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INTRODUCTION

A complete introduction to the subject and its problems is given in the next section, Origin of Study.

However there are certain terms used throughout the paper, and which seem to require explanation, that I would like to define at once.

For an authoritative definition I have had recourse to the report An Experience Curriculum in English, a report of a Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English (1). The terms are correlation, fusion, and integration.

These terms have been defined on page ten of the above report as follows:

"The terms correlation and integration are used loosely to cover all sorts of attempts to establish connections between the various subjects of school and college study".

Fusion. "the combination of two subjects, usually under the same instructor or instructors".

Integration. "the unification of all study (and other experience)". This is done through "the initiation of vital activities which reach out into various fields and absorb subject content......"

The first term, correlation, is used more widely today

II.

for the purpose of embracing many divergent forms. It is the subject of a later report, *A Correlated Curriculum*, published by the same organization.

From this report I have obtained a classification of these widely different forms. The various chapters are entitled:

I. Correlation of English with Other Fields Through Incidental References and Isolated Projects.

II. An English Course Based on Correlation with Other Subjects but not Implying the Modification of Courses in Any Other Field.

III. The Fusion of English with One Other Subject.

IV. The Fusion of Group Subjects.

V. A Curriculum Based on the Integration of All Educational Subjects or Transcending Subject-Matter Divisions.

These classifications were used at the end of this paper.
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ORIGINS OF STUDY

A short time ago while talking with an instructor in vocational education I was informed of the critical attitude he had towards the teaching of English. The crux of his remarks was that English teachers brought their subject beyond the comprehension of large numbers of their pupils. This was illustrated by the example of an English teacher who had failed a total of fifty per cent of her class.

Why English teachers should thus be singled out for criticism in this regard was a problem to me. Visualizing these pupils in relation to all their school subjects, it seemed hardly possible that English should thus become the most fatal. The same skills that are taught in the English course are used in most of the other subjects. Would the same situation arise in a one-room schoolhouse or in any educational situation where all subjects were taught by one teacher?

It would seem that departmentalization, where English is isolated from the rest of the curriculum, would be an important consideration in the explanation.

Again, a school administrator once said to me that in his opinion English was the subject where a great many teachers are apt to lose their perspectives and teach one
phase of their field to the neglect of larger and more essential matters. We have seen the expansion of the field of high school English to the point where it included all types of activities from verse-speaking choirs to motion picture appreciation. Personally, I was for simplification and the effective teaching of fundamentals. English should be taught in relation to individuals and in relation to uses or functions. Its chief concern is the development of the arts of reading, writing and speaking. Between these ends and classroom techniques a great many practices are apt to interpose. There are apt to be assignments and drills without meaning and without relation to any real situation, thoroughly isolated and artificial.

Applying the same line of reasoning to other teachers and subjects the same difficulty arose. Each teacher is prone to regard her own particular field and more, her own particular phase of that field, as taking precedence over many, if not all, others. She is concerned with the aims and objectives of that field, and, the fault may be, to the disregard for all others.

The departmental idea has intensified these attitudes, narrowed teachers visions, and isolated the subjects of the curriculum from one another.

Moreover, the technical reaches to which any subject may be put can carry the classroom material beyond any real meaning that it may have for the average pupil.
Thus, "Under the elective system, students go through school with the most scattered and lopsided views of life, and even when elections are reduced to a minimum and a set program of studies required, failure to correlate the various subjects of instruction leaves the student unaware of their connection as related parts in the scheme of life". (1)

The report goes on to state: "We can no longer ask students to solve such a picture puzzle for themselves. We must somehow show them the picture by a carefully integrated curriculum so taught that the connection of each subject with every other subject and with the whole of life will be unmistakable for the student." (2)

This would be the last step, one by which the present school organization would be broken down and remade on a different basis, whose objectives would be to synthesize the materials of the various divisions in the curriculum.

The foregoing would offer as reasons for such a change the several aspects of modern life which seem to require it, as follows: (3)

1. Hyper-specialization and the need for viewing life as a whole.
2. The "increasing mobility of our population".
3. The "noise, confusion, and distraction of urban life".
4. "The civic and political indifference."
5. The need for making clear the "philosophical implications of the new learning".

(1) See A Correlated Curriculum (henceforth abbreviated to CC), a report of the Committee on Correlation of the National Council of Teachers of English, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936, page 1.

(2) Ibid, p. 1

(3) Ibid, p. 2
As can be readily seen, such a course would mean an upheaval. I began to think in terms of what might be done with the present order. It was evident that the content and objectives of the various subjects had to be simplified and pointed towards a central focus. It might even become advisable to simplify the program of studies. Granting that a breaking down of subject matter lines was undesirable, it was obvious that some common ground or focus-point on which the synthesis of school subjects might take place was needed.

This would involve the creation of a new department or the reorganization of one already existent. Tentatively, I set up the English department as the one most suited for this purpose: "In the very nature of the subject, English occupies a unique position in the school. It will function best in cooperation with other departments. The basis for this cooperation is faculty study." (1)

A number of difficulties arose. The first was basic. Regarding the scheme of attempting this synthesis in the English course, Professor George Reynolds in his address before the English section of the N. E. A. in Denver (1935) said: .... "facts and generalizations" are "neither of much value from the distinctive point of view of literature."

Dr. Allan Abbott of Columbia: "True integration cannot be had by imposing one view of life, one center or organization,

one frame of reference, however important, and excluding the rest." He goes on to state that "literary values" cannot be determined by a "frame of reference" outside of literature itself. (1)

To these we reply that the appreciation of mere art for art's sake in an educational situation is "eclipsed by more didactic purposes". (2)

This greater didactic purpose is the moulding by education of the individual into a fully-developed, integrated person. The hope for a new curriculum and organization lies in part in the "current organismic psychology of education and the classroom practice by which necessary racial experience patterns reflected in the integrated subject-matter patterns of the new curriculum can be transformed by the student into life patterns of his own that will weld information, understanding, and skill so inextricably into the warp and woof of his nature that transfer of this training into new life situations as they arise will be possible". (3)

This psychology, known as Gestalt, differs from its predecessor, behaviorism, which considered the individual as composed of various distinct and separated reactions, in that it looks upon the human being and his personality as a dynamic whole. The concept is explained in the following statement by

(2) CC., p. 7
(3) CC., p. 3
Kurt Koffka of Smith College:

"The general significance of this hypothesis is that our space perception in all three dimensions is the result of organized brain activity and that we can understand our space perception only in terms of organization, i. e., in terms of actual dynamic processes, and not in terms of mere geometrical stimulus-sensation correlations." (1) (2)

