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On the Anniversary of English Journal

Dave Wendelin

Kim Stafford, writer, teacher, poet, recently wrote this about great teachers, “A great teacher provides a hearth where you come home to your own work. In the presence of such a guide, the distractions of the world recede, and you begin to hear your own song. You recognize your secret gift, your passion, the stories humming quietly within you” (pamphlet for the Northwest Writing Institute, August 2002). What a statement about the teachers in our lives who have nurtured and encouraged us, what a wonderful tribute to our colleagues, and perhaps to ourselves, as we reflect on our own role as influential educators.

On the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the publication of English Journal, I find Stafford’s words an apt metaphor for how many feel about the Journal itself—as a great teacher, beckoning readers to its warm hearth for reflection, inspiration, stimulation. The Journal remains a welcome mentor and companion of English teachers around the world; as you read Leila Christenbury’s historical tribute on the following pages, I am sure you will be filled with pride and awe at the journey the Journal has made through time, prompting fond recollection of the topics, themes, and even controversies that have dwelt within its pages over the years.

English Journal is a place for leadership and for response—its editors and contributors have forged new ground, have reflected on trends and issues swirling within our profession, have moved us to laughter and, yes, to tears. The articles, poems, reviews, and columns have shaped the professional lives of countless teachers and impacted wonderfully the teaching and learning that so magically unfolds in countless English language arts classrooms around the world every day.

The Secondary Section of the National Council of Teachers of English is proud of English Journal— as the flagship journal of the Council, it speaks eloquently of the power in the teaching of English. We salute editors James Hosic, W. Wilbur Hatfield, Dwight Burton, Richard Alm, Stephen Tchudi, Kenneth Donelson and Alleen Pace Nilsen, Ben Nelms and Elizabeth Nelms, Leila Christenbury, Virginia Monseau, and now Louann Reid for their leadership, for their wisdom, and for their guidance as they have nurtured the “stories humming quietly within.”
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CAN GOOD COMPOSITION TEACHING BE DONE UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS?  

EDWIN M. HOPKINS
University of Kansas

No.

This is a small and apparently unprotected word, occupying a somewhat exposed position; but it is upheld by indisputable truth.

If another answer is possible, if good teaching can be done under present conditions, it is passing strange that so few teachers have found out how to do it; that English composition teachers as a class, if judged by criticism that is becoming more and more frequent, are so abnormally inefficient. For every year the complaints become louder that the investment in English teaching yields but a small fraction of the desired returns. Every year teachers resign, break down, perhaps become permanently invalided, having sacrificed ambition, health, and in not a few instances even life, in the struggle to do all the work expected of them. Every year thousands of pupils drift through the schools, half-cared for in English classes where they should have constant and encouraging personal attention, and neglected in other classes where their English should be watched over at least incidentally, to emerge in a more or less damaged linguistic condition, incapable of meeting satisfactorily the simplest practical demand upon their powers of expression. Much money is spent, valuable teachers are worn out at an inhumanly rapid rate, and results are inadequate or wholly lacking. From any point of view—that of taxpayer, teacher, or pupil—such a situation is intolerable.

1 For reference to the data upon which this article is based, see general note at the end.

But every English composition teacher knows what is wrong; and every such teacher always has known. Perhaps every such teacher, at some time in his more or less brief career, has undertaken to explain the matter to someone in authority; perhaps to be told that it is all really too bad, but that nothing can be done. Perhaps not much can be done; but at least certain facts can be made public, and with the facts the pathetically simple explanation.

A single statement will explain the fundamental trouble. Not very many years ago, when effort was made to apply the principle that pupils should learn to write by writing, English composition, previously known as rhetoric, became ostensibly a laboratory subject, but without any material addition to the personnel of its teaching force; there was merely a gratuitous increase in the labor of teachers who were already doing full duty.

Teachers as individuals protested and have continued to protest, but no protest has hitherto availed. Probably no other laboratory subject has ever been introduced into any school till space enough and apparatus enough and teachers enough had been provided to insure to each pupil that degree of individual attention necessary to his individual development. But the laboratory teaching of English during all these years has had so little provision made for it that it has been, for the most part, little more than a travesty.

While victims of public ignorance and carelessness are at work in one room of a modern school, across the hall there is likely to be a laboratory in science or manual training. There the instructor spends long hours, but the student capacity of his room is limited; his work affords variety and opportunity to carry on personal investigation by the side of or with the aid of his pupils; and when his scheduled hours are ended his day’s work is done; he retains opportunity for broad preparation, for personal scholarship, and even for relaxation. Because his department is equipped according to its demonstrable need, scientifically ascertained, and not according to a tradition that is almost prehistoric, his work succeeds, and his salary increases; while it may be that he in his uncomprehending heart fails to pity his unlucky colleague across the hall, whose laboratory hours, because the work may be “done
at home," have no schedule limit, but may and often do extend
from sunrise to midnight, for six and seven days in the week.

Yet the actual needs of a composition teacher, scientifically
ascertained, are almost insignificant compared with those of any
other laboratory teacher having an equal number of pupils. He
needs no special building, and no apparatus save such as should
be in the school library and in its lecture-room equipment, but
merely time—time to come into direct personal touch with each
member of his classes. Since, then, the total available supply of
time is even more limited than is the total supply of space avail-
able for scientific laboratories, the proper course in English com-
position as in science is to determine the proper number of pupils
for a single teacher, according to the demand that each pupil
makes upon that total supply.

If it be assumed that English is of sufficient importance to
justify making adequate provision for it, that the opportunity
to take it shall be open to all students, and that, in English com-
position teaching, actual individual practice in speaking and
writing is necessary, we must next inquire what sort of practice
is desirable, and how much time it takes to get desired results.
Here experience must indicate the answer. Its answer is that
training must include both oral and written practice in equal
proportion; it defines the minimum and the average of written
practice necessary, and the corresponding minimum and average
of necessary time. It then ascertains the physical and psycho-
logical limits of an instructor's strength when engaged in the work,
and so determines by a simple computation the maximum and
the average number of pupils that he can train effectively within
those limits. It then finds that while the time required for effective
oral training seems rather greater than for written training, the
mental and physical burden of the oral work is commonly less; so
that if a teacher should make use of either to the exclusion of the
other, his choice would not make a material difference in the number
of pupils he should have. Hence to find the right number for one
sort of practice is in effect to find it for the other also.

Approaching the problem then from the familiar side of theme
writing, and assuming suitable conditions and a minimum require-
ment in written work, experience shows that the corresponding
maximum number of pupils consonant with efficiency for a single
teacher in secondary schools should not exceed eighty, and in a
college freshman class sixty; and that the proper average number
for average needs and conditions as they exist at present is for
secondary schools about fifty and for colleges about thirty-five.  

Investigation then shows that, under the conditions actually
existing, the average number of pupils assigned to a single teacher
exceeds the stated maximum by more than 60 per cent, and the
stated proper average by more than 160 per cent. That is to say,
in the average of all schools under present conditions, composition
teachers have from two and a half to three times as many pupils
as they should; and this means not only a corresponding depre-
ciation of the value of their output, and a corresponding enormous
waste of money, but it is subjecting such teachers, if they make
endeavor to prevent such depreciation and waste, to a physical
and mental strain that is two and a half times the ascertained
limit of endurance. Moreover, investigation indicates further that
while teachers of other subjects are often in particular cases
weighted beyond the limit of efficiency, and that in some subjects
the average is above that limit, the most nerve- and brain-
exhausting part of an English teacher's duty, his theme reading,
may be from two to five or six times as great as any similar duty
of other teachers. Because of this, the average of the total labor
devolving upon English composition teachers is apparently between
50 and 100 per cent more than the average total of that of any other
class of teachers whatever.

These, in substance, are some of the facts which show good com-
position teaching to be impossible under present conditions; and
the more essential of these facts have received, since the prelimi-
nary publication of them a few months ago, corroboration that is
apparently more than sufficient to place them beyond the possi-

1 In complete accordance with these results was the proposition made by the
English department and the president of one of the largest colleges in the United
States to secure the maximum of efficiency in English composition by making twenty-
five students the limit for a single instructor.

8 See address of Chairman Fosler, Publications of the Modern Language Associa-
tion (March, 1911), pp. lixiv-lxiv.
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bility of dispute. Yet in times past, when English teachers have stated these facts to educational authorities, they have not infrequently been called incompetent, ignorant, or even untruthful; while more often and perhaps more recently they have been assured that these matters, while possibly true, are after all unimportant and irrelevant; that they have no bearing upon the situation, or that they have nothing to do with the real problems of English teaching.

But investigation shows that there are few schools in the entire country in which these facts are not directly responsible for admitted lack of efficiency. A large proportion of English composition teachers labor under conditions which make their work a farce if not a tragedy. An occasional administrator who does recognize the nature of the situation may assure them that they are not held responsible for more than is “reasonable under the circumstances,” but public opinion and public criticism enter to this statement an effective denial. The public does not know anything about the circumstances, but it does seem to know that it pays for something that for some reason it is not receiving; and the teacher is not usually in a position to escape either the blame or the penalty.

Of course the general averages stated cannot be accepted as defining the conditions of any particular school; it is necessary and also easy for each school to investigate its own conditions for itself. But the school that is so fortunate as not to be subject to criticism for unsatisfactory English teaching or for killing its English teachers, or both, is probably not a school governed by a board or set of officers that, presumably regarding these averages as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial, or the making of them as meddling, keep their heads in the sand, and, when requested to make investigation, refuse the request. Many a school officer has given these matters attention, possibly for the first time, within the last few months; some have found conditions more or less satisfactory, some have found otherwise; and the word that these have used more often than any other to designate what they have found is the word “appalling.” Of course other things are

necessary in teaching besides time; good teachers and right principles and methods also count; but to require the best workman, even with the best tools, to finish an assigned task in one-half or one-third of the necessary time is to spoil the work or the workman or both; that the results should be appalling is inevitable.

If such are some of the present conditions of English composition teaching, what then can be done? Clearly there must first be complete publicity and universal recognition of these elementary and elemental facts. Then public opinion must determine whether to continue these conditions, or to give up the attempt to teach the subject, or to teach it to a limited number only, or to provide adequately for teaching it to everybody. Presumably there is among these but one choice possible.

If in practical business affairs an investment fails to bring desired results, the common practice is to ascertain whether those results will justify an increase of the investment sufficient to insure obtaining them, or whether the business shall be discontinued. This is precisely the nature of the English situation.

In pro rata teaching cost and in equipment cost, English is one of the less expensive subjects in the school curriculum. Because the number of its students exceeds that of any other subject, its total cost is high; but the public seems willing to pay as high and relatively much higher to conserve the interests of a less number of pupils in certain other subjects, because these subjects, it is said, have a bearing upon their industrial and economic future.

Then is or is not training in English expression necessary to a successful industrial and business future? For years the answer to this question has been in theory, without dispute, an affirmative one, yet no effort has been made to determine scientifically the necessary cost; it has perhaps been guessed at, or the English budget has been fixed according to convenience after other things were provided for.

Whatever the cost may be, the decision of public opinion is hardly in doubt. While the minimum change consonant with favorable conditions might increase the cost of English teaching from 60 to 75 per cent, and an immediate and complete change to ideal conditions might double that estimate, the cost of other
equipment would not increase, and even these high figures are not prohibitive in relation to the cost of other and less essential subjects, and in view of the number of English pupils. Again, this cost can eventually be somewhat reduced by wise management. For, if high efficiency be paid for and established at the beginning of the educational process, that is, in the primary schools, it will, when secured, operate automatically to bring about high efficiency in the secondary schools, even with their present teaching force, because of the improvement in the material furnished them; and indeed it will go far to terminate an unprofitable dispute, and render unnecessary any English composition requirement in colleges. Again, co-operation of all teachers in all departments at all times with the training in English will also operate to reduce the total cost of English, when such co-operation is secured.

Still, as there must always be enough English teachers to teach English, the investment in it must be increased. Or else, if efficiency in English teaching must be given up as unattainable, the only course that is fair to all, however undesirable otherwise, is to make a definite announcement of the fact. Let it be known either that instruction in English is provided for a limited number of pupils only and that others must go without; or else that training in English, such as it is, while open to all, is inferior because the schools cannot afford to pay for more than 40 per cent of the instruction necessary to teach it properly, and because it is not fair to ask or expect English instructors to furnish the rest at their own expense; let it be known that, as school boards and officers have been saying privately for years, it is “too bad, but it cannot be helped.”

But public opinion, when fully informed, is likely to say something very different; and it seems well worth while to make every possible effort to enlighten it. Hence the extended campaign, explained below, of which this article is a part; a movement not simply to make good composition teaching possible, but to improve the efficiency of all teaching of all subjects by substituting accurate collection of all possible data, and trustworthy inference therefrom, for that ignorant or careless dependence upon tradition and the merest guesswork that still now and then makes itself felt in other educational matters than the teaching of English composition.

---

GENERAL NOTE

Moved by common knowledge of the circumstances recited in the preceding article and the failure of various attempts to obtain relief, the English Section of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association in 1909 appointed a committee to gather certain data bearing upon the general situation with a view to general publicity. The committee made a preliminary report in December of 1909, and was instructed to publish the results already arrived at and to request further data for a final report.

Without funds, through various educational agencies, the committee secured publication and distribution of the preliminary report in seven states—Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Mississippi, Michigan, and Wisconsin—to the number of twelve thousand copies, including copies sent out on order at cost, by the Graduate Magazine Press, University of Kansas. Replies received unanimously corroborate every detail of the report, with the qualification that the report is conservative, as it was intended to be—that it understates the seriousness of the matters under consideration.

But the accompanying requests for further information as to cost and labor met with such slight response that the committee found it necessary to follow up the twelve thousand copies with hundreds of personal letters, and with personal requests presented to bodies of teachers at annual gatherings. These supplementary efforts brought better returns, but still limited in number, because the new questions required for full answer the co-operation of school officers and of departments other than English; and this co-operation was very often refused. Meanwhile the general inquiry was endorsed by the National Council of Teachers of English as of the first importance at the present time; and the report elsewhere in this number of the Journal, the Council is aiding the committee to the utmost extent of its resources.

Before this number appears, the results thus far obtained, though not so complete as is desirable, will have been submitted to the Modern Language Association; but there still remains, before publication, an opportunity almost to make them fully adequate. State educational agencies will be requested to make the gathering of essential data of teaching cost and efficiency a part of their regular duty; but returns from that source cannot be had for at least two years, while a little present help from friends of the movement will make the final report of this committee sufficiently conclusive, and available for immediate and effective use everywhere.

To this end a blank form is inclosed in which general questions give place to a specific tabular statement of points involved. Few will be able to fill this blank completely, and in many cases, for reasons already stated, almost no information can be had. But every detail that can be given, whatever must be omitted, will be of exceptional value, because this part of the investigation is at a stage at which even a comparatively small number of additional replies will establish the practical certainty of the results.

Hence as matter of personal interest and consequence as well as urgency, all readers of this statement are asked to send to the committee upon the inclosed blank with the least possible delay as much of the information they are asked for as is obtainable; and if none can be had, to state the fact and the reason—no names of persons or schools to be made public by the committee under any circumstances. The committee has reason to believe that the results of this timely aid at what seems a pivotal moment will pay for the friendly effort a thousand fold, and pay quickly.

