania State U)
President, College English Association
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Ronald Santor (California State U, Sacramento)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Edwin H. Sauer (Chicago Teachers College South)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Dorothy O. Saunders (Third Grade Teacher, Brookmont School, Washington, D. C.)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Co-Author, <u>They All Want to Write</u> (1952, 1963, 1984)

Marlene Scardamalia (York U)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Diane Lemonnier Schallert
Associate Editor, Reading Research Quarterly
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Joseph Schiffman (Professor, Dickinson College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

W. B. Schneider (Professor, Southern Illinois U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Lowell Schoer (U of Iowa)
Co-Author of Research in Written Composition (1963)

Robert Scholes (Brown U)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Mark Schorer (U of California)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Karen Schriver
1987 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision" (College Composition and Communication, February 1986)

Herbert Schueller (Professor, Wayne State U, Detroit, Michgian)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Faith Schullstrom (Guilderland Central School District, New York)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sheila Schwartz
Third International Conference, 1980

Fred Newton Scott
MLA President, 1907
NCTE President, 1911-12, 1912-13 (NCTE's only two-term president)

President, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1914-15
Author of "Two Ideals of Composition Teaching." The Standard of American Speech and Other Papers. (1926)

John R. Searles
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Donald A. Sears (Skidmore College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Sam Leaton Sebesta (Curriculum Center, U of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1966)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Co-editor of Using Literature in the Elementary Classroom (NCTE, 1989)

Robert E. Shafer (Professor, Hunter College; Professor, Department of English, Arizona State U)
Teachers College, Columbia U, 1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
CEE Conference Program Committee, 1965-66
IRA/NCTE Committee on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction, 1979-82
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984
IRA Committee on Communications Technology and Literacy Education,1987-88

Derrick Sharp (Uplands, Swansea, Wales)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Lionel Sharp (Cazenovia College)
Chair, CCCC, 1975

George B. Shea (Belleville West High School, Belleville, Illinois)
English Coalition Conference, 1987)

William D. Sheldon (Syracuse U)
IRA President, 1961-62
Group Recorder, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

NCTE Committee on Research, 1971

J. Stephen Sherwin (State U of New York at Buffalo, 1971)
NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
Consultant Reader for Janet Emig's manuscipt prior to the publication of The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971)

Francis Shoemaker (Teachers College, Columbia U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Diane Shugert (Associate Professor of English, Central Connecticut State College)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
CEE Spring Conference Program Chair, 1988 (Boston)
NCTE Standing Committee Against Censorship, 1989
NCTE/SLATE Steering Committee on Social and Political Concerns, 1987-90

Michael F. Shugrue
MLA Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966
Author of English in a Decade of Change
MLA Assistant Secretary for English

John Simmons (Florida State U, Tallahassee)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Rinaldo Simonini (Longwood College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

John M. Sinclair (Professor of Modern English Language, U of Birmingham)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

Robert C. Slack (Professor, Carnegie Institute of Technology)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Joseph Slater (Colgate U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Eugene E. Slaughter (U. S. Office of Education; Southeastern State College, Oklahoma)
Chair, NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English, 1961
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Associate Chair, Program Committee, CEE Conference, 1966
USOE Representative, Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Robert C. Small, Jr. (Professor, College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic U)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986
Chair, CEE 1988-89
CEE Spring Conference Program Chair, 1989 (Charleston)

Marjorie B. Smiley (Professor, Hunter College, City U of New York)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Dora V. Smith (Professor, U of Minnesota)
NCTE President, 1935-36
NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
CEE Program Planning Committee, 1963-64

Edward L. Smith, Jr. (U of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Frank Smith
NCTE David H. Russell Award for Distinguished Research in the Teaching of English, 1984

Hallett D. Smith (California Institute of Technology)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Henry Nash Smith (U of California at Berkeley)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Mark Smith (Northern Michigan U, Marquette, Michigan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Michael Smith
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Vernon Smith (Indiana U, Bloomington)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