Accordingly, in the field of education there is seen the need for teachers "abandoning" their subject in an attempt to see the problem in the whole. Why fall upon English? Professor J. Paul Leonard of Stanford University


(2) See also Ibid, page 148, Wolfgang Kohler, "The most dangerous property of a concept like "sensation" consists in the fact that such local elements are very easily regarded as depending upon local processes in the nervous system, each of which would be determined by one local stimulus, in principle. Our observations are in complete disagreement with this "mosaic theory" of the field. How can local processes which are independent of and indifferent to each other be at the same time organized into larger units of well-observable extent in some areas? How, again, can relative break of continuity at the well-observable limits of those areas be understood, since these limits are not limits everywhere between little pieces of a mosaic, but appear only where one group or unit ends? The hypothesis of independent little parts is unable to give an explanation. Only a consideration which takes account of how the local conditions for the whole field relate to each other begins to approach an understanding of those facts.
makes a sweeping answer:

"All of our studies show that pupils are seriously deficient in social competence, adequate reading ability, intelligent communication, powers basic to understanding of qualitative relationships and knowledge of daily problems and social tensions, and the ability to earn their own living."

Correlation of the type which I describe seeks to develop relationships, communication as an aim that is school-wide, reading ability in all classes by means of materials and content primarily social.

Another difficulty presented to a program based on the correlation of other subject content through English was the presence, in the English course, of a large amount of material that required whatever time could be devoted to it. It seemed that if it were to take on a new field of activity it had to be set free from some of its present concerns.

The obvious solution could be found in the ancient "Every teacher a teacher of English" idea. This has never been very effective. The reason perhaps is that the teaching was not continuous, simplified, or systematic. But with English carrying over into other classrooms on the basis of some accepted and practical plan, the present concerns of English could be cared for by having other teachers share responsibility for matters of form,
communication, reading, and so forth.

For if education is to say "something simple, obvious, definite", if education is to establish a synthesis, why not English as the synthesizing ground? With other subjects to furnish facts and understandings within their fields, parts of the total picture which must be put together and connected with pupil experiences, what better place than English to set up these correlations?

This may seem radical and impractical. But its radicalism and impracticality might be lessened, I thought, by a study of current practices with respect to correlation among those schools of the traditional pattern which have set up devices aiming at these outcomes.

Thus originated the plan of sending questionnaires to the schools of Massachusetts. The problems posed were as stated below.

I. What limitations of degree should be put upon a plan for correlation to be used in the present schools of Massachusetts?

II. To what extent is English being freed of sole responsibility for traditional matters of English teaching?

III. To what extent is English being freed of sole responsibility for traditional matters of form in writing and speaking?
IV. To what extent is the reading traditionally proper to an English course being introduced in other courses?

V. To what extent is the English base being broadened to include reading materials and subject matter from all fields?

VI. To what extent is the content of other courses being introduced in the English course through composition?

VII. To what extent is being made provision for liaison between English and other studies?

VIII. To whom is being given the role of initiating and sustaining these procedures?

IX. What are the obstacles in the way of reorganization along the lines laid down?

X. What types of schools are most adaptable to the plan?

XI. What are the most significant items among the returns?

XII. On the basis of current practice what plan of correlation might be acceptable?
PROCEDURE

Since the study was one which attempted to devise a plan for correlation or synthesis of school subjects within the limitations of current practice the first step was to find out what was being done that might be incorporated in the plan. A questionnaire (see Appendix I) based on the report A Correlated Curriculum and including such items as might be applied to the schools of Massachusetts and such as might be helpful in constructing the plan, was sent out. (1)

Make-up.

Questions were planned to answer the foregoing twelve problems in terms of present organizations and practices. Restating the general problems, I have set down below the particular questions.

I.

What limitations of degree should be put upon a plan for correlation to be used in the present schools of Massachusetts?

A. If any subject groupings in your course of study have been discarded would you be willing to send a copy with annotations indicating changes of this type?

Yes ________  No ________

B. If working under this type of organization (fusion, correlation, or integration), would you be willing to send a syllabus of fundamentals, aims, or objectives?

Yes ________  No ________

(1) See "Scope"
These questions were included to see if any of the schools had touched upon the more extreme forms of correlation. (1) The point was quickly settled as none of the schools reporting gave an affirmative reply.

C. Adoption of a school-wide vocabulary ________.

This adoption would be one of the first steps in the adoption of a complete synthesis of subject matter.

Only one school checked the item.

II

To what extent is English being freed of sole responsibility for traditional matters of English teaching?

A. How many of the following techniques are taught in your school? (2)

1. Please indicate where taught by checking the box (or boxes) under the class (or classes).

   Thus for example:

   English Social Language Commercial Science Math Pract. Fine
   Studies/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / Arts/ Arts

   Reading * * * * * * * * * *

   The above would be interpreted to mean that reading techniques are taught in English, Social Studies, Language, and Science.

   Eng./Soc./Lang./Sci./Math./Pract./Fine/
   St./Lang./Sci./Math./Fine/
   / Arts/ Arts

a. Literature
b. Reading
c. Composition
   (oral)
d. Composition
   (written)
e. Composition
   (creative)
f. Grammar
g. Usage
h. Spelling
i. Vocabulary

(1) CC., p. 5
(2) See CC., pp. 84, 93, 94, 184, 282.
Since English was included among the various subject fields, it is evident that no clue to the desired answer was given. Schools could have checked all nine techniques under English and no other. The purpose of the question was to discover which techniques were most adaptable and which fields could most readily adopt them.

The inclusion of several of the techniques in the list is questionable:

1. Vocabulary. No doubt there is a certain technical English vocabulary. Aside from these, there are certain word groupings, for example, epithets, which have been taught in English courses, though of late authorities have questioned such direct teaching methods. It is nevertheless true that vocabulary as such is the domain of all subjects.

2. Spelling. A school that is organized to take care of spelling errors when they first appear is ideal. However, all teachers are responsible for the spelling of the technical vocabulary of their course. Again, spelling is best checked in connection with use.

3. Usage. This is discussed in another section of the questionnaire.

4. Grammar. The direct teaching of grammar has been disputed. Authorities and studies have revealed that it is best taught functionally,
or via the thought approach.

5. Reading. Certain reading techniques, for example, comprehension, interpretation, skimming, are developed in all courses using printed materials. Remedial reading is done through special classes as is, sometimes, developmental reading.

Consequently, perhaps the more significant items in this question are those which deal with the places where these techniques may be taught.

