To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Gina Smith Claywell entitled "Grammar Instruction Trends in the Composition Classroom: A Bibliographic/Historiographic Essay." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in English.

Ray Wallace

Dr. Ray Wallace, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Kim Morris Barton

Allison Enson

Accepted for the Council:

C W Minkel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of the Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special admission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of the source is made.

Requests for permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted by the copyright holder.

Signature Gina Smith Claywell

Date 7 May 1991

GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION TRENDS IN THE COMPOSITION CLASSROOM: A BIBLIOGRAPHIC/HISTORIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Gina Smith Claywell

May 1991

Copyright © Gina Smith Claywell, 1991
All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my unborn child, whose urgent kickings and increasing size encouraged the completion of this work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Ray Wallace, for his jovial encouragement and for challenging me to excel. I would also like to thank the other committee members, Dr. Kerri Morris and Dr. Allison Ensor, for their support and willingness to listen.

I would also like to express many thanks to my husband, Gerald, for his patience and for motivating the completion of this work. Thanks also are long overdue to my parents, Dennis Leon and Faye Smith, and other family members for their support throughout my educational career. Thanks, finally, to our Heavenly Father, whose blessings are innumerable.

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to examine what has been written about, and what has been occurring in, composition classrooms in regard to grammar instruction in the last two centuries. By researching textbooks, articles from various eras, and bibliographic reviews, several trends in grammar instruction are revealed. The traditional grammar methods used throughout the 1800s have greatly influenced teaching pedagogies of the 1900s despite studies indicating traditional grammar's ineffectiveness in helping students write Edited American English better. Linguistic developments around the 1960s encouraged the inclusion of new grammars into the composition classroom; some scholars, however, suggested the dismissal of grammar altogether. By the 1980s, researchers began to suggest that some grammar knowledge is essential for freshman writers. In order to communicate clearly via writing, students must have some basic grasp of the patterns of their language, hence grammar studies will and probably should continue to be incorporated into writing classes, though not with traditional, often unproductive, methods.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION: Why Study Grammar?	1
1	"The Language of the Schoolmaster"	11
2	"Students' Right to Their Own Language"	47
3	The Misreading of Earlier Decades	80
4	The Nineties and Beyond	100
5	Annotated Bibliography	108
	LIST OF REFERENCES	148
	VITA	159

INTRODUCTION

WHY STUDY GRAMMAR?

Countless, no doubt, are the numbers of students who have undertaken a freshman composition course at an American college or university only to discover that they have "poor grammar," which ultimately leads to their less than successful performance in the class. "Poor grammar," as defined by an arbitrary, standardized American dialect, develops despite years of formal training in the memorization of the rules that define that standard dialect and despite the students' knowledge of and fluency in a local or regional dialect. Instructors have over the past 200 years tended to overlook the fact that there are a variety of grammars (i.e., dialects governed by inherent rules or patterns of speech), none of which are inherently wrong; instead, instructors have tended to equate the development of knowledge in traditional grammar (to be defined later) as success in the composition classroom, with little regard to the actual usefulness of such a knowledge on the students' ability to write. This equation very much privileged a particular class (middle to upper class) of students over others for much of American collegiate history.

The definition of, and to some extent the attitudes of teachers towards, "grammar" has changed somewhat over the last two centuries. Throughout this period, it has served as a catch-all phrase representing the study of the patterns of language as well as usage (punctuation, spelling, mechanics, etc.) within the composition classroom. But, the way it has been more technically defined over the years also indicates its connections to the acceptance of a standardized dialect.

Before the turn of the nineteenth century, Lindley Murray defined grammar as "the art of speaking and writing with propriety" (qtd. in Woods, "Evolution" 12): a definition which prejudiced rules over the writer's needs. By the middle of the 1800s, David Tower described the benefits of grammar study: "a knowledge of grammar enables us to speak and write correctly"; though not dramatically different, Woods says that at last an acknowledgement of the importance of the speaker had been made (qtd. in "Evolution" 12). Throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, grammar tended to become more of an aid or scientific tool in the acquisition of language skills (Woods, "Evolution" 12).

In the 1900s, a distinct difference between grammar and usage developed; Holbrook cites James Stalker's view of grammar: "Grammar is the description of the structure of a language or a theory of language. Usage. . .choose[s] among the correct or incorrect forms of those available in the current dialects of English" (260). Holbrook asserts that

usage has further evolved to include the role of dialects and choices of appropriateness over what seems correct according to any one arbitrary standard (260). Not only has the way of looking at grammar changed, but its classroom presentation has changed considerably throughout the 200 years in question due in large part to the development of linguistic theories concerning language in the mid-twentieth century. The study of linguistics involves the science of language; including morphology, phonology, syntax, and semantics, it examines the patterns of language formed by particular grammars or dialects.

The "school tradition" grammar, a term coined by Henry A. Gleason, Jr. in *Linguistics and English Grammar*, was prevalent in much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; this type of grammar study focuses on the word and the sentence (Rose 488). Holding to a firm belief in the necessity of prescriptive, mechanistic grammar study, instructors from grammar schools and one-room schoolhouses to colleges and universities encouraged the memorization of rules, and students received very little practice in actual writing. This "traditional" grammar study included, in the years before 1850, exercises in memorizing the parts of speech and rules guiding how those parts should be presented, as well as "parsing" (oral application of those rules), and correcting ungrammatical sentences (Connors 4). Variations of these exercises continued throughout the twentieth century

to include sentence diagramming and the like. Actual writing practice was not stressed because of a general emphasis on oral communicative abilities over written ones.

During the first half of the twentieth century, Charles C. Fries developed structural linguistics in this country, and, by the mid-1950s, it was being presented in college classrooms; words were classified "according to their function in a sentence. The emphasis in grammar instruction would be shifted from individual words to the structure of the whole sentence" (Rose 490). Structural grammar is, Albert Kitzhaber says, concerned with "'the interrelationships and patterns which make up the intricate structure of languages.' It boldly sets out to be a science" ("Themes" 77). Kitzhaber continues, "...it presents a vastly truer picture of the English language and its modes of working than traditional school-book grammar does" ("Themes" 82).

Structural grammar has not been, according to Shirley K. Rose, universally adopted, however, because informed teachers and effective textbooks in it were rare and because of another development--generative transformational grammar (491). Rose defines transformational grammar, which is based on the work of Noam Chomsky:

> . . .the idea of a transformation can account for the disappearance of parts of the original kernel sentences in the process of their combining with or

> becoming embedded within one another. The theory that a sentence undergoes structural changes or transforms between its original form (deep structure) and final form (surface structure) allows for all the parts of the two or more original sentences to exist in deep structure while some of these parts do not appear in surface structure. (487-488)

Though often credited with the creation of sentence combining--a type of instruction wherein stylistic, grammatical, and rhetorical studies can be meshed--transformational grammar actually is more a way of defining how the sentence combining exercises work, according to Rose who says the sentence combining *concept*, if not its name, was utilized with the school tradition and structural grammars years beforehand (Rose 487).

As a result of these linguistic developments of the past decades, new definitions of grammar have emerged. Holbrook says Smelstor has developed a four-part classification of grammar:

> *Traditional grammar* includes knowledge of the parts of speech, often studied via exercises such as sentence diagramming. It is based on Latin grammar, and "describes how a language should operate";

Functional grammar studies acceptable usage and mechanics in actual writing rather than focusing on isolated rules outside of a writing context;

Structural grammar focuses on the basic sounds and meaning units that comprise our language; it describes *how* our language actually operates;

Transformational grammar examines word units in their sentence contexts--for instance, noun and verb phrases-- and it too defines how our language operates. (260)

Patrick Hartwell, in turn, has developed five meanings of grammar, based partly on W. Nelson Francis' three meanings of grammar:

Grammar 1 includes the formal patterns of language we know by the age of five or six. Though complex, all speakers of the language are thoroughly familiar with this grammar at quite an early age;

Grammar 2 involves the scientific study of the patterns of Grammar 1. This branch is concerned with describing, analyzing, and formulating our formal language patterns;

Grammar 3 incorporates usage or "linguistic etiquette." This grammar often is partnered with negative descriptors, such as "bad" (i.e., "'he ain't here' is bad grammar").

Hartwell inserts Grammar 4, grammar as it was and is still often presented in grammar textbooks, and Grammar 5, "grammatical terms used in the interest of teaching prose style," to his definition of grammar (109-110). So, grammar has, throughout the last two centuries, evolved in meaning from proper usage according to one dialect to that plus much, much more.

As a result of the changing perspectives on grammar and linguistics over the years, classroom instruction has subsequently undergone changes; this study proposes to examine these trends of grammar instruction in composition classrooms throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The study of formal grammar has traditionally been undertaken at all levels of education. It continues to be taught in primary and secondary schools though to a lesser degree because of research reporting its ineffectiveness even at those levels, and its instruction there affects its presentation in the college classroom. Not only does it affect student attitudes about what to expect from English classes, but it also may be stealing time away from actual writing instruction. Many college instructors avoid teaching grammar for fear it will bore their students, but their misuse of grammar (again according to the standardized American dialect) often forces them to realize the need to reinforce somehow earlier grammar instruction. For the purpose of this study, "composition instruction" on the

college freshman level is assumed to mean the study of effective writing, rhetoric, and usage. During much of the nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth centuries, composition courses focused on grammar instruction with a de-emphasis on the rhetorical content and stylistic fluency of student writing. Now, that trend has been virtually reversed.

In fact, many of today's first-year college students enter the composition classroom self-assured that their lack of grammatical sophistication will be their downfall. To their surprise, they discover that, with an occasional exception, depending on the teacher's method and the student's abilities, grammar is de-emphasized in both instruction and evaluation of writing. This may be totally opposite to the experience their parents or even older siblings had in college during other eras of composition instruction.

Trends exist in the teaching of composition just as they do in all college curricula. Throughout the American collegiate history of the 19th and 20th centuries, various types of grammatical instruction have emerged, receded, and re-developed. A description of these types and of how they are presented, in essence of what grammar <u>is</u> in college classrooms, is necessary to understand the grammatical trends of yesterday, today, and, quite possibly, tomorrow.

Because the grammatical teaching styles in the middle of this century so closely resembled those of the nineteenth

century, Chapter One deals with the years from the 1800s through the 1960s. The 1960s were turbulent times in America even for subjects as innocuous as the teaching of grammar; the 1970s saw the culmination of the developments of earlier years, and Chapter Two explores both decades. Chapter Three details the more conservative attitude of the 1980s, when the results of the earlier decades were questioned, even renounced, by scholars; activity in the classroom, however, was slow to respond to these new ideas. Chapter Four questions the effectiveness of the current trend of grammatical instruction in college composition and where we may be heading in future years. Chapter Five contains an annotated bibliography of the field.

Whether or not grammar instruction is prominent in college composition classrooms, grammar, as patterns of acceptable language, most assuredly remains a vital component of the communication, both written and oral, in those classrooms and in every communication act daily. Woods suggests that ". . .it is possible that studying diction, usage and syntax may provide a conceptual frame of reference for the innumerable 'lessons in language' that we absorb daily from our linguistic environment" ("Cultural Tradition" 10). The influence of grammar permeates American society, and therefore the study of how it is taught is crucial in determining possible improvements in teaching methods. Composition instructors admittedly perform a Herculean feat

as they prepare first-year college students to think and write analytically. With that instruction, clear *communication* is vital, else the students' writing is in vain. James Muir says, ". . .we become aware that there is, in fact, an order in the serial expression of language. We must, in using the linguistic form of the expression, know how to punctuate it (in writing) or how to modify our voices (in speaking) in order to ensure that it will be interpreted. . ." (1-2).

Since room for error in our highly technological world is diminishing, helping students realize the advantages of overcoming grammatical or mechanical errors might very well need to be re-emphasized in composition courses, though not necessarily with traditional approaches and not to the exclusion or interruption of other vital components of the composition course, such as rhetoric, style, and actual composing practice.

CHAPTER 1

"THE LANGUAGE OF THE SCHOOLMASTER"

During the early 1800s, composition instruction in American colleges greatly resembled that of the 1700s. Likewise, instruction at the close of the 19th century influenced composition teaching techniques through the mid-1900s. But during the 19th century, slow, significant changes were made in the teaching of English courses, brought about by influential, philosophical leaders and by social changes in America that increased demands for more democratic institutions. With the exception of a few progressive reformers, however, *grammar's* role in the composition classroom of the 1800s remained inflexible and mechanistic.

Few instructors seemed to have heeded earlier advice against the futility of memorization; Erasmus said as early as 1511 "that he has 'no patience with the stupidity of the average teacher of grammar who wastes precious hours in hammering rules into children's heads'" (qtd. in Woods, "Cultural Tradition" 5). The strict memorization of and recitation of rules seems to have been continually enforced in virtually all collegiate English programs throughout the

19th century. This chapter will detail the history of grammar instruction in American college composition courses from the 1800s until 1960.

Several scholars in the expanding field of composition have devoted articles, dissertations, or books to the composition heritage of early American colleges and universities. Namely, James Berlin, Robert Connors, Albert Kitzhaber, and William F. Woods have written detailed accounts about composition in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The history they recount is based primarily on available textbooks rather than class syllabi or teacher notes. The works of these authors, along with that of others, will be described herein. Most of the works ascribe both the consistencies and the changes of early grammar instruction to social influences of the times.

William Woods notes that the "emotionally-charged, value-laden" study of grammar prevalent in early American history was seen as "a transmitter of cultural heritage; as a collection of rules representing the art, or skill of using the language with 'propriety'; and as an instrument of 'mental discipline'" ("Cultural Tradition" 3). Grammar fit well with the notion prevalent during much of the nineteenth century concerning the faculty psychology of mental science (Kitzhaber, *Rhetoric* 3). Connors says in his article, "Grammar in American College Composition: An Historical Overview," that Latin and Greek were no longer the vital

components of education (3). James Berlin, in *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*, which is a history based on Marxist theory, attributes the simultaneous decline during the late 1800s and early 1900s of the study of classical rhetoric, which dominated the 18th century, to the American Revolution and to the subsequent de-Anglicizing of American institutions (4, 13-14).

The first two decades of the nineteenth century saw an increase in American population and in the number of schools, plus a rise in the status of teachers (Woods, "Evolution" 4). English grammar--a rigid discipline comprising memorization of grammatical rules and terms, oral parsing of words, and the correction of ungrammatical sentences--began to be the dominant subject of elementary ("grammar schools") and secondary schools throughout the newly created states near the time of the American Revolution (Connors 3-4). Woods suggests that

> for most eighteenth and nineteenth-century grammarians, the "rules" of accidence [inflection] and syntax were the actual principles of how the language worked. . . .It followed that memorizing--actually, "internalizing"--prescriptive rules of grammar was an essential part of learning to write and speak correctly...once a student *knew* the principles of speaking and writing, only facility

> was lacking, and students had their whole lives ahead of them to practice in.
>
> ("Cultural Tradition" 7)

Woods says the eighteenth-century prescriptive emphasis on correctness, found in the traditional grammar taught in lower-level college courses, was established in the nineteenth-century due in large part to one book--Lindley Murray's *English Grammar* of 1795: "This was a text to be memorized, definition by definition, rule by rule, and recited as a proof of learning. To strengthen one's memory of the rules, exercises in parsing. . .were provided throughout the text" ("Cultural Tradition" 3, 8). "Parsing," Woods explains, "was probably the most common exercise used to teach English grammar in the nineteenth century" ("Cultural Tradition" 4). Woods cites Samuel Kirkham's textbook as also being influential; both "made English grammar teachable" ("Evolution" 5-6).