1 Copies may still be had on order; rate, ten dollars a thousand, single copies, five cents, postpaid.
A Brief History of English Journal*
Leila Christenbury

*English Journal* is one of the oldest continuously published academic journals in the United States of America. The first issue appeared in January 1912, just one month after the December 1911 founding of its sponsoring organization, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). The first editor of *English Journal* was also the nascent NCTE’s first Secretary-Treasurer.

*EJ*, as the journal also came to be known, was the sole journal published by NCTE, and it was envisioned as both the voice and the conscience of the profession. Looking both inward and outward, *EJ* carried news of NCTE and minutes of meetings, announcements of professional interest, reviews of books, reports on research, descriptions of successful pedagogy, curriculum outlines and analyses, and calls for changes in educational practice. Originally the only journal of NCTE, and thus representing English teaching at all levels, it became, subsequent to the advent of College English and additional, other publications geared to the elementary level, a journal primarily for secondary teachers of English.

Considered the flagship journal of the National Council of Teachers of English, over its 90 years of continuous publication *EJ* has both reflected the realities of contemporary American secondary education and the profession’s calls for educational reform and innovation.

In its history, *English Journal’s* circulation has ranged from a low of a few hundred to a high of 65,000. Over the years it has been published anywhere from ten to six times a year, both on a monthly schedule (with a break for summer), and, currently, on a bi-monthly schedule appearing continuously throughout the year. The length of the journal has been as short as 60-some pages and as long as a whopping 160 pages (under the Monseau editorship in the early years of the twenty-first century). *English Journal* has boasted among its contributors famous writers and educators, among them: Ted Koozer, Henry Taylor, Jonathan Kozol, Ted Sizer, Alfie Kohn, and Howard Gardner. It has carried advertising, although the location of ads has varied depending upon the editor.

Beginning with the Tchudi editorship in the 1970s, original poetry, puzzles, photography, and cartoons have been printed alongside articles in issues of *English Journal*. Beginning with the editorship of Kenneth Donelson and Alleen Pace Nilsen in the 1980s, *EJ* covers were routinely printed in full color. All these practices have continued to the present day.

Once privately owned by James Fleming Hosic, both the journal’s first editor and NCTE’s first Secretary-Treasurer, *EJ* was sold to NCTE in 1957. While NCTE has always handled the production of *EJ* and the journal is both printed and mailed by the organization, the editors have been, since the late 1950s, independent from NCTE and affiliated with a college or university.

After the 40-year association with *EJ* of editor W. Wilbur Hatfield, editors were given a limited term of office. Since 1955 that term, which could be renewed, lasted a total of 9 years; beginning with Tchudi, the term was 7 years. Currently, a single 5-year nonrenewable term is the norm.

Once selected, the *EJ* editors have authority to appoint column editors and select reviewers and
members of the Advisory Board. The editors have maintained offices in their institutions where correspondence and editing of manuscripts have been handled. To support their work, the editors have enjoyed both institutional as well as NCTE funding for their years with *English Journal*.

**SETTING THE TONE**

The first article of the first issue of *English Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1912, “Can Good Composition Teaching Be Done Under Present Circumstances?,” was an angry, pointed piece regarding the state of school funding and staffing and the subsequent burdens on English teachers at the time. The author, Edwin M. Hopkins of the University of Kansas, answered his article’s title query with the short, but succinct, single-sentence first paragraph: “No.” Hopkins went on to note the “intolerable” burdens on teachers of writing.

While he was at times histrionic, his argument seemed to be born of bitter experience and a sense that nothing would change in American secondary education if the case were not strongly made. Hopkins wrote: “Every year teachers resign, break down, perhaps become permanently invalided, having sacrificed ambition, health, and in not a few instances even life, in the struggle to do all the work expected of them.” Using research studies of the time, Hopkins called for public information and more research to improve composition teaching and to reduce class size for English teachers.

It could be argued that “Can Good Composition Teaching Be Done Under Present Conditions?” was almost archetypal, setting a tone for much of the succeeding content of *EJ*. Based on research regarding school practice and geared to improvement of the profession, Hopkins’ article was a template for much of what followed in the journal. In the decades following, almost every editor would either solicit or publish articles that were similarly specific, pointed, and which contained calls for reform and change and used research to underscore their ideas.

In recognition of the importance of this first article, not to mention his pivotal role in the early years of NCTE, the Edwin M. Hopkins Award was established in the mid 1990s to honor outstanding articles published in *English Journal* by university or college professors (the Hopkins Award was established in addition to the Kay and Paul Farmer Writing Award which recognizes outstanding *EJ* articles written by classroom teachers).

**THE EDITORS AND THE ISSUES**

*English Journal* has, between January 1912 and December 2002, been edited by eleven individuals, seven single editors, a pair of co-editors, and an editor and associate editor. The current incoming editor, Louann Reid of Colorado State University, will begin her term in January 2003. Hailing from Illinois, Florida, Hawaii, Michigan, Arizona, Missouri, Virginia, and Ohio, and most of them associated with colleges and universities, the seven men and four women editors have founded other organizations (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Hosic), edited other NCTE journals (College English, Hatfield; English Education, Nelms; ALAN Review, Donelson and Nilsen, Christenbury), and served as chair of NCTE’s Conference on English Education (Burton, Donelson). Three have been elected president of NCTE (Hosic, Tchudi, Christenbury). Two editors have been given NCTE’s Distinguished Service Award (Burton, Tchudi); one has received the Rewey Belle Inglis Award (Christenbury). One editor has received the Edwin M. Hopkins Award (Nelms, the full text of which is reproduced in subsequent pages), and almost all have written or edited books published by NCTE. The two earliest
editors (Hosic and Hatfield) were NCTE’s first two Secretary-Treasurers.

Further, among the editors there is sense of apprenticeship and continuity, as almost all of English Journal’s editors, before their own terms of office, reviewed manuscripts for \textit{EJ}, wrote articles and reviews which were published in \textit{EJ}, and even regularly edited columns for \textit{EJ}.

James Fleming Hosic
Editor, 1912-1921

The history of \textit{English Journal} is both the history of the secondary English teaching profession in America and the history of the individual editors. No editor is as compelling as James Fleming Hosic, chair of the Committee of the Round Table, professor at Chicago Teachers College, and president of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English. The first Secretary-Treasurer of NCTE (1912-1919) and its ninth president (1920), Hosic later went on to found an important and influential educational organization, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. And, in a curious wrinkle of those times, Hosic was also the owner of \textit{EJ}.

During Hosic’s energetic editorship, \textit{EJ} was published ten times a year, excepting July and August. The journal subscription cost $1.50, in addition to the $2 dues for NCTE. The first issue of \textit{EJ}, 64 pages long, was published in January 1912 and included an even split of articles by college professors and secondary English teachers.

A feature of the early issues \textit{EJ} was its inclusion of the proceedings of NCTE meetings, and in \textit{EJ}’s first January 1912 issue is contained the minutes of the December 1-2, 1911 founding meeting.

“The fact remains... that there are numerous unsolved problems of English teaching; witness the discontent. The Journal hopes to have a useful part... it aspires to provide a means of expression and a general clearinghouse of experience and opinions for the English teachers of the country, whether members of some organization or working alone. If not a household name, the Journal would be at least a welcome visitor and a bearer of helpful messages to all who are interested in the teaching of the mother tongue.”

Inaugural Editorial, 1912

James Fleming Hosic
Editor, 1912-1921
of NCTE as well as 14 other pieces. Another aspect of *EJ* was the Round Table, a section that was named in honor of the experimental NEA group that had founded NCTE. The Round Table started with Hosic’s editorship and continued on for many years.

As NCTE matured and gathered strength, it increased in size and wealth: it was reported that in November 1916 NCTE boasted 1,700 members and had $480 in its treasury. Much of this was likely due to the influence of NCTE’s journal and the hard work and energy of James Fleming Hosic, its young and charismatic editor.

**W. Wilbur Hatfield**  
Editor, 1922-1955

The second editor of *EJ* was W. Wilbur Hatfield. He was the longest termed editor, serving, in turn, as assistant editor to Hosic and then as sole editor for an astounding total of 40 years of service. Termed by one member as a “Dickens character in the flesh,” the bowtie-attired Hatfield was not only *EJ* editor but also NCTE Secretary-Treasurer (1920-1953), a post that was precursor to the modern position of Executive Director of NCTE. Active in NCTE until the 1970s, Hatfield was a deliberate editor and leader and had been involved in NCTE from the very first. A friend and associate of James Fleming Hosic (who had since moved on to work in other educational endeavors), Hatfield provided the steady consistency and the breadth of interest in issues that the young journal needed. In addition, Hatfield used surveys to determine English teachers’ interests.

Reviewing the issues of *EJ* under Hatfield’s time, there is a sense of stability and traditional interest (a typical article format he 1930 *English Journal* is on “Most Common Grammatical Errors”). While many of the issues, notably from the 1940s, are staid, even dull by modern standards, *English Journal* appeared, as promised, on a regular basis and covered all aspects of English teaching, curriculum, and books. Faded somewhat was the frisson of the first issue and the fire of the new organization, but English teachers, within the pages of *EJ*, continued to discuss and argue.

In 1957, NCTE moved its headquarters to Champaign-Urbana, and *EJ* was purchased for $24,000, taking the journal from private ownership to organizational ownership. It also signaled the emergence of *EJ* into the modern educational world.

“We design to make [English Journal] an open forum for all, conservative and radical alike, who have important ideas and can state them well...unless we teachers of English take up this matter of experiment in our own field it will be done for us by workers unfamiliar with the actual problems of English, who may secure results which we are forced to follow in our teaching although we are convinced that they are wrong.”  
Inaugural Editorial, 1922
Dwight L. Burton  
Editor, 1955-1964

Remembered by his contemporaries as intellectual, acerbic, and bright, Dwight Burton moved *English Journal* out of musty corners and into the mainstream of English teaching issues. The previous editor was 73 when Burton took over, and a hallmark of the new regime was an increase in research-based articles and journal issues which concentrated on a single topic or theme. Using a bright red cover on which the table of contents was displayed, Burton's editorship was lively and a marked departure from the conservative feel and look of the Hatfield era.

A Florida State University professor and a student of renowned Dora V. Smith, Burton's interest in "life adjustment" education was evident in many of the articles he printed in *EJ*. In addition, his interest in young adult literature meant that a number of articles on that topic appeared in *EJ*; for instance, "The Adolescent in American Fiction" was the opening article in the September 1957 issue.

Despite his claim that there would be no new policies for *EJ*, Burton's years moved the journal into contemporary times.

Richard S. Alm  
Editor, 1964-1973

Richard (Dick) S. Alm taught at the University of Hawaii, but there is little official record that the communication between his editorial offices and mainland NCTE headquarters was a problem, even an issue. Considering the constant inquiries from contributors and the many editorial details regarding manuscripts, this is a bit remarkable, and it may indicate the kind of professionalism that Dick Alm brought to *EJ*.

Alm's writing had appeared in *EJ* under Burton's editorship (one example is "The Utmost Need," November 1957) and like many of the editors before him, he was familiar with *English Journal* and its history. Yet there were changes: during his 9 years as editor, Alm saw NCTE grow to almost 60,000 members, and the demands from the membership were shifting.

Accordingly, Alm's editorship was marked by a number of truly controversial, landmark articles, among which are: James Sledd's "Bi-Dialecticism and the Teaching of English" (December 1969), which evoked a firestorm of controversy regarding Black English Vernacular, one of the hot topics of the day; August Franz's "Abolish English" (September 1970), a provocative and deliberately outrageous proposal meant to inspire discussion; and John K. Crabbe's "Those Infernal Electives" (1970), one of the first articles which signaled the decline of one of the most popular secondary English curriculum innovations of the time.

Within the pages of *EJ*, Dick Alm aired controversies and discussions, and he set the stage for what would become a series of widespread and startling changes with the new *EJ* editor, Stephen N. Tchudi.
Stephen N. Tchudi
Editor, 1973-1980

The youngest individual to edit *English Journal*, Stephen (Steve) N. Tchudi of Michigan State broke open the pages of *English Journal* and established, in rapid succession, a dizzying array of changes. (While the Tchudi family had initially spelled their surname Judy, Steve Tchudi returned to the original spelling in 1982).

The list of Tchudi innovations is long: in appearance, *EJ* now sported very contemporary, even edgy art both on the cover and within the pages of the journal. *EJ*’s page size was enlarged for the first time, and, moving the journal from its academic look to something more modern and even spicy, type sizes and faces varied within the journal. Additionally, advertising was found in selected areas of journal, not just in the back pages.

A 1978 doctoral dissertation by Charlotte K. Jones analyzed *EJ* from 1959 to 1976. Jones found, specifically in Tchudi’s editorship, more articles on ethnic studies, ethnic literature, and literature written for adolescents; language articles not on grammar but on dialect, usage, and doublespeak; reduced coverage of composition, oral communication, and the teaching of reading. Using completely thematic issues, Judy’s *EJ* was an explosion in the field. Steve Tchudi also ran issues entirely devoted to the history of English teaching (his inaugural September 1973 issue also featured a cover with a retrospective of *EJ* covers), and he sponsored a Spring Poetry Festival showcasing original poetry by students.

*English Journal* no longer looked like an academic journal for high school teachers yearning to be college professors; it appeared in tune with the times in both content and appearance. While not all readers liked the changes, *EJ* became influential and widely read, a forum for the controversies and tensions of the times. Among others, its issues on urban English, young adult literature, and multicultural studies set it apart. On the other hand, Tchudi’s devotion to the history of the profession was obvious: as noted above, his first issue, September 1973, featured a collage of previous *EJ* covers, and his history issues (September and November of 1979) were important retrospectives of secondary English teaching in America.

Steve Tchudi left *EJ* with a reputation as being a tireless, energetic editor who would take on the tough issues, publish the articles, and inspire dialogue and argument. For many, the editorship of Steve Tchudi marked the height of influence and prestige of *English Journal*.

“I believe English Journal must be directly concerned with broad theoretical questions of importance to the profession, but it must be no less involved with the issues of day-to-day survival in today’s schools. It needs to be a practical magazine, dealing in concrete terms with problems faced by classroom teachers, but it cannot drift toward gimmickry or shallow eclecticism. It needs to be a scholarly journal, investigating ideas at the forefront of the discipline, but it cannot fall prey to pedagogical fantasy.”

Inaugural Editorial, 1973

Steven N. Tchudi
Editor, 1973-1980
Kenneth Donelson
Alleen Pace Nilsen
Co-Editors, 1980-1987

Colleagues, collaborators, and long time co-authors (of a popular and best selling text on young adult literature), Arizona State University professors Kenneth (Ken) Donelson and Alleen Pace Nilsen were the first co-editors of *English Journal*. Both were familiar with *English Journal*, and Nilsen had edited a column during Steve Tchudi's years with *EJ*. Differing in ideas and temperament, they brought to the journal their interest in feminist studies, censorship, and humor.