B. If the teaching of these techniques in other classes is planned to supplement or replace their being taught in English classes, kindly fill in below.

Or, if the correlations are independent, please fill in.

/Always/Often/Sometimes/Rarely/Never/

To supplement
To replace
Independent
Correlation

This question was included to ascertain the purpose to which these teachings have been put. A teaching to replace would be a very favorable sign that English was being taken over by the other subjects. Even a movement to supplement would mean that with proper organization and methods replacement might in time be in order. Whereas, independent correlation indicates power that might be put to more effective work.

III

To what extent is English being freed of sole responsibility
for traditional matters of form in writing and speaking?

A. Discussion and adoption of common (school-wide) objectives in writing ________ (1)
   in speaking ________

B. Adoption of a style manual for written work ________ (2)

C. Securing uniform minimum requirements of decent English in all classes ________ (3)
   in some classes ________

D. Oral compositions checked for English in other classes ________ (4)

E. Written compositions checked for English in other classes ________

The fact that what is taught in the English course is not followed up in other courses has often been assigned as the reason for ineffectiveness. If some plan for this follow-up could be worked out the English load would be immeasurably lightened.

IV.

To what extent is the reading traditionally proper to an English course being introduced in other courses?

A. Discussion and adoption of common (school-wide) objectives in reading ________

B. Literature introduced in: (encircle field)
   1. Social Science. 2. Language. 3. Commercial

(1) CC., p. 284 ff.
(2) CC., pp. 180-181
(3) CC., p. 284 ff.
(4) CC., p. 265 ff., p. 258

These questions would give the clue to extension of English content to other fields with a subsequent gain for English in the time required for correlating activities.

V.

To what extent is the English base being broadened to include reading materials and subject matter from all fields?

A. Please check the box which best characterizes your selection of reading materials.

/Always/Often/Sometimes/Rarely/Never/

1. Required Reading

2. Free Reading

3. Free Reading from a limited choice

B-1. If the last plan is used, is the reading organized around themes or core topics?

/Always/Often/Sometimes/Rarely/Never/

C. If the last plan (no. 3) is used, by whom were the booklists made?

English teachers

Teachers from various fields (including (English)

D. Teachers cooperate in making a syllabus of books for reading

by all classes

by some classes
E. Subject matter of reading exercises drawn from:

(Encircle field) (1)
1. Social Science. 2. Language. 3. Commercial.
7. Fine arts.

Item A would indicate whether or not English is being relieved from a program of the intensive reading of required classics. It would indicate gains in the attempt to engage in programs of extensive reading about themes or core topics set up in other classes. (Item B)

Items C and D would reveal how representative of the various fields the reading material is. Item D would point out the limits to which these programs could be put.

Item E would enable us to discover with which fields English could best cooperate in the setting up of a plan.

VI

To what extent is the content of other courses being introduced in the English course through composition?

A. Written compositions of other classes checked by English teacher

English class

B. Use in Composition of material taught in other classes (2)

(Please name the fields below)

1. ____________________________

(1) CC., pp. 20-21, 96.
(2) CC., pp 20-21, 94, 107
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________
6. __________________________________________
7. __________________________________________

C. If this use is planned to go along with the work in other fields please indicate.

Yes _______ No _______

If content of other courses is used in English theme work, a synthesis of this material could be more readily introduced there; the bases for this work should be broad, pointed, and philosophically sound; teachers would seek to have students establish the nexus and proceed to conclusions.

Item C would indicate to what extent what is being done is deliberate or the product of chance.

VII

To what extent is provision being made for liaison between English and other studies?

A. Individualized Methods (1)

1. Other teachers visit English classes ________________

2. Other teachers familiarize themselves with courses of study in English classes ________________

(1) CC., p. 281
3. English teachers visit other classes

4. English teachers familiarize themselves with courses of study in other classes

B. Centralized Methods. (1)

1. Drawing up charts of work in various related courses

2. Offering suggestions

3. Serving as librarians in supplying materials to various courses

4. Administering to pupils of these courses cooperative tests

C. Group Methods. (2)

1. Initiating or conducting meetings between teachers of various courses for the purpose of drawing up related plans

2. Planning or helping to plan projects in which these teachers may engage together

3. Planning or helping to plan a correlated curriculum

These items range from the scattered, intermittent, rather haphazard characters of the first group, through the rather top-heavy and dictatorial characters of the second, to the more representative, discussion-type, of the last. They would reveal, however, not only which methods are preferable but also the extent to which supervision of

(1) CC., p. 278 ff.
(3) Ibid
of this type has been adopted.

VIII

To whom is being given the role of initiating and sustaining these procedures?

A. Have you any liaison agents between English and other courses? (1)

Yes ___ No ___

B. If so, what are the official titles of these agents?

C. Is it part of the English teacher's job in your school to act as an agent of this type? (2)

Yes ___ No ___

1. Education of the faculty by the English department as to the value of reading skills (3) ___

   writing skills ___

   speaking skills ___

Such a program must be begun and kept in operation by supervisors or some other types of agents. It seems apparent that such activity should not conflict with classroom duties. If so, the program is apt to suffer.

IX.

What are the obstacles in the way or reorganization along the lines laid down?

A. The positive program outlined in this questionnaire seems to be:

(1) CC., p. 278, ff
(2) CC., p. 284 ff.
(3) Ibid
1. undesirable. 2. inexpedient. 3. impractical
4. difficult to obtain.

B. Reasons:
1. overlooks the difficulties of administration ____ (1)
2. overlooks the difficulty of grouping ____ (1)
3. overlooks the size of most classes ____ (1)
4. is too inflexible as a program ____
5. requires too much supervision ____
6. requires too many teachers ____
7. requires too much time ____ (1)
8. requires too much planning ____ (1)
9. requires too much teaching preparation ____
10. promises no great rewards ____
11. overlooks the demands of college preparation ____ (1)
12. overlooks the teaching of needed essentials ____ (1) (2)
13. fosters the danger of neglecting phases of education ____ (1)
14. forces teacher to rely on inferior materials ____ (3)
15. neglects (encircle) literary, social, historical, scientific, civic, etc. values ____ (3)
16. fosters topical monotony in the classroom ____ (1) (3)
17. fosters wearisome repetition in the classroom ____
18. merely spreads a smaller part of what is now taught over a larger teaching area ____

(1) CC., p. 196
(2) English Journal, Mr.'39, p. 184
(3) " " Mr.'36, p. 195, 196
C. Unclassified reasons.

Criticisms of the plan by eminent educators and other plausible criticisms were submitted in a checklist concluding the questionnaire.