Kirkham's text, *English Grammar in Familiar Lectures* (1823), was written in a "relaxed, conversational style"; early nineteenth-century writers were in general, according to Woods, striving to make their books more accessible than their eighteenth-century counterparts' work had been ("Evolution" 7).

Woods indicates primary and secondary instruction was often conducted in one-room schoolhouses where teachers faced students with widely-varying preparation. Murray's four-part

book allowed for easy memorization for the students and for an easier estimation of students' understanding of the material by the teacher ("Evolution" 6). Textbooks then took advantage of print size, according to Woods, moving to smaller print down each page as explanations of grammatical concepts became more complex; thus, the books were applicable for young and old students alike ("Evolution" 6). Woods says a demand for correct usage occurred with

> the rise of middle class citizens toward positions of wealth and respectability. . . .What the middle class desired was a fixed and easily accessible standard which they could adopt. At the same time, ironically, the upper classes were hoping that such a standard would be a means of distinguishing between the true aristocrat and the gilded arriviste. ("Cultural Tradition" 7)

Citing Ronald F. Reid, Berlin states that the development at this time of newly specialized tutors started a move toward the specialized faculty and curriculum that was to become prevalent at Harvard in the late 19th century (14), hence signifying a change in teaching methods, not only in English classrooms, but campus-wide as well.

Harvard composition at the beginning of the 19th century was influenced, according to Berlin, by its first Professor of Rhetoric, John Quincy Adams; his comprehensive rhetoric, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, left "no part of the

composing process to chance, offering explicit advice for the student at every step of the way" ("Writing" 15). Correcting written compositions written by juniors and seniors was among several duties required of Adams' position; younger students were expected to be proficient at memorization and recitation (Berlin, "Writing" 14). Woods claims grammar exercises began to take on greater importance during the nineteenth century for two reasons: they gave instructors some relief time, and they encouraged "self-active" learning, a concept well-known by the 1830's that "clung most tenaciously to grammar exercises, the notion that drills in grammar were a discipline for the mind" ("Cultural Tradition" 8).

Berlin says that because of the strong belief in Scottish Common Sense Realism--held in America during the first half of the 19th century--the works of three prominent rhetoricians became a dominating influence in the American university system ("Writing" 7). The concept, safe economically, politically, and religiously, allowed Hugh Blair, George Campbell, and Richard Whately to surface as the primary rhetoricians of the day; their works embraced Scottish Common Sense Realism's philosophical underpinnings (Berlin, "Writing" 6-7, 33). These clerics and teachers did not, however, support the "established religious, political, and social arrangements" in America at the time (Berlin, "Writing" 32-33). Berlin sees their popularity as puzzling

because of their differing opinions from that of many Americans at the time ("Writing" 18).

Until the Civil War, Hugh Blair's treatise of 1783, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, was widely popular (Berlin, "Writing" 25). Tibbetts says both Blair and Campbell were "mainly interested in the clear and idiomatic use of language" (313). Connors says, however, that Blair's text, based on 18th-century rhetoric, did not reflect Campbell's subsequent thoughts on grammar (7). Blair implied that a review of grammar would be beneficial as writers mature and that rhetoric and grammar must somehow work together (Connors 7). John F. Genung, who will be discussed later, seems to have echoed this same theme in his merging of rhetoric and grammar.

Blair thought, according to Connors, that good, stylish writing required grammatical knowledge and purity: "If any imagine they can catch it merely by the ear or acquire it by a slight perusal of some of our good authors, they will find themselves much disappointed" (Blair, qtd. in Connors 8). Berlin accuses Blair of holding a "limited, mechanistic conception of language," perhaps because of comments like this ("Writing" 28). Connors says the statement led several generations to treat grammatical knowledge as a cure-all for writing problems (8).

Though Blair said merely reading good writing would not ensure *adequate usage* in one's own style, he nevertheless

chose to study literature as a means to teach writing, a method that led to his importance in the 19th century, according to Berlin ("Writing" 27). Blair suggested that reading and studying examples of quality writing *could* lead to one's own *efficient, effective writing* (Berlin "Writing" 8, 25). Such statements call to mind the notion of *imitation*, a pedagogical device found in ancient rhetoric that remains in use today as a means of helping students develop a more polished writing style. Blair's practical text (as opposed to Campbell's theoretical one) included two chapters on the structure of language, and one each on style, sentence structures, and figurative language (Berlin, "Writing" 26).

Berlin finds "regrettable" the fact that Campbell--not classical rhetoricians such as Aristotle, Cicero, or Quintilian--became *the* American "philosopher of rhetoric in the 19th century" ("Writing" 18). Nevertheless, Campbell's influence, which peaked after the Civil War and lingered to the end of the 19th century, perhaps remains today: "Campbell's rhetoric is often remarkably familiar, since it is the rhetorical system with which most writing and speech teachers are acquainted--however, unconsciously" (Berlin, "Writing" 21).

Campbell's rhetorical devices include the use of persuasion, the reproduction of the message to elicit an effect or emotion in the reader (Berlin, "Writing" 21-22,

24). Berlin says Campbell's works also deal with grammatical concerns: "Campbell is concerned with usage, realizing that this is a matter of social custom, not rule. . .He also includes a long four-part section on diction and an entire chapter on 'grammatical purity'" ("Writing" 23). This inclusion, according to Berlin, was due in part to the new middle class' growing interest in "the social implications of language"; subsequently, his section on usage remained central in composition textbooks near the turn of the century ("Writing" 23-24).

A. M. Tibbetts states in "Were Nineteenth-Century Textbooks Really Prescriptive?" that Campbell's second book of *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* was devoted "not to propriety but to the necessity of clarity in usage" (313). Connors claims Campbell, though he made such statements as "where grammar ends eloquence begins," did not sneer at grammar, but he did draw a distinction between the study of it and rhetoric, which absorbed him (7). Tibbetts, whose work is concerned with whether or not the grammarians of the nineteenth century understood that language changes, says Campbell acknowledged that change (therefore implying that the rules enforcing that language must change too) as early as 1776 (310).

The work of Richard Whately, more like Blair's than Campbell's, was highly practical; Berlin says it was, in fact, "a composition textbook--not a theoretical statement or

even a commentary on literature." Whately encouraged the teachers to be responsible for "correctness and style." Whately also emphasized helping students find a subject for a theme, to outline, and to narrow and focus their thesis statements (Berlin, "Writing" 29-30). Berlin explains that Whately emphasized correct usage and the need for comparisons between instructor-written essays and those of the students:

> As in Blair, studying the principles used in criticizing the finished product is assumed to be valuable in learning to create the product itself. Finally, it is difficult to avoid noting that this plan for teaching composing is the one still found most commonly in today's composition textbooks, some 150 years after its presentation.
> (Berlin, "Writing" 30)

The effects of Scottish Common Sense Realism were not American composition's only imports. Woods points out that a movement toward educational reform, drawn from German, Swiss, and English examples, occurred in the 1830s and '40s; Swiss educator Pestalozzi was one source of reform ("Evolution" 4, 9). In 1831, Roswell Smith was inspired by Pestalozzi's work to write *English Grammar on the Productive System;* extremely popular, it was based on inductive questioning and "marked a turning of the tide for grammar teaching" (Woods, "Evolution" 10). Woods states that Smith's contributions included making students write sentences of their own, "a type of

constructive work which was to become a central emphasis in both grammar and composition teaching by the 1850s" ("Evolution" 10-11).

Around 1850, other European teaching methods began to be used in America, including creative and compositional devices (Connors 4). Connors says Samuel S. Greene's various editions of *Analysis* were vital in this move. In Greene's 1874 text, "sentence analysis is more thoroughly developed, perhaps, than in any other grammar text of its time" ("Evolution," Woods 14).

Though Greene's work was popular, "the field of grammar continued to be overwhelmingly formalistic and abstract, having little to do with communications skills as they really existed" (Connors 4-5). Applications were made to both oral and written grammar in recitations, but Berlin suggests written language began to be the focus of college rhetoric courses as the nineteenth century continued, due in part to the specialization of elocution teachers concerned primarily with oral communication and to the change in America's culture from oral to print; "the ability to write effectively was becoming more important than the ability to speak at public gatherings" (Berlin, "Writing" 34). Woods says sentence parsing slowly gave way to sentence "analysis" and sentence "synthesis" or construction and that the written exercises became lengthier ("Evolution" 5).

Formal grammar instruction in American elementary and secondary schools began a decline after its peak in 1850, according to Connors (3). It also began to change on the collegiate level. Even a former inductive grammar devotee, William H. Wells, began to see grammar study's lack of effectiveness: "The great object to be attained, is not the mastery of a textbook in grammar, but the acquisition of language" (qtd. in Connors 5). Woods indicates that by 1850, eclecticism had become the byword in textbook publishing because authors were combining the two recognizable approaches to the teaching of grammar: the traditional method of memorization, etc., and the reform method of inductive questioning (based on Swiss reforms) and self-activity ("Evolution" 11). The two approaches could be combined in textbooks without contradiction because they were based on the faculty theory of psychology (i.e., they were thought to develop mental discipline and certain mental faculties) and because drill exercises were used in both methods (Woods, "Evolution," 11).

The American college textbooks that developed between 1850 and 1870 were, for the most part, imitations of the works imported from Europe, according to Berlin ("Writing" 31). Grounded in the Common Sense Realism as espoused by Blair, Campbell, and Whately, the works of Samuel P. Newman and Henry Day "were typical of those studied at American colleges after the Civil War" (Berlin, "Writing" 35, 40).

Newman's camp encouraged the development of taste in helping students' written products be more effective; literature and style were the focus of Newman's instruction. He suggested that students translate sentences and construct outlines and that teachers should correct students' compositions. Newman's emphasis on correctness and skill in language use are based largely on Campbell's work, Berlin explains ("Writing" 35-38).

Likewise, Berlin says, Henry Day based his philosophy on Campbell ("Writing" 38). Connors, however, suggests that Day was "a theoretical pioneer" and that his work "was too original for its own good"; therefore, his text of 1867, *Grammatical Synthesis: The Art of English Composition*, was not wildly popular (9). Connors continues that Day united grammar, rhetoric, and logic in the text and that at least some schools, at last, were finally mixing composition with grammar (9).

Grammar remained strong, however, because of the conservative desire to retain it and because a new pedagogy for grammar had infused life into it between 1850 and 1880 (Connors 5-6). Based on terminology and methods used in textbooks by Greene and by William Swinton, "sentence building" or "language lessons" used grammar in students' own sentences, rather than focusing on the memorizing-by-rote and parsing of older, formal-grammar methods, just as Roswell Smith's earlier work had done (Connors 6).

Alonzo Reed and Brainerd Kellogg further breathed life into the study of grammar in 1877 with the publication of their *Higher Lessons in English* (Connors 6). Connors points out that Reed and Kellogg, believing grammar to be necessary but only when serviceable, invented the sentence diagram--"*the* essential grammar pedagogy from 1880 through 1970" and the focus of college-level grammar discussions through about 1925 (6). Woods notes that grammar texts after 1850 do show a change in emphasis toward "the concept of the sentence as the basic unit of language" as opposed to the earlier texts' emphasis on etymology and syntax ("Evolution" 13). Gertrude Buck and other theorists criticized sentence diagramming around the turn of the century for its "mechanical and linear nature"; nevertheless, no pedagogical methods were developed to replace it throughout most of the next century (Connors 6).

Traditional grammar instruction was in dire straits by the 1880s; since it was considered to be "hateful" to students and ineffective in helping them write or speak more fluently, the state of Connecticut discontinued grammar study (Connors 5). George P. Marsh, a pioneer linguist, implied in 1860 in *Lectures on the English Language* that grammatical knowledge *was* beneficial to help students *discuss* language, but not to *use* it (Connors 5).

As the "systematic theoretical rhetoric" of past centuries was replaced with a more practical course, one more

concerned with writing correctness and eloquence, instructors of the 1850s and 1860s began to look for ways to mesh grammar with rhetorical lessons. Correct speaking and writing became an indicator of social status (Connors 8-9).

> The new college was to serve the middle class, was to become an agent of upward social mobility. It was based on an educational psychology that abandoned mental discipline and the training of faculties in favor of a view emphasizing individual differences and the importance of the student's pursuing his own natural talents. (Berlin, "Writing" 60)

Because Harvard College acknowledged the importance of the new class structures and recognized the need to maintain high standards, a written admissions exam was introduced in 1874; more than half of the students taking the original exam failed, and the faculty, according to Connors, was stunned by the poor quality of the students' writing (9).

Subsequently, Harvard developed "English A" to help freshmen students with their writing problems; English A was the only required course in Harvard's elective curriculum (Berlin, "Writing" 60). Many American colleges and universities soon developed similar courses as a panic over America's "illiteracy" problem spread (Connors 10). Kitzhaber claims that the appearance of freshman English courses led to the widely-held notion 75 years later that a

composition class is little more than a service course ("Perspectives" 443). College students' inability to write was blamed on their failure to grasp grammar earlier in their education, so "form-based mechanical lessons" were instigated to combat students' writing failures (Connors 10). "We now see this as an *essentially* incorrect idea, and identify students' poor writing in 1874 as a result of their lack of composition practice. . ." (Connors 10).

Connors further suggests that textbooks such as Joseph H. Gilmore's *Outlines of the Art of Expression* and, more importantly, Edwin A. Abbott's British-written *How to Write Clearly*, "the first identifiable handbook of composition," obviously reflected the sudden infusion of grammar into college composition classrooms (Connors 10-11). Berlin states that, indeed, grammar instruction was finding its way into writing courses thanks to the introduction of working-class students to colleges; before, grammatical knowledge was considered a necessary prerequisite for college entrance ("Writing" 73).

Grammatical concepts were not, however, introduced into most of the popular *rhetoric* texts of the day (Connors 11). Many of the rhetorics continued to be based on the works of Blair, Campbell, and Whately, but Berlin notes that two new camps were developing: one led by Fred Newton Scott, Joseph Villiers Denney, and Gertrude Buck, and the other by Barrett

Wendell, John F. Genung, and A.S. Hill--Professor of Rhetoric at Harvard ("Writing" 58).

Tibbetts says Hill's and Genung's textbooks were written in the tradition of Blair and Campbell: "Their texts emphasized the necessity of using words that expressed ideas clearly, words that could be precisely understood. Hill. . .gave twenty pages to 'Clearness' but only a little over three pages to 'Elegance.' In his chapter on *Diction*, Genung. . .wrote: 'In the choice of words, let the paramount consideration be exactness'" (313-314).

Connors suggests only Genung's composition books included grammatical concepts; as a result, they were immensely well-liked. In fact, Genung's *Practical Elements of Rhetoric* of 1886 was "the most popular composition textbook" from 1887 to about 1894 (Connors 11). Genung, one of the major rhetoricians of the 1880-1900 period, attempted a dignified merging of rhetoric and grammar in his books, including in them syntactic exercises and illustrated rules. "But even in employing grammatical processes as working-tools," Genung wrote, "rhetoric imparts to them a new quality distinctively rhetorical, the quality by which they become methods in an art, means to an end" (qtd. in Connors 11). Genung said he introduced the "laboratory method" in writing classrooms by asking students to study and imitate literary models (Berlin, "Writing" 74). This laboratory method allowed for the scientific and practical classroom

orientation popular at the time (Berlin, "Rhetoric" 21-22). Genung also produced the first freshman anthologies (Berlin, "Writing" 74). Rose says a later work of Genung's also contains sentence-combining exercises (484).