At the onset of their appointment, they made a concerted effort to find out what readers wanted and surveyed them regarding what they wanted to see in the journal. One of the results was that Nilsen and Donelson regularly identified new contributors to the journal who were publishing for the first time in *EJ*. Another popular feature of their editorship was the Bait/Rebait column, a pro and con set of essays which allowed two authors to take widely different stands on a controversial issue and, point by point, to battle it out. Letters to the editor (Our Readers Write) were printed routinely, and while Donelson and Nilsen often lamented readers' excessive attention to stray typos found in the journal's pages, the letters dialogue was consistent and lively.

Moving away from the Tchudi art and type face/type size variety, Ken Donelson and Alleen Nilsen commissioned a total redesign, returning *EJ* to more of a classic, academic look, a design change which would endure until 1994 and which pleased many readers.

As co-editors, Nilsen and Donelson also alternated the writing of the issue's editorial for each month and moved *EJ* from its appearance 9 times a year (monthly, September through April) to eight times a year (monthly, September through April).

As a final point, Donelson and Nilsen's very collaboration was a bit unusual in the profession. While times were changing, and doors were being opened for women both within NCTE and in other areas of education, the presence of a woman co-editor, equal to her male counterpart in work load and decision making, was discounted by many within the profession for some time. As their editorship continued, however, it became obvious that Nilsen and Donelson were an equal pair, not an editor and his assistant. In some significant ways, this collaboration opened the doors for successive editors. In their editorial partnership in *English Journal*, Donelson and Nilsen demonstrated that their devotion to gender equality and use of nonsexist language was not a political gesture but a lived experience.

“Readers will undoubtedly notice several new features in *EJ*...most of the changes have evolved from suggestions made to us by readers...We hope [to] encourage newcomers to contribute to *EJ* and will suggest *EJ* is not put together by an in-group of good-old-boy college academicians writing to each other.”

Inaugural Editorial, 1980
While *English Journal* concerned itself with secondary English teachers, none had ever been an editor of *EJ*. The appointment as associate editor of Elizabeth (Beth) Nelms, spouse of editor Ben Nelms and a classroom teacher, was a ground breaker and was part of the many changes that the Nelms editorship contained. For his part, Ben Nelms was one of the most experienced and best prepared of the *EJ* editors to assume the post; for years he had also successfully edited the NCTE quarterly, *English Education*, and he had also edited an *EJ* column during the Nilsen and Donelson years.

One of the Nelms’ great loves was art, and *EJ* covers reproduced a wide range of literature- and language-related famous paintings and sculpture. The editors did not just put the art on the cover, however; within each journal, Ben Nelms devoted a few pages (entitled “Covering EJ”) explaining the art selected and its relationship to English language arts. While Ben and Beth Nelms often found themselves in conflict with NCTE regarding specifics of cover selection, *EJ* readers appreciated the variety and the care. In addition, *EJ* was now regularly filled with photographs of teachers in classrooms and their students.

Memorable articles from the Nelms era spawned discussion and subsequent articles; some of these responses and rebuttals extended over years within *EJ*. Among these were “Why High School Teachers Don’t Write” (March 1990), a heartfelt piece from Karen Jost, a classroom teacher who insisted she and her colleagues did not have the time to follow well-meaning advice from their university-based counterparts regarding teachers daily writing. Within *EJ*, there were dozens of replies to Jost, and presentations at subsequent NCTE conventions took up her challenge. Other memorable articles involved a section devoted to the “alienated” student as well as an extensive series of articles on the pros and cons of teaching *Huckleberry Finn*.

Ben Nelms wrote in a later issue of *EJ*, “Our profession has the expertise, experience, and good will to achieve reforms of an unprecedented nature and on a massive scale.” Numbers confirmed the influence of *English Journal*: at the height of the Nelms editorship, the *EJ* editorial offices received for its consideration 1,000 manuscripts a year, and the letters to the editor were healthy in number.

“For the seventh time in its more than seventy-five year history, the English Journal has new editors...These days we are particularly aware of tensions among curriculum goals; competencies that administrators and parents expect students to achieve; experiences with language and thought processes that our students find interesting and relevant; and the knowledge of our cultural and linguistic heritage that our colleagues and university mentors have identified as important.”

Inaugural Editorial, 1987

Ben F. Nelms, Editor, 1987-1994
Leila Christenbury
Editor, 1994-1998

A protégé of Tchudi (who printed her first professional article), Donelson and Nilsen (for whom she edited an EJ column for 4 years) and Nelms (who also published her and later appointed her chair of the EJ Farmer Award), Leila Christenbury was the first woman to edit EJ alone, and she brought a sense of history to her editorship. A former high school English teacher and English education professor at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Christenbury’s editorship also signaled shifts in English Journal.

EJ had essentially kept the same design and logo for some 14 years, and one immediately visible change in Christenbury’s editorship was a total redesign. Some readers were pleased, some appalled by the new typeface, page design, the white space, the use of a cursive intro capital letter to begin each article, and the computer icons for columns, but the redesign quibbles paled alongside controversies that soon appeared in the journal’s pages.

During Christenbury’s years as editor, a series of articles – followed in subsequent issues by rebuttal articles and letters to the editor – appeared regarding the College Board’s Pacesetter English program, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the NCTE/IRA standards. All three issues were hotly debated within the pages of EJ and, eventually, to distance itself from some of the controversy, NCTE removed the term “official” from EJ’s masthead and placed on the editorial page a disclaimer regarding the journal’s content.

In less controversial aspects, Christenbury recruited some 300 outside reviewers and made the journal fully referred; almost all submissions – EJ continued to receive 1,000 manuscripts a year – were handled within weeks, and submissions were returned to the writers with specific feedback regarding content and revision suggestions. Issues featured nontraditional themes, including breaking the rules, violence in the schools, media literacy, and the needs of ESL students. Letters to the editor were published monthly, and photographs, cartoons, and puzzles also sprinkled the journal.

In her April issues, Christenbury returned to Tchudi’s Spring Literary Festival, making it a judged competition for teachers who submitted original short stories, poetry, essays, and photographs. Volunteer judges for the festival included literary luminaries such as George Garret, Henry Taylor, Mary Clearman Blew, and Kim Stafford. The winning selections were printed, and the winning photograph became the cover for the April issue.

“What we can do is participate in a dialogue of sorts, in a conversation, and make a connection with other teachers across this nation, across the world, and across the hall. In the pages of this journal, this English Journal is somewhat of an answer to the isolation of the classroom. Here are the stories of students working in the library and moments in third period; here are the ideas for teaching short stories and poetry that have been tried with some success. Here are plans for the literary magazine, the computer center, and the drama festival. Here is what others are reading and thinking and dreaming on.”

Inaugural Editorial, 1994

Leila Christenbury
Editor, 1994-1998
Virginia R. Monseau
Editor, 1998-2003

Former high school English teacher and professor of English Education at Youngstown State University, Virginia (Ginger) Monseau, like the editors before her, had deep roots in NCTE and with English Journal. Her first professional article had appeared in EJ during the editorship of Nilsen and Donelson, and one of her major professors, Stephen Dunning, was a student of former EJ editor Dwight Burton who was, in turn, a student of Dora V. Smith.

Other links to previous editors were obvious: like Christenbury and Tchudi and Nelms, Monseau was interested in the appearance of the journal, and she commissioned a redesign which used a perfect binding, a classic typeface, and bold face type to indicate pages and introductory sections of articles. Monseau maintained the printing of monthly letters to the editor, and cartoons, puzzles, and photographs appeared in each issue. As in previous years, all manuscripts were reviewed by at least two readers, and specific feedback was offered to contributors.

In a break with tradition, however, Ginger Monseau’s editorship inaugurated a bi-monthly publication schedule for English Journal; for the first time in the journal’s history, issues appeared six times a year (every other month), making the dialogue among readers more consistent and the appearance of the journal more regular. (Leila Christenbury had initially recommended to NCTE this publication schedule in 1993, but it was not until Monseau’s editorship that the change was implemented.)

Monseau’s editorship was not without controversy. As with Christenbury, letters to the editor were both scathing and laudatory, and one especially hot topic involved the September 2001 issue where a cartoon spoofing President George Bush was misinterpreted as a deliberate, tasteless post-September 11 attack on the president.

Monseau also hosted themed issues on topics which EJ had not addressed for years: the peace curriculum, teaching English in the city, humor, the pernicious effects of high stakes testing (cleverly termed “assessing ourselves to death”), multigenre teaching, connections between teachers at all levels, and the history of the profession. In the latter issue (January 2000), Monseau invited all the living former editors of English Journal to write a retrospective of their years with EJ (their essays are reproduced in the following pages).

A Monseau innovation was the use of “Cross Conversations,” a dialogue column in which one teacher would write and another respond, somewhat like the Bait/Rebait format from the Donelson and Nilsen years. Her “Insights for Interns” column focused on new teachers and elicited much comment from readers who were in their first years in the classroom.

“This journal gives us power. It stokes us when we’re doing things right and pinches us when we need to do better. Above all, it encourages us to keep going-in spite of criticisms, in spite of politics, in spite of battle fatigue. Deep down inside we know how important our work is. Why else did we become English teachers?”

Inaugural Editorial, 1998
Future Directions:
A Look into the Crystal Ball

Virginia R. Monseau

Trying to predict the future is risky. If being editor of the English Journal for five years has taught me anything, it’s to expect the unexpected. When I worried that a particular issue fell short of reader expectations, congratulatory letters and e-mails proved me wrong. When I was especially excited about a certain issue and convinced that readers would love it, there was sometimes very little response.

But when it comes to looking ahead to the future of the English Journal and its place in secondary education, I’m confident it will continue to prevail as the journal for secondary English teachers. EJ has survived ninety years of educational movements and reforms, both resisting and pushing the swinging educational pendulum as it moves back and forth between the traditional and the progressive. That pendulum continues to swing, and the journal continues to give voice to all who have intelligent, well-reasoned arguments for what they do in their classrooms. It continues to be a forum for educational differences, challenging us to think about the disparate views of others who may have unusual (and sometimes anti-mainstream) perspectives on what constitutes “best practice.”

So where do I see EJ going in the next couple of decades? First of all, technology will continue to be a driving force in how the journal is conceived, assembled, produced, delivered, and read. While we had sound reasons for not accepting manuscripts electronically in the past, the pressure is...
on to ditch that dated submission guideline. True, there are bugs that must be worked out (format problems, platform differences, viruses, and reviewers who cannot or will not read manuscripts online), but the fact remains that it's much less expensive and more efficient to produce and deliver a journal electronically than it is in paper format. Right now NCTE is offering its subscribers both methods of delivery, but I wouldn’t be surprised if electronic publication becomes the norm in the not-too-distant future. For any number of subscribers lost to this form of publishing, there will most likely be a gain of many more who embrace the technology.

With advanced technology comes a rethinking of the journals contents. The longtime feature that I called “English in the News” (formerly called “This World of English” by previous editors) now delivers “old news” to readers who have daily access to the Internet. The process of producing a journal the traditional way takes months, rendering some news obsolete before it ever reaches readers.

In some ways, the same is true for a feature like “Teacher to Teacher,” where readers share ideas for the classroom. With myriad teacher Web sites on the Internet, and with projects like NCTE's Co-Learn, teachers can access and exchange ideas immediately without waiting two months for the next issue of the journal to arrive. Educators are beginning to expect immediate gratification when it comes to their teaching needs—something that quick Internet access can provide.

In spite of the changes technology will make in the publication of the English Journal (and other journals, as well), the same professional issues will always be with us, depending on which educational philosophy holds sway at the time. Testing and assessment, for example, will not go away anytime soon, and English Journal must and will continue to be a forum for discussion on this important issue. I fear what may happen to our teachers, though, as a result of this sometimes ill-conceived emphasis on teacher accountability. Morale is low among teachers who are doing their very best, but whose best is not good enough for ill-informed politicians and an uninformed public. English Journal must be the voice and support of these teachers as they struggle to educate our students in ways they know are most effective. As a journal for all English language arts teachers, EJ cannot afford to espouse any particular party line.

The decrease in English Journal's subscription base over the last decade or so can be alarming, but the reduced numbers may be due to changes in NCTE's membership policy, which now allows members to choose among several publications rather than being bound to their section journal. Another factor may be the recent formation of the Middle Level Section, many of whose members formerly subscribed to EJ but now may choose to subscribe to Voices from the Middle instead. Important, too, is the increased cost of joining NCTE, as well as other professional organizations, and the decreased resources available to teachers. If state support for education continues to decline as it has in recent years, professional development will continue to suffer. Teachers who have always found it hard to attend conferences away from home may now find they can't even afford membership in their professional organization. NCTE must find a way to reach such teachers through its publications.

But let's not end on a negative note. When I think of all the wonderful manuscripts I've read during my tenure as editor of EJ and all the lively conversations I've had with teachers across the country, I am in awe of their knowledge, ability, and hard work in the face of the daily demands they must meet. I'm astounded at their ability to
keep up with what's happening in the profession and to implement these new ideas in their classrooms. Reading about their work has often helped me to focus and improve my own teaching. Exciting things are happening in English classes today, and no amount of reduced funding will deter the best English teachers from meeting the needs of their students. And English Journal will be right there beside them, helping in any way it can.
of "traditional" literacy education. Having aimed to make students lifetime readers and lovers of literature, competent essayists, and speakers of standard English, the "old English" seemed largely to have been - in the words of the era - a "demise" to younger generations.

An article published in my first issue as editor (September 1973) gave some sense of the excitement of those times. John Weather wrote of "Forces and Fragmentations: Toward the Role of Imagination in Life and Learning and The Margins of That." In our broad sense, education, literacy, and experience are one, like a piece of a jigsaw puzzle. The skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening (SWLS) are often called "basics," but they are more than that. They are the foundation for all learning, the core of literacy, and the key to understanding the world around us.

The next few years saw a shift in the way we think about literacy. The emphasis on "basics" was replaced by a focus on "literacy" - the ability to read, write, speak, and listen. This change was reflected in the language we used to describe literacy. In the 1970s, the term "literacy" was used to describe the ability to read and write, while the term "literacy education" was used to describe the process of teaching literacy. This change in language reflected a shift in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of learning and understanding.

In the 1980s, the focus on literacy education continued, with a shift towards a focus on "literacy as a tool for learning." This shift was reflected in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of learning and understanding. In the 1990s, the focus on literacy education continued, with a shift towards a focus on "literacy as a tool for living." This shift was reflected in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of living and understanding.

In the 2000s, the focus on literacy education continued, with a shift towards a focus on "literacy as a tool for democracy." This shift was reflected in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of democracy and understanding.

In the 2010s, the focus on literacy education continued, with a shift towards a focus on "literacy as a tool for global citizenship." This shift was reflected in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of global citizenship and understanding.

In the 2020s, the focus on literacy education continues, with a shift towards a focus on "literacy as a tool for sustainability." This shift is reflected in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of sustainability and understanding.

The focus on literacy education continues to evolve, with a shift towards a focus on "literacy as a tool for all." This shift is reflected in the way we think about literacy, from a focus on the skills of reading and writing to a focus on the process of literacy for all and understanding.
“Dissociativized” education—a sound mind in a sound body—was the subsequent legacy of that tradition in the West. To argue that content was a byproduct of those debates is to misread the history of education and its impact on society.

Nietzsche and Fanon both argued that Western education was a form of colonialism, an instrument of cultural domination. Their views were influenced by the broader context of colonialism and the struggle for national independence in the 19th and 20th centuries. The idea of education as a means of cultural domination is still relevant today, as we confront issues of globalisation, identity, and cultural diversity.