Provision in the form of a blank space for individual criticisms was made. Analysis of these reasons should reveal the points where greatest difficulty is apt to be met.

Problems to be answered indirectly by the questionnaire.

IX. What are the obstacles in the way of reorganization along the lines laid down?

X. What types of schools are most adaptable to the plan?

XI. What are the most significant items among the returns?

XII. On the basis of current practice what plan of correlation might be acceptable?

Handling data

The number of items out of the one hundred and thirteen listed on the questionnaire were tabulated for each school. The schools were then arranged on a frequency scale according to the number of items checked by each. A mean number of checks was then computed for the reporting schools. This mean was then expressed in terms of the percentage of the total number of checks (113) it expressed.

With certain exceptions, to be noted later, individual items were then expressed in terms of percent and, if their percentage exceeded that expressed by the mean above, they
were interpreted as significant. (1) Since most of the items could be marked in only one way, that is, *Yes*, they would either be checked or left blank. Thus, the number of checks for each item was limited by the number of schools reporting, actually, thirty-six. Then each item would be one-thirty-sixth of a hundred (1/36 of 100) or two and seventy-eight hundredths (2.78). To get the per cent of each item it was merely necessary to multiply the number of checks it received by 2.78.

The items which were not to be answered *Yes* by mere checking were analyzed by means of ratios for the purpose of perceiving the more significant tendencies or practices. Such items were found in Section II, Items A and B and in Section V, Items A and B. In computing the results for IIA, one device used consisted in arranging the techniques on a frequency scale according to the number of checks. The mean number of fields, outside of English, where the techniques were taught was computed. The same was done in interpreting the number of English techniques taught in each field outside of English. No mean of less than 1.00 was interpreted as significant.

IIA also employed a ratio in which the most significant item was arbitrarily given a rating of 1.00. IIB employed the device known as the mode or point in a frequency scale, (1) In the tables following significant items are starred (*)
that includes the largest numbers of cases. IIB also used a ratio interpreting a five point scale. The formula used follows:

\[ \text{Ratio equals } 0.8X_1 \div 0.4X_3 \div 0.2X_4 \div \frac{N}{N} \]

Where \(X_1\) equals the frequency at Always, \(X_2\) at Often, \(X_3\) at Sometimes, and \(X_4\) at Rarely,

And \(N\) equals the total number of cases for each classification. Each ratio expressed was computed separately; the same formula was used for each classification.

VA used ratio to one (1.00) where one was understood to stand for the total reading program. The formula used follows:

\[ \text{Ratio equals } \left( 4X_1 \div 2X_3 \div \frac{N}{N} \right) \times 11.17 \]

Where, \(X_1\) and so forth equals the values as given in the formula above, and \(N\) equals the number of cases, and 11.17 is the constant necessary to make the ratio comparable to 1.00.

VB took the ratio for the reading programs characterized as Free Reading from a limited choice and raised each figure for each interval of the five-point scale to a per cent of this ratio by multiplying by a constant.

The additions to the questionnaire dealing with
obstacles to adoption of the program were simply ranked according to the frequency with which the obstacle was checked. The mean number of obstacles returned was calculated. The obstacles were arranged on a frequency scale. The number of highest ranking obstacles equal to the mean number were interpreted as significant.

Scope:

The questionnaire was sent to one hundred senior high schools of Massachusetts. These samples were chosen first, on the basis of community size, and second, with regard to the type of high school: three-year, four-year, or six year. Slightly more than one-third, therefore, of all high schools of Massachusetts were solicited. This also means that slightly more than one-third of the high schools from each population group were questioned: about thirty-seven percent of those in towns ranging from a population of one to one thousand, the same of those from one thousand to two thousand, and so forth through to the larger cities. The same percent (37) of those with the three, four, and six types of organization received blanks.

Returns:

Thirty-six schools reported. The number of checks for each school ranged from 0 to 49, (see Figure 3) with a mean number for all of 21.76. Expressed in terms of percent of the total number of blanks on the questionnaire (113), this mean number changed to 19.34 per cent. Thus, for all items calculated in terms of per cent anything
greater than 19 per cent was interpreted as significant.

(See Figure 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>No. received</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-3,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-4,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-5,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-6,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000-7,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000-8,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-9,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,999</td>
<td>2 or 3 (2)</td>
<td>11 or 12 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-49,999</td>
<td>4 or 6 (2)</td>
<td>5 or 11 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-59,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-69,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000-79,999</td>
<td>1 or 0 (2)</td>
<td>1 or 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>2 or 0 (2)</td>
<td>6 or 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 (1) 100

Figure 1. Returns according to community size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. of returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-year</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Returns according to type of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items Checked</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.76 equals mean checks
or 19.34 equals mean percent

21.76 equals mean checks
or 19.34 equals mean percent

Figure 3. Mean percent and checks.

(1) One school replied anonymously.

(2) For large cities containing more than one high school
the population was divided by the number of high schools
and the city size rated at the resulting figure.
TABULATIONS.

I. None of the schools reported curricula that were based on fusion, correlation, or integration of subject matter. No schools had organizations that transcended subject matter divisions. Only one school indicated a trend in the direction of synthesizing subject matter by the adoption of a school-wide vocabulary.

II. The extent to which English is being freed of sole responsibility for traditional matters of English teaching.

How many of the following techniques are taught in your school?

1. Please indicate where taught by checking the box (or boxes) under the class (or classes).

   Thus for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   The above would be interpreted to mean that reading techniques are taught in English, Social Studies, Language and Science.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Figure 4. Techniques taught outside English course.
In computing the results of these questions it was seen that with thirty-six schools reporting on seven major fields each technique could receive a top figure of two hundred and fifty checks. Taking this as the perfect score, the checks were distributed as seen in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>No. of checks (out of 252) (for each technique)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Composition</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Composition</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Composition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 B. Frequency with which English techniques are taught outside of English classes.

The frequency with which individual schools taught these techniques outside of the English course was then tabulated. The means for these tabulations was computed. (See Figure 4B). Thus, Literature was taught in three subject fields by three schools; in two fields by six schools; in one field by nine schools) totals: (9 & 12 & 9 or 30: (see Figure 4B). The mean, therefore, for thirty-six schools was .834.

Tabulations were made for each of the seven major subject fields. Out of a possible 324 checks for each subject field, distributions were given in Figure 5.
Subject Field          | No. of checks | Mean No. |
------------------------|--------------|----------|
Language                | 115          | 3.166*   |
Social Studies          | 76           | 2.11*    |
Commercial             | 59           | 1.64*    |
Science                 | 53           | 1.47*    |
Mathematics             | 17           | .47      |
Practical Arts          | 14           | .39      |
Fine Arts               | 8            | .22      |

Figure 5. Subject Fields in which English techniques are taught.