Genung removed persuasion from the composition classroom; because it required close contact with an audience, Genung insisted on its orality and suggested that scientific language be the language of the classroom (Berlin, "Writing" 67). Berlin also claims Genung varied material of Campbell's, developing many of Campbell's terms, such as accurate use, present use, intelligible use, and scholarly use, into terms of his own ("Writing" 72).

A. S. Hill, too, borrowed heavily from Campbell, particularly Campbell's "offenses against grammatical purities," such as barbarisms, improprieties, and solecisms--errors in word origin, order, and meaning (Berlin, "Writing" 23, 72). Hill's work of 1892, *Foundations of Rhetoric*, focused on a gradual progression from words to paragraphs (Berlin "Writing" 68). Tibbetts claims that Hill understood linguistic change; he was aware, also, that "'grammarians and lexicographers have no authority not derived from good use'" (312).

Berlin indicates that Barrett Wendell suggested that unity, coherence, and mass (later to be called emphasis) were the three principles inherent in sentences, paragraphs, and larger units of discourse ("Writing" 70). Wendell asked

students to write daily journal entries, thereby encouraging writing and saving teacher time; correction symbols were introduced, and student editorial groups were developed to find superficial errors in student writings (Berlin "Writing" 74). Tibbetts says of Wendell, "so far as usage was concerned, Wendell above all wanted accuracy" (314).

The popular idea in the 1890s that "a paragraph was an essay in miniature" was due in part to Wendell's notions and to the induction of daily theme writing which became common after 1891 (Berlin, "Writing" 69). Interestingly, Berlin says Scott and Denney expressed similar ideas about paragraphs, although they, along with Buck, challenged the current-traditional rhetoric as set forth by Hill, Wendell, and Genung ("Writing" 69, 62). The paradigm the latter established for teaching writing otherwise went unquestioned, particularly in elementary and secondary schools, but to some extent in colleges as well, until after 1960: "current-traditional rhetoric takes the most mechanical features of Campbell, Blair, and Whately and makes them the sole concern of the writing teacher" (Berlin, "Writing" 11, 62). Berlin claims the works of Genung, Wendell, and Hill "were authoritative in tone and frequently arbitrary, imposing standards that are clearly dialectical biases of a particular class. . . .All seem to be striving for the conviction of the scientist, unconscious that they are reporting a class bias, not a physical law" ("Writing" 73). This blind adherence to

a pre-established, "standard" dialect continued throughout much of the twentieth century (and perhaps continues today!)

Berlin suggests that the work of Scott, Denney, and Buck provided an alternative, though ignored to a large extent, to the increasingly popular current-traditional rhetoric:

> At a time when students were given vague directives to write about a work of literature or about what 'interested' them, Scott and Denney were offering students a complete rhetorical situation that arose out of their experience, including the purpose of the writer, his role, and the audience to be addressed. And every feature of writing instruction--grammar, usage, paragraphs, forms of discourse--was offered within this rhetorical context. ("Writing" 83)

The current-traditional method, Rose notes, included sentence combining, though not yet termed as such, in rhetorical contexts (484, 487). Scott and Denney felt this approach would help students understand the value of grammar and usage to their own writing because of the social context within which they worked (Berlin, "Writing" 82). Berlin finds, however, Scott's textbooks, written with Denney and Buck, to be disappointing in their familiar content, perhaps due to pressures of publishers or to the fact that he had not yet transformed his ideas into hands-on classroom practice ("Writing" 77, 81).

Buck, a former student of Scott's, taught at Vassar College for 22 years, during which time she wrote many textbooks and theoretical comments on rhetoric. Her work is detailed in essays by Rebecca Burke and by Gerald Mulderig. Buck promoted a "democratic rhetoric of public discourse" (Berlin "Rhetoric" 36, 50). The rhetoric developed by Scott, Denney, and Buck failed, however, to achieve popularity and to a large extent disappeared in college composition (Berlin, "Writing" 84).

Current-traditional rhetoric, as mentioned earlier, remained prominent throughout the end of the nineteenth century and much of the twentieth century. Indeed, Berlin states, freshman English was becoming little more than a technical writing course:

> The purpose of writing is to report, not interpret, what is inductively discovered. . . .Invention is not necessary: after all, the scientist does not invent meaning, he discovers it through the correct use of his method. ("Writing" 63)

Irrational or unverifiable discussions were inappropriate, so that writing about one's experiences was restricted (Berlin, "Writing" 75). Students were writing more and more but were being told less and less about composing; instead, they were being prepared for "their move up the corporate ladder--correctness in usage, grammar, clothing, thought, and a

certain sterile objectivity and disinterestedness" (Berlin, "Writing" 74-75).

Connors says that, during the 1890s, debates raged over whether or not grammar and rhetoric should be separate; many of the "old-fashioned" instructors fumed over students' illiteracy (12). Their solution was based on the findings of The Harvard Committee. Assigned in 1891 to study the effectiveness of English A at Harvard, the Committee, who knew nothing about writing instruction, notes Berlin, focused its report on the obvious problems with student writing such as spelling, grammar, usage, and handwriting (60-62). "They thus," Berlin says, "gave support to the view that has haunted writing classes ever since: 'learning to write is learning matters of superficial correctness'" ("Writing" 61). This concept was reflected in the textbooks of Hill and Wendell (Berlin, "Writing" 62).

Secondary schools were going to have to be responsible for grammar and formal correctness, the Committee concluded, because college instructors could not assume the role of teaching the basics of the language (Connors 12). Berlin notes one benefit of this conclusion: English instruction became a permanent fixture in secondary schools ("Writing" 61). "The Harvard Reports made the ability to write correctly, if not necessarily with intelligence, an important rite in the entrance process for college" indicates Berlin; the educated now spoke and wrote with the dialect of the

upper middle class, the traditional college-attendance group. "Composition teachers became the caretakers of the English tongue, and more important, the gatekeepers on the road to the good things in life, as defined by the professional class" (Berlin, "Writing" 72).

Berlin points out that grammar instruction receded somewhat during the 1890s; the paragraph, instead, became a central concern, along with daily themes, due in part to the Harvard Report ("Writing" 68-69, 73). Throughout the 1880s and '90s, more attention had been paid to figurative language and to the assigning of topics for student essays that would be appealing and experience-based in theory (though based on the forms of discourse in practice) (Berlin, "Writing" 71-72, 68). Berlin suggests that the forms of discourse, style, and the study of diction and sentence structure were all vital components in composition instruction throughout the last three decades of the 1800s. Invention, too, was of crucial interest as textbook writers argued over its role, if any, in rhetoric ("Writing" 64, 70-71). Patrick Hartwell, in "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar," says that in 1893 the Committee of Ten (*Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies*, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office) placed grammar study squarely amid the English curriculum: "But the committee explicitly noted that grammar instruction did not aid correctness, arguing instead that it improved the ability to think logically" (125-126).

Nevertheless, classroom instruction by the turn of the century continued to include grammatical instruction for its perceived ability to reduce errors in writing. Holbrook states, "prior to 1900, language study in American schools revolved around the continuous study of grammatical components" (259). This occurred, despite that fact that, as Dora V. Smith indicated in 1932, "up to that time there was no evidence available in print to support the premise that a knowledge of technical grammar was useful in speaking and writing" (qtd. in Holbrook 259). Berlin claims traditional grammar instruction revived at around the turn of the century ("Writing" 73), and Connors suggests that college rhetorics had begun re-inserting grammar as early as 1895: "Basic grammatical correctness was coming to be regarded as the prime desideratum for composition" as formal exercises again replaced rhetorical lectures (12). Scholars seemed, however, reluctant to admit that this concern for grammatical correctness was again taking classroom precedence, writing instead about "philological training" and the "science of language" while ignoring (or ignorant of) the fact that teachers were continuing to encourage grammatical correctness as espoused by A. S. Hill and in Edwin A. Abbott's *How to Write Clearly* (Connors 12). This apparent disregard of events actually occurring in the classrooms would be repeated later in the 20th century.

Composition courses had become a permanent fixture at American colleges and universities by the end of the nineteenth century, and despite occasional attacks from different fronts, continue so today; Berlin explains this is attributable to many different factors, but is due largely to the fact that "the student's ability to use language effectively is perhaps the single most important result of a college education" ("Writing" 85). Students at the end of the nineteenth century were considered accomplished if their writing was superficially correct (Berlin, "Writing" 73). Woods suggests grammar textbooks then were attempting "to avoid the 'technical' or 'theoretical' parts of grammar; a large influx of rural workers and immigrants created quantities of classrooms filled with students who understood merely the rudiments of English grammar ("Evolution" 17).

The scientific method was emphasized by the turn of the century because elective curricula had replaced classical models of education (Berlin 18). Edwin Wooley specifically said the aim of his textbook, *Handbook of Composition*, was not scientific, merely practical, but Connors indicates that it does include 350 prescriptive, error-based rules (12). The book, published in 1907, was part of the move to ensure that college instruction kept up with the acceleration grammatical correctness began to show after 1900 (Connors 12). Wooley also established the definition of grammar that would be adopted throughout much of the twentieth century:

"a set of rules about words and sentences that define mistakes as perceived by an English teacher" (Connors 12). Comments in a book by F. A. Barbour published in 1901 suggest that little change had occurred in perceptions of grammar's all-powerful ability from those held in the prior century:

> In modern pedagogy, there is a consensus of opinion as to [the] high educational value [of grammar] in three leading aspects: 1. It has no superior in the school curriculum, and no substitute in the school curriculum, as a discipline of the logical faculties. 2. In a marked degree, it increases the power of interpretation of thought in all subjects of study. 3. It has an indirect though important bearing upon expression of thought in two respects: (a) in all cases of careful revision and especially in the case of mature students, who through self criticism need to correct bad habits of long standing; and (b) the establishment in the mind of a sort of rough-hewn model of thought form--a powerful, though it may be unconscious, aid, whenever the mind is seeking to shape its own ideas into similar concrete form...the analytic-synthetic process of mind. (qtd. in Rose 488)

Berlin suggests current-traditional rhetoric was firmly grounded in college classrooms after 1900, although composition began to lose prestige because many scholars,

such as Wendell and Genung, were turning their attention to literary criticism ("Writing" 75). Literary studies provided advancement, Berlin indicates, but composition instruction, locked in an eighteenth-century mentality, was relegated to graduate students and junior faculty members ("Writing" 75). Woods comments on what has happened in American university instruction since the early part of the twentieth century:

> the teaching of grammar, composition, literature, and rhetoric (speech) has for the most part been directed toward strictly utilitarian, or in the case of literature, departmental goals; as a consequence, these subjects have gone separate ways. . .Grammar study continued essentially as a training course that students (especially the foreign-born and the urban poor) were supposed to have in order to speak and write acceptably. It is doubtful that grammar study...had much to do with the shaping of those students' language behaviors. (10)

Tibbetts says comments in the 1907 rhetoric, *Manual of Composition and Rhetoric*, by Gardiner, Kittredge, and Arnold suggest that they realized the arbitrariness of grammatical sources of knowledge: "they are authoritative in so far only as they correctly record the results of a study of the best writers" (qtd. in Tibbetts 312). Comments such as this were perhaps what led Tibbetts to his argument that "the *theories*

of usage" from 1850-1925 "were generally not prescriptive"; the authors of books then, he notes, had broad interests in rhetoric and composition and not merely in grammar (310).

Grammar instruction after 1910, nevertheless, was widely presented, primarily through popular handbooks and gradually became more important to teachers who used the handbooks for paper-grading (Connors 13). Rose discusses how William E. Rose, her grandfather and an instructor from 1915 to 1926, used sentence-combining exercises as "a foundation of grammar study and foundational themselves to later work in paragraphs and essays" (489). Connors claims rhetoric waned between 1910 and 1930, and that college grammar during that period upheld "the most old-fashioned, rigid, and puristic prejudices of the nineteenth century" (13). Kittredge again voiced that grammar depended on whatever language was in vogue (Tibbetts 311-12). Kittredge and Farley's *An Advanced English Grammar*, one of the best-known grammars of the this century's first twenty-five years, suggested that the language of educated writers and speakers ultimately formed accepted grammar (Tibbetts 311-312).

In 1922, Fred Newton Scott denounced brutal theme corrections (another means of emphasizing the "standard" dialect and incorporating formal grammar's restrictiveness) because they destroyed students' desire to communicate. Rather than realizing students' inherent ability to communicate, Scott said teachers were assuming students were

void of that capability and were attempting to fill the emptiness with "abstract, scholastic language," thus they were denying the students' human experience and enforcing "the language of the schoolmaster" (Berlin, "Writing" 78).

Connors suggests that in the late 1800s and early 1900s, there were differences not only between the way rhetoric perceived itself and composition courses were actually taught, but also between the actual grammar instruction being taught and the prevalent ideas about the descriptive, flexible grammar that linguists were developing (13). Though support for prescriptive grammar did recede after 1900, Connors says the incorporation of progressive, descriptive language studies was slow to catch on (13). Disorganized attacks against traditional, rigid grammar were made before 1910 by scholars such as Gertrude Buck, but a formal movement was still years away. Most members of the National Council of Teachers of English, formed in 1911, were content with grammar instruction; only in the late 'teens were a few outspoken members, such as Fred Newton Scott, G.P. Krapp, and Sterling A. Leonard, crusading against prescriptive grammar (Connors 14).

During the period between 1910 and 1920, researchers began conducting measurements to determine grammar's worth to the development of literacy skills; Connors indicates that, although these studies focused on elementary and secondary schools, they indicated an unwillingness across educational

levels to accept blindly the old curricula (15). Studies were beginning to indicate the minimal carryover effect of grammar on composition. Franklin S. Hoyt's 1906 experiment found no connection between grammar study and logical thinking ability (Hartwell 126). Connors cites Briggs' 1913, Charters' 1915, and Johnson's 1917 studies as having similar results (15). Hartwell says William Asker's study of 1923 was only one of several conducted in the 1920s that showed no correlation existed between knowledge of grammar and the ability to recognize error (126).

The Linguistic Society of America, formed in 1924, was composed of a few hundred "philologically trained teachers" interested in the history of the English language and its comparative differences with other languages; this society formally set linguistics apart from other fields of study (Connors 14). Connors quotes Leonard Bloomfield's comments from 1925 which sadly reflect the state of English instruction then (and to some extent today!):

> Our schools are conducted by persons who, from professors of education down to teachers in the classroom, know nothing of the results of linguistic science, not even the relation of writing to speech or of standard language to dialect. In short, they do not know what language is, and yet must teach it. (14)

Connors points out that Charles C. Fries added his voice to the antiprescriptive movement beginning to be organized by the likes of Krapp, Leonard, and Scott, as well as scientific linguists of the time (15). In Fries' *The Teaching of the English Language* of 1927, he says,

> Even after more than a hundred years of linguistic study based upon the historical method, the fundamental principles upon which the modern scientific view of language rests and the results of scholarly investigations in the English language have not reached the schools. On the whole the schools still perpetuate with very little change the eighteenth century point of view....
> (qtd. in Connors 15)

The "common school grammars" Fries decried are directly linked to today's grammar-based texts says Hartwell (110). Fries would later be credited with the development of structural grammar (Rose 490).

Scholarly journals in the 1920s, Connors indicates, contained only a few defenses of formal grammar; most articles either avoided taking sides, attacked prescriptive grammar, or reported research findings about formal grammar's benefits. Handbooks, drillbooks, and workbooks continued, however, to be unchallenged in actual classrooms. Public attitudes about grammar at the time were mixed; the publication of Leonard's *Current English Usage* in 1932 and

Marckwardt and Walcott's *Facts about Current English Usage* in 1938 led to mourning over grammar's decline in *popular* magazines (Connors 16). Hartwell claims a number of studies were conducted in the 1930s that pitted formal grammar study against the more active manipulation of language popular with the functional grammar movement; traditional grammar invariably failed (126).