M. Trika Smith-Burke (Professor of Educational Psychology, New York U)
NCRE Seminar, 1985
NCRE Publications Committee Chair, 1986

George Smock (Indiana State Teachers College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Sydney Smyth (Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh, Scotland)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Nancy I. Sommers
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
1983 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Responding to Student Writing" (College Composition and Communication, May 1982)

Margaret Meek Spencer
Co-author of The Cool Web
Third International Conference, 1980

William T. Spouge (Chair, Department of English, Mount Pleasant County Secondary School, York, England)
NATE Assistant Secretary
Boston International Conference, 1965

Imogene Springer
NCTE Vice President, 1973-74
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1983

James R. Squire (Professor of English, U of Illinois; Senior Vice-President, Ginn and Company, Boston)
NCTE Executive Director, 1960-67
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Co-Chair, Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Author of "A School for All Seasons," English Journal (March 1966)
NCTE Executive Committee Award, 1967
Author of "The Running Water and the Standing Stone," PMLA 83 (June 1968)
Co-author of Teaching English in the United Kingdom: A Comparative Study (1969)
Chair, NCTE Committee on Research, 1971
English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
Author of "Research Can Make a Difference," Research in the Teaching of English 10: 63-65
Author of "The Collision of the Basics Movement with Current Research in Writing and Language." The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Are The Real Basics? (NCTE, 1982)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCRE Seminar, 1985
Editor of The Dynamics of Language Learning (1987)
Chair, IRA Committee On Implementation of Studies and Research, 1987-88
Chair, NCTE Committee on the Fund to Support and Advance the Teaching of English, 1988-89

Robert Squires (Oneonta High School, Oneonta, New York)
NCTE President, 1980-81
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Ralph C. Staiger (Professor of Education, U of Delaware, Newark)
Boston International Conference, 1965
IRA Executive Secretary-Treasurer, 1962-73
IRA Executive Director, 1973-84
IRA Special Representative to the International Book Committee, 1987-88

James Stalker (Professor, Michigan State U, East Lansing)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Susan Steffel (Classroom Teacher, Maple Valley High School, Vermontville, Michigan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Carrie Stegall (Holliday, Texas)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Erwin R. Steinberg (Dean and Professor of English, Carnegie Institute of Technology)
NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
Chair, CCCC, 1961
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Research Development Seminar, 1963
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Author of Needed Research in the Teaching of English, 1963
Author of "A Pox on Pithy Prescriptions," College Composition and Communication 37 (February 1986): 96-100.

Hazeldean Stent (Ohio Department of Education)
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certiification, 1986

Marilyn S. Sternglass (City College of the City U of New York, 1988)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
NCTE Commission on Composition, 1988

A. Wilber Stevens (Idaho State College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Donald C. Stewart (Kansas City U)
Chair, CCCC, 1983

Ruth S. Stickle (East Leyden High School, Franklin Park, Illinois)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Peter Stillman (Boynton/Cook Publishers, Deansboro, New York)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Susan Stires (Junior High School Teacher, Boothbay Harbor, Maine)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Edward Stone (Ohio U, Athens)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

George Winchester Stone, Jr.
MLA Executive Secretary
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
Editor of Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English, (MLA 1964)

Barbara M. H. Strang (Professor of English Language and General Linguistics, U of Newcastle upon Tyne)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

James Stratman
1987 Co-Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision" (College Composition and Communication, February 1986)

Leslie Stratta
Third International Conference, 1980
Co-author, "Changing the Model for 'Examining' Achievements in Writing." English in the Eighties (1982)

Dorothy S. Strickland (Professor, Teachers College, Columbia U)
IRA President, 1978-79
Co-Chair, IRA/NCTE Committee on the Impact of Child Language Development Research on Curriculum and Instruction, 1979-82

Ruth G. Strickland (Research Professor of Education, Indiana U, Bloomington)
NCTE President, 1959-60
Conference on Needed Research, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Boston International Conference, 1965
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1984