The places in which the teaching of English techniques were preferred by the schools returning were ranked according to techniques. Language was ranked first according to the number of checks it received in each of the nine techniques except one, Oral Composition, where it ranked second.

For the purposes of comparison, then, Language was given a rating of 1.00 as being the place preferred, next to English, for the teaching of English techniques. The ratios of the other fields to Language was then computed.

(Figure 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Field</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Arts</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Preference-Ratio of Subject Fields for teaching English.

The next step was to ascertain the extent to which the schools returning sought by this teaching of English outside.
English classes to supplant or supplement its teaching in the English course.

12. If the teaching of these techniques in other classes is planned to supplement or replace their being taught in English classes, or, if the correlations are independent, please fill in below.

(a five-point scale with the designations Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never, was included.) (See Figure 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always/ Often/Sometimes/Rarely/Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To replace</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement</td>
<td>2 2 8 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Correlation</td>
<td>7 5 6 2 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Purposes in teaching English techniques.

In spite of the apparent gaps between each of the three characteristics given in Figure 7, it can be seen that they and their five levels make up a descending scale of value, from complete replacement to absolute independence. Consequently we may fix the central tendency by mere inspection. We will re-arrange the tabulations as in Figure 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To replace:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never (1)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Correlation</td>
<td>Never (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid-most point (see Note 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-- Mode I *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Rearrangement of tabulations for Figure X.

From Figure XI we discover that eighteen of the thirty-six significant items on the quasi-frequency scale range from "independent-correlation-always" to "independent-correlation-sometimes". This fact should enable us to interpret the mode of the distribution as a somewhat limited tendency to favor independent correlation. However, the high frequency at "supplementary-correlation-sometimes" advances the contention that this is an alternate though somewhat lesser choice. Consequently, we have designated it as Mode II.

(1) To say that the teaching is never for replacement is to say that it is supplementary or independent. Hence, this item can not be grouped on the frequency scale.

(2) The more the teaching is independent the more removed the organization will be from one which aims at correlation. Hence, the inverse arrangement.
Computing the results with a different method using numerical constants for the ratings Always, Sometimes, etc., a better mathematical relationship was brought out.

The formula used:

\[
\text{Ratio Equals} \quad \frac{.3x1 + .6x2 + .4x3 + .2x4}{N}
\]

where \( x1 \) equals the frequency at Always
\( x2 \) equals the frequency at Often
\( x3 \) equals the frequency at Sometimes
\( x4 \) equals the frequency at Rarely,

and \( N \) equals the total of frequencies for each classification.

The results of these computations are given in Figure XII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To replace</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To supplement</td>
<td>0.426*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Mathematical Ratios for each Type of Correlation
III. The extent to which English is being freed of responsibility for traditional matters of form in writing and speaking.

Practice | No. of schools | Percentage
---------|---------------|------------
Discussing and adopting common objectives in writing | 9 | 25% *
Discussing and adopting common objectives in speaking | 9 | 25% *
Adopting a style manual for written work | 5 | 13.9%
Securing uniform requirements of decent English in all classes | 7 | 19.5% *
Securing uniform requirements of decent English in some classes | 7 | 19.5% *
Checking written compositions for English in other classes | 22 | 61.2% *
Checking oral compositions for English in other classes | 15 | 41.7% *

Figure 10. Devices extending responsibility for English form.

Most of the items in this table are significant. They indicate the prevalence of unplanned correlation, however, which does not lighten the English load. A trend in the direction of definite responsibilities for English is noted. Since all dove-tail into the third item it seems that faculty planning is required along this line to offset the losses in effectiveness which must occur under plans six and seven.
IV. The extent to which English reading for skill and content is being introduced in other courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>No. of schools checking</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussing and adopting common objectives in reading</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Language</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Social Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Practical Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing literature in Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Devices extending English reading.

In Item 2 it is doubtful if literature in English was meant. However, there are a great many English works and translations written in the idioms of foreign countries which could be read not only in general language courses but also in courses on a single language.

These introductions are haphazard and unsystematic. They lack continuity which impairs their effectiveness. The mere setting up of objectives will not suffice for putting a definite program into operation, a program in
which content is limited in scope and graded according to sequence.

It also seems apparent that the extension of English reading must be confined to the fields of Language and Social Studies with a somewhat slighter chance for its introduction in Science. The item might have been significant if the reading implied by the question had not been literature. Thus the number of checks for each of the above, given in Part II, A of the questionnaire, were:

Language - 16; Social Studies - 13; Science - 8;
Commercial - 5; Mathematics - 4; Practical Arts - 1;
and Fine Arts - 0.

V. The extent to which the English base is being broadened to include reading materials and subject matter from all fields.

The total reading program was given a ratio of one (1.00). It was then found that the various types of reading programs bore ratios to one another as follows:

I. Required 0.36*
II. Free 0.29*
III. Free (limited choice) 0.33*

Analyzing the last ratio, it was found that the use of core topics bore on a five point scale the following relationships to the ratio for III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(total equals numerical value for III)

Figure 12. The use of core topics in free reading activities.
The booklists were made by English teachers in fourteen schools (38.9%); by teachers from various fields (including English) (and including in some cases (2) the school or community librarian) in seven schools, or 19.5% of the total reporting.

Seven schools (19.5%) reported the making of syllabi for reading by some classes by teachers working cooperatively. Two (5.6%) reported the same method in making syllabi for reading by all classes.

The subject matter of reading exercises in English was drawn from other fields as seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Field</th>
<th>No. of Schools Checking</th>
<th>No. of Schools Returning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Fields from which readings are drawn.

From the foregoing it would seem that the importance of required reading is declining. Gains are registered in the attempt to engage in programs of extensive reading. The use of core topics in these programs occupies a very favorable position with the range from Sometimes to Often heavily outweighing all other degrees.

It is evident from the other items that English teachers have a strong representative majority in the
making of booklists. Perhaps a more equitable representation of other fields should be secured. A trend in this direction is indicated by the significant per cents of the two following items.

That a program of correlation in the schools of Massachusetts must be limited to certain subjects is again evidenced in the table which follows. Since these items imply more definitely a program of informational reading, the significance of certain subject fields has changed from that indicated in Part IV. This time Social Studies ranks first, with Science second, while Language, which ranked first before, descends to the position of sharing third place with Fine Arts.