In 1935, the NCTE condemned grammar teaching in its *Experience Curriculum in English*: "There is no scientific evidence of the value of grammar which warrants its appearance as a prominent or even distinct feature of the course of [English] study" (qtd. in Connors 16). Connors says linguistics and composition were increasingly dialectical in the 1930s as linguists became wholly concerned with "comparative and structural description" while ignoring teaching and the issue of appropriate usage; because of a lack of training in linguistics, and because much of linguistics' concern was with speech, most English *instructors* were unable to apply the new research in linguistics to their writing classrooms (17). Linguistics became its own department in many universities after 1940 and became increasingly unconcerned with the problems of the teaching of grammar in composition classrooms (Connors 17). English teachers, Connors says, were still asking "what should 'grammar' be and how can it help students read and write better?" (17).

Two new movements in the forties and early fifties slowed grammar teaching's growth, suggests Connors (17). The General Semantics movement "concerned itself with words and their representative functions"; the Communications movement concentrated on reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Connors 17-18). Berlin notes the large flood of university students after WWII and an expanding economy once again made businesses interested in the writing ability of new employees ("Writing" 76). Handbooks of grammar grew in size and content to cover the entire composing process; Connors says only a very few handbooks published between 1930 and 1960 included the concepts, such as structural grammar, which linguists had been developing (18).

In 1952, Charles Fries *did* publish a textbook that applied linguistics, *The Structure of American English;* the textbook, which followed a "descriptive, nonnormative approach" and was gradually termed "structural grammar," caused little excitement (Connors 18). Textbooks of structural grammar, such as Paul Roberts' *Patterns of English*, reached college classrooms by the mid '50s, but few really *good* textbooks were developed (Rose 490-491). Rose says teachers were not adequately trained in structural grammar, and generative transformational grammar soon replaced it; one advantage structural grammar did hold was that sentence-combining exercises based on it could eliminate any need for students to master difficult grammatical terms

(Rose 490-491). Still, in the 1950s, "most English teachers continued to slumber through a long summer of lethargic acceptance of linguistic ignorance" (Connors 18). Connors says these attitudes continued among classroom instructors during most of the 1950s; publishing professionals, however, were for the most part against traditional grammar (18).

Connors agrees that, though Fries' 1952 book was not popular, it led to the publication of several texts that used "structural grammar" as a model (19). Books, such as Paul Roberts' *Patterns of English* and Donald Lloyd and Harry Warfel's *American English in its Cultural Setting*, appeared in 1956 and supported what scholarly journals had been promoting for years, leaving teachers with no middle ground in textbook choice: either they supported the old traditions or the new movement (Connors 19). The textbooks recorded a difficult, exacting concept, and few teachers were knowledgeable in structural linguistics (Charlton Laird, qtd. in Connors 19). Subsequently, the textbooks did not become extremely popular, but their introduction, along with various other complex issues, helped lead to a growth of interest in linguistics in the 1950s that changed the discipline forever (Connors 19). By 1959, the wealth of studies that had been conducted proving grammar study's ineffectiveness led John J. DeBoer to say: "in all these studies...the results have been consistently negative so far as the value of grammar in the

improvement of language expression is concerned" (qtd. in Hartwell 126).

Structural linguistics' relationship to English was a ticking timebomb in 1959, due in part to the call-to-arms by Harry Warfel in the February 1959 *College English* (Connors 19). Warfel denounced the outdated handbooks, workbooks, and grammars, as well as the "thought" and "general education" of the times; he claimed the "function-based grammar" linguists had accepted was the best basis then available for learning composition (Connors 20). Warfel boldly stated, ". . .structural linguistics has unlocked the secrets of language. . . .The teaching of composition must undergo a revolutionary change" (qtd. in Connors 20).

Indeed, the timebomb would explode in the 1960s as new theories and methods emerged into the writing classroom, and traditional grammar was, for the most part, pushed aside. After 160 years of virtually unchanged pedagogies, writing instruction was on the verge of bubbling over, a cauldron of steaming, frustrated opinions and studies that had reached its boiling point.

Perhaps the disregard for evolving methods and enlightening research evident throughout the nineteenth and much of the twentieth centuries was due to lack of knowledge of these changes, lack of training in how to incorporate the changes, lack of up-to-date texts, or simply, since literature was becoming a more prestigious field of study for

English teachers, lack of interest in what made for effective teaching of writing. Tibbetts attempts to minimize the inadequacies of the formulas and textbooks used throughout the years leading up to the 1960s:

> [they] were not blindly prescriptive and reactionary...They were not monuments of relativism either. They were textbooks that tried, honestly and fairly, to present for their times reasonable theories about language. Just as important, the writers of these books were vividly aware of the realities and practicalities of life and language; they were not ivory-towered pedants. (315)

Many, however, neglected the research and emerging linguistic field, as has been shown. The teaching of grammar was at its peak, and, as Woods says, "it is from the 19th-century that we inherit our own fundamental attitudes about grammar in the schools" ("Cultural Tradition" 3). Those attitudes were challenged in the 1960s, as composition underwent Warfel's predicted "revolutionary change."

CHAPTER 2

"STUDENTS' RIGHT TO THEIR OWN LANGUAGE"

A review of textbooks that were published at the onset of the 1960s indicates that, indeed, change was in the air. In the April 1960 issue of *College English*, John C. Sherwood detailed the contents of textbooks published in 1959, as well as some textbooks published in 1958, examining "complete course" textbooks, readers, controlled research books, handbooks, and workbooks. He cites two "complete course" texts as being outdated: Harry Shaw et al's *A Complete Course in Freshman English*. . .

> is dated because he embalms most of the trends that have swept over composition since 1940: semantics, communication (including "listening"), and the concern with 'ideas' and 'values' which leads. . .to. . .questions of doubtful relevance even to the teaching of writing or even listening. . . . In spite of the fact that Professor Paul Roberts is quoted at length on the subject of usage, the analysis of the grammar of English makes few concessions to linguistics. (Sherwood 427)

Donald Davidson's *American Composition and Rhetoric* likewise ignores the winds of change being brought about by linguistics: "Even more than Shaw, Davidson writes on grammar in happy innocence, as if structural linguistics had never been. . ." (Sherwood 427).

In the section devoted to handbooks, rhetorics, and grammars, Sherwood bemoans the fact that textbook writers had failed to incorporate the fascinating changes being brought about by the study of linguistics; "One would expect this year's handbooks to be exciting documents in the linguistics controversy, but in actual fact many tend to cautious compromise (Sherwood 433). In discussing Robert H. Moore's second edition of *Effective Writing*, Sherwood states,

> One naturally looks these days to see what a handbook is doing with the parts of speech; Moore, deviating from both the tradition and the linguistic school, advises the students that 'function is a surer guide than form'--not very helpful advice if the student has no command of either function or form or any clear idea as to why there should be a conflict. . . .In the long run Moore usually returns to the traditional grammar. (433)

Sherwood found Hans Guth doing more of the same in *Words and Ideas: A Handbook for College Writing*: "Even more than Moore, Guth confuses things by introducing innovations in

grammatical analysis which he has not the space to explain adequately. Basically his intent seems to be to keep the terminology and much of the material of the old grammar and to add linguistic concepts as needed....This muddle over grammar is all the more unfortunate since many parts of the book, such as the sections on logic and persuasion and the introduction to the grammar, are excellent" (Sherwood 433-34). Sherwood cites only a few grammar workbooks as being linguistically oriented; Francis Connolly and Donald Sears' *The Sentence in Context: Essentials of Grammar and Rhetoric* addresses linguistics while most rely instead on "common school grammar" (434, 436-37).

Ken Macrorie's *The Perceptive Writer, Reader, and Speaker* is described as "liberal in grammatical matters, accepting structural linguistics (or as Macrorie would put it, 'revolutionary grammar') and usage as the standard of value" (434). Sherwood continues, "the brief space allotted to mechanics hardly allows him to do more than form attitudes and state general principles"; in short, Sherwood lists Macrorie's text as "a poor treatment of grammar" (434-45).

Sherwood theorizes that thoroughly but briefly describing the grammar of English is impossible:

> . . .everything has to be explained at length and not even the instructor can fill in the gaps. A brief grammar in traditional terms is perfectly possible and at the very least will provide a

> vocabulary through which instructor and student can communicate, but it will always tend to be an over-simplification. As for a long grammar of either type, all but the poorest students do not need it, and the poorest may be beyond help. It would be unfortunate if the interest in linguistics should revive the obsession with grammar which most teachers are finally getting over. (435)

Traditional grammar is kept alive in the workbooks Sherwood reviews (to his dismay): "It is sad to report that the workbook continues to be popular. . . .What keeps it alive is partly its appeal to students and teachers hungry for certainty and simple answers, in a field which has no simple answers, but mostly the relief it gives to overworked instructors (435).

Sherwood did find one reader that incorporated some of the developments that had been taking place concerning the teaching of composition. The purpose of Leonard F. Dean and Kenneth G. Wilson's *Essays on Language and Usage* seemed to Sherwood to be "to liberate the student from his 'anxiety about being correct' by putting 'the usual handbooks in perspective.' This purpose seems to relieve the editors of any obligation to present linguistic controversies impartially; the linguists are exhibited triumphing over their foes, and the foes. . .are silenced" (431).

Connors says that, from 1960 to 1963, "linguistics and its impact on composition were fighting issues" (20). A few rational scholars were able to see structural linguistics' adaptability for *describing* language, not for composing; they suggest teachers assimilate the knowledge linguistic science has to offer and then incorporate that know-how into more insightful teaching (Connors 20-21).

Kitzhaber describes how structural grammar works: "The structural linguist adheres strictly to form as a criterion of classification, since it is the most objective aspect of language and therefore the most satisfactory for his purposes" (*Themes* 79). Both structuralists and traditionalists were, however, doomed, according to Connors, because Noam Chomsky's "linguistic revolution" was on the horizon (Connors 21). "Even the tenuous bridges between linguistics and handbook grammar that the structuralists had built were impossible to maintain after the ascent of transformational-generative grammar"; traditionalists found Chomsky's concepts difficult to follow and preferred their old methods of teaching, though traditional grammar "did not flourish openly" (Connors 22). Chomsky describes generative grammar: " a system of rules that relate signals to semantic interpretations of these signals" (*Topics* 12).

Frank Zidonis further explains not only how generative grammar works but also why it seemed at the time to represent a new plateau in the teaching of writing:

> With the advent of generative grammar, which in essence represents the psychological process of producing sentences, a logical approach to the study of composition has become available. For it is the goal of generative grammar to specify by ordered rules the well-formed sentences, and only the well-formed sentences, of English. Grammars not based on any theory of language--whether they be Functional, Formal, Corrective, Normative, Traditional, or Structural--ignore the most important goal a grammar could have: accounting for the creation of new well-formed sentences of the language. (408)

Connors implies that Chomsky's notions were even more difficult for teachers to grasp--including such concepts as phrase-structure rules and obligatory transformations--than the buzzwords and ideas behind structural grammar (22).

In 1965, Zidonis reported the findings of a two-year experiment in teaching generative grammar (albeit to ninth and tenth graders); neither the experimental group nor the control group had studied formal grammar for at least two years prior to the study (Zidonis 405). They were then exposed to one year of studying the "phrase structure rules" and to a second year of informally studying the "transformational rules" of generative grammar; drills and exercises helped clarify the techniques and concepts (Zidonis

405). Zidonis discovered that the generative grammar was learned fairly easily by students due to its "consistency, specificity, and relevance to the production of well-formed sentences"; he says the study enabled students to reduce error occurrence in their writing, to increase the proportion of well-formed sentences they wrote, and, perhaps (though not proved by statistics), to write more structurally complex sentences (Zidonis 408). After rigorously analyzing the writing samples of ninth graders, Zidonis found that

> almost half of the sentences written by the ninth graders were judged to be malformed. This finding runs counter to the widespread contention of the structural linguist, who is not concerned with well-formedness as a grammatical goal, that children have acquired virtually full command of the grammar of English at an early age. The more likely contention is that the grammar of English is never fully mastered. (409)

A survey of eighty colleges and universities published in October 1961 by Herman Estrin asked, "What practical methods do you use in the teaching of grammar? How do you incorporate grammar and usage assignments into the composition? How do you determine usage achievement?" among other things (43). Although "correctness in mechanics" was listed as one of the four criteria used to grade themes,

responses suggested that grammar instruction was often de-emphasized, even ignored:

> We try to keep our emphasis on the structure of the paper, on paragraphing, and on sentence structure. I suspect that our colleagues in other departments are fussier about spelling than we. Papers clearly sub-standard in mechanics are failed without hesitation. (qtd. in Estrin 43)

Admittedly, some respondents seemed to invoke grim exercises to "develop a complete understanding of the function of grammar," but the attitudes of most responses seem clearly anti-traditional grammar (Estrin 44).

In 1961, Glenn Leggett, and in 1962, Albert Kitzhaber published articles in *College English* bemoaning the state of freshman composition. Each decries the fact that the writing course had become little more than a service course in the eyes of other departments; Leggett calls it "an orientation course to college" (42), while Kitzhaber says "it aims at a minimum standard of accomplishment. It is a 'skills' course" ("Perspectives" 443). Kitzhaber implies this adversely affected instructors' attitudes.

With the relative lack of prestige afforded composition, fewer instructors were willing to teach it; Kitzhaber warns "when those who presumably know most about the subject decline to teach it, someone else must try" ("Perspectives" 444). Leggett, too, felt composition deserved the best minds

English departments had to offer, "not necessarily to teach the course, (though that would be helpful) but to think about it, talk about it," to give it dignity (42). Leggett suggests the frustration, bore, and general embarrassment freshman composition had become could easily lead one to agree with those calling for the abolishment of the course; however, the disadvantages listed in connection with freshman English, such as the dullness of the writing and a special competence necessary in teachers, were "smoke-screens" (Leggett 41).

Even the course description in most college catalogs, which often emphasized the teaching of freshmen to write clearly and correctly and the review of grammar and mechanics, etc., sounded boring to Leggett, who implored, "we need to put the freshman writing course right smack in the English department's general concern, where it belongs" (41). For solutions, Leggett recommends treating freshmen more intellectually and offering them something new and fresh to learn (41). Kitzhaber says the cure for the weariness English instructors were experiencing was "to make it possible for composition to be taught substantially better in the lower schools," hence echoing the Harvard Report of some seventy years earlier ("Perspectives" 444). Kitzhaber suggests that this could be done by helping teachers "realize that good writing does not come from the mechanical application of rules but instead that it is the result of a

series of choices involving the demands of writer, subject, purpose, and audience" ("Perspectives" 442).

The now-famous words written in 1963 by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer in *Research in Written Composition* helped end the popularity of grammar instruction: "the teaching of formal grammar has a negligible or, because it usually displaces some instruction and practice in actual composition, even a harmful effect on the improvement of writing" (37-38). That statement helped Patrick Hartwell, who wrote "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar" in the February 1985 issue of *College English*, arrive at his conclusions about grammar. (Those conclusions were harshly criticized and will be detailed later.) Hartwell indicates that in 1960 Ingrid Strom concluded, though unqualifiedly so, after reviewing twenty experimental studies:

> direct methods of instruction, focusing on writing activities and the structuring of ideas, are more efficient in teaching sentence structure, usage, punctuation, and other related factors than are such methods as nomenclature drill, diagramming, and rote memorization of grammatical rules. (qtd. in Hartwell 126)

Hartwell says Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's and Henry C. Meckel's research reviews in 1963 were in agreement with Strom (126). Kolln and Neuleib and Brosnahan later say the two studies differ.