Nietzsche’s philosophy of education was closely tied to his ideas about the role of the individual in society. He believed that education should be a means of personal development, allowing individuals to transcend their limitations and achieve greatness. This idea of education as a means of self-realisation is still relevant today, as we seek to understand the role of education in personal growth and development.

Fanon’s ideas about education were influenced by his experience of colonialism and the struggle for national independence. He believed that education should be a means of cultural liberation, allowing individuals to reclaim their cultural heritage and resist the forces of cultural domination. This idea of education as a means of cultural liberation is still relevant today, as we seek to understand the role of education in the struggle for cultural identity and cultural freedom.

In conclusion, the ideas of Nietzsche and Fanon about education are still relevant today, as we seek to understand the role of education in personal growth, cultural development, and cultural liberation. Their ideas challenge us to think critically about the role of education in society, and to consider the ways in which education can be used to promote a more just and equitable society.
Since Spanish was also involved with Dave Emighlet, whose work reflected on the 1970s annual evolution of the profession, from Spalding and the National Catholic Education Act of the 1970s, through the "Project English" years and the "Towards a New English" movement, to the exciting changes in the 1980s. It will be interesting to see how the work of English teachers, including the work of Charles H. Brown, has influenced the evolution of English teaching, and how that influence has been perceived in the classroom.

This is the case, however, that the future of English teaching was a significant challenge to the profession. The key article, by Al Capo, was the first in a series of essays on the status and role of English in the 1980s. He pointed out the difficulties of the profession and the need for new approaches, but also an opportunity for English teachers to take a more active role in shaping the future of education. He also suggested that English teachers should focus on "teaching excellence" by the development of positive relationships with students and parents, and by creating a more inclusive and flexible learning environment.

At the risk of sounding like an old-timer, I'd like to say a few things that can help English teachers to grow and develop. First, it is important to develop a sense of community and to work together to solve problems. Second, it is important to continue to learn and to stay up-to-date with new developments in the field. Third, it is important to support each other and to help each other to succeed. Finally, it is important to remember that the future of English teaching is in the hands of all of us.

So, let's work together to make English teaching a more effective and enjoyable experience for all.

Works Cited
Gender Benders: Men and Women Navigating the Freeway to Equity

Ken Donelson and I were coeditors of the *English Journal* between 1980 and 1987, when the feminist movement was having its biggest impact on public education. In those heady days a lot of us thought that once we cruised onto the Freeway to Equity, all we would need to do would be to follow the signs and move full speed ahead. Twenty years later the traffic is still flowing, but in our rush we’ve more or less ignored the fact that what happens to women in the profession also affects men, which in turn affects women, and so forth. This is why I have chosen to focus on the changing relationships between males and females in NCTE.

In 1980, *EJ* had never had coeditors, nor had there been a woman editor. This, plus the fact that Ken was older and better known in Council circles, contributed to a general expectation that Ken was really the editor and I was his assistant. We countered this perception by alternating whose name went first on the *EJ* masthead and by taking turns writing the editorials. By the time we finished our seven-year term, most people viewed us as true coeditors.

Those who in the beginning had a hard time viewing us as equal partners were only making assumptions based on what they had seen in NCTE. When the Council was organized by high school English teachers in 1911, approximately one-third of the thirty-five who signed the roster of charter members were women. However, it was not until 1929 that a woman (Revey Belle Inglis) was elected president. In J. N. Hooke’s 1979 book, *A Long Way Together: A Personal View of NCTE’s First Sixty-Seventy Years*, only seventeen out of a total of the sixty-nine listed presidents were women. For NCTE’s journals (*Language Arts* [earlier called *Elementary English*], *English Journal*, *College English*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, *College Composition and Communication*, and *Abstracts of English Studies*), the only women whose names were listed among the thirty-two editors were Iris Tiedt and Julie Jensen, who edited *Language Arts* in the 1970s.

For another rough comparison of male and female leadership roles in NCTE, I counted the names in the index of Hooke’s history and found that what appeared to be 133 women’s names compared to 387 men’s names—a ratio of approximately 1:3. To get a glimpse of current practices, I counted the names in the index of the most recent NCTE Directory. Because it lists only officers and people on committees and commissions, I assume that it is somewhat reflective of current leadership. Here I found approximately three female names for every two male names. (I did not count such names as Pat and Kelly that are used for both males and females.) The difference in ratio hints at the changes that are taking place, as do the front page listings of officers and staff members.

I asked John Kelley, NCTE membership development associate, how these ratios compared to overall membership. He said that on the last big survey that NCTE took, the overall ratio of women to men was 4:1. Current statistics, which may not be “the most reliable” because not everyone fills out the profile form and “our male constituents do not return the form as often as their female counterparts,” show that males make up 17 percent of the Secondary Section membership, while females make up 53 percent. In 1985, when Ken and I were editors, males made up 32 percent and females 68 percent. A current statistic that surprised Kelley was that in the College Section males now make up only 33 percent of the membership with females totalling 67 percent. Traditionally, the College Section has been 45 to 50 percent male. I suspect that some of this change comes from there being fewer men in English education.

What worries me more than any of these statistics is an experience we had this spring at Arizona State University. Two of our most capable doctoral students in English education (both women) were asked by our GSEA (Graduate Students of English Association) to offer some pedagogical workshops on Friday afternoons for the benefit of those graduate students who were aspiring to become college teachers but who did not have teaching assistantships and so would not get training in methods of teaching. The workshops were wonderfully prepared and well attended, but not by male students. One male, an international student, came to the first one but did not return to the others, most likely because he felt uncomfortable being the only man.

The workshops were wonderfully prepared and well attended, but not by male students.

I talked to our director of composition (a male), who conducts the training sessions for teaching assistants and also conducts mentoring sessions open to all graduate students. He said that males and females attend his required seminars in equal numbers, but in the open seminars males are noticeably absent. He wonders whether males simply don’t like to admit they need help or whether the topics of the seminars (coaching student writing, the process approach to writing, setting up workshops, mentoring students, one-on-one conferencing, initiating reading conversations, etc.) are anathema to them.

If the latter is the case, it fits with the observations that Deborah Tannen made in her book *You Just Don’t Understand* (Morrow, 1990) when she contrasted men’s style of public speaking or report talk with women’s style of private speaking or rapport talk. She wrote that, in their conversations, women establish connections and negotiate relationships:

Emphasis is placed on displaying similarities and matching experiences. From childhood, girls criticize peers who try to stand out or appear better than others. People feel their closest connections at home, or in settings where they feel at home—with one or a few people they feel close to and comfortable with—in other words, during private speaking. But even the most public situations can be approached like private speaking. (127)

In contrast, men use talk to preserve their independence and to negotiate and maintain status in hierarchical social orders:

This is done by exhibiting knowledge and skill, and by holding center stage through verbal performance such as storytelling, joking, or imparting information. From childhood, men learn to use talking as a way to get and keep attention. So they are more comfortable speaking in larger groups made up of people they know less well—in the broadest sense, “public speaking.” But even the most private situations can be approached like public speaking, more like giving a report than establishing rapport. (127)

Current fashions in English education favor what Tannen describes as women’s language. Tannen does not say whether such language patterns and attitudes are the result of nature or nurture, nor
does she say that they are always exhibited by the predicted sex. She is not trying to further cement such differences but to lend insights so that males and females will recognize that many misunderstandings can be traced to differences in communication styles.

Her insights are important to male and female English teachers who are caught in a shifting paradigm and are trying to understand each other.

In the first issue of WILLA (Fall 1992), Lana Hartman Landon made some interesting observations about "The Trap of Domesticity for Women Professors." She wrote about how her generation of women easily recognized the absurdity of expecting to look and act like the perky June Cleaver and the serene Donna Reed while doing the kind of housewifely jobs that made their own mothers look harried and frantic.

Matthew Stewart to the contrary, few of today's women aspire to be "Polly Perfect," managing their homes as "nicely" as did their mothers. However, Landon suggests that many women now approach teaching in the same way that our mothers approached parenting and housework. We take to heart the old adage that "Men work from sun to sun, but women's work is never done," and we let our teaching expand to fill whatever time is available.

We take to heart the old adage that "Men work from sun to sun, but women's work is never done," and we let our teaching expand to fill whatever time is available.

When Landon talks to female colleagues, she frequently discourses about the need to listen, to respond, and to be sensitive to the feelings of others. She emphasizes the importance of communication in the classroom and suggests that teachers should be aware of their own biases and assumptions.

Landon was writing for an audience of women and asking them to consider the effects on their own lives of "domesticating the curriculum." She wants to raise awareness of the issues and encourage others to think more critically about the way society organizes knowledge and values different forms of knowledge.

Contrasting styles of communication keep the opposing groups from recognizing, and certainly from articulating, what is at the heart of their differences. Men, who want to get closure on student assignments and on administrative tasks, so that they can feel free to think about activities that they consider more important or longer lasting, are frustrated by the new styles of teaching. "Nurturing" women, on the other hand, are accustomed to keeping several balls in the air at the same time, so they don't feel pressured in the same way that men do by the never-ending "process" approach to writing and reading. After all, this kind of teaching, as opposed to lecturing, explaining, judging, and reporting, is a lot like motherhood, which girls have been prepared for all their lives.

While the two groups do not talk with each other about their differing attitudes, they seek relief by grouping among like-minded colleagues. The so-called "slackers" suggest that the so-called "mothers" are intellectually unable to make scholarly contributions and so conspire to create buxworth just to slow down their competition. They further complain about being manipulated and controlled, and they engage in a kind of passive resistance by forgetting about committee meetings and ignoring the carefully crafted guidelines that the "mothers" have put together. If confronted, they offer inexact excuses, which cause the "mothers" to roll their eyes and make snide and sexist remarks.

It won't be good for any of us to have a profession that is primarily female. We've been there and done that, and it didn't work.

As if this weren't enough to drive men out of the teaching profession, many—but not all—of the perks and the special privileges that men used to get are disappearing. In my experience, it's still true that male student teachers get job offers earlier than do equally qualified females, but in the "old days" they would have also gotten higher salaries because males were given teaching credit for military service and were offered extra pay and prestige for add-on administrative and sports-related assignments. Also, for those males who go on to get doctorates and teach in universities, it must be psychologically satisfying for them to lecture to classes filled with aspiring young women and to work closely with the best and brightest in directing their dissertations and publishing articles.

I have observed several English education graduate programs that operated mainly on the "respect," "charm," "charisma," "sex-appeal," or whatever you want to call it, of the all-male faculty, but the only time I've heard a man speak about this particular aspect of his job was a decade ago at a Conference on English Education meeting at NCTE's annual convention. One of the grand old men of the profession got up and lamented the fact that the feminist movement had dried up his source of smart and beautiful doctoral students. He complained that the women who used to come into his English education program were now going to law school or medical school or earning MBAs. He met a decidedly chily response, because most of us at the meeting were women laboring under the illusion that indeed we were the exact kind of women whose absence he was lamenting.

Many women—including me—are happy to see the disappearance of what was doubtfully a lopsided and unfair system, but in the back of my mind I have a nagging suspicion that we will be sorry if all the men flock to the exit ramps while we go tooting merrily along. Certainly, all of our students need to see men who respect and love reading and writing. And from a purely selfish view of our own profession, men and women need to balance each other's teaching.
Oh, Those Golden Teaching Days of Yore

Ken Donelson

years ago, an opponent in a debate launched into a tirade about the miserable level of English teaching in high school. There once was, she announced, a golden age, a Camelot, when parents trusted and respected English teachers, when students respected and unquestioningly did all that English teachers wanted. But that was, she said, pointing her finger at me, no longer true. We had destroyed the dream and the English curricula by dropping the teaching of grammar, by refusing to hold the line on good usage (her example was the distinction between shall and will), by having students write in journals instead of having them write formal essays, by ignoring classics we had once made students love in favor of second-rate and near-pornographic modern material, and (her last point was almost shouted in triumph) by becoming liberal and politically correct and introducing multicultural things, all second or third-rate.

Was there ever such a time? No, and no one who knows a little about the history of secondary English teaching in the United States recognizes that Camelot was never ours. We are a group forever doomed to have problems teaching language, literature, and composition and, it seems, to find only temporary fixes for these problems. The first article in the first issue (January) of the first year (1912) of the English Journal, for example, was Edwin M. Hopkins’s “Can Good Composition Teaching Be Done under Present Conditions?” The entire first paragraph answered “No.” So much for the good old days.

Fifteen years earlier, Samuel Thurber in a brilliant article, “Five Axioms of Composition Teaching” in the January 1897 School Review lamented that all teachers, English included, ought to share in the responsibility for teaching writing:

...the special teacher of composition should be abolished. He does no good, and he stands in the way...the reading of juvenile writing in great quantities is inconsistent with mental and physical health. All the teachers of a school should share equally this task of supervising the English writing. I do not see how any teacher, man or woman, can have the effrontery to claim to know good English better than the rest; and I do not see how any teacher can submit to the drudgery of having several times his share of this work thrust upon him.

And J. F. Genung’s sensible, and largely unheeded, advice two years earlier in the September 1895 School Review is still worth following:

...the teacher should do much work in writing out himself what he gets his pupils to write. He cannot appreciate the significance of his tasks otherwise.... I should be ashamed of myself to have the presumption to tell students how to write if I did not test the forms and processes myself by seeing how they work in actual writing. (The Teacher’s Outfit in Rhetoric) 409

What of those old days when we taught good, and always decent, literature? Plato would have banned poets and dramatists from his Republic; but we’ve had our share of critics and censors in
Attacking novels was a common sport for librarians, who largely saw themselves as protectors of young people—in other words, censors. The last years of the nineteenth century, and after, fiction, usually novels, was persistently criticized by moral critics.