It would seem then that English could best cooperate with Language and Social Studies in programs of recreational reading; with Social Studies and Science in programs of informational reading.
VI

The extent to which the content of other courses is being introduced in the English course through composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English teacher criticizes composition of other classes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36% *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English class criticizes composition of other classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of content from other fields in English composition:

- Social Studies: 18 (49.9% *)
- Science: 17 (47.3% *)
- Language: 7 (19.5% *)
- Commercial: 7 (19.5% *)
- Practical Arts: 6 (16.7%)
- Fine Arts: 6 (16.7%)
- Mathematics: 1 (2.8%)

Figure 14. Devices extending other content to English course.

Unlike Sections IV and V where perhaps the lack of suitable reading materials may hinder a program of correlation that endeavors to include all subject matter, there seems to be no reason why greater equality among subject fields cannot be obtained here. The reason why Social Studies and Science outweigh the other items may be because English teachers are more familiar with these fields. With a program in which the English course sought to
synthesize the outcomes in other fields no such preponderance of subject matter in certain fields could be allowed. However, the study is based on current practices and on the potentialities of present schools and teachers. Consequently, again it seems that English must cooperate with only certain fields, specifically, Social Studies, Science, Language, and Commercial in securing a program that seeks the correlation of subject matter.

In an additional question it was asked if this use of material in composition was planned to go along with the work in the other fields. Five schools answered Yes, limiting this planning to certain courses. Thirteen answered No. The preponderance of negative replies affirms a previous analysis; namely, that there is an educational loss when schools engage haphazardly in these activities. Whatever time or effort should be spent in organization and coordination would be offset by the corresponding elimination of this loss.
The extent to which provision is being made for liaison between English and other studies.

A. Individualized Methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers visit English classes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers familiarize themselves with course in English.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English teachers visit other classes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English teachers familiarize themselves with other courses.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36% *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Centralized Methods

- Drawing up charts of work in various related courses. | 0 | 0%  
- Offering suggestions | 6 | 16.7%  
- Serving as librarians in supplying materials to various courses. | 9 | 25% *  
- Administering to pupils of these courses cooperative tests. | 3 | 8.3%  

C. Group Methods

- Initiating or conducting meetings between teachers of various courses for the purpose of drawing up related plans. | 2 | 5.6%  
- Planning or helping to plan projects in which these teachers may engage together. | 3 | 8.3%  
- Planning or helping to plan a correlated curriculum. | 5 | 13.9%  

Figure 15. Devices providing liaison between English and other subjects.
In Section VIII an opportunity was given the schools to indicate how and by whom the work in this section was carried out. No schools checked the employment of agents other than English teachers or department heads for the execution of these methods. However, it was possible that in checking Items B and C execution might have been in the hands of the principals, especially if the principals were the ones checking the questionnaires.

The official titles of these agents were given by names as follows: English teachers - three schools; English department heads - one school.

Turning this information to our interpretation it would seem that responsibility for these activities rests largely on the English department. In the order of their significance they were:

1. English teachers familiarize themselves with other courses. In the initiating of a plan for correlation this would necessarily be the first step, for without it there could be no genuine synthesis.

2. They serve as librarians in supplying materials to various courses. If by this practice is meant the selection of materials by others outside the course it is questionable because of its autocracy. Such a program will function best through faculty cooperation.

3. They offer suggestions. This has the marks of an administrative device. Coming from another teacher it
would lose its effectiveness unless faculty cooperation and unity were prevalent.

4. Other teachers familiarize themselves with course in English. This is scarcely a significant item although it merits attention in view of the large numbers who checked the practice of criticizing the compositions of other courses for English. It would appear that insofar as the teacher knows English content she is willing to teach it. The coordination of this teaching with what is actually being done in the English course is less apparent.

5. Planning or helping to plan a correlated curriculum. Bordering on the significant items is this one indicating a definite trend in the direction discussed by this paper. Although small its percent is greater than the difference between it and the mean percent of all items so scored. One city school was represented, two large towns, and two small towns. One of the large towns, listed in the state document (No. 2) of the Department of Education as having an average per pupil cost of close to one hundred and twenty dollars, also stated that a new curriculum had been started but not yet completed.

Again irresponsible methods outweigh those that are the result of definite plans and purposes. Again lack of organization of the whole school for the accomplishment of definite aims that only the whole school working as a unit can attain, is revealed.
Those to whom is being given the role of initiating and sustaining these procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaison agents (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education of faculty by the English Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As to value of:</th>
<th>No. of schools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reading skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Supervisory devices.

Perhaps because of the wording of this question or otherwise these items were insignificant.

Summary of Sections VII and VIII. It seems that any program within the present set-up would suffer from a lack of supervisory, service, and intelligence-personnel. It is not enough to say that English teachers or department heads will do it. To do it they would have to have their teaching loads lightened. This would mean more teachers perhaps. Consequently it would be as well to employ this personnel in the beginning.

(1) The official titles of these agents were: English teachers - 2 schools, both English teachers and English department heads - 1 school. Three other schools reported that it was part of the English teacher's job to act as an agent of this type. Total - 6 schools or 16.7%.
With the foregoing and especially the last three sentences in mind, let us turn to a consideration of the obstacles in the way of reorganization. As stated by employees of the schools reporting, we received the information tabulated below.

Characterizations of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified</th>
<th>No. of Schools checking</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Difficult to obtain&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Impractical&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Inexpedient&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Opinions of the program

The conclusion is obvious.
Reasons why the foregoing conclusion, namely, that the program was difficult to obtain, was reached were then taken from a checklist supplied with the questionnaire. I have abbreviated the original statements (see page 20) and ranked them according to difficulty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>No. of checks Received</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative difficulties</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.45%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping difficulties</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.75%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time requirements</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.05%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present sizes of classes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.35%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory requirements</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.35%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present number of teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.65%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning requirements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest requirements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest requirements (Repetition wearisome)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest requirements (Topical monotony)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No accomplishments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching preparation requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect to phases of education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility as a program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on inferior materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect of literary value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No greater rewards promised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18. Reasons for opinions expressed.
Discussion. There might be certain administrative difficulties in securing the faculty cooperation and course coordination demanded. The planning of the program would be attended by grouping difficulties. Now the present size of classes affects the problem is questionable. If size of classes would impair teaching efficiency the same is doubtless impaired under the present organization.