Meckel noted that none of the studies up to then had looked at longterm effects of grammar studies (which Braddock et al also say), but Meckel continued that none had examined the effects of grammar study on editing or revising. He did suggest, however, that other methods are more efficient at helping students write better and that the memorization of rules does not improve usage. He concluded that more research needed to be done to examine what kind of grammatical knowledge could perhaps transfer to composing ability (Neuleib and Brosnahan 29). In 1962, Kitzhaber also suggested that perhaps more study needed to be conducted concerning the composing process and writing instruction ("Perspectives" 444).

In 1963, Kitzhaber published *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College* which discusses in length the writing of college students as determined by a Dartmouth College study. The study sought to determine how English could be taught more effectively at Dartmouth, how long writing improvement continued after instruction, and how responsible were faculty members at large for the writing abilities of their students. Kitzhaber notes that the course really was little more than a service course in correctness in the eyes of other departments: "...freshman English, many people think, ought to fix, once and for all, the habits of correct usage and clear orderly writing so that teachers in other departments need take no special pains about these

matters. If the course cannot establish these habits, they argue, why is it required?" (*Themes* ix-x). Also, instructors in other courses perhaps tolerate sloppy writing and thus contradict messages English teachers are stressing (Kitzhaber, *Themes* 6). Many English composition courses at the time were moving to studies in literature; however, Kitzhaber claims, ". . .it is nearly impossible--perhaps really impossible--to prove or disprove the effectiveness of a particular course pattern and say that *because* the course emphasizes great literature or semantics or rhetoric, *therefore* the students taking it learn to write with greater skill and fluency" (*Themes* 1-2, 5).

Despite the moves to other patterns of instruction, other courses were continuing, according to syllabi, to rely on "work in the fundamentals" and "extensive drill on the 'mechanics' of composition"; Kitzhaber found this occurring less and less, though, as self-help and writing clinics were beginning to be used instead of class-wide instruction (*Themes* 11, 93). "In effect, many college English departments are now saying--and meaning it--that matters of this sort are not a proper subject for college instruction and must be learned before the student enters college" (Kitzhaber, *Themes* 23). Remedial courses did, however, focus mainly on drill in grammar, usage, punctuation, etc. (Kitzhaber, *Themes* 19).

Kitzhaber finds that "English teachers for the most part have been teaching a static system of grammar, one that reflects almost no awareness of the enormous amount of scholarly investigation of language during the last three-quarters of a century and more, or of the revolution that language study has undergone in the last thirty years" (*Themes* 81). He claims that "parents would rightly be shocked" to know that their children were being taught by teachers and from textbooks that were so clearly outdated (*Themes* 81-82). The textbooks being used continued to be prescriptive with little inclusion of the new linguistics knowledge then available; in fact, Kitzhaber says, the freshman composition textbooks were "among the poorest, the least scholarly, that the student will encounter" (*Themes* 15-16). Kitzhaber does admit that a half dozen good textbooks were available concerning structural linguistics (*Themes* 75).

Kitzhaber briefly explains differences in school grammar, structural grammar, and transformational grammar (as defined earlier), admitting that "The study of English grammar is in an unsettled state nowadays, but this should be a cause for satisfaction, not dismay" (*Themes* 82). The study of traditional school grammar, Kitzhaber says, "has little or no perceptible effect on the student's ability to write good prose"; nevertheless, the innovation of programmed instruction promised a means of incorporating traditional grammar and usage, while using structural linguistics'

terminology, into workbooks beneficial for remedial students: "...whereas workbook instruction has never carried over very successfully to the student's own composition habits, machine instruction may succeed somewhat better because of the immediate-feedback principle..." (*Themes* 83, 87-89).

Kitzhaber implies that, perhaps, secondary school systems were more ambitious than colleges and universities in bringing up-to-date language information into the schoolroom, such as "the principles of English structure, the relation of speech to writing, information about American dialects and linguistic geography, [and] something of the history of English" (*Themes* 96). Once this occurred, Kitzhaber predicts, ". . .many colleges and universities will be getting substantial numbers of freshmen who have had the benefit of this kind of instruction and who will find the traditional prescriptive grammar naive and inaccurate" (*Themes* 97). Since high schools had been doing better at preparing students in English and were requiring more writing, and since junior colleges were attracting weaker students and four-year institutions were being more selective, a rise in "the average level of ability" was detected, according to Kitzhaber (*Themes* 63). Still, colleges simply were not reforming their freshman composition courses to suit Kitzhaber:

> . . .college English departments seem increasingly willing to abandon the responsibility for giving

> systematic instruction in composition just as soon as a majority of entering freshmen show themselves able to observe a minimum standard of correctness in written English--as though mere correctness were all that one should try to teach in a composition course, as though correct writing were necessarily the same as good writing. (*Themes* 98-99)

Indeed, Kitzhaber's remarks against the misplaced emphasis on correctness found in college composition classrooms seems progressive; however, he himself proposes an adherence to maintaining severe rules where spelling is concerned; his message seems somewhat contradictory to the rest of his entire book. He suggests that students' three-page papers be failed if they contained three or more misspellings: "It would not be a bad idea, in fact, to formulate a 'blacklist' of gross errors in the mechanics of writing and to give the list to students at the beginning of the term, warning them that after a certain point in the term errors of these kinds will be severely penalized in their papers" (*Themes* 136-37).

Kitzhaber claims that one concrete way to help students write better is to help teachers know more about the language. Citing the 1960 NCTE survey of 374 four-year liberal arts schools, Kitzhaber states that 42 percent did not offer a course in history of the English language; 72 percent of those schools did not offer a modern English

grammar course. Of the 28 percent who were, Kitzhaber claims, only about 15 percent were truly up-to-date; others were depending on outmoded, Latin-based grammar texts (*Themes* 142). Kitzhaber implies that the lack of these and other vital courses is indeed frightening: "Freshman English in the nation's colleges and universities is now so confused, so clearly in need of radical and sweeping reforms, that college English departments can continue to ignore the situation only at their increasing peril" (*Themes* 26).

In the October 1963 issue of *College English*, Margaret Ashida and Leslie Whipp suggest that the long-awaited revolution was finally occurring in English grammar; they cite W. Nelson Francis' 1954 statement--"a revolution as sweeping in its consequences as the Darwinian revolution in biology" (18). Unfortunately, they claim, English departments were failing to see the move as anything more than a fad, despite the fact that the traditional methods of teaching English were not working for anyone: "The program served neither teacher nor student partially because it failed to define or even identify clearly what it sought to teach" (Ashida and Whipp 19). Handbooks of the time were little help; "even the best handbooks offer but a redaction of traditional prescriptions for 'correct' English--no matter what the context or purpose" (Ashida and Whipp 20). But, by having the student to investigate the structures of professional writing, the student "sees that the traditional

prescriptions which he has been taught are unrelated to writing practices, and that he himself can be at least as responsible an authority as most of his traditional texts" (Ashida and Whipp 21).

By October 1964, reviews of *Research in Written Composition* were being published in *College English*. Jean H. Hagstrum states that Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer had "worked with scholarly caution, and their choices inspire confidence. These are undoubtedly the five best 'scientific' studies ever conducted on written composition" (53). Nevertheless, Hagstrum finds the five studies themselves often lacking; for example, the Buxton study, which examined whether the "writing" method (where no marks were made during paper-grading) or the "revision" method (where intensive marking and evaluation occurred) was the better method of composition instruction (53). The revision method won, but Hagstrum indicates that the laboratory was imprecise (54).

Hagstrum also questions the results of the Harris study because it failed to consider certain points. Examining whether traditional, formal grammar instruction or the "direct method" (where grammar was not taught with a textbook but as a part of "sentence building and structure" and via imitation) was most effective at teaching students about correct English, the researchers found little difference after one year but a decisive difference after two in favor of the direct method (Hagstrum 54). The researchers claimed

that "training in formal grammar seems to have impeded the achievement of correctness"; Hagstrum, however, suggests that the students had perhaps not reached a level of linguistic achievement to the point where they were ready to study grammar (they were between twelve and fourteen years old) and that the results were expected, considering what was taught:

> Instruction in composition improved composition, including one of its constituent virtues, correctness. Instruction in grammatical definition improved the students' ability to define grammatical terms. But why are these separate and legitimate aims of instruction placed in competition? Why shouldn't both be taught? (54)

Other writers in the sixties were also questioning what was being done in composition and how students were arriving (or failing to arrive) at a knowledge of effective writing. In 1965, Hargis Westerfield amusingly discussed the superstitions often held for no apparent reasons by college freshmen: "I believe that many students live in a world of superstitions about writing. These superstitions consist of the unanalyzed fiats, baseless grammatical prohibitions, and short-circuited teaching that a freshman picks up before college" (311). Later that year, Robert L. Fichtenau questioned the introduction of a myriad of rhetorical principles all at once to struggling writers. Fichtenau

notes that many articles had been written emphasizing the need for rhetorical principles to be taught in writing courses instead of a grammar and mechanics or literature focus; nevertheless, Fichtenau does list the need to "follow accepted conventions in grammar, usage, and mechanics" as one of the seven goals of a composition program (720-21). Fichtenau sees asking a student "to struggle with all or nearly all of the aspects of rhetoric...at once" as a flaw; instead, he suggests breaking up the aspects of rhetoric into several units of study (720). Fichtenau also encourages the study of semantics after the student has started writing (not before) so the student will see how the study relates to the improvement of his own writing (737).

The NCTE and the CCCC published in 1965 the results of their study of English courses in two-year colleges across the country. More than 41 percent of the 292 teachers reported that they do not teach grammar in composition courses; the study implies, however, that four-year programs tend overall not to teach grammar at all (*English in the Two-Year College* 29). Structural linguistics was beginning to find its way into the two-year college curriculum; although 28 percent of those who taught grammar chose to teach traditional grammar, 46.7 percent used combined approaches including structural grammar, and to a much lesser extent, transformational grammar (*English in the Two-Year College* 29). Still, a mere three percent of English department

chairs surveyed said their departments used anything but traditional grammar, especially concerning remedial courses: "Our study of the grammar included in regular English courses shows this same prevalence of traditional grammar. The facts of our study point to the simple truth that, on the whole, two-year college teachers of English do not know the newer developments in linguistics" (*English in the Two-Year College* 81-82).

Indeed, many individual responses from the survey suggested the respondents knew very little about transformational grammar. Often, administrators favored traditional grammar, and since the administration often selects textbooks, a traditional grammar text often set the tempo for the course: "It is pointed out that if the grammar handbook is traditional, it is very difficult to use any other approach" (*English in the Two-Year College* 31). Grammar handbooks were vital to first semester courses; they were second only to readers. The second semester courses, which seem to have focused more heavily on literature, did not place as much emphasis on the grammar handbooks; they were fourth in usage overall (*English in the Two-Year College* 42).

The study reveals that not only were English textbooks a problem for English teachers, but that the drastic social changes of the era were beginning to be felt throughout English classrooms nationwide. English instructors were

experiencing a great deal of logistical and pedagogical problems with the newly-established "open-door policy" where "no high school graduate is denied the opportunity to attempt college work." The influx of students resulting from this policy not only increased the number of students in the classrooms but also the variety of student abilities and backgrounds (*English in the Two-Year College* xii). Teachers also seemed to be intimidated by their own lack of knowledge, particularly in linguistics; 45.6 percent felt they needed more training in that subject (*English in the Two-Year College* 61).

The study subsequently determined that "...the two-year college teacher has not kept up with a science which is relevant to the job and which is so fully developed that an unabridged dictionary based upon it could be produced" (*English in the Two-Year College* 30). Conclusions of the study include a call for further studies which should examine, among other varied items, "the relationship of formal grammar, linguistics, and semantics to writing" and a "course of study in composition with useful insights from structural linguistics and transformational grammar" (*English in the Two-Year College* 77).

Another look at two-year community colleges was undertaken in a study published by Barton and Beachner in 1970. The study includes an examination of the students who enroll in such institutions: they are often married, work in

addition to attending classes, have a lower "academic aptitude level" than typical four-year college students, and are often from the middle and lower socio-economic classes (Barton and Beachner 12). The study states that, in July 1965, more than 68 percent of the junior colleges nationwide were providing remedial English programs, but the "intensive grammar review and a succession of writing assignments" simply were not helping students improve their writing, although mechanics, usage, etc., *are* important to formal writing (Barton and Beachner 19, 66). Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* and development of error analysis grammar instruction seemed to be a breakthrough for remedial instructors--though not limited to two year colleges and not made public for several years (Neuleib and Brosnahan 29).

The Barton and Beachner study proposes a "precomposition course" to help alleviate student problems and also suggests writing clinic work (the precursor to writing centers and/or writing labs), student-teacher conferences, and programmed teaching, among other things, as alternatives to the study of grammar, which was, evidence suggested, not working:

> In view of the fact that most freshmen who demonstrate weakness in grammatical usage and mechanical skills do so in spite of having been exposed to at least eight full years of prior instruction in these concerns without apparent success, it indeed seems foolish now to decide that

> in a twelve-week composition course he can be taught this material as a prelude to writing. (Barton and Beachner 19, 66)

In January 1966, Gerhard Friedrich wrote a stirring essay on the concerns of teaching our language and the communication process, concluding that "the teaching of English may be regarded as having several major emphases, but these need not be at odds with each other, for they are all vitally related to our language" (27). Friedrich does see composition instructors as professionally failing if they privilege the study of literature over composition, and reading and discussion over writing practice (25). Neither, he says, can teachers rely on packaged courses with answer manuals "to escape the perfunctory and the ponderous in our attempts to cultivate verbal skills and confidence in those skills" (Friedrich 22). And while writing with conventional correctness is one of several duties a writer has in the act of composing, Friedrich suggests that teachers should avoid becoming "fault-finding grammarian[s], intent on an unimaginative, pedantic perfectionism" (20).

A wealth of composition research was conducted in the 1960s, especially about sentence combining in its various applications. Rose says sentence combining fit as well into the transformational grammar paradigm as it had in the traditional school and structural grammars (483). Kellogg Hunt's study of 1964 (published in 1965) showed an increase

in the syntactic maturity of fourth through twelfth graders after using sentence combining (O'Hare 141). A 1964 study by Bateman and Zidonis (published in 1965) also showed that improvement in syntactic complexity followed transformational grammar study mixed with sentence-combining practice (Hartwell 127). John C. Mellon incorporated transformational grammar with sentence combining in his study of 1969; though he said students wrote more maturely afterwards, O'Hare said it is difficult to prove that the improvements were due to the grammar unit instruction involving difficult grammar rules, or to the sentence combining itself, or to the combination of the two (10). Also in 1969, J. Stephen Sherwin concluded, "instruction in formal grammar is an ineffective way to help students achieve proficiency in writing" (qtd. in Hartwell 127).

Later, Frank O'Hare studied the effects of sentence combining when no grammar instruction was used at all; students achieved significant gains in syntactic complexity, which led some scholars to the assumption that earlier sentence combining studies based on transformational grammar, such as Mellon's and Bateman and Zidonis', achieved their results because students were manipulating language and not because they were learning that particular grammar (Hartwell 127).