Orville Dewey's Discourses on Human Nature, Human Life, and the Nature of Religion (1847) is typical of the time. Novels are "luxuries [and not] substantial food" (261). And thirty years later, an article in the first year of the American Library Journal (a year later the magazine was renamed the Library Journal) quoted William Kite, librarian of the Free Public Library in Germantown, PA, on the deadly influences of novel-reading:

I could tell of one young lady of my acquaintance, of fine education, who gratified a vitiated taste for novel-reading till her re-form was thrown over, and she has, in consequence, been for several years an inmate of an insane asylum. ... Instances could be furnished by the records of such institutions in too sad frequency. But we need not seek them. Have we the moral right to expose the young to such career? "(Fiction in Public Libraries"

(March 1877). 178"

Attacking novels was a common sport for librarians, who largely saw themselves as protectors of young people—in other words, censors. In 1893 in a Los Angeles debate about the value of reading novels, Lena Fenner said:

The habitual novel reader is a literary tippler. ... Novel reading does not strengthen the intelligence and is of no practical value in the struggle for education. The habitual novel reader loses the power of concentration and of memory. (Los Angeles Herald March 3, 1893)." cited in Henry Winifred Splinter's "Literature in Los Angeles before 1900." Journal of the West January 1966: 44-45"

English teachers in the early days of the English Journal (from 1912 onward) were often equally concerned about fiction, particularly contemporary novels. Emma Breck, level-headed in her other articles, adviser English teachers to beware of new and popular fiction:

Much popular fiction is decidedly unfit for high-school students and should not even be displayed where it may attract and tempt them. They will take the more wholesome books upon her to our shelves if there are no glittering counter-attractions. Therefore our lists should be selected and exclusive. "(The Efficient High-School Library" English Journal [January 1916]: 13"

And lest we think that such an attitude toward fiction is all in the past, Nancy Garfen cites a school board member who said she didn't think fiction had any place in a high school library. ("Annie on My Mind: How It Feels to Be the Author of a Challenged Book." VOYA [June 1996]: 82-84"

About those wonderful days when kids loved the classics and we made sure they loved the classics, Louise Pounds April 1921 article in the English Journal should suffice:

We are often told that it is the duty of the teacher of English to bring her pupils to "love" the classics. That she fails to do this, much or most of the time, is often made a subject of complaint. ... The teacher of literature should not feel that it is obligatory upon her to impart love of the classics, especially of all the classics, to her pupils. Rather it is her the less ambitious duty to make her pupils know and understand the works which they study. This is not a utopian ideal. It is one which she can carry out. The "love" which is imparted is the personal affair of the pupils and must be left to take care of itself. (182-83)

But presumably the study of grammar must have been basic to English and better taught and more immediately practical to students to back them. Katharine B. Fisher in "The Teaching of English" in the September 1899 Academy questioned that points:

The legend indeed appears on many a printed page: "English Grammar teaches the art of speaking and writing the English language correctly." But the art of competent testimony shows that it has been in spite of the grammars rather than because of them if young people have attained any proficiency either in writing or in speaking. (312)

Nor would Otto Jepsen, one of the gods of language study, have agreed that grammar was particularly practical:

A great many people seem to think that the study of grammar is a very dry subject indeed, but that it is extremely useful, assisting the pupils in their writing and in speaking the language in question. Now I hold the exactly opposite view. I think the study of grammar is really more or less useless, but that it is extremely fascinating. I don't think that the study of grammar, at least in the way in which grammar has been studied hitherto, has been of very material assistance to any one of the masters of English prose or poetry, but I think that there are a great many things in grammar that are interesting and that can be made interesting to any normal schoolboy or schoolgirl. "(Modern English Grammar." School Review (October 1910): 300"

Lambasting English teachers was commonplace back then, as it is now. Even before the turn of the century writers were certain that the English curriculum was going to hell:

The defective preparation of college freshmen in elementary English is owing to the fact that most high schools have undertaken the work of "fitting boys for the duties of life." (Francis W. Winston, letter to the editor of Nation (December 17, 1898): 495"

Others were convinced that English teachers taught as poorly as it was possible to teach:

English is probably both the least-taught and the want-taught subject in the whole educational field. It is bad in the grade schools, worse in the high schools, worst in the college, while the university reaps the full benefit of this evil cresendo. "The English" of the modern curriculum varies from a silly combination of "Mother Goose" and the jargon of science or the shibboleths of religion to a disgusting synthesis of antiqué philology and emaciated literature. No wonder some of the men and women who speak and write their language well extend to prove judgment passed upon poetry: English untaught is taught best. A teacher of English is so often a spoiler of English. (Alexander Chamberlain, "The Teaching of English." Pedagogical Seminary [June 1902]: 161"

There's much to be learned by reading about the past of English teaching. Most of what you'll read in the early years of the English Journal will seem surprisingly undated, and that is almost as true of the Academy (1886-1903), the best source of articles on English teaching prior to the English Journal. Education and the School Review also have articles worth reading. Samuel Thurber, who published widely, is one of my favorite begetters of English teaching, almost always practical, with ideas and techniques we can learn from today: ... we sometimes forget that literature, in reality, is a thing for the few. People, in general, have never had, and never will have, any artistic sense when it comes to style, or that subtle quality which all literature possesses. More rare than an ability to appreciate classical music or the mastery of painting is the ability to enjoy intensely pure literature. ... Yet I have known teachers who thought that unless boys and girls liked Milton, and that unless men and women read poetry, they were lost. ("Voluntary Reading in the Classical High School from the Purdue Point of View." School Review (February 1900): 176"

And a bit more Thurber (of his many quotable quotes):

As the primal law of all literature teaching— the most fundamental of all the principles on which such teaching should rest—I submit the simple thesis, that it should be interesting. ("English Literature in the Schools." Academy [December 1891]: 497"

I admire many writers and teachers from the past. Dora V. Smith, who began the study and use of adolescent books at the University of Minnesota Lab School, is in many ways the grandmother of most secondary English teachers, even if they do not know it. Her doctoral students like Dwight Burton, Dick Alm, and Bob Carben and all their undergraduates and graduates carried Dora V. Smith's message across the country. (See Chris Crowe's column in this issue. Ed.) I admire James Flemming Hosic for his work in helping to create NCTE and edit the English Journal until 1921 and Wilbur Hatfield who took the English Journal over in 1922 and made it his.
The two I most admire are Samuel Thurber and Lou LaBrant. [See P. L. Trumbo’s article on LaBrant in this issue. Ed.] I’ve already quoted from Thurber, and I’ll end with a few of LaBrant’s comments. Brilliant, scholarly, a delightful writer, and one of the most cantankerous of NCTE leaders, she was convinced that all English teachers must write:

I believe then that the teacher should know the agony of putting words on paper. We have some pretty cliche’s talking about writing for fun, and the joy of just doing a simple composition. Writing anything that is worth writing is not pure joy unless you happen to be a most unusual person. Writing is hard work. (“Inducing Students to Write.” English Journal [February 1955]: 71.)

LaBrant had some sympathy—mixed with a bit of irritation—for teachers who could not see the power they had if they would only exercise it. She remembered a summer when she was teaching a course in the secondary English curriculum. The class was discussing the values of wide reading. A distressed teacher in the class finally objected:

“You see, I can’t do that,” she complained. “At our school we have a list of one hundred books, and our students must choose from that.” Asked why the students must limit themselves to the hundred books, she was unable to explain further than to say, “We have this list; we must use it.” On being pressed, however, the teacher admitted (a) that the list had been made by her department of English, (b) that the department had worked through a committee of three, (c) that she had been on the committee, and (d) that she had been chairman of the three. It had simply not occurred to her that she could initiate changes—

additions or subtractions—without difficulty. Actually, it developed, the list had been made as an initial step in broadening the reading of the students, and had gradually reversed its function, being finally a list for limiting their explorations. (“A Little List,” English Journal [January 1949]: 35.)

Her venom was sometimes directed at bigoted or blind English teachers. After commenting on teachers who were language snobs and who encouraged their students to be likewise, she wrote about a teacher who was even more slow-witted than usual and therefore more dangerous:

She told me she had just attended a meeting addressed by a representative of dock workers. Eagerly I asked her what he said. “I just couldn’t listen,” she replied. “His language was so crude I was miserable.” “Faced by an opportunity to gain a point of view to be learned only by word of mouth, her knowledge of English was insufficient to enable her to listen intelligently.” (“The Place of English in General Education.” English Journal [May 1940]: 298.)

My rationale for reading in the history of English teaching is simple—it gives us perspective about those golden days of yore, we can learn that the most startling new techniques usually come from something long ago, and it’s fun. Mostly it’s fun.

KEN DONELSON, a past editor of English Journal, has been fascinated by old issues of Ej for years because he learns so much about the present from reading the past.

Reconstructing English: From the 1890s to the 1990s and Beyond

I edited the English Journal from 1987–1994, during a period of new nationalism for English teachers. While I was preparing the first issues, the English Coalition was meeting “to hammer out a statement that might be helpful to those interested in education reform” (Lloyd-Jones xvi). Seven years later, as I prepared my last issues, the National Standards Project, jointly sponsored by NCTE and IRA, was struggling toward resolution. Both these developments—the English Coalition and the Standards Project—aimed toward a national consensus on the nature of English and the needs of teachers and students in the field. In the meantime, as Charles Subur points out, standards projects of one kind or another were proliferating. Even the National Writing Project, which in the 1980s had been a loose confederation of grassroots projects, moved toward codified regulations, a systematic national review process, and a uniform national format.

During these years I was frankly less than enthusiastic about these national efforts. Now, five years later, other responsibilities and interests have distanced me from these immediate issues. However, it still appears to me that this drive toward a national agenda and a Council presence in policy-making at national and state levels has fallen short of its promise. What is more interesting to me now is how we might use an understanding of our past to inform our response to current initiatives.

The 1890s: A Historical Perspective

In March 1994, toward the end of my tenure as Ej editor, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of high school English as we know it. The task faced by the Committee of Ten in the 1890s had been to unify English to (1) reconcile the disparate strands (grammar, rhetoric, analysis, philology, liter-
time coming, was formalized with the organization of what was to become the International Reading Association in 1947. At about the same time, the formation of the Conference on College Composition and Communication within NCTE publicly recognized that the teaching of writing had been given short shrift in the Council as a whole. Significantly, the Conference was then, and still is, directed primarily toward college teachers. Though the writing projects and the whole language movement of the 1980s made strides toward bridging the gap, the teaching of writing in elementary and secondary schools had suffered. Likewise, linguists have long found their primary professional homes in a number of other organizations, so that the study of language in public schools has usually been limited to traditional grammar and is rarely addressed in NCTE meetings and publications. Thus, our discipline has been fragmented into separate and unequal sub-disciplines.

Furthermore, for the past quarter of a century, college and university professors of English have participated in NCTE in small numbers, preferring instead the Modern Language Association, the College English Association, and the Association of Departments of English. NCTE leaders drawn from the ranks of higher education most often come from English Education, CCCC, and, sometimes, the two-year colleges. Though the elements of serious growth in influence and visibility during the past two decades, it has been dominated by a whole language approach that, as admirable as it may be, is not shared by most secondary and college teachers of English nor the large number of serious professionals who have affiliated themselves, often militantly, with other factions in the so-called "reading wars."

Hence, as we face another century, the second century of secondary English, the need is no less acute than it was in the 1890s to unify English. The challenge is much the same: (1) to reconcile the disparate strands of our discipline, and (2) to focus the efforts of teachers at different levels toward goals that, if not uniform, are at least harmonious. However, that task is complicated rather than promoted by the legacy of the Committee of Ten, and the long-standing impact of their report has undermined in one way or another the new nationalism of the 1990s.

The Conference on English of the Committee of Ten was a group of seven university representatives, a Boston headmaster, a superintendent, and one school teacher. They brought together under one rubric called "English" the disparate disciplines that had found a place in college preparatory courses. The report of the conference, first published in 1894, is the charter of high school English. Already, in its statement of purpose, the first critical juncture for the fledgling profession is implicit:

The main objects of the teaching of English in schools seem to be two: (1) to enable the pupil to understand the expressed thoughts of others and to give expression to thoughts of his own; and (2) to cultivate a taste for reading, to give the pupil some acquaintance with good literature, and to furnish him with the means of extending that acquaintance. (Report 1894)

Thus, what could have been two separate disciplines, communication (or rhetoric, it might have been called then) and literature, were joined together in holy matrimony. Literature was singed out and given a privileged place in the high school curriculum, but it earned this position by being enlisted in the complex of verbal communication skills. One consequence of this pattern is the separation of literature from the other arts or humanities. The study of literature was mandated for all four years of high school but necessarily separated from the study of art, music, architecture, dance, and intellectual/social history. As demonstrated by Workman and Spamm and Culp, imaginative teachers who have re- captured that lost unity see how mutually supportive and intellectually challenging such studies can be. Incidentally, and somewhat surprisingly, as Zill and Wingate and Kerman show, there is no evidence that taste in literature or commitment to the reading and support of serious literature is any more pronounced in the US than taste in music, the visual arts, or dance. Though the study of literature is mandated for adolescents, the study of music and the arts is almost always a matter of free electives and usually offered in courses that require "doing" rather than analysis and critical discrimination. That there is not a bigger discrepancy between public support for serious literature, which is required, and the other arts, which are electives, should be a cause for some speculation. Theodore Sizer argues for a reconfiguration of school subjects into two separate courses: Inquiry and Expression, on the one hand, and Literature and the Arts, on the other.

However, what was achieved in this brief statement of the goals of English was not inconsequential: clarity of purpose and balance among competing interests. The Jeffersonian ideals of an enlightened citizenry, capable of discernment and articulate expression of ideas, stood alongside the somewhat more aristocratic longing for cultivated taste and the opportunity for enhanced sophistication. The utilitarian stood side by side with the belittlesthetic: the need for practical competence with the aspiration for social grace; what would become known as the language arts (reading, listening, writing, speaking) with the literary canon. The combination seems inevitable. Given the makeup of the conference, dominated as it was by representatives of universities—al common selective institutions at this time—and by the emphasis in that era on the need for uniform college admissions requirements, it is now hard to conceive of any other arrangement.

Literature has usually emerged the master, at least with older, college-bound students; communication skills the handmaiden—with all the inequity those gender-laden terms imply.

Nevertheless, it was an arranged marriage of different and unequal partners; and already in the wording of the nuptial vows there are hints at how difficult the achievement of harmony and equity in the partnership might prove. According to Willinsky, the first of the "two" main objects is itself twofold: understanding and expression; the second is threefold: taste, acquaintance with the canon, and "the means for extending" that acquaintance—presumably powers of analysis and discrimination, something like Matthew Arnold's touchstones. The more visible consequence of the Committee's critical decision, of course, has been more than a hundred years of genuine but faltering efforts to maintain the precarious balance assumed in their simple statement of goals. Literature has usually emerged the master, at least with older, college-bound students; communication skills the handmaiden—with all the inequity those gender-laden terms imply. In the early 1990s three books appeared that explored the causes and consequences of this imbalance.

John Willinsky's provocative book, The Triumph of Literature/The Fate of Literacy, traces the history of English in more detail and from another perspective, that of the influence of four prominent critics: Matthew Arnold, F. R. Leavis, Louise Rosenblatt, and Northrup Frye. He begins with the labor movements of Victorian society, before English was a subject of universal study, and he concludes more than a century later, with our need "to create participants in a culture that encompasses literature but that runs on writing and reading in its broadest sense" (179).

Writing at about the same time, the late Alan Purves, in The Scribal Society, distinguishes between "the merely literate," those who can read and write well enough to function, perhaps even prosper, in our materialistic society, and "the new scribblers," those with the language and textual awareness to have a hand in shaping society. Instead of an illiterate peasant class and a literate elite, we now have a "merely" literate consumer class and a "scribal" overclass with the power to manipulate, even dominate, their fellow citizens. What separates them, perhaps among other distinctions, is the power to understand and use language. Purves writes:

The emerging economic and social picture of the industrialized nations is such that literacy will be the province of the many but scribalism the province of relatively few. At the same time, the sense of powerlessness of the merely literate may come to outweigh their contentment with their lot. In that case, it is possible that more and more people will be willing to embark on the road to scribalism and seize control of information. (12)

Jay Robinson, in Conversations on the Written Word, makes an even more sweeping claim: "The possibility for a just society is grounded in the uses we make of literacy and of liberal education" (265). Can English departments meet this demand? He is pessimistic. "If departments of English continue to define themselves as departments of literature and mean by that term imaginative works only," he writes, "then there is need for new kinds of departments, just as there is for differently prepared teachers" (32).
It might be expected that the understanding and expression required in the first goal of the 1959 report would include, in fact require, attention to news media, public discourse, and the popular arts. NCTE has often and insistently encouraged this dimension of English teaching, but the dominance of literature has precluded the allotment of much time or energy to these pursuits, and too often any attention at all to newspapers or movies or political campaigns is seen as anti-intellectual and/or peripheral to our calling. As the Information Age has burst upon us, the sophistication required to function as free, productive adults has intensified. Like their immediate predecessors, the national movements of the early 1960s made only limited progress in addressing this issue.