Ingrid Strom (Professor, Indiana U)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
CEE Program Planning Committee, 1963-64

Rosalind Strong (Intensive Language and Reception Centre, New South Wales)
Third International Conference, 1980
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William Strong (College of Education, Utah State U, Logan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

David Stryker (U of Florida)
CEE Program Planning Committee, 1963-64

Geoffry Summerfield
Author of Summerhill
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966
Third International Conference, 1980

Henry Sustakowski (State U College, Buffalo, New York)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Denham Sutcliffe (Kenyon College)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Wendy Sutton (U of British Columbia, Vancouver)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kester Svendsen (U of Oregon)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Jonathan Swift (Classroom Teacher, Stevenson High School, Detroit)
NCTE Secondary Section Chair
Director, Global Education Program, Stevenson High School
Third International Conference, 1980

Betty Swiggett (English Language Arts Curriculum Specialist, Hampton City Schools, Virginia)
NCTE Committee to Evaluate Curriculum Guides
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Contributor, English Teachers At Work

Peggy Swoger (Mountain Brook Junior High School, Birmingham, Alabama)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Sister Mary Sylvia, S.S.J. (Mount St. Joseph Teachers College, Buffalo)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962
CEE Program Planning Commitee, 1963-64

Hilda Taba (San Francisco State College)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Ivan Taylor (Howard U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Mark Taylor (School of Library Science, U of Southern California, Los Angeles)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Stephen Tchudi (Professor of English, Michigan State U, East Lansing; Professor, U of Nevada-Reno,1990)
Author of Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English
Author of The ABCs of Literacy
Author of Lecture Alternatives in Teaching English
Editor of Teaching English: Reflections on the State of the Art (1979)
Editor of English Journal, 1973-1979
Co-author of The Young Writer's Handbook (1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE President 1984-85
Editor of English Teachers at Work (1986)

Susan J. Tchudi (Central Michigan U, Mt. Pleasant; U of Nevada-Reno, 1990)
Co-author of The Young Writer's Handbook (1984)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

William H. Teale (Professor, U of Texas at San Antonio)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Chair, IRA Early Childhood and Literacy Development Committee
Editorial Board, Reading Research Quarterly
Editorial Board, Language Arts

Co-editor, Emergent Literacy: Writing and Reading
Editor of Language Arts, 1990

William Templeman (Professor, U of Southern California)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Kathryn Territo (Waterford School, Oaklyn, New Jersey, 1962)
Conference on Needed Research, 1962

Sharon Thomas (Department of American Thought and Language, Michigan State U, East Lansing)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Owen Thomas (Professor of English, Indiana U, Bloomington)
NCTE Commission on the English Language
Author of Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English (1966)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Author of "Competence and Performance in Language" in New Directions in Elementary English (NCTE, 1967)
Author of Metaphor: and Related Subjects (1969)
Author of The Arts and Skills of English (1971)
Author of "Teaching Children about Language," in The Humanity of English (NCTE, 1972)

Denys H. Thompson
Editor, The Use of English
NATE Vice-Chair, 1965
Boston International Conference, 1965

Nancy Thompson (U of South Carolina, Columbia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Nell Thompson (U of Nebraska, Lincoln)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Joseph W. Thomson (U of Illinois)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Project Staff Member for the National Study of High School English Programs (Cooperative Research Project No. 1994 conducted by the U of Illinois and the National Council of Teachers of English, 1963-65)

David Thorburn (Massachusettis Institute of Technology)
Featured Speaker, English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

Willard Thorp (Princeton U)
President, American Studies Association
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

Ann Thurman (Creative Drama Advisor, Evanston Public Schools, Evanston, Illinois)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Iris Tiedt
Editor, Elementary English, 1972-76

Robert J. Tierney (Associate Professor of Education, Ohio State U, 1985)
NCRE Seminar, 1985