O'Hare states, ". . .although a knowledge of transformational--or for that matter, traditional--grammar is

an indispensable tool for the researcher and a potentially useful tool for the teacher of English, there was no justification for assuming that it would help students write better" (2). O'Hare says one important aspect of his sentence-combining system is that no study of grammar, either traditional or transformational, is required (2). The system offers the practicality teachers need because it can be learned in just a few inservice sessions (O'Hare 30-32). O'Hare says students were bored with and unable to do traditional grammar, and grammar study "has failed to help students write any better," despite its occupation at the center of language study (27, 30). "Perhaps grammar study and too much concern with error build barriers between the beginning writer and the composing process" (O'Hare 73). The 1978 study by Daiker, Kerek, and Morenberg revealed that college students improved their writing by studying sentence combining exercises and essay writing only (Neuleib and Brosnahan 29).

In "The Problem of Defining a Mature Style," published in 1968, Francis Christensen questions the emphasis being placed on maturity by the sentence combining scholars: "I would say that we should not in our grammar and composition courses focus on tying syntactic knots that we must add courses in reading to untie" ("Problem" 576). Rather than encourage students to write the jargonistic prose of most adults, Christensen encourages using the writing of

professionals as a goal ("Problem" 575-76). Christensen implies that lack of knowledge among teachers about the syntactic features of mature writing, as well as derivative, negative handbooks fulls of "rules for salvaging misbegotten sentences," created a halt in progress toward helping students improve their writing ("Problem" 572-73).

Another article by Christensen criticizes fallacious teaching tricks such as sentence graphs which were intended "to force to quick maturity" the writing of college freshmen; Christensen insists that professional writing is really not much different from student writing ("New Rhetoric" 7-8). Professional writing is *not*, however, the "contorted academic or journalistic prose--what might from its shape be called 'pretzel prose'" that arbitrary teaching systems, such as the sentence graph, encourage (Christensen, "New Rhetoric" 9).

The notion of a *standard* academic prose came under attack in the mid-seventies, following "the social upheavals of the 1960s, and the insistence of submerged minorities on a greater share of American society" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 1). Students from a wide variety of backgrounds--due in large part, no doubt, to the "open-door policy"--subsequently had varied language abilities; teachers, often trained primarily in literature, were attempting to teach that which they did not know themselves (CCCC, *Students' Right* 1). The committee recommended (just as many earlier studies had) that teachers come to an understanding of modern linguistics and the

history and nature of the English language: "Once a teacher understands the arbitrary nature of the oral and written forms, the pronunciation or spelling of a word becomes less important than whether it communicates what the student wants to say" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 15).

Rather than focus on one "standard English," the study suggests that the ability to write precisely and effectively in a variety of dialects might be ethically and educationally wise; "We need to discover whether our attitudes toward 'educated English' are based on some inherent superiority of the dialect itself or on the social prestige of those who use it" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 2). The official statement released in November 1972 by the Executive Committee of the CCCC says in part, "We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and the training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 2-3).

The students who do speak "non-standard" dialects are often slowed by "their exaggerated concern for the least serious aspects of writing. If we can convince our students that spelling, punctuation, and usage are less important than content, we have removed a major obstacle in their developing the ability to write" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 8). Simply maintaining the "standard dialect" with a degree of correctness does not necessarily make for clear, forceful writing; "students need to recognize the difference between

handbook rules and actual performance" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 8, 10). Many of the handbooks, the committee found, still adhered to. . .

> social-class etiquette and cultural stasis. . . . This restrictive attitude toward usage is intensified by the way school grammar is presented as a series of directives in which word choice, syntax, surface features of grammar, and manuscript conventions are lumped together in guides of 'correctness'. These restrictive handbooks, by their very nature, encourage their users toward imitation, not toward generation of original written statements. (CCCC, *Students' Right* 10)

Nevertheless, the students raised in an environment encouraging the "standard dialect" often succeed after college, "often in spite of and not because of, their schoolroom training in 'grammar'" (CCCC, *Students' Right* 2). So, regardless of the dialect used at home and the types of writing used in college, students who choose to get ahead should be advised in the composition classroom that they will need to be able to write Edited American English (EAE) if their job requires formal writing (CCCC, *Students' Right* 15). Even though "humanity tells us that we should allow every man the dignity of his own way of talking," the human who wants a job should perhaps conform (CCCC, *Students' Right* 18).

The best way to ensure that students become adept at Edited American English continued to be a topic of debate in 1977. Janice Neuleib wrote "The Relation of Formal Grammar to Composition" to point composition instructors (who obviously were still teaching, or considering teaching, formal grammar) to the studies that had been conducted seeming to prove grammar's unworthiness in helping students write, studies which might have been misinterpreted or improperly conducted. She summarizes five studies, four of which have previously been mentioned, all of which based their research on writing samples rather than on less-valid objective tests (247). Neuleib says the R. J. Harris study of 1962--often cited as "the study that really began to do a serious investigation of the worth of instruction in formal grammar"--showed formal-grammar groups not performing as well as groups using classroom and sentence-combining practice to study common composition errors (247). The study does, however, seem to Neuleib to focus too heavily on error counts in its final evaluation (247). The study by Bateman-Zidonis is next summarized by Neuleib, who points out that the significant growth transformational grammar seemed to encourage was experienced primarily by only four students (247). Based only on the results of these two studies, "experts concluded, a bit prematurely...that traditional grammar does not work and that transformational grammar does" (Neuleib 248).

Concerning the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer study of 1963 (*Research in Written Composition*), Neuleib points out that the statement (quoted earlier in this study) concerning grammar's "negligible" and even "harmful effect" has perhaps been taken out of context; just before that, the authors had stated, "Uncommon, however, is carefully conducted research which studies the effect of formal grammar on actual composition over an extended period of time" (qtd. in Neuleib 248).

Neuleib states that the 1969 study by John C. Mellon concerning sentence-combining's effectiveness raises some interesting questions and verifies and clarifies the Bateman-Zidonis study; other than that, Neuleib says, the study merely proves that sentence combining students "learned what they were taught and that the students in the traditional grammar class did not learn what they were not taught" (248).

Reports of a three-year study in New Zealand which was published in 1976 looked at differences in student writing after instruction based on either traditional grammar, transformational grammar, or no grammar at all. Writing performance and language competency were equal after two years; after three years, the traditional grammar group seemed to have improved, though their attitudes about English did not (Neuleib 249). Neuleib says, "It becomes clear that, at least in this study, no grammar instruction works quite as well as any grammar instruction" (249). Based on this one

study (keeping in mind that it was not conducted in American schools), the authors drew conclusions which Neuleib found "startling": they suggest that "only very bright students benefit from grammar instruction at all"; students who are not taught grammar are better at editing their own work; and grammar study should be excluded from the lower grades because it does not seem to help and because it creates negative feelings among the students (249).

Neuleib reacts in response that perhaps bright high school and college students could benefit from grammar study later in life and that we should alter grammar instruction in the lower grades to reduce any negative attitudes. The fact that the results of the New Zealand study disagree with the results of the Mellon and Bateman-Zidonis studies also leads Neuleib to conclude, "there must be more research done" (250).

Hartwell reports that studies by Betty Bamberg in 1978 and 1981 led her to believe that enough evidence had been collected against grammar instruction; she found "...time spent in grammar instruction in high school is the least important factor of eight factors examined, in separating regular from remedial writers at the college level," a result which also seems contradictory to the transformational grammar/sentence-combining studies (127). Subsequently, Neuleib finds it distressing that so few good studies, some of which reported contradictory results, had been conducted:

"One good research investigation on grammar and composition every seven years in the entire English-speaking world is sparse evidence for drawing absolute conclusions" (250). Neuleib calls for a verification of studies that will, perhaps, add prestige to the composition field: "It is no wonder that the hard sciences look at us a bit cynically; we need to clarify our findings by duplicating our experiments and by improving research controls" (249).

Despite the developments in linguistics, the acceptance by most scholars and more and more instructors of the need to forego traditional grammar instruction, and the adoption of a more liberal attitude about what constitutes appropriate usage in writing, the 1970s closed on a confused note. Many in the composition world seemed to feel sure that grammar instruction was unnecessary in college curricula; few studies conducted in the sixties and seventies could unequivocably state why. Still other instructors were continuing to teach formal grammar, blissfully unaware of the changes around them (and depending, no doubt, on the adage that since they were taught that way, that's the only way to teach). The composition instruction that entered the eighties was greatly changed, thanks to the new grammar methods, from the pedagogies of just twenty years earlier. The field was, however, still in a state of flux--literature was privileged over composition in many English departments, making research in literature more attractive to conducting

research in grammar instruction and/or composition; composition instructors (who were often graduate students primarily interested in the study of literature) were perhaps so swamped with paper-grading and associated chores and with ill-prepared students (due, no doubt, to the "open-door policy") to conduct scholarly research; and many instructors simply might not have known, because of administrative restraints, about what had been and what needed to be done. This state of confusion about grammar instruction's role in the composition classroom would continue throughout the 1980s.

CHAPTER 3

THE MISREADING OF EARLIER DECADES

In *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*, Stephen North recalls a striking analogy made by Paul Bryant in "A Brand New World Every Morning". Bryant likened composition teachers to geese, who begin each morning unable to approach the day's challenges with insight because they have not retained any memories from the previous day (326). There are no doubt some similarities, particularly for those instructors who insist on adhering to their tried and true methods regardless of the evidence stacked against those methods: repeatedly unsuccessful student writing.

In the 1960s and '70s, writing instruction based on learn-by-rote teaching was denounced by compositionists who said traditional grammar instruction was not vital to a composition classroom. However, a summary of the articles produced during the 1980s about the teaching of writing suggests that the *researchers* in this dynamic field are not geese, but are instead very much like a group of waterfowl *hunters* with varying success rates.

Armed with powerful ammunition in the form of very specific studies and hypotheses, they headed determinedly out on a late afternoon hunt. They intended to bag the perfect way of incorporating traditional grammar, or a grammar approach of some kind, or no grammar at all with writing and rhetorical instruction. They then tried to make this combination digestible to freshman writing students who they hoped would walk away from the laden table of composition knowledge as gourmet (or at least better) writers. However, once in the field, the hunters found they had arrived too late. This chapter will detail scholarship of the 1980s with its varied pronouncements, many of which seemed to repeat the findings of the earlier decades. Finally, scholars began to see that those earlier declarations developed from misreadings; the more retrospective researchers began to take an evaluative look at what had been done in previous decades, and they determined that the move away from grammatical instruction of some type may not have been beneficial after all.

Many scholars of composition instruction in the 1980s should perhaps have noticed the move long before away from the conflict concerning the assumed uselessness of the traditional grammar approach of teaching students how to write. Several articles in the education and composition journals in the 1980s, though fewer than before since grammar had been dismissed so strongly by then, repeated the now

well-worn adage--traditional grammar seems to have little effect on the teaching of writing--ignoring the fact that more progressive scholars were considering what type, if any, of grammar instruction *is* effective. Therefore, the repetition of the findings of the likes of Braddock et al and Kellogg Hunt seems at first glance unnecessary. Later in this text, some essays such as Neuleib and Brosnahan's will be reviewed which indicate that those earlier studies may have been misread or perhaps lacked total validity.

Possibly another reason for the continuance of old theses may very well be that many teachers were actually still teaching with product-method techniques in the eighties. Scholars such as Witte and Faigley were trying to convince instructors to discontinue privileging the student's final text over the student's process of writing and were having some success: "...modern composition classroom practices put greater emphasis on 'cooperating in the process of writing rather than on criticizing the products of composing' than did the practices of earlier years" (54). Woods said in 1985 that "the teaching of traditional grammar still has considerable public and institutional support", however ("Cultural Tradition" 11). Therefore, the continued appearances of pro-process articles were probably attempts by the authors to further convince the old vanguard that their outdated modes of instruction simply were not working. Subsequently, the "back to basics" alarm was sounded:

> The 'back to basics' ethic that is shaping current English curricula propounds formal instruction in grammar, such as sentence diagramming, as a solution to declining composition skills and as a replacement for the 'trendier' English units in literature and film. Running counter to this trend, however, are the writing-as-a-process approach and research that casts doubt on the notion that the study of grammar results in improved writing. (Holbrook 259)

By 1986, Connolly indicated that, more and more, "...many college writing programs have deliberately moved away from the simple 'assignment-product-rating' cycle of writing instruction, which emphasizes testing displayed knowledge, and toward what is generally called a 'process' approach, which values writing as an instrument of learning" (2).

No doubt, educators encouraging strict adherence to handbook rules could still be found. Slowly and surely, however, grass-roots instructors were finally realizing that the old approaches really did need changing. Connors suggested in 1983 that the notion that students should be taught mechanical correctness, even if they learned nothing else, was based on early America's social system which strongly emphasized gentility. For the past century and a half, as has been shown, traditional grammar was an institution in the classroom. When the de-emphasizing of

grammar did occur, it was a result of the social upheaval of the 1960s, according to Chadwick (54-55). Many writers of the eighties stressed (and re-stressed!) the futility of expecting students to write better by forcing a formal grammar pedagogy upon them. Works by others seemed to reiterate the findings of the 1960s and '70s against traditional grammar instruction. (See also Hudson, 1987; Rosenberg, 1983; Hurley, 1980; and Viera, 1988.) Clark's article of 1981, "Formal Grammar: Does It Help Improve Writing?", repeats the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer conclusion that intensive study of formal grammar may be harmful to student writers (Kolln 147).

The intentions of some of the works of the eighties seemed to go beyond simple repetition by adding proof to the anti-grammar notion via examples. For instance, Deborah Larson details a summer workshop program in response to the apparent uselessness of grammar rules in teaching effective writing. Students perform *Snow White* in both black and standard dialects. Also, Gail Stygall reported in 1988 that increases in basic writers' success rates were noticeable after Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis switched its basic writing program to a process course.

Janet Marting tackles the issue that, despite the apparent failure of traditional grammar theories, the process approach still was not being incorporated into the classroom as it should be. Hood describes the necessity of

incorporating a critical literacy approach to the classroom instead of the traditional "mechanical" method which

> ...encourages passivity and acceptance of authority, places a disproportionate empahsis [sic] on correctness at the expense of critical thinking, and restricts interpretation and sequential thought by requiring students to pattern compositions on pre-established rhetorical forms. (2)

Likewise, Dixon states that the old pedagogy belittles the thinking ability of students while presupposing a cognitive superiority of the instructor (14). Dixon discovered on a practical level that the concepts of formal grammar simply did not help her students become better writers.

So why didn't other writing teachers realize this? Many teachers probably would not, or possibly had not known to, convert. Perhaps they did not have the time, adequate textbooks, or training to change, or perhaps they simply did not want to.

Teacher attitudes seemed to be an important aspect of the successful Flint Middle School Writing Project in Michigan described in 1986 by Rosen and Wright. The two-year project involved giving teachers a writing process model with which they helped students along composing stages. The project coordinators discovered that teaching the teachers of writing takes commitment on the part of students, teachers, and administrators alike:

> Any school or district embarking on a program that requires teachers to master a new set of understandings and skills must acknowledge the length of time it takes before the new learnings are consolidated and become a natural part of each teacher's instructional approach. Also, teachers' needs and concerns must be supported as they undertake the changes that lead to true professional progress. (19)

Though based on a middle school system, the realization this study evokes--that new instructional methods require time to be incorporated successfully--may seem to provide a valid excuse for the slowness with which college instructors have reacted to linguistic developments. Although the project was successful, Rosen and Wright admitted that many more teachers needed to be reached to make truly dramatic changes system-wide (19).