Four Decades: A Personal Note

I have just completed my fortieth year as a teacher of English. If my memory serves, I have been a member of NCTE from the beginning of those forty years. At least, I know I have been a reader of the English Journal even longer, having discovered the little red monthly journal in the stacks of the college library where I was an undergraduate. For some sixteen of those forty years, I have been involved in editing one NCTE publication or another (English Education in the 1970s; the ill-fated NCTE Forum Series in the 1980s, and English Journal in the early 1990s).

One suspects that, like most “golden ages,” the good old days of English studies exist only in our imagination.

An enthusiast by nature, I have been carried along from one enthusiasm to another in these forty years—from the Basic Issues Conference that was the topic of the first professional meeting I attended in the fall of 1959; through the Dartmouth Seminar of 1966, up to Pacesetter English in the 1990s. These have been interesting times in which to teach English, and my response has ranged from heady optimism to cautious skepticism, as noted in my 1966 English Journal article. Our journals, books, conferences, and alliances have proliferated, and each one has trumpeted new approaches, new issues, new concerns.

“English is not what it used to be—probably never was,” I remember writing once. I referred, of course, to the manifold changes our discipline has undergone during the century or so of its formal existence. I also alluded to the persistence of nostalgic trends that tend to romanticize some “golden age” of English studies (the Back to the Basics movement of the 1970s; the Back to the Classics initiatives of E. D. Hirsch, Allan Bloom, Dianne Ravitch, William Bennett; and others in the past decade; and even the Back to Dartmouth impulse behind the English Coalition Conference of 1987). One suspects that, like most “golden ages,” the good old days of English studies exist only in our imagination.

If one goal of a professional organization is to serve as an advocate for its membership, NCTE’s recent history is a chronicle of losing battles. The major initiatives sponsored by the Council in my forty years have been noble failures. Oh, not because they were given a fair trial and failed to prove effective, but rather because they were soon abandoned—ignored, neglected, or gradually forgotten, sometimes repudiated by the Council itself.

- Project English in the early 1960s, for example, the first instance of generous appropriation of Federal funds for curriculum development in English, scarcely outlasted its funding. Even a decade later one would have been hard-pressed to find copies of its carefully constructed units and course guides, much less textbooks or teaching materials that grew out of it.
- Phase electives in the late 1960s, an innovation that developed a life of its own outside of NCTE, was blown out of the water after just a few years by a public outcry against the “shopping mall curriculum.”
- The Dartmouth Seminar of 1966 may have planted seeds that have flourished in the writing projects, the whole language movement, and expanded visions of research, but the specific curricula that it spawned (for example, James Moffett’s Interaction series and Alan Purves’s Responding series) foundered in the reactionary period of the early 1970s.
- The English Coalition of 1987, much-heralded as Dartmouth II, had a profound influence on the participants, who were eloquent on the speech circuit and at national conventions for a year or two, but, as noted by Lloyd-Jones and Elbow, the two official publications it produced never found an audience. Its announced theme, “Democracy through Language,” spoke to the needs of this decade with particular urgency, but it would be difficult to point to any specific achievement in high-school English that proceeded directly from the Coalition itself.
- As for the Standards for the English Language Arts, I suppose the jury is still out. After the first round of harsh reviews and perfunctory defenses, these standards don’t seem to have much public life. At least they clearly have not shaped the national debate or undergirded national assessments in any substantive way. If John Mayher is right, the final report represents another triumph of literature over literacy, of academic interests over personal/social perspectives, of collegial interest. What is certain is that the Standards function more as a statement of ideals than as a clear guide to practice; moreover, they take no responsibility for laying out what resources would be required to implement the kind of teaching they envision.
- Campaigns to reduce class size and improve conditions for the teaching of English still fall far short of their goals. The article published in the first issue of the English Journal in 1912, documenting the importance of class size in determining the effectiveness of instruction in composition, would be just as timely this month, eighty-eight years later.

1990s: Promising Approaches

spite of the recurring problems facing the profession and my skepticism about the brave new technology of 1990, each month that I edited the English Journal brought fresh evidence of the ill and effectiveness with which English teachers I work. Looking back over those fifty-six issues and those in the intervening five years reaffirmed my conviction that our profession has the expertise, experience, and good will to achieve reforms of an unprecedented nature and on a massive scale. With rare exceptions, whatever topic we announced brought forth scores of manuscripts pointing to workable strategies, imaginative approaches, and clever use of materials. Most, of course, adhered to some version of the subject invented by the Committee of Ten, but many also pushed at the edges of conventional curricular structures. Some wrestled openly and honestly with tensions inherent in the prevalent definitions of our role. Some called into question our basic tenets and proposed ingenious new alignments of our professional priorities.

I have identified five initiatives that came to our attention during those seven years and that hold particular promise for the next century of English. I identify each of these developments with one person prominently associated with it, but in fact all five represent the collaborative efforts of many individuals. Each represents a significant way to reconfigure the English language arts.

Nancie Atwell: Teachers Telling Their Stories

For all the emphasis on national agendas and mandates during my seven years as EF editor, the one catalyst that engendered widespread national attention and reform was the publication of Nancie Atwell’s In the Middle. Within a year, middle-school students all over the country were participating in status-of-the-class reports, topic searches, group sharing, and dialogue journals. One of the largest outpourings of manuscripts we had for any topic was the response to a call focused on her book (published under “English in the Middle,” January 1989). Our initial review of the book had been enthusiastic but had questioned whether other teachers reading the book would have the background and personal magnetism to imitate her methods. Nancie Atwell cannot be cloned, Gilles concluded. That conclusion worried Atwell. “The letters show me that I am not unique,” she responded in her ensuing article. Curiously, many, many teachers did clone Atwell’s classroom strategies, if not her personal charisma, some with remarkable degrees of success.

However, what made her work the professional landmark it became was not the profusion of imitations and variations, but the impetus it gave other teachers to report and publish their classroom experiences. "I aimed for voice," she wrote, "to be one teacher telling my story to other teachers,
One persistent problem classroom teachers brought to our attention during this period was the increasing number of alienated students.

One of the things the EF staff strove for in those days, and I think achieved, was to discover and encourage precisely these kinds of classroom stories—stories that described teaching strategies in enough detail that others could emulate or adapt them, stories that recorded students’ responses to these strategies with rich, “thick” description, and stories that reflected on the underlying principles they demonstrated and made connections with what other teachers, theorists, and researchers were saying. One of the most meaningful results of Atwell’s work was that it persuaded publishers that there was, indeed, a market for such well-written teacher accounts. One could not begin to catalog all such books now in print, but among the first and best were Linda Reid’s Seeking Diversity, Mary Mercer Krogness’s Just Teach Me, Mrs. K. Tom Romano’s Clearing the Way, Janet Allen’s It’s Never Too Late, and Kathleen Andrasick’s Opening Tests. The profession has been enriched by these stories. They tell of middle school students and high school students, with college-bound students and “at-risk” students, with literature and writing. What they all have in common, to one degree or another, is a genuine effort to balance the language arts, both to focus and to diversify the goals of the English curriculum.

**Patricia Stock: The Dialogic Curriculum**

One persistent problem classroom teachers brought to our attention during this period was the increasing number of alienated students. These were students from all ability and socioeconomic levels, though in greater numbers in “mainstreamed” and lower income families, for whom school simply seemed to be irrelevant. They ranged from apathetic to cynically complacent to disruptive to dangerously hostile. Everywhere teachers were asking how the teaching of English could recapture their interest and address their needs. We suspected that the roots of their alienation lay at least partly in the structure of schools, including the approach toward language and literature that had become institutionalized in the English curriculum.

Early on, we learned of an experimental class in Saginaw, Michigan, that was tackling this problem head-on and, in the process, demonstrating how the theme of democracy through language, enunciated within the English Coalition, could be enacted in an actual school environment. Called Inquiry and Expression, a term borrowed from Sizer, the course was based on the premise that students will learn to read and write better if they are reading and writing to inquire about issues that genuinely concern them. Further, their efforts will be supported if their teachers adapt lesson plans to what they learn from and about students through their joint inquiries.

The course focused on questions related to growing up in Saginaw. Beginning with their own stories and those of relatives and others whom they could interview, students soon branched out into stories gathered from literature. At the same time, they began to formulate questions they would like to investigate and to consider methods for recording and reporting their findings. Much of the work was done in small groups or individual conferences, but as a community of learners they began to appropriate a common vocabulary and set of allusions. By mid-course they were testing their own findings by reading and responding to essays about adolescence written by psychologists, sociologists, and cultural historians. The dialogue was further expanded because students in two very different high schools were working collaboratively on a publishing project, which eventually culminated in a book, The Bridge: Linking Minds, Crossing Up in Saginaw.

This project built on and extended the storytelling of teachers like Atwell, Krogness, and Allen by enlisting students to tell their own stories—identifying issues, conducting investigations, reporting results, and publishing their products. At the same time, a team of teachers, including university colleagues, was raising and exploring questions about teacher planning, student learning, and ongoing and summative assessment. The experiment, described in an NCTE book by Patricia Lambert Stock, came to be called a dialogic curriculum. Students participated in and developed an articulate awareness of important kinds of dialogues: among themselves, within themselves, with their families and communities, and with the broader culture represented by imaginative literature and intellectual discourse. They gradually learned to appropriate terminology, ideas, and organizing schemes from these cultures, but, equally important, they discovered that they could represent their own perspectives and conclusions in forms that would find a public audience. Perhaps the most important underlining dialogue, however, was that between students-inquirers and teacher-inquirers.

We engaged in what might be called consultative teaching, teaching that encourages learners to identify and articulate researchable issues, teaching that asks researchers to learn necessary information and to develop appropriate course competencies they will need to address issues and problems that confront them. As consultative teachers, in individual conferences and small groups, we discussed the books students were reading, the compositions they were writing, the issues and problems they were identifying and addressing, and we taught students “on the spot” such lessons in literacy and literature as their work suggested they were ready to learn.

**Dennie Palmer Wolf: Pacesetter English**

A more ambitious project was Pacesetter English, part of a national incentive sponsored by the College Board and Educational Testing Service to open national standards and assessment to all students. The advisory committee, coordinated by Dennie Palmer Wolf of Harvard, was particularly aware of the problems inherent in devising a common curriculum for an increasingly multilingual, multiethnic, and “economicallyiven” society. Preliminary results of the committee’s deliberations were presented at the NCTE convention in 1983. Many of the participants in that workshop had been wary of such a project in the hands of people previously responsible for advanced placement courses and SAT-style assessments; critics such as Harvey Daniels remained unconvinced. It seems clear to a fair observer, however, that the committee was aware of those concerns. Further, the hands of such professional leaders as Arthur Applebee and Robert Scholes, as well as active classroom teachers such as Kristina Elias, are apparent in the underlying principles of the project.

The prototypical twelfth grade course they had developed, “Voices of Modern Cultures,” centered on ambitious goals. Large numbers of students, they proposed, would be taught so that they were ready for “demanding post-secondary opportunity.” (3) Whether in college or the world of work to accomplish this task, students would be prepared to inherit and enter cultural conversations; gain textual power in face-to-face communications as well as written and graphic language; and think about language use, especially those “conflicts, debates, and choices that frame literacy and literature” (4-5). In an introductory essay, Wolf set out the underlying assumptions of the course, incorporating Gerald Graff’s basic contention, “Culture is a debate, not a monologue” (7). Wolf elucidates, “The contemporary world is full of renegotiations, of what is ‘normal,’ ‘wise,’ ‘true,’ or ‘lovely.’ The point is not to simplify or suppress these discussions. We have to teach students how to think through these debates in informed and responsible ways” (7).

It is impossible here to do justice to the complexity of this curriculum or the excitement generated at the 1993 workshop by Alice Kawa- zoe’s illustrative samples of teaching strategies and student work. Perhaps a simple list of the integrated thematic units envisioned for the course gives some idea of how it diverges from typical twelfth grade fare:

1. Many Selvou/Many Languages: Students begin by considering their own language and cultural identities and by examining and responding to poems that speak to their situation.

2. Stranger in the Village: Encountering the Other/Being the Other: Students work through essays, short stories, and journalistic accounts about what it means to be an outsider and write their own essays or stories about what it means to be different.

3. Culture as a Medley of Voices: Permitting New Voices to Enter: This topic may be approached through a work outside the mainstream of American culture and/or through a canonical work that takes on different meanings when read by a contemporary reader. The example cited throughout the essay is Zora Neale...
Hurston’s *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, only then being admitted to the American canon.

4. Renewing Old Voices: Producing and Revisiting Dramatic Work. Using a work such as *Othello*, students examine how the multiple media of modern culture support and encourage new versions of old classics.

5. New Languages in a Culture: The Case of Film. This unit might focus on texts transposed into film; films as “edited reality”; films on modern media and filmmaking; and/or the modern mythology of the film, such as the Western.

6. The Interplay of Conflicting Voices: Media, Documentary, and Journalism. This unit focuses on multiple and prismatic accounts of the same event through various sources and media. Throughout these units, students collect their own performances in a portfolio. These personal portfolios are designed to help students clarify their thinking and demonstrate their progress in entering cultural conversations, developing textual power, and thinking about important issues in language, literacy, and literature.

Clearly, such a course envisages the students as active participants in ongoing cultural debates. They learn that all texts involve several cultural conversations, both in the way they are developed and in the responses they elicit. They learn the cumulative value of reading and responding to texts through the reading of networks of texts. Finally, they see that literacy requires the understanding of various kinds of texts: poetry, fiction, drama, essays, journalism, memoir, autobiography, documentary, feature films, television series, and the like.

Robert Scholes: The Redefinition of English

The term “textual power,” borrowed by the Pacesetter project, was defined and the concept explicated in a 1985 book by Robert Scholes, which was brought to the attention of *EJ* readers in a review by Robert Probst in December 1987. Two essential components of textual power emphasized in that review are (1) the ability to resist manipulation (“the students who come to us now exist in the most manipulative culture human beings have ever experienced”) and (2) the capacity to exert influence (“reading and writing are important because we read and write our world as well as our texts”; “textual power is ultimately the power to change our world”).

He rejects the goal of “coverage” as both impractical and inappropriate: It’s just “lining up some masterpieces chronologically and calling that literary history.”

In a more recent book, *The Rise and Fall of English*, Scholes extends and expands upon his argument. The subtitle, *Reconstructing English as a Discipline*, captures his purpose and methods. How would he reconstruct the discipline? You have to read his erudite and witty chapters called “A Flock of Disciplines: A Trivial Proposal” and “A Fortunate Fall” for the details. For example, he redefines the classical trivium by replacing grammar with Language and Human Subjectivity and Representation and Objectivity and by updating rhetoric as Persuasion and Meditation. He redefines the role of theory and history in the English curriculum in radical ways and gives a prominent place to “reading and writing” a variety of texts, including genres, modes, and media not often associated with instruction in schools. Significantly, I think, the book is dedicated to “the teachers with whom [he] shared the experiences of the English Coalition and Pacesetter English,” who have “changed [his] life.”