We have seen the shortages due to lack of supervisory agents. The present number of teachers is related to the size of classes. We have seen the unplanned nature of most of what is being done at present. Interest difficulties are not inherent in the program but are products of its execution. College requirements are applicable to only a small minority of most school populations. By essential requirements is probably meant the securing of essential matters of form in English. Again, the difficulty is not inherent. The next item and the last question the basis upon which the program is laid. This has been treated in the introduction. One of the most significant items is the one which follows. Teachers must be fitted by training for the execution of such a program. It is encouraging to think that this was ranked so low. The last four items were deemed insignificant or their significance was overlooked. Perhaps they were not regarded as essential or again, inherent difficulties.
The mean number of obstacles checked was 3.75. The total number it was possible to check was 18. On this reckoning it appears that the schools on a whole dismissed as not entitled to consideration about 79% of the items listed. Accordingly, the four most significant items were:

1. Administrative difficulties and supervisory requirements.
2. Grouping difficulties.
3. Time requirements.
4. Present size of classes and number of teachers.

**OBSTACLES TO DEVICES AS INTERPRETED BY SCHOOL EMPLOYEES.**

The section of the questionnaire dealing with the above was then analyzed. Twenty-six schools replied. Checking a mean number of 4.17 obstacles concluded that correlation by means of these devices was "difficult to obtain".

Analysis of all viewpoints revealed that the following factors were difficult to overcome. The factors are ranked in the order of difficulty.

1. Administrative factors
2. Economy factors (time, effort and cost)
3. Interest factors
4. Educational factors
5. Theoretical factors
6. Material factors

**COST AS AN OBSTACLE.**

The schools contributing were ranked according to the number of devices employed and according to the amounts of their per pupil costs. A coefficient of correlation was then computed using the Pearson product-moment formula. A low correlation of .22 resulted.
Perhaps the more significant obstacles were those that were offered apart from the checklist. Certain participants wrote out their own reactions to the plan. Fourteen schools reported in this fashion, extending a total of twenty-six criticisms, or, as the questionnaire stated, reasons "why the program isn't in operation". These reasons are classified and tabulated below.

**Criticism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers would resent such an organization which among other features breaks down subject alignments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such a program is too complex for efficient operation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty is already overburdened with work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is too radical for the community or for those in authority</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike for the idea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Unclassified analyses as to defects of program.
Schools most adaptable to the plan.

Schools were arranged on a frequency scale according to the number of devices submitted by each school. The range extended from 0 to 49, with the mean at 21.76. This range was then divided into four levels with each interval containing 25% of the cases. The schools were then designated as city schools, large town schools (5000 population or over), small town schools (less than 5000 population).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>TYPES OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Large Town</th>
<th>Small Town</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means: 47.75  70.5  65.75

Figure 20. Ranks of schools according to adaptability to program.

It would appear then that the large towns are, on the basis of current practice, more adaptable to the plan; small towns rank second; cities are least adaptable. An analysis of this situation might reveal that the organization in large towns is more fluid and flexible; its teaching staffs and officials younger and more inclined to experimentation. More important perhaps, the smaller faculty produces more unity, since there is greater inter-action between individuals and departments. The question raised is why the smaller schools did not rank first.

(1) The anonymous school was ranked here.
Summary.

I.

1. None of the schools reporting indicated reorganizations of the program of studies to meet the aims expressed by the terms correlation or integration.

Five schools indicated that they were planning correlated curriculums.

2. One of the schools not participating remarked that it was working on a new organization and might be able to supply details later in the year.

3. One school, the one ranking highest in the number of items contributed, said that it was now working under a new type of organization but could not send a syllabus. The same school also stated: 1) that its supervisors (heads of departments) were planning a correlated curriculum; 2) that its teachers were meeting to draw up related plans; 3) that it employed liaison agents (heads of departments); and 4) that it had adopted a school-wide vocabulary. Otherwise, the schools reporting seemed to rely on certain of the less radical items which follow.

II.

1. The four most significant English techniques, suitable for teaching in other fields were: (1)

   a. Reading
   b. Spelling
   c. Written composition
   d. Oral composition

(1) see Figure 4.
2. The most significant field for the teaching of these techniques was Language. Other significant fields were:
   a. Social Studies
   b. Commercial
   c. Science

3. In no schools was this teaching done to replace the teaching of these techniques in English. The most significant figure was the movement to correlate this teaching independently with the teaching in English.

III.

1. The teaching of form in matters of writing and speaking in the English course was followed up in other classes by the checking of oral and written compositions there for English.

2. One-fourth of the schools have adopted common (school-wide) objectives in writing and speaking.

3. The last significant item was the securing of uniform minimum requirements of decent English in all or some classes.

IV.

1. The reading of literature is being extended to Language and Social Studies courses.

2. Common (school-wide) objectives in reading are being adopted.
1. The content of the English reading course is being broadened to include materials from:
   a. Social Studies
   b. Science
   c. Language
   d. Fine Arts

2. When this is done, sometimes these readings are organized about themes or core topics.

3. These readings are still in the main set up by English teachers, but the making out of lists for reading by English teachers and teachers other than English is significant.

4. Required reading materials are balanced by free reading materials most of which are from limited choices.

VI.

1. English teachers criticize the compositions of other classes.

2. The English composition course used content from:
   a. Social Studies
   b. Science
   c. Language
   d. Commercial

3. This use is not planned to go along with the work in these fields.

VII.

1. For the sake of liaison between courses English teachers are becoming familiar with other courses.

2. Librarians supply materials to various courses.
Conclusions.

Almost nothing along the lines of school organization to meet the problems raised by correlation is being done. The reason given was that a program so organized would be "difficult to obtain" because of: 1) administrative difficulties and supervisory requirements, 2) grouping difficulties, 3) time requirements, 4) the present size of classes and number of teachers, and, 5) the resentment of school employees or the community.

As a result, most of the schools employed individual tactics. The problem of school organization was too complex. If anything was being done it was accidental, or again, individual, in its nature. Many schools favored the correlation of other courses with English, but few indicated that this would imply a modification of other courses or the planned cooperation of teachers in these courses. Consequently with such limitations the program would have to be classed as enrichment rather than correlation.

Reorganization along this line was indicated by the movement to secure uniform minimum requirements for English in other classes and the adoption of school-wide objectives in reading, writing, and speaking. However, the reorganization of materials according to their scope and sequence has yet to be accomplished.
Recommendations.

That there is an opportunity for the work is revealed by the amount of correlation that is being carried out independently. It seems desirable that something be done to offset this loss.