Eleanor Q. Tignor (LaGuardia Community College)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Kay Torrant (Newton Schools, Newton, Massachusetts)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Anthony L. Tovatt (Professor of English, Ball State U, Muncie, Indiana)
Member of the CEE Conference Program Committee, 1965-66
Co-editor of On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English (NCTE, 1970)
Author of Oral-Aural-Visual Stimuli Approach to Teaching Written Composition to Ninth Grade Students (1967) (Study cited by Emig in The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders)

F. G. Townsend (Florida State U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1963

Lynn Quitman Troyka (Queensborough Community College, City U of New York)
Chair, CCCC, 1981

Joseph I Tsujimoto
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Author of Teaching Poetry Writing to Adolescents (1988)

Arlin Turner (Professor, Duke U)
Allerton Park Conference, 1963
Director of the NCTE Commission on Literature (1966)

Donald R. Tuttle (U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.)
Consultant, NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English, 1961
Allerton Park Conference, 1963

Eileen Tway (U of Chicago Laboratory School; Professor, Miami U, Ohio)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Priscilla Tyler
(U of Missouri at Kansas City; Graduate School of Education, Harvard U, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1962-63; U of Illinois, Champaign, 1966)
NCTE Committee on the State of Knowledge about Composition
NCTE Second Vice-President, 1962-63
Chair, CCCC, 1963
Questionnaire respondent for Janet Emig's research (1964) leading to The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders,
Arts of Language Conference, 1966
Cited by Janet Emig as one of her own teachers of composition and one of those to whom Emig dedicated The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders, 1971
NCTE Distinguished Service Award, 1978

Ralph W. Tyler (System Development Foundation)
NSSE Board of Directors, 1985-87

Gregory L. Ulmer (U of Florida)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Howard P. Vincent (Professor of English, Kent State U, Kent, Ohio)
Boston International Conference, 1965

Betty Jane Wagner (Professor, Reading and Language Department, National-Louis U, Evanston, Illinois)
Director, Chicago Area Writing Project
Chair, NCTE Committee on Language and Learning Across the Curriculum
Midwest Regional Director, National Writing Project
Chair, NCTE Elementary Section Nominating Committee
Author of "A Valid Way to Assess the Effects of a Writing Project," English in the Eighties (1982)
Co-Author of Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13

Thomas E. Walker
NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1976

Gary F. Waller (Carnegie-Mellon U)
English Coalition Conference, 1987

R. D. Walshe
Third International Conference, 1980
Publications Editor, Primary English Teaching Association (1982)
Editor of Donald Graves in Australia: Children Want to Write

Jerry W. Ward, Jr. (Tougaloo College)
English Coalition Conference, 1987
Manuscript Reviewer for MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers (1984 and 1988)

William S. Ward (U of Kentucky)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

William Warden (U of Toronto Schools, Toronto, Canada)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Kenneth Watson (U of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Visiting Professor, Department of English, Michigan State U, 1987

Sam Watson, Jr.
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

John Watts
Third International Conference, 1980
Author of "English in an Integrated Curriculum," in English in the Eighties (1982)

Ken Weir (North Staffordshire Polytechnic, Stoke-on-Trent, England)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Esther Westendorf (Curriculum Center, Wantagh Public Schools, Wantagh, New York)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Helen C. White (U of Wisconsin)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Natalie White (Garland, Texas)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Frank Whitehead (Senior Lecturer in English and Education, U of Sheffield, England)
NATE Chair, 1965
Boston International Conference, 1965
Author of The Disappearing Dais, 1966

Reed Whittemore (Professor of English, Carleton College)
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

H. G. Widdowson (Institute of Education, U of London)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Autrey Nell Wiley (Professor and Director of the Department of English, Texas Woman's U, Denton)
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Texas Woman's U
Basic Issues Conference, 1958
NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English, 1961
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Andrew Wilkinson (Lecturer in Education, U of Birmingham, England, 1965; U of East Anglia, 1979)
Boston International Conference, 1965
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Cecil B. Williams (Professor, Texas Christian U)
Editor, College Composition and Communication 1959-61
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Hazel Browne Williams (U of Missouri-Kansas City)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Joseph M. Williams
Discussion Group Leader, English Curriculum Under Fire Conference, 1978