In "Basic Skills, Basic Writing, Basic Research", Joseph Trimmer asks, "Why hasn't the basic research on basic writing had more of an impact on remedial English?" (7). Dealing primarily with remediation, Trimmer concludes that remedial English courses at the time greatly resembled the basic skills courses of the turn of the century; mechanical correctness, drills, and exercises are emphasized. Sixty percent of basic writing programs he surveyed focused on sentence grammar (5). After talking with several publishing

house editors, Trimmer discovered that those textbooks on the educational market which were inclined toward the use of sentence grammar sold best. In a hopelessly cyclical pattern, teachers were buying those books because they were available and because they did not understand, believe in or examine other avenues, so publishers produced those books because that is what teachers bought (6-7). Charles Meyer suggests an obvious solution: instructors should stop having students buy those textbooks and should insist on updated manuals (29). This, of course, puts an even greater burden on educators, particularly inexperienced ones (and admittedly many freshman composition and remedial writing instructors are graduate students or part-time and non-tenured instructors). Instructors would first have to convince their administrations to allow more freedom of textbook choice; they then might have to instruct without textbooks if suitable replacements are not available--the educational equivalent of walking a tightrope without a net.

The textbooks available in 1985, particularly workbooks for basic writers, are reviewed by John A. R. Dick; he states that the best texts avoided "detailed reviews of traditional grammar" while giving students ample practice in writing, proofreading, and sentence combining (140). Among large (250-500 pages) workbooks, Dick mentions three as useful, clear, and complete. Rizzo's *The Writer's Studio*, Fawcett and Sandberg's *Grassroots*, and Fortune and Gray's

Experience to Exposition. Another text, *The Comp-Lab Exercises* by Epes, Kirkpatrick, and Southwell, offers supplemental tapes to help explain grammar and usage to students (141).

Better standard-sized workbooks (200-500 pages) include both exercises and discussion of grammar, often coupled with stylistic considerations; Dick focuses on Skurnick's *The Heath Basic Writer*, Licklider's *At Your Command*, and Sullivan's *Helpbook for Student Writers* (142). The brevity of shorter (under 250 pages) workbooks makes it necessary for instructors, even when using the better short texts, to supplement the exercises included (Dick 143).

Meyer finds the definitions of modern handbooks to be outdated; textbooks often seem to be based on the author's understanding of grammar and not on available research, and they are too often based on behavioristic psychology: "there is good evidence that the knowledge gained from exercises involving rote drill is not internalized very deeply (18, 20, 26). Meyer details Bartholomae's findings, which suggest that students do not perceive the errors in their own writing; they unconsciously correct many of the errors when reading the paper aloud (26). Meyer concludes, "Grammar may be only a small component of a writing course, but whenever we have occasion to teach it, we ought to teach it well" (29).

So, while many educators of the 1980s seemed to be repeating what research in the 1960s and '70s had already told them, their words also seemed to be falling on more than a few deaf ears. By the repetition of their conclusions, however, perhaps they were trying to awaken their sleeping companions. Calls for new approaches and textbooks seemed to suggest, especially in the latter 1980s, that some change was finally actually arriving in classrooms. In 1986, Connolly and Vilardi collected 28 descriptions of writing programs from across the country, discovering that "methods are replacing muddles. The daily practice of writing instruction is now generally informed by the rich theory and research of the past quarter century" (1). Connolly and Vilardi suggest that freshman English was increasingly interested in writing and reading: "Where handbooks are used, they are treated as reference tools, not course syllabi" (3). Basic writing courses were changing, too, away from "drill-and-skill remediation" to methodologies similar to those found in general writing courses (Connolly and Vilardi 3). However, other researchers were, by the late eighties, reassessing long-held beliefs and taking stock of the ammunition aimed at the teaching of grammar in writing instruction.

Some would suggest that in order to communicate, humans do require at least some knowledge of what part the individual words play in a sentence or paragraph or essay. Therefore, some terminology or very basic grammar instruction

supporting Edited American English seems necessary in order for students to be competitive on the collegiate level according to the more progressive works of the last decade, such as Kolln:

"...we have been misled into thinking we should somehow be able to teach such skills without giving our students a conscious understanding of grammar, the system of syntax in any systematic way" (49).

Several ways of incorporating grammar were presented in articles of the 1980s, while some writers said that the teacher's personal understanding of grammar is the link to helping students write better. Unlike the writers mentioned earlier who seemed to be in somewhat of a repetitive research cycle, these other researchers were at least questioning past findings. By encouraging a swing back towards grammar, they suggested that a completely anti-grammar approach was misguided. Unfortunately, the teachers who dealt with students daily had by that time fallen prey to the myth that no grammar at all should be taught. It perhaps became a convenient excuse for those teachers not confident of their personal understanding of grammar anyway. Kolln says, "we continue to cite those early studies...to justify excluding grammar study of any kind from the curriculum" instead of studying what aspects or methods of grammar instruction would be beneficial for students ("Alchemy" 141). The 1963

Research on Written Composition quotation, Kolln claims, had a harmful effect on freshman students:

> instead of seeking ways to use what the linguists have pointed out about the rules we have within us, to help our students better understand their own linguistic resources, we have quoted over and over again that unqualified and misleading statement about the harmful effects of teaching formal grammar. And we have bent over backwards to avoid spending classroom time on anything that smacks of grammar, old or new. ("Alchemy" 148)

However, despite the composing-process and linguistics revolutions, grammar never truly left. For example, in describing the self-paced freshman English course at a Texas college, William Shaw states that grammar tests and diagnostic testing were used to place students. Witte and Faigley published in 1983 their report of writing programs at four universities and their conclusions of how writing programs should be evaluated. Too often, they indicate, writing programs are judged via objective testing No doubt the importance of grammar in selecting students for advanced or basic courses continued throughout the '80s and remains today. Despite all the talk against the teaching of grammar, students were and still are required to understand it.

According to Neuleib and Brosnahan, writers <u>can</u> learn grammar, with certain effective instruction methods, and "the

newly acquired knowledge contributes to writing ability" (29). In "Teaching Grammar to Writers," Neuleib and Brosnahan also repeat that many readers had taken those famous words by Braddock, et al, out of context. Neuleib and Brosnahan seemed to think long-term exposure to grammatical concepts (when taught appropriately through grammar instruction such as Shaughnessy's error analysis, DeBeaugrande's learner's grammar, or Bartholomae's method of detecting error patterns) might affect writing positively.

Kolln likewise attacked the findings of Braddock, et al, criticizing their "undefined terms" and "strong and unqualified" language. She claims the report was based on unreliable research conducted by other educators over many years, and that very different conclusions could be (and had been by Meckel) drawn from them ("Alchemy" 140).

Neuleib and Brosnahan also criticize the conclusions Hartwell drew from Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's study: "The message teachers often carry from such an article is to abandon grammar instruction of any type" (34). The October 1985 Comment and Response section of *College English* contains rather harsh criticisms to Hartwell's February 1985 article. Joe Williams says Hartwell is wrong to suggest that "a knowledge of *any* grammar is irrelevant to the teaching of writing"; Williams says, "We *ought* to teach a grammar of style...*as a vocabulary crucial to talking about style...*" ("Four Comments" 642). Richard Cureton fears that Hartwell's

suggestions will politically demolish the study of the English language ("Four Comments" 643). Carole Moses says Hartwell was attempting to straddle the grammar fence: "he wants to use research to buttress his own position against grammar instruction but also wants to deny the validity of research when his own beliefs are threatened" ("Four Comments" 646). Moses says the study of grammar must be combined with the application of grammar in a student's own writing ("Four Comments" 647).

Ed Vavra said at a 1985 conference that Kellogg Hunt's 1965 work was also misinterpreted. Vavra said wrong conclusions were drawn: "Hunt never conducted a study that led to the conclusion that grammar is not worth studying (or teaching)" (3). Graves and Elgin had reached similar assertions, and in 1986, Meyer repeated "we cannot ignore the teaching of grammar, nor can we expect it to succeed if it is taught the traditional way" (17).

So, if teachers of the 1980s did happen to read any professional journals, what types of models could they expect? How could they incorporate a less structured grammar curriculum into the writing classroom? Suggestions, as one might expect, varied considerably. In 1981, Bamberg suggested modifying the "student writes, teacher corrects" method to one of peer review, and she also encouraged a combination of traditional and transformational grammars. Using those same techniques, Rouse reported in 1985 that he

had seen improvement in the writings of his night course basic writing students. Papay found that transformational and structural grammars helped improve students' writing while encouraging mental discipline. Gorrell also promoted the use of transformational grammar. In 1981, Joseph Swonk described his interesting method of correlating grammatical structures with the personality types of his students. Carl Shinkle expressed in 1987 what many other writers of the 1980s had said: grammar is best taught in connection with actual student writing.

Since "lack of interest fosters poor writing," Marilyn Kurata devised a procedure to combat the inevitable situation when the need for grammatical instruction rears its ugly head in a composition classroom:

> Students with extensive writing experience in high school are bored by a review of basic grammar and essay format. Students who are less well-prepared are confused by the avalanche of rules and forms which instructors are required to cover. (4)

Subsequently, Kurata encouraged student review of work.

In separate articles in 1984, DeBeaugrande discussed the use of grammar in the classroom. In "Forward to the Basics: Getting Down to Grammar," he indicates that grammar should not be expressed vaguely or technically, but rather with the grammar of the students' own speech:

> None of the many textbooks that cross my desk explains grammar in a way that a naive, unskilled writer can immediately understand and use. . . .as long as school grammar is couched in vague or technical terms, it is not 'basic' enough to help students with genuine literacy problems, and we will achieve very little by going 'back' to it. (DeBeaugrande 358-359)

DeBeaugrande suggests that grammar be accurate, workable, economical, compact, operational, and immediate ("Forward" 359). In "Yes, Teaching Grammar Does Help," DeBeaugrande again encourages teachers to use a learner's grammar with clear, practical language.

Likewise, Woods suggests in his 1985 article that teachers not choose the easy approach of teaching grammar, "a reductive, mechanical study of labels and paradigms" ("Cultural Tradition" 11). Rather, he says grammar should be related to literature, non-fiction prose, composition, and speaking. Micheal S. Kearns accurately assesses the need of college freshmen for the vocabulary which grammar instruction provides. He suggests in "Basic Grammar and Freshman Composition" that four modules of grammar should be integrated into first year writing courses: syntax, free sentence combining, directed sentence revision, and theory. Within each module, special emphasis remains on the students' writing.

Berkowitz and Watkins-Goffman write in "Putting Grammar in Its Place in the Writing Curriculum" that grammar can best be inserted into the teaching of writing at the editing stage. Therefore, students still have initial freedom to express their own ideas, and grammar instruction becomes more meaningful as they incorporate it into their actual work. Boiarsky said in 1981 that meshing student writing with grammar instruction, along with other techniques, had proven effective in metropolitan Atlanta schools.

Ellery Sedgwick suggests in "Alternatives to Teaching Formal, Analytical Grammar" that transformational grammar, sentence combining, expansion, and imitation are just a few viable ways of teaching syntax and usage. In a 1981 article, Dale Holloway advocates three semantic theories: case grammars, the "given-new" contract, and cohesion.

One 1988 essay that echoes voices of the 1970s--and that decade's acknowledgement of the validity of the student's own dialect--would probably have been considered blasphemous by legions of long-departed traditional grammar advocates and by many instructors just a mere thirty years earlier! Tom Romano points out that perhaps students should use no grammar at all (in *creative* writing drills). He suggests allowing sentence fragments and double voice among other traits of Grammar B (an alternate style proposed by Winston Weathers) in student writing. Although obviously not acceptable in formal communication, this approach might very well have a

positive effect on students' attitudes. It seems logical that if a student is allowed to play with language, and if he can eventually learn to enjoy writing, then half of a teacher's battle is won.

Thomas Friedmann raises the issue that grammar rules are boring to composition students; also, grammar rules are often accompanied by *incorrect* examples in handbooks. Rather than being shown what to do, some textbooks detail what not to do. He indicates that students should be taught using correct versions of a grammatical situation, which are then rewritten. Obviously, a strategy linking correct guidelines with wrong examples could have been leading students astray for years.

In 1984, Martha Kolln repeated her assertion that the importance of teaching grammar had been overshadowed by the harsh criticism of the 1960s and '70s against formal grammar. In "Rhetorical Grammar for Students," Kolln says teachers should show students how grammar is important to rhetoric by teaching sentence slotting. Once students understand that sentences are a series of slots that can be filled in a variety of ways, then stylistic instruction can occur by looking at how the arrangements of those slots change the rhythm and meaning of the sentences.

Regardless of the approach taken, the ultimate success of a composition course in its goal of creating better writers is determined by its instructor. Noguchi noted in

1987 that "errors persist not because of the lack of language ability in students but because of the instructor's lack in exploiting that ability" (26). Similarly, Neuleib and Brosnahan say, "In our opinion, the preparation of teachers is the crucial issue in teaching effectiveness. A confused teacher increases student perplexity" (31).

Neuleib and Brosnahan's grammatical testing of twenty-four English certification candidates revealed that "an obvious discrepancy existed between the prospective teachers' perceptions of their formal grammar knowledge and their demonstrated knowledge" (32). Though the candidates rated themselves a three or above (on a scale of one to five) in grammatical skills, "The results of the grammar test, given with the questionnaire, however, indicated little retention of formal grammatical knowledge and an inability to apply grammar to editing problems" (Neuleib and Brosnahan 32). Most said they had learned grammar through traditional instruction methods. The authors of the study say that "unless teachers are informed about the imperfections of traditional grammar, students will fail to understand it and thereby to learn and retain it" (Neuleib and Brosnahan 31). The suggestion is made that instructors "study the historical background of grammar, be well-acquainted with better descriptions of language...and appreciate relations among different grammars" (Neuleib and Brosnahan 33). The authors conclude, "When teachers do more than 'cover' grammar,

writers will improve their writing by using the grammar they have learned" (33).

Teachers of the 1980s still insisting on pursuing a strictly traditional grammar curriculum to increase writing students' skills had surely missed both the incoming and outgoing tides of change that developed between the 1960s and the 1990s. By that time, as Kolln states, "Grammar" no longer had to be "synonymous with diagramming or drillwork or memorizing rules; studying grammar can also mean thoughtful discussion of choices in generating and combining and manipulating sentences--at every level of the curriculum" ("Alchemy" 149). Nevertheless, research on how to enable instructors to better reach their students remained inconclusive at the end of the 1980s. Writers such as Kolln and Neuleib and Brosnahan who suggested a return to grammar, though with a departure from traditional methods, seemed credible and progressive, indicating possible directions for the 1990s.

CHAPTER 4

THE NINETIES AND BEYOND

As many as three centuries ago, English instructors were the objects of ridicule by critics as formidable as Milton: "...how much contemptible nonsense there is from the grammarians and teachers of composition. When the former teach their art, they talk like barbarians, and the latter talk like infants" (qtd. in Friedrich 22). A look at the history of grammar and composition instruction in America throughout the past two centuries suggests that a great deal of confused babbling has taken place here as well. Connors sees grammar's place as partner, willing or otherwise, to rhetoric:

> A great deal of the history of composition in America seems to be a clumsy shuffle-dance of grammar with rhetoric, with first one and then another leading. It will not end soon, for the wish for certainty and algorithmic closure represented by the one struggles always with the desire for originality and creativity represented by the other. So long as language is part science,

> part art, and part magic, the grammarians and the rhetoricians will be struggling with each other to lead the dance. (22)

The desire for that certainty and closure will assuredly keep the need for an understanding of grammar and usage critical to the ability to write, although instruction of that knowledge is gradually being deleted from collegiate classrooms. The preceding chapters reveal that grammar instruction was prominent, with some minor exceptions, throughout much of the 1800s and early 1900s; after the 1960s, it began to lose that prominence, but by the close of the 1980s, scholars were beginning to rethink the conclusions that decline was based upon. Northrop Frye is quoted in Hagstrum as saying, "I do not know what role the nomenclature of grammar plays in the study of writing, at what stage it should be learned, or how much of it is really essential, but of its central importance there cannot be any real question" (54).