The emphasis of the book is on the discipline of English. He rejects the goal of “coverage” as both impractical and inappropriate: It’s just “lining up some masterpieces chronologically and calling that literary history.” He rejects the domination of rhetoric by literature and seeks a balance between the two by redefining both in terms of textuality. He seeks the core of the discipline quite literally—in the disciplines required to understand, situate, adapt, produce, and reflect upon texts. Given mastery of those underlying disciplines, he would give teachers and students fairly wide leeway in determining what particular texts they might deal with. “What we need is a greater variety of courses, with a constant and prevailing emphasis on the process of reading” (169).

The ABCs of the reading curriculum are not at all radical: (a) the process of reading takes precedence over the coverage of texts; (b) the reading of modern and recent texts can whet the appetite for earlier “classics”; and (c) students should learn to read a wide range of texts, from various times and places, and in various genres and media. “Reading advertisements, reading films and television shows, reading political speeches, reading poems, plays, essays, stories and everything else under the sun—this is what we should be teaching.” How will we know whether we have succeeded? When we can demonstrate that students read and write better, and “become better and more critical consumers of all the texts and media they encounter” (142).

Arthur Applebee: Redefinition of Curriculum

The other major influence on the Pacesetter curriculum appears to have been Arthur Applebee, whose work is timely. He is used to point toward the future in 1994 in our issue commemorating the work of the Committee of Ten. His book, *Curriculum as Conversation*, won the David H. Russell Award in 1998.

Applebee’s acceptance address is itself eloquent testimony to the difference that can be made by one researcher. Reprinted in the May 1996 issue of *Research in the Teaching of English*, it is a generous, lucid, and inspiring account of his thirty-year career. What distinguishes his work, aside from the care and insightfulness with which he has pursued his agenda, is his ability to bridge multiple theories—linguistic, literary, sociocultural, sociocognitive, and philosophical—and, at the same time, to keep his vision firmly grounded in actual classrooms and the work of practicing teachers.

“I think we have reached a point in research in the teaching of English,” Applebee says, “where we have a fairly widespread consensus about the nature of effective teaching and learning” (363). The evidence supporting this contention is persuasive, especially if one compares the present situation with that of, say, thirty years ago. One thinks of the sophistication and breadth of research being published, the coherence of that research in spite of recurring tensions and controversies, and the grounding of research in a wide variety of theoretical approaches. But Applebee continues to raise two enormously troubling specters: (1) there has been relatively little evidence of improvement of student achievement over those thirty years, and (2) research has dealt more effectively with how we teach and learn rather than how we can improve teaching and learning so that “students will emerge from our classrooms as more literate, more accomplished human beings” (363).

Applebee has been able to avoid the twin pitfalls that have beset the profession since the early 1960s:

1. The tendency of movements like Project English and phase electives to privilege curriculum over the day-to-day issues of classroom teaching. Project English based English curriculum development squarely on logical analyses of the subject disciplines incorporated under the heading of English. The phase elective movement sought content that would energize and motivate contemporary adolescents. Both addressed issues of what should be taught, when, and to whom rather than how students learn and how teachers teach.

2. The tendency of a process-oriented research and pedagogy to privilege individual learning patterns and personal growth over the broader social and academic goals. These tendencies have been formulated—however ineptly—by public-policy makers, the press, and indeed much of the profession itself. Today they dominate the national agenda, while the personal-growth goals favored in most NCATE projects are neglected or rejected.

His choice of the metaphor of conversation as a focal theme for curriculum development is an apt one. Conversation, as Applebee uses the term, implies thoughtful deliberation and negotiation, the appropriation of ideas and forms from other sources, and the representation of one’s own ideas and imaginations for an ever-expanding community. To prepare students for such “conversations” would ultimately prepare them for civic responsibility, intellectual growth, and the productive collaboration so often required by the modern workplace.

In “Building a Foundation for Effective Teaching and Learning in English,” Applebee
himself enumerates ways that the reconfiguration of curriculum as conversation might prove hopeful:

1. It emphasizes the active, participatory nature of learning.
2. It leads to a natural integration of the language arts—reading, speaking, writing, listening, viewing.
3. It defines the central role of the teacher as a mediator between the conversation of the classroom and the broader conversations of society and culture.
4. It focuses on open-ended questions and issues that are important and relevant.
5. It offers meaningful criteria for evaluating the curriculum: Does it generate or impede meaningful conversations?
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### Conclusion: What's Next?

Where do we go from here? If we had another Committee of Ten, charged with planning secondary schools for the twenty-first century and doing so without any knowledge of the curricula that have developed over the past hundred years, would English survive as a subject? If so, would it resemble the bifurcated version we’ve inherited—literature and communication together, with literature dominant? Or would it more nearly approximate Robert Scholes’s integrated emphasis on textuality and intertextuality, on cultural conversations and textual power? Would it find a way to strike a balance between the demands of language, literature, and literacy? Or would it divide, as Sizer imagines, into two separate departments, maybe Communications and Humanities? Would it follow Willinsky’s lead in “fostering students of literacy and well as literate students”? Would it find a way to go beyond Purves’s “mere literacy” to the “scholarism” required by the Information Age?

Probably we should be grateful that no such Committee will be assembled or that its recommendations would be unlikely to assume the proportions of a national mandate. However, if such a national committee were to address the needs for an English curriculum in the twenty-first century, it could do no better than to begin by synthesizing the combined wisdom of Atwell, Stock, Wolf, Scholes, Applebee, and their associates. We know, though, that curriculum, like politics, is local. Individual teachers and local planning committees, to whom the task of re-constructing English will finally and inevitably fall, will be well served by a consideration of the issues raised and the solutions proposed in these five promising approaches. Probably that is the best that can be hoped from the new nationalism of the 1990s. But that’s not bad. The hope and idealism implicit in the English Coalition’s dominant theme, “Democracy through Language,” will come closer to reality if these five developments are taken seriously.

### Standards for the English Language Arts
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Our History, Ourselves


Leila Christenburg

You have now entered Council history,” was the rather solemn benediction bestowed by the NCTE official who informed me, in a late spring 1993 phone call, that I had been selected to become the eighth editor of English Journal. The statement might seem a bit overdone, but, at the time, entering NCTE history was not far from how I felt. English Journal had been a pivotal part of my career in teaching, and it had figured heavily in my dissertation research. I had significant contact with the past four English Journal editors, and, over the years, nine of my pieces had appeared in the journal. I had edited a regular review column (1983–87), and I had chaired the 1989 English Journal Farmer Awards. Fifteen years after my first article appeared in EJ, I became the editor of the journal that was, for many and certainly for me, the very definition of secondary English teaching.

While during my years as editor of English Journal I worked in two rooms at my university, supported by only two full-time editorial assistants and a part-time graduate student, beyond the office I had talented outside reviewers and column editors, inventive cover designers, and an active advisory board. I was backed in my decisions by the immediate sponsoring body of English Journal, the Steering Committee of the NCTE Secondary Section, and with the advice of other professional and personal friends, I was able to implement some innovations in the journal. Bolstered by the language of the governing NCTE document, “Rights and Responsibilities,” I knew I had obligations but also that I could exercise intellectual freedom. The document was the Magna Carta of NCTE editors and clearly stated that the editor had full autonomy in editorial decisions.

In the good times, reading and editing the 1,000 manuscripts submitted yearly, crafting the issues, working with the writers, coming up with the ideas, and fine-tuning the design made being the editor of English Journal deeply satisfying. With eight issues published every year to a readership of 65,000, I felt I was in a unique position to help influence and shape the professional conversation. That belief, more than anything, made the demanding work wholly worthwhile.

But being the editor of English Journal was not, by any means, all good times. It was, in a profound sense, intense, gnawing, and, as an added surprise, character-building. While every editor knows well the often thankless aspects of putting together a publication—the common editor’s cynicism is that most readers believe that all successes are due to the writers and all failures to the editor—with English Journal, circa 1984–98, came challenges that transcended the usual strains of any editorship. I wanted the journal dead center in the midst of serious discussion and argument, and I got my wish. With my years as editor came a continual round of controversy, and maintaining balance and perspective became an ongoing task. Being the eighth editor of English Journal was, in retrospect, less like entering Council history than like entering the whirlwind.

The Readers React

My opening English Journal editorial called for readers to “respond, argue, question, proclaim” (September 1994: 16), and they did. Yet there was a surprise in store for me. It wasn’t that readers protested the changes I had made in the journal, or that they simply wanted to debate the issues: It was that there also appeared to be a deep intolerance regarding the mere appearance of a number of topics addressed.

I had fully expected some English Journal readers to respond less than enthusiastically to aspects of my editorship and what I took to calling the “new English Journal.” Though mindful of English Journal’s history, even reverent regarding it, I changed a number of long-standing features, almost all of which were detailed in my application for the editorship and almost all of which I implemented when I was named editor.

Thus the English Journal graphic design, which had been largely unchanged for fourteen years, and the logo, which had been in existence for even longer than that, were both updated. I added new columns; deleted or relocated others, stepped up the use of cartoons, puzzles, games, and photographs; and printed monthly letters to the editor. While traditional topics remained for themed issues, English Journal also called for manuscripts on issues considered both conservative and liberal: breaking the rules, school violence, multiple intelligences, whole language, media literacy, the teaching of grammar and usage, the teaching of the classics, and the future of reform in the English classroom. An annual literacy festival, referred to outside just as “the teacher photography, essay, poetry, and short which kind.”

While I did not think these additions were terribly outré, not all readers thought that the changes were needed or an improvement. The outline of the reaction was most publicly represented in the letters to the editor (most of which saw print), where it became obvious that the tenor of discourse had shifted from the relatively decorous letters published infrequently by previous English Journal editors to what I started receiving and putting in the journal every month.

Along with many missives of praise and agreement, letters that offered serious discussion of the issues, and letters that took issue with other letters, there were some on a far different plane. I received and, as a matter of conscience, published letters from readers that used relatively unflattering language. One reader registered her “dismay” regarding the “cheesy” new design (November 1994: 12). More seriously, one self-described “angered” reader called what appeared in English Journal “trash” and an example of “compromise[d] principles” (December 1994: 9). For one letter writer, early in my editorship, in English Journal “almost anything goes except a strong, consistent moral stand; the journal was “allowing a forum for any and all positions on contemporary social and moral issues” (December 1994: 9). While I appreciated that latter comment, on a more grim note, I was urged to “be more responsible to those who read [my] magazine” (December 1994: 9) and chastised for a “lack of taste” and for publishing “inflammatory” material (February 1997: 9), material that was “junk” (March 1997: 9) and “deplorable” (March 1995: 12). After two years of my editorship, one reader concluded in a letter that “the ‘new EJ seems to have an affection for the outer edges of the profession” (April 1996: 11).

Perhaps it is a legacy of post-Watergate distrust, but, in general, the level of readers’ suspicion was high. When articles on certain subjects did not appear, many readers assumed it was because the articles had been deliberately suppressed, not just as was almost always the case, not submitted in the first place. One reader protested that the lack of articles on nontraditional new teachers in a focus issue was a deliberate attempt to silence those teachers (September 1995: 11); the paucity of work on Canadian writers in a literature issue was a conscious decision by an American magazine to exclude articles.
about Canadian literature (February 1995: 8), poems written by college teachers were crowding out those submitted by secondary teachers and usurping their rightful space (February 1995: 12). Even more frustrating, in all three cases invitations to the writers to submit their own manuscripts on the topics (or poems) were greeted with silence.

Efforts to be scrupulously balanced in editorial coverage failed to impress some readers. When four disparate articles appeared in the September 1995 issue under the heading “English, Religion, and the Religious Right,” one reader inveighed against English Journal’s “blatant bias against the Religious Right” (November 1995: 11). Though two of the four articles were written, respectively, by a self-identified member of the Religious Right and one by a self-identified religious believer (and others by a self-identified former fundamentalist and one by a historian), there was no pleasing this reader or others who called with complaints. For a few, English Journal was nothing more than a mouthpiece for the NCTE party line (Personal Letter, January 6, 1995). English Journal was little more than a “politically safe” journal that avoided hard topics (Personal Letter, September 3, 1996).

As alarming as some of the above was, it became clear that many of the letters and communications represented more than just traditional intellectual dissents. We were disheartening to me as editor were the letters and phone calls not just arguing a point regarding the content of what had appeared in English Journal, but protesting that certain opinions had no place in its pages. As my years as editor went on, I wondered if, for some subscribers, freedom of speech was a relative concept?

At times the protests merged on the silly. One reader was outraged that English Journal had printed, as part of the traditional section profiling the four judges for the spring Literary Festival, an article on the contest’s concept and editorial. The very concept of a literary contest and its prizes, the reader wrote, was “offensive.” To that end, the reader wrote a letter to the editor, on the concept of the judge’s daughter’s high school graduation, “had nothing at all to do with the teaching or learning of English arts and skills” and, further, “offends me intellectually and ethically” (to the point where I wish to) “disassociate myself from NCTE and all its publications” (Personal Letter, April 1, 1997). For printing a poem that satirized school administrators, one reader promised in a phone call that English Journal would soon be the target of a statewide orchestrated letter writing campaign. The campaign never materialized—although, sadly, the author of the poem, a classroom teacher, was subsequently disciplined by his school district and in danger of losing his job. An article by a journalism teacher that, among other examples, cited the prose of Playboy magazine, should, according to one reader, never have appeared in English Journal because of that reference. Sending a copy of his complaint to the NCTE Executive Committee, the reader demanded a promise in writing that Playboy would never be mentioned in English Journal again, or he would resign from NCTE. (Of course I could not make that promise, and I assume the reader made good on his threat.) At one point a letter writer, a professional colleague who had always written otherwise good sense, even objected to the publication of certain letters to the editor, noting that, by printing them, English Journal did little more than encourage “pettiness and parochial thinking.” “Judicious” selection of more appropriate letters showing more “sensitivity” was this writer’s solution (April 1995: 11).

As is obvious from some of the examples above, often the efforts of editors did not stop with their complaints to English Journal. The letter writers and phone callers promised protests to the members of NCTE’s institutional hierarchy: the Executive Committee, the Executive Director, and the president. Often (but not always) those threats were made good. Immediate suspension of membership in NCTE, as well as subscription to English Journal, was the usual form of protest. Always I wrote back to each complainant and expressed my regret that he or she would be leaving NCTE and not subscribing to English Journal.

And yet the situation was not completely dire. Many letters praised what EJ had done and was continuing to do, and in particular, during attacks on articles that included the word “lesbian” or on the authors of those articles, readers wrote eloquent defenses, not only of the authors’ ideas, but of the journal that had printed their work. As editor, I found the fall and spring NCTE conventions most helpful and during those conferences heard numerous positive words from attendees. A sample of three letters sent to English Journal, which represent just a few of the many encouraging comments I frequently received:

“Thank you again for continuing the great American literary tradition of free thought” (February 1995: 10).