James Wilsford (Orange School District, Orangeburg, South Carolina)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Gordon Wilson (Miami U)
Chair, CCCC, 1966

James R. Wilson (San Francisco State College)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Marilyn Wilson (Associate Professor, Department of English, Michigan State U, East Lansing)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Rosemary Wilson (Philadelphia Public Schools)
Arts of Language Conference, 1966

Stuart Wilson (Classroom Teacher, J. W. Sexton High School, Lansing, Michigan)
IFTE Seminar, 1984

Miriam E. Wilt (Professor of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Temple U, Philadelphia)
Boston International Conference, 1965
Dartmouth Seminar, 1966

W. Ross Winterowd (U of Southern California)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Stephen P. Witte (U of Texas at Austin)
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979
1984 Winner of the Richard Braddock Award for "Topical Structure and Revision: An Exploratory Study" (College Composition and Communication, October 1983)

Merlin C. Wittrock (Professor of Education, U of California, Los Angeles)
Editor of Handbook of Research on Teaching
NCRE Mid-Decade Seminar, 1985

Denny T. Wolfe (Professor, English Education, College of Education, Old Dominion U, Virginia)
Chair, NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1986
Consultant, NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification, 1990
Chair, NCTE Assembly on International Exchange
Chair, CEE Commission on International Concerns

Bernice Wolfson (U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

Claire A. Woods (South Australia Education Department)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Advisory Board, English Education 1988-89

James A. Work (Professor, Indiana U)
Basic Issues Conference Series, 1958

William Work
Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America
Dartmouth Seminar Consultant, 1966

Brooke Workman (West High School, Iowa City, Iowa)
NCTE Commission on Preparation of English and Language Arts Teachers, Subcommittee on English Education and English Studies
English Coalition Conference, 1987

Austin Wright (Professor, Carnegie Institute of Technology)
Allerton Park Conference, 1962

Robert L. Wright (Michigan State U)
Group Recorder, San Francisco Research Conference, 1963

George S. Wykoff (Purdue U)
Editor, College Composition and Communication, 1953-55

Seymour Yesner (Brookline High School, Brookline, Massachusetts)
Chair, NCTE Committee on Testing, 1979
IFTE Seminar, 1984
NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum, 1988

Richard E. Young (Professor of English, U of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
Buffalo Conference on Researching Composing, 1975
CCTE International Conference on Learning to Write, 1979

Frank J. Zidonis (Ohio State U, 1963)
San Francisco Research Conference, 1963
Co-Author of The Effect of a Study of Transformational Grammar on the Writing of Ninth and Tenth Graders (1966)

Driek Zirinsky (Professor, Department of English, Boise State U, Idaho)
IFTE Seminar, 1984
Editor, CSSEDC Quarterly
CEE Subcommittee on Preservice Teacher Education

Appendix V

Selected Publications Resulting from

Professional Association and Inter-Association Conferences

Basic Issues Conference Committee. The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English. Champaign: NCTE, 1959. ERIC ED 016 640. Rpt. in PMLA 74 (September 1959): 1-12.

Britton, James, ed. English Teaching: An International Exchange. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1984.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. New York: Vintage, 1960.

Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell. Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Urbana, NCTE, 1978.

Dixon, John. Growth through English: A Report Based on the Dartmouth Seminar 1966. London: Oxford U P, 1969. 1st ed., 1967.

Eagleson, Robert D. English in the Eighties. Sydney: AATE, 1982.

Elbow, Peter. What Is English? New York: MLA; Urbana: NCTE, 1990.

Freedman, Aviva and Ian Pringle, eds. Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. Conway, Arkansas: U of Central Arkansas for the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, 1980.

Freedman, Aviva, Ian Pringle, and Janice Yalden. Learning to Write: First Language/Second Language. New York: Longman, 1983.