A mere understanding of what constitutes a noun or verb is, however, useless unless it can help students become more proficient in, and perhaps interested in, language. In our increasingly complex society, students must continually upgrade their language abilities; Friedrich says, "...the skills of speaking and listening, reading and writing are so essential in our highly articulate modern society that they require central and continuing attention" (20).

Writing itself is becoming a critically important skill on the job, unlike the early period of American history when oral culture was supreme, according to Witte and Faigley. They say college graduates are increasingly using writing as a vocational skill (43). With the rise in importance of print, an increase in the number of writing errors committed seems inevitable; Friedrich bemoans this fact: "The misuse of language in public life is a widespread and notorious practice, ranging from ignorant faults and obscurities to calculated deceptions" (20). Kitzhaber reminds us, though, that content is critical as well; "...correctness alone does not make good writing. A student who writes well must have something to say and must say it effectively" (*Themes* 90).

Twenty years after this comment was made, however, a survey of English department directors and instructors revealed that they thought the public wanted them to produce students who were able to create "mechanically correct" writing upon graduation (Witte and Faigley 43). The introduction of the appropriateness of a variety of dialects that began in the seventies--reaffirmed by a recent Ann Arbor court decision that acknowledged the black English dialect's legitimacy (Holbrook 260)--has perhaps only begun to reach the grass roots level. Students are finally able to express themselves in their native dialect (although with the understanding that academic and career presentations should still be completed in Edited American English), and are

finding more channels for their communication than ever. The introduction of computers/word processing systems into the classrooms are opening up new areas for student instruction (and opening up yet another area of possible student confusion or intimidation, making it all the more necessary for students to be comfortable with their language).

Instruction in composition classrooms is expanding to also include television programs and films, collaborative learning techniques, such as peer tutoring, and conferencing with individual students (Witte and Faigley 54-56). Sentence combining seems to be used less extensively despite rhetorical applications that can be made with it. Overall, a "by-the-way" approach to the study of grammar and the detection of usage and mechanical problems within students' own writing seems to be the direction composition instructors will be taking in the nineties and beyond. All of these methods can present the fundamentals of grammar to students without relying on the traditional methods of rote drills and boring exercises. Less pressure is placed now on freshman composition instructors--who have been told so long not to teach grammar that many perhaps do not know how--to present effective grammar lessons and an avoidance of errors. The surge in writing centers, one-to-one conferencing, and peer-editing reflects the new approaches that ensure students' grammatical problems are addressed.

Writing-across-the-curriculum promises to be another method by which students will be given the opportunity to increase their writing abilities; the fact that students are provided with subject matter on which to write and a context in which to write seems to be a motivational approach for not only helping students better express themselves but to also reach a better understanding of their subject. An increasing number of "writing intensive" courses are showing up in college catalogs. Whether these WAC courses are housed under the English department or under their respective departments, a critical eye--one just as keen as the one that has been focused on English department writing courses over the years--must remain on the effectiveness of the instruction. A sheer number of words written without supervision (possible as other faculty members begin to realize the amount of time it takes to read/grade essays) might have students writing *more* but the quality of thought and expression might not be increasing.

Witte and Faigley suggest that the complex process of evaluating an entire writing program "involves much more than assessing the written products of students at the beginning and the ending of a term" (2). Not only do the evaluator's personal preferences become important, but the variety of approaches among writing programs creates an evaluative problem as well (Witte and Faigley 74). Witte and Faigley suggest that evaluators ask some probing questions about

writing programs and include topics such as cognitive skill development, students' ability to write effectively in other disciplines, student attitudes, differing delivery methods, whether or not the program makes "the public sensitive to abuses of language," and selection of text materials (75-77).

Evaluating textbooks must become a process whereby instructors look beyond what's popular or successful and determine what will ultimately be effective; a best seller may not necessarily be pedagogically sound. Writing instructors must constantly question the effectiveness of techniques being used. This is sure to begin occurring more consistently across the country, because finally the instruction of instructors is being considered. Advanced degrees in the teaching of composition and rhetoric are being offered, and research in the field is gaining prestige. The result, I hope, will be more articulate, sound research attempting to determine the best ways to incorporate linguistics and grammar--if indeed they are ultimately proven to be needed in composition classrooms--and to determine better ways of refining methods and reviewing textbooks. Another result will be that instructors will be urged to complete training in linguistics, grammar, and general studies of the English language; regardless of whether or not those topics are presented to freshmen, they are vital information to everyone working intimately with the written language.

Researching the previous chapters leads me to believe that research in grammar instruction has been ambiguous at best. I feel the validity of research that serves as the basis for instruction must be continually questioned, though not to the point of being completely skeptical. The intent and findings of studies must be examined and evaluated on their own worth; subsequent studies that build upon those works should be undertaken.

I see occasionally reversing roles with students and thereby writing ourselves is a vital way both to understand the demands placed on students and to experience the constraints the "rules" of our language can place on writers. Essentially, instructors should, in my opinion, undertake a myriad of approaches to the teaching of writing to ensure that all students eventally come to an understanding of how they can improve their writing and of the tools (words or parts of speech) that comprise their language. Instruction must be made interesting to the students, but just as they learn the language of other fields (for example, mathematics and science), so must they come to know the freedom which a knowledge of grammatical patterns can bring to their writing.

Teaching students to write maturely, effectively, and clearly (which implies that somehow, somewhere they understand what is and is not acceptable usage for that specific context) can be frustrating, difficult, exciting, rewarding, and sometimes, nearly impossible. However,

legions of English instructors have, no doubt, been thanked years later for the changes they were able to produce in a student's writing. The work and its repurcussions can be lasting, as Christensen suggests: "...if we succeed in our teaching, the features we have settled upon will mark the style of the generations we teach. What we teach and the way we teach it, do have an effect, and the effect can be bad as readily as good" ("Problem" 573). Instructors must examine what has been studied, written, and tried in the past and must understand what pedagogies have informed their own instructional methods and viewpoints, all of which, it is hoped, this survey will help achieve. Scholars must examine all of what has been done and then make suggestions for further studies or new approaches. I feel instructors owe this much to the profession, to the students, and to society to be prepared and to prepare students to express thoughts which can be clearly understood in a world of split-second communications. "Composition teachers should realize that it is not enough for a young writer to have something to say. Finally, he must be able to express it..." (O'Hare 75).

CHAPTER 5

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is an annotated bibliography of sources available in the field of grammar instruction. Sources are divided according to the era in which they were published; dates used to divide the sections correspond to those used in the preceding chapters.

1800-1960

Abbott, Edwin A. *How to Write Clearly*. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1875.

Attempts to determine the grammatical mistakes most often made and then to create a rule to warn against that particular error; the text has been called the first handbook of composition.

Adams, John Q. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory, Delivered to the Classes of Senior and Junior Sophisters in Harvard University*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Hilliard and Metcalf, 1810.

The first Professor of Rhetoric at Harvard, Adams presents in lectures this comprehensive rhetoric which completely guides the student to better rhetorical writing.

Asker, William. "Does Knowledge of Grammar Function?" *School and Society* 17 (27 Jan. 1923): 109-111.

Finds no relationship between grammatical knowledge and the ability to spot errors in writing.

Barbour, F. A. "History of English Grammar Teaching." *Educational Review* 12 (1896): 487-507.

Details the trends in grammar instruction including the move by some states to drop grammar teaching; offers comments about grammar instruction from instructors and linguists.

---. *The Teaching of English Grammar: History and Method.* Boston: Ginn, 1901.

Includes a rationale for using techniques in the 19th-century closely resembling modern sentence combining.

Blair, Hugh. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres.* Philadelphia: Troutman and Hayes, 1853.

This popular, influential rhetoric encourages the study of literature to evoke efficient writing; good style, Blair says, requires a knowledge of grammar.

Bloomfield, Leonard. "Why a Linguistic Society?" *Language* 1 (1925).

Defends the Linguistic Society of America; says instructors know little about linguistic science, or even language.

Buck, Gertrude. "Make-Believe Grammar." *School Review* 17 (1909): 21-33.

Critiques sentence diagramming because it is mechanical and linear.

Campbell, George. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric.* London: William Tegg, 1850.

States that the aim of the orator is the effect on the audience, not invention; suggests that "grammar ends where eloquence begins."

Connolly, Francis and Donald Sears. *The Sentence in Context: Essentials of Grammar and Rhetoric.* Harcourt, Brace, 1959.

This college grammar workbook addresses linguistics and can be used as a condensed rhetoric text.

Committee of Ten. *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies.* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1893.

Determines that grammar should be at the heart of English instruction because of its ability to help students think logically and not because of any ability to aid correctness.

Davidson, Donald. *American Composition and Rhetoric.* 4th ed. Scribner's, 1959.

This college composition textbook includes grammar and models of writing, plus a correction chart.

Day, Henry. *Elements of the Art of Rhetoric.* Hudson, OH: Skinner, 1850.

Follows many precepts of Campbell in this philosophical rhetoric.

---. *Grammatical Synthesis: The Art of English Composition.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1867.

Unites grammar, rhetoric, and logic since all are based on Thought in this text used by some colleges in the late 1860s, though never very popular.

---. "Study of the English Language." *American Journal of Education* 16 (March 1866): 641-651.

Questions how composition should be taught in American schools and universities; suggests drills in capitalizing, punctuation, and paragraphing, then exercises in helping the student connect the appropriate words with his thought, and finally a progression to rhetorical considerations.

Dean, Leonard F. and Kenneth G. Wilson. *Essays on Language and Usage*. Oxford, 1959.

This college reader presents a selection of language and usage texts; correctness in writing is de-emphasized.

DeBoer, John J. "Grammar in Language Teaching." *Elementary English* 36 (1959): 412-21.

States that the variety and consistency of findings of studies have shown negative results when examining the effect of grammar on the improvement of language expression.

Farley, F. E. and George Lyman Kittredge. *An Advanced English Grammar*. Boston: 1913.

Suggests that living languages must change in this popular grammar textbook.

Francis, W. Nelson. "Revolution in Grammar." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 40 (1954): 299-312.

Defines three meanings of grammar: 1) the patterns of language; 2) the science of studying those patterns; and 3) proper usage.

Fries, Charles C. *American English Grammar*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1940.

Attempts to inform instructors of modern grammatical knowledge.

---. "Preface." *The Teaching of the English Language*. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1927.

Says linguistic study developments had not reached schoolrooms; most still followed an eighteenth-century point of view and worshipped grammar rules.

Gardiner, J. H., et al. *Manual of Composition and Rhetoric.* Boston: 1907.

Espouses the notion of linguistic change; says traditional reference texts are authoritative only in that they represent the best writing available.

Genung, John F. *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric.* Boston: Ginn, 1886.

Combines grammar with rhetoric in this popular textbook; refers to grammatical elements as "Fundamental Principles."

Gilmore, Joseph H. *Outlines of the Art of Expression.* Boston: Ginn, 1876.

Combines formal grammar and sentence-level advice with stylistic rhetoric; perceives that much of pupils' early training in English is defective.

Godkin, E. L. "The Illiteracy of American Boys." *Educational Review* 13 (1897).

States that instructors should not be required to teach the basics of the English language on the college level. The Harvard Report, of which Godkin was an author, studied the English A course at Harvard to determine its effectiveness at helping students write better.

Greene, Samuel S. *An Analysis of the English Language.* Philadelphia: Cowperthwaite, 1874.

Includes the writing of original sentences within his grammar lessons; seems to view grammar as a science and carefully examines the mechanics of sentence analysis.

Guth, Hans. *Words and Ideas: A Handbook for College Writing.* San Francisco: Wadsworth, 1959.

Presents innovative grammatical analysis methods; logic and persuasion sections are also included.

Guthrie, Warren. "The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America, 1635-1850." *Speech Monographs* XIII (1946), 14-22; XIV (1947), 38-54; XV (1948), 61-71; XVI (1949), 98-113; XVIII (1951), 17-30.

Offers an introduction to 19th-century rhetoric; James Berlin says he has been influenced by this groundbreaking study.

Hatfield, Wilbur, et al. *An Experience Curriculum in English*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1935.

Condemns the teaching of grammar in this NCTE document; because no scientific evidence had proven grammar's value, the authors suggest that it be de-emphasized.

Hill, Adams Sherman. *Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition*. New York: American Book Co., 1902.

Written for secondary school students, this text repeats Hill's notions of constant linguistic change.

---. *The Foundations of Rhetoric*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1892.

Focuses on words, sentences, and paragraphs in this composition text.

---. *The Principles of Rhetoric and their Application*. New York: American Book Co., 1878, 1886.

Suggests that language evolves depending on frequence of usage and new inventions.

Hosic, James F. "The Essentials of Composition and Grammar." *School and Society* 1 (1915): 581-87.

Examines studies by Hoyt (1906), Briggs (1913), Charters (1915), and Johnson (1917) which suggest that grammar instruction does not affect composition.

Hoyt, Franklin S. "The Place of Grammar in the Elementary Curriculum." *Teachers College Record* 7 (1906): 483-84.

Finds no connection between grammatical study and logical thinking abilities and concludes there is no relation between technical grammar knowledge and the ability to use English.

Hunt, T. W. "The Study of English in American Colleges." *Educational Review* 12 (Sept. 1896): 140-50.

Describes the history and recent developments in literature, language, and rhetoric in American colleges.

Jesperson, Otto. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles.* New York: Barnes and Noble, 1909-1949.

A grammar textbook based on traditional grammar, it refines terms from those typically used in the 18th century.

Kirkham, Samuel. *English Grammar in Familiar Lectures.* New York: Robert B. Collins, 1825.

Addresses the text of this grammar directly to the student attempting "practical writing."

Krapp, George Philip. *Modern English: Its Growth and Present Use.* New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Differentiates between standard English and good English; says language should help writers attain their goals.

Laird, Charlton. "The Parts, or Vestigal Remnants, of Speech." *College English* 18 (1957).

States that structural linguistics is difficult and exacting, that linguists are in disagreement about the teaching of structural linguistics, and that many teachers are not yet trained in teaching it.

Leonard, Sterling A. *Current English Usage*. Chicago: Inland Press, 1932.

This text, published posthumously, helps develop the empirical reality of usage.

Lloyd, Donald J. and Harry R. Warfel. *American English in its Cultural Setting*. 1956.

This college text uses structural grammar as a model.

Lyman, Rollo L. *English Grammar in American Schools Before 1850*. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1921, No. 12.

Details the rash of prescriptive grammar texts and articles especially prevalent from 1785-1800; also describes the 50 year rise in popularity of grammar in elementary and secondary schools after 1775.

Macrorie, Ken. *The Perceptive Writer, Reader, and Speaker*. Harcourt, Brace, 1959.

Details "revolutionary grammar" (based on structural linguistics); emphasizes the idea of perception in the process of composing, and includes sections on social problems with language and on the mass media.

Marble, Albert P. "On Teaching the Effective Use of English." *Educational Review* (Jan. 1892): 22-30.

Says the appropriate, elegant, and forcible use of the language implies culture and a knowledge of the language; to achieve this, the author suggests instructors expose students to good literature and to correct speaking and that they provide students a variety of topics in writing.

Marsh, George P. *Lectures on the English Language*. New York: Scribner's, 1860.

Sees grammar knowledge helpful as a means of talking about language rather than using it to create.

Mead, William E. "Conflicting Ideals in the Teaching of English." *Educational Review* (March 1903): 275-288.

Presents the results of a survey conducted on a variety of educational levels to a variety of individuals across the U.S. concerning