“ Anyone that chooses to further discussion and open minds and hearts... is doing its job to promote academic freedom and tolerance in our society at large and deserves to be commended, not excoriated” (February 1995: 11).

“It is gratifying to know that I subscribe to a journal with backbone” (April 1995: 11).

On balance then, I felt that the controversy was healthy and marked a journal that continued to raise important issues and, at its best, succeeded in disturbing the universe. A few times, however, I wondered if that wasn’t an overly optimistic assessment of the situation. What, I questioned, had eroded our tolerance for opposing viewpoints, our appreciation for the role of an academic journal as a place for open discussion and disagreement?

Where did a stinging argument against a point of view become a stinging protest that that point of view should never see print? How did time-honored dissonance turn into demands for suppression?

Where did a stinging argument against a point of view become a stinging protest that that point of view should never see print?

Yet it was not only some subscribers who wished that certain articles never see print in English Journal. The other corner of my editorial whirlwind was occupied by a segment of the leadership of the National Council of Teachers of English, the publisher of English Journal, who, 1994-98, entered into battles of editorial control and attempted to explicitly shape the journal’s content.

Institutional NCTE and the Partnership Wars

My years as editor of English Journal were years when NCTE, as an institution, was attempting to help shape national educational policy. It was a tough assignment, the stakes were huge as far as influencing American education, and the attempt was fraught with controversy. Some of NCTE’s leadership saw the best path as entering into negotiation with other groups who appeared to be on the fast track to shaping policy. Yet negotiation was only the preliminary step. The question of the early and mid-1990s was not only the extent to which NCTE could—or should—enter the discussion, but also the extent to which NCTE might lend its endorsement to specific reform and curriculum programs promoted by other entities. One of the major issues was the creation of standards for the English language arts. NCTE partnered in the standards discussions with our sister organization, the International Reading Association, and both the negotiations and the funding sources (among them, the federal government) became complex in the early and mid-1990s. In addition, discussions had also
been ongoing with the College Board’s Educational Testing Service (ETS), which was sponsoring Pacesetter English, a senior course that was an alternative to Advanced Placement English. Finally, NCETE had been in long negotiation with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), a group that was interested in setting criteria, testing it, and thus determining eligibility for Board certification of teachers.

To what extent institutional NCETE would align itself, endorse, or further any of these movements was of great import in the early 1990s and the topic of fierce argument among some NCETE members. On one hand, there was the fear that being involved would compromise the organization’s principles; on the other hand, not being involved obviously meant not having sufficient or even any input into what could come to affect English language arts teachers. Harvey A. Daniels, in an English Journal article (which I will explore further, below) summarized the dilemma succinctly: “Is it effective to join in projects whose sponsors, designs, values, or goals are alien to us? Is it possible, or smart or right—to work both sides of the street?” (“Pacesetter English: Let Them Eat Standards,” November 1994: 44). For most members, the answer to that question was not clear or even immediately as, in almost all cases, the extent of control that NCETE would be allowed to exercise over the final document, product, or set of criteria was often murky.

There was much at stake, and there was little consensus on the wisdom of institutional NCETE becoming a partner with any outside program or organization. Yet, from my perspective, the partnership was a gold mine: What better topic for an academic journal to explore?

1994–95: ETS and Pacesetter English

Pacesetter English, the brainchild of ETS, provided a set curriculum and a timed, fee-based final test for students who were not in AP English but who wanted a similar experience. I—and I suspect many others—had not heard of Pacesetter until the early 1990s, but at the 1993 NCETE Fall Convention a draft of the program was circulating, and in many discussion groups at the conference, arguments emerged.

Two of the most vocal commentators on Pacesetter were Harvey A. Daniels, who found the program not only elitist but “top-down, business-driven, government-officiated” (November 1994: 44), and Kristina Elias, who, to the contrary, saw Pacesetter as a course “designed for all students . . . [which] attempts to help this multi-cultural, multi-ability brood achieve national English standards” (“A Positive Look at Pacesetter English,” November 1994: 50). Accordingly, I asked both individuals to write for the November 1994 English Journal, whose focus, “Reforming and Re-forming the School,” was ideal for the topic.

But what I saw as a fair and balanced pairing sent reverberations through some of the NCETE leadership. The phone calls to the English Journal editorial office began July 18, 1994, during the production of the November issue, and it was not until August 29 that the struggle was resolved. Dimly aware at the time of the importance of what was unfolding, I kept an ongoing log of the events and the discussions, from which I take almost all of the following specifics.

During the Pacesetter controversy in summer 1994, I received several calls on the topic, all of which were from NCETE leaders and officials, both inside and outside the Illinois headquarters, and I had a number of face-to-face meetings with NCETE officials at the Standards Retreat in Indianapolis during the weekend of July 22–24. The focus of the calls and the meetings was only one of the Pacesetter articles, the Daniels manuscript, and the discussion became very serious when an ETS official and one from the Council of Learned Societies both promised lawsuits if the piece was printed in English Journal. While one high-ranking NCETE official was supportive of my stand and offered crucially important aid, other NCETE officials implied dire consequences. In a face-to-face conversation in Indianapolis, one NCETE official explicitly argued that, because NCETE members were involved with Pacesetter, the article should not be printed. There was also an effort to have the article circulated before its appearance in the November EJ.

For my part, I did not perceive anything in the Daniels manuscript as worthy of a lawsuit. I did not accept the argument that NCETE’s partnership interest should affect the publication of an article in an NCETE academic journal, and I had, as editor, accepted the piece and planned to run it, with the Elias article, in November 1994. I also did not plan to circulate the article to anyone or any group before its publication in the journal. I cited the Rights and Responsibilities document and, in two separate discussions (July 21, July 22) conveyed to the appropriate NCETE official that I would have to resign immediately if the Daniels manuscript did not, as planned, run in the November 1994 EJ.

In the end, I did not have to resign: The Daniels article was not circulated beforehand, it was published in November, and neither ETS nor the Council of Learned Societies sued. Yet, possibly in anticipation of further such struggles, I was informed on August 2 that the term official would be permanently and immediately removed from the English Journal masthead (“in light of recent events,” one NCETE official communicated in a phone call). It would not appear again during my editorship.

There was, though, another development, which proved that from a firestorm could come real good. It may have surprised some Pacesetter proponents, but I accepted immediately offers to write further articles on the subject, and, as a follow-up to the November 1994 Daniels/Elias pairing, “Pace-setter Revisited” appeared in the January 1995 English Journal. The section had an introductory piece by me, giving readers some background, and pro-Pacesetter articles from Dennie Palmer Wolf, Michael Holzman, and Robert Scholes. A lone dissenting article came from Jim Vopat, who, betraying the anger generated on one side of the topic, made his piece on Pacesetter a nomination for the 1995 NCETE Doublespeak Award.

1994–97: NBPTS

The topics of controversy were not exhausted, however. Another wrinkle in the partnership wars was visible articles on NBPTS, and though not as visible as with pieces on Pacesetter English, from my perspective the struggle was actually more intense.

In the case of NBPTS, the unease regarding what English Journal was printing emanated from the highest echelons of NCETE headquarters. The pressure was applied not only to me but to one of the writers, and, for the first time, the Steering Committee of the Secondary Section became actively involved defending not only EJ, but me as editor. Once again, I found little option but to promise my resignation if my decision to print an article was overridden. This time, though, I was in more serious doubt as to the outcome, and, because I had been editor for almost three years, the stakes seemed higher.

It began with Anthony B. Petrosky, who had spoken at the 1994 NCETE Spring Conference regarding his ongoing work with NBPTS. Petrosky and his team had been creating and field testing an assessment instrument for teachers in pursuit of NBPTS Board certification, a crucial task that was being watched carefully by those interested in NBPTS’s progress. Petrosky, who was highly thought of and whose work lent real credibility to the idea of Board certification (not to mention NCETE-endorsed Board certification), had been recently dismissed by NBPTS.

Once again, I found little option but to promise my resignation if my decision to print an article was overridden.

In a November 1994 English Journal article, “Schizophrenia, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ Policies, and Me,” Petrosky outlined his involvement with the group. In a bitter essay, he criticized NBPTS and its policy making, policy making which, Petrosky contended, was specifically excluding classroom teachers. Because many believed that NBPTS was one of the few organizations of its kind to do just the opposite, put classroom teachers on its board and incorporate their suggestions, Petrosky’s contention to the contrary was a small bombshell.

Yet, while a number of subsequent letters to the editor objected to the Petrosky article, in particular to his use of schizophrenia as an analogy to his work with NBPTS, it was not until Joan N. Steiner, then chair of the English Journal’s sponsoring group, the Secondary Section, wrote a piece that raised questions about NBPTS that the controversy erupted in earnest.

Concerned about the possible partnership of NCETE and NBPTS, and frustrated by what was perceived as NBPTS’s consistent vagueness regarding certain of its policies and practices, Steiner wrote a column for the September 1995 English Journal. As with Pacesetter, during the production
process (this time in the summer of 1995), calls were made to the *English Journal* editorial offices and to Steiner herself to forestall publication of the piece. It also became apparent that this article, raising questions, was considered ill-advised and ill-timed. Citing once again the "Rights and Responsibilities" document, I broached the subject of resignation. This time the response from NCATE Headquarters was glacial—while during the Fawcetter controversy I had one crucial ally, there appeared to be none regarding NBPTS, and communication on the topic ceased. It seemed there was a standoff, and, in the September 1995 *English Journal*, Steiner's "National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: Issues and Concerns" was published.

In a way, I felt I had been playing a game in which I was only partly informed of the rules.

I thought the controversy was finished. Some NCATE leaders, however, were not so sanguine. One manifestation of that attitude was a Headquarters decision that on the *English Journal* copyright page would now appear a permanent addition, a content disclaimer statement, part of which reads:

Publicity accorded to any particular point of view does not imply endorsement by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, or the membership at large, except in announcements of policy, where such endorsement is clearly specified. (February 1996:4 and subsequent issues)

About that time I was told through NCATE that protest calls were being made to members of NCATE Headquarters by leaders of NBPTS. Soon I was informed of a pending rebuttal from NBPTS, and I assured NCATE personnel that the NBPTS piece, whether article or letter to the editor, would be handled routinely. While I am not sure that at this point anyone at NCATE believed it, once again, I welcomed printing an opposing viewpoint, and in the March 1996 issue a three-column letter from NBPTS president James A. Kelly appeared. In that letter, Kelly cited the "diservice" the Steiner article had done to readers of *EJ* and called the journal a purveyor of "blatant . . . mis-statements" and "an amalgam of inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and fictions" (March 1996: 11–12). In an editorial comment in that same issue, I reinforced *English Journal*’s mission to "continue to uphold discussion and debate within NCATE" (March 1996: 13) and stood by the accuracy of the Steiner column. Yet the criticism of Secondary Section chair Steiner was stinging, and the thirteen members of the organization she headed, the Steering Committee of the Secondary Section, wrote a letter to *English Journal*. The letter, published in April 1996, maintained that not only did Steiner "know what she [was] talking about," but that her questions were appropriate:

Where else should the questions be raised for and with our colleagues than in our professional journals? And who should they be raised by but our elected leader who has been representing the Secondary membership so vigorously and effectively? (April 1996:10)

The NBPTS issue appeared to have a life of its own and wound into the annual winter gathering of NCATE leaders in Urbana, Illinois. At its February 3, 1997, meeting, the Steering Committee of the Secondary Section put the topic on its agenda, not only in regard to NBPTS, but in response to my decision not to seek a second term as *English Journal* editor. When members of the Secondary Section pointedly quizzed an NCATE official regarding the repeated pressure placed on me regarding published articles, the group was told that while the "Rights and Responsibilities" document was in force, it was considered wholly fair game to press any and all editors regarding the appearance of articles in journals (Tape Recording, Steering Committee of the Secondary Section meeting, February 3, 1997). While the comment confirmed what I had come to suspect, to this day I am still surprised. In a way, I felt I had been playing a game in which I was only partly informed of the rules.

**Conclusion**

The years 1994–98 were, from my point of view, tumultuous ones for *English Journal*. Certainly I was not the first editor to encounter dissension: Steve Tchudi (editor 1973–80) had no qualms about pushing the envelope on many topics, and he used counterculture writers and arts with regularity and was regularly criticized for such. Ken Donelson, with the support of his coeditor Alleen Nilsen (1980–87), offered his immediate resignation when the NCATE Executive Director ordered the removal of a homosexual poem from *English Journal*; the poem was printed. Under editor Ben Nelms (1987–94), *English Journal* ran a number of unsettling and hard hitting articles, particularly on the subject of gay and lesbian topics and on alienated students, and Nelms was in continual battle with NCATE regarding the art on the *English Journal* covers.

Current editor Virginia Monseau (1998–present), at least from the evidence of recent letters, has "disappoointed" (May 1999: 12) and "saddened" (May 1999: 12) readers and has been asked if "it is possible for *English Journal* to stick more with English issues, rather than every issue being a study in ‘political correctness’" (May 1991: 12). My years as editor held their own challenges—and their deep satisfactions—and when, in mid-1998, the whirlwind touched down and my last issue was mailed, I left the journal with a sense of release and relief.

Recreating what I wrote during that time, I find in the January 1995 *EJ* the heart of my beliefs about *English Journal*. I, of course, do not hold these alone: There are many members and officials of NCATE who share the same beliefs and who, during my years as editor, stood with me. So I say it for all of us.

I could say it a bit differently today, but I couldn't say it better. Further, it represents that small part of Council history into which I do hope to be entered, possibly even remembered.

Disagreement, discussion, argument is the stuff of our profession, and the honest exchange of views is the essence of what we do, what we teach, in fact, of what we live. *EJ* has over the years remained a responsible forum for ideas. And, I might add, when it ceases to be such, it will no longer be the journal that has served our profession so well for these eight decades—smooching over our philosophical chaos in the name of presenting a united front will not, I think, do any of us any good. In order to change we must continue to talk, to argue, to negotiate our differences and, indeed, our hostilities. Silencing the conversation is not only counterproductive it is, bluntly put, wrong.

Ideas matter, and the expression of those ideas matters. One would hope . . . that our ideas are not so fragile nor our principles so shaky that they cannot withstand honest scrutiny and forthright discussion. Accordingly, all are invited, as always, to write *English Journal* and express popular, unpopular, wrong-headed, right-headed, dissenting, and asserting views. While threats, lawsuits, demands, and distributions are not welcome, good articles always are. (January 1995: 59).

**Note**

There are a number of antagonists mentioned in this article, but identifying them by name serves no purpose. I battled with them all, and they know who they are. There are also, however, a number of people who at crucial moments helped me in ways large and small. To them, some of whom will be surprised to see their names on this list and may not even know what they did and when, I give thanks: Karen Smith, Kate Hope, Cliff Maduini, Bill Sobolik, Kristin Elias, Drek Sindas, Patti Stock, John Mayer, Peter Smageriansky, Harvey A. Daniels, Jim Snel, Susan Ohanian, Diego Davalos, Ben Nelms, Alleen Nilsen, Ken Donelson, Steve Tchudi, Joan N. Steiner, Carol Avery, Alan M. McCool, and, finally, Tucker Conley.

Leila Christenbury is a former high school English teacher, a past editor of *English Journal*, and current vice president of NCATE.
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