Hillocks, George, Jr., ed. The English Curriculum Under Fire: What Art The Real Basics? Urbana: NCTE, 1982.

Kitzhaber, Albert. What Is English? Dartmouth Seminar Working Party Paper No. 1. Working Papers of the Dartmouth Seminar. ERIC ED 082 201.

Jensen, Julie, ed. Stories to Grow On: Demonstrations of Language Learning in K-8 Classrooms. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1989.

Kitzhaber, Albert. "What Is English?" Dartmouth Seminar Working Party Paper No.1. Working Papers of the Dartmouth Seminar. ERIC ED 082 201.

Lewis, E. Glyn. "Postscript to Dartmouth--or Poles Apart." College English 29 (1968): 426-34.

Lloyd-Jones, Richard and Andrea A. Lunsford. The English Coalition Conference: Democracy through Language. Urbana and New York: NCTE and MLA, 1989.

Marckwardt, Albert H. "From the Basic Issues Conference to the Dartmouth Seminar--Perspectives on the Teaching of English." PMLA 82 (September 1967): 8-13. ERIC ED 016 683

Marckwardt, Albert H. "The Dartmouth Seminar." NASSP Bulletin 51 (April 1967): 104-05.

McHugh, Nancy. "Changes in the Teaching Conditions between 1957 and 1987." What Is English? by Peter Elbow. New York and Urbana: MLA and NCTE, 1990.

Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of English: Guidelines for the Teaching of English from the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College. New York: Holt, 1967.

Olson, Paul A., ed. The Arts of Language: Needed Curricula and Curriculum Development of Institutes in the English Language Arts: Language, Literature, Composition, Speech and Reading. Report of a Project English Conference held at the U of Nebraska, February 26-March 1, 1966. Contract Number 3-6-061764-0568. Lincoln: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, 1966. ERIC ED 011 974.

O'Neil, Wayne. "Conference Report: The Dartmouth Seminar." Harvard Educational Review 39 (1969): 359-65.

Purves, Alan C., Ed. "The 1972 NCTE Seminar on Research in English Education," Research in the Teaching of English 7 (Fall 1973): 144-289.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. Research Development Seminar in the Teaching of English: Report of Seminar Proceedings. Project #G-009. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1963.

Russell, David H., Margaret J. Early, and Edmund Farrell. Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the San Francisco Conference. Champaign: NCTE, 1964.

Squire, James R. "The Relation of College English Departments in Relation to Other Groups Interested in the Teaching of English," in Proceedings of The Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English. Ed. Richard Wasson. Washington, D.C: United States Office of Education, 1963.

Squire, James R., ed. A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. Champaign: NCTE, 1966.

---., ed. Discussions at the Mid-Decade Seminar on the Teaching of Reading and English. Urbana: ERIC, 1986. ERIC ED 274 967.

---., ed. The Dynamics of Language Learning: Research in Reading and English. Urbana: NCRE and ERIC, 1987.

Steinberg, Erwin. Needed Research in the Teaching of English. Proceedings of a Project English Research Conference held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, May 5-7, 1962. Cooperative Research Monograph No. 11. Washington, D. C.: U. S. GPO, 1963. ERIC ED 020 154.

Steinberg, Erwin R. and William A. Jenkins. "Needed Research in the Teaching of the Elementary School Language Arts." Elementary English 39 (December 1962): 790-93.

Tchudi, Stephen N., ed. Language, Schooling, and Society: Proceedings of the International Federation for the Teaching of English Seminar at Michigan State U, November 11-14, 1984. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1985.

Walshe, R. D., ed. Donald Graves in Australia: Children Want to Write. Rozelle, New South Wales: PETA, 1981.

Wasson, Richard. Proceedings of The Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English. Washington, D.C.: USOE in cooperation with the U of Illinois (Project #G-1006, Contract No. OE 3-10-058), 1963.

Working Papers of the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English at Dartmouth College (Dartmouth Seminar). Hanover, NH. August 20 to September 16, 1966. ERIC ED 082 200 to 082 216.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293010559650