The most that can be done to satisfy the aim it seems, in view of the evident difficulty of total reorganization, and the lack of adequate supervisory and administrative facilities, is to institute the fusion of certain courses with English. The most preferred points of correlation according to this method would be between:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a. English and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b. English and Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>c. English and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d. English and Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>e. English and Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This plan could make use of the following devices:

a. A reading list made up by both departments.

b. Extensive readings in both classes about core topics instituted.

c. Literature introduced in this reading list as well as materials from the other field.

d. Uniform minimum requirements of decent English, reading, writing, and speaking objectives set up.

e. Reading, writing, and speaking opportunities worked into the unit.

Such a plan would make use of most of the significant items checked on the questionnaire.

However, regarding a synthesis of educational
experience, the theme set up in the introduction, even this would fall short. At best it is a movement to have the content and aims of one subject interpret those of another and it would, in part, offset certain evils of extreme departmentalization which, in effect, isolates English from the rest of the curriculum.
Appendix I

Name of School
City or Town
Number of pupils: 12th grade ______ 11th grade ______
10th grade ______ 9th grade ______

I.

How many of the following techniques are taught in your school?
1. Please indicate where taught by checking the box (or boxes) under the class (or classes).

Thus for example:

Reading * * * *

The above would be interpreted to mean that reading techniques are taught in English, Social Studies, Language, and Science.

English/Soc./Lang./Com./Sci./Math./Pract./Fine./
Reading * * * *

a. Literature
b. Reading
c. Composition (oral)
d. Composition (written)
e. Composition (creative)
f. Grammar
g. Usage
h. Spelling
i. Vocabulary

2. If the teaching of these techniques in other classes is planned to supplement or replace their being taught in English classes, kindly fill in below.

Or, if the correlations are independent, please fill in.

To supplement
To replace
Independent correlation
II

If the work in other classes is related to the work in Literature or vice versa, please fill in below. Please encircle the type of course; Thus (Social Science)

1. Subject matter of reading exercises drawn from:
   e. Mathematics  f. Practical Arts  g. Fine Arts

2. Literature introduced in:
   e. Mathematics  f. Practical Arts  g. Fine Arts

3. Teachers cooperate in making a syllabus of books for reading by all classes ________
   by some classes ________

4. If you check the above (no. 3) would you be willing to send the syllabus so devised?
   Yes ________  No ________

5. Discussion and adoption of common (school-wide) objectives in reading ________

6. Education of the faculty by the English department as to the value of reading skills ________

III

If the work in other classes is related to the work in Composition, or vice versa, please indicate the manner. (Indicate by checking the blank space to the right of the method.

1. Oral compositions checked for "English"in other classes ________

2. Written compositions checked for "English"in other classes ________

3. Written compositions of other classes checked by
   English teacher ________
   English class ________

4. Use in Composition of material taught in other classes ________
   (Please name the fields below)
   a. ________
   b. ________
   c. ________
   d. ________
   e. ________
   f. ________
   g. ________

5. If this use (no. 4) is planned to go along with the work in other fields, please indicate.
   Yes ________  No ________
6. Adoption of a school-wide vocabulary
7. Adoption of a style manual for written work
8. Discussion and adoption of common (school-wide) objectives in writing
8. Discussion and adoption of common (school-wide) objectives in speaking
9. Education of the faculty by the English Dept. as to the value of
   writing skills
   speaking skills
10. Securing uniform minimum requirements of decent English
    in all classes
    in some classes

IV

1. Have you any liaison agents between English and other courses?
   Yes ______  No ______

2. If so, what are the official titles of these agents?

3. Is it part of the English teacher's job in your school to act as an agent of this type?
   Yes ______  No ______

4. If you have these agents, please check below the manner in which they operate. (Please check under Column I)

5. Or, if you do not have agents of this type, but do engage in the activities listed below, please mark the activities with an asterisk (*) under Column II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Drawing up charts of work in various related courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Offering suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Serving as librarians in supplying materials to various courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Initiating or conducting meetings between teachers of various courses for the purpose of drawing up related plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Planning or helping to plan projects in which these teachers may engage together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Administering to pupils of these courses cooperative tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Planning or helping to plan a correlated curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V.

If any of the following devices are used, please check.

1. English teachers visit other classes ____________________________
2. Other teachers visit English classes ____________________________
3. English teachers familiarize themselves with courses of study in other classes ____________________________
4. Other teachers familiarize themselves with courses of study in English classes ____________________________

VI.

1. If any subject groupings in your course of study have been discarded, would you be willing to send a copy with annotations indicating changes of this type?
   Yes ______ No ______

2. If working under this type of organization (fusion, correlation, or integration), would you be willing to send a syllabus of fundamentals, aims, or objectives?
   Yes ______ No ______

VII.

Please check the box which best characterizes your selection of reading materials. /Always/Often/Sometimes/Rarely/Never/

1. Required reading ____________________________
2. Free reading ____________________________
3. Free reading from a limited choice ____________________________
4. If the last plan is used, is the reading organized around themes or core topics? /Always/Often/Sometimes/Rarely/Never/
5. If the last plan (no. 3) is used, by whom were the booklists made?
   a. English teachers ____________________________
   b. Teachers from various fields (including English) ____________________________
It may seem, after you have answered the three sheets of the questionnaire, that the practices suggested are seldom employed.

From my own experience I would agree. But what is the reason? Is it because the report has not received a sufficiently widespread publication? Have school officials and teachers rejected the findings or the authority of the committee? Or is the basis of the report in question? Perhaps the plans are worthwhile but have not yet been put into operation?

Therefore, if your replies are largely negative, as no doubt many will be, will you check the reasons below, or add your own analysis on the back of this sheet.

A. The positive program outlined in this questionnaire seems to be:
(Please encircle) 1. undesirable. 2. inexpedient.
3. impractical. 4. difficult to obtain. 5. ____________

6. ____________

because it: (please check reasons)
1. overlooks the difficulties of administration
2. overlooks the difficulty of grouping
3. overlooks the size of most classes
4. is too inflexible as a program
5. requires too much supervision
6. requires too many teachers
7. requires too much time
8. requires too much planning
9. requires too much teaching preparation
10. promises no great rewards
11. overlooks the demands of college preparation
12. overlooks the teaching of needed essentials
13. fosters the danger of neglecting phases of education
14. forces teacher to rely on inferior materials
15. neglects (encircle) literary, social, historical, scientific, civic, etc., values
16. fosters topical monotony in the classroom
17. fosters wearisome repetition in the classroom
18. merely spreads a smaller part of what is now taught over a larger teaching area

* There were three sheets in the original questionnaire.
B. The program seems desirable. The reason why it isn’t in operation may be because:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

(Use back of sheet if necessary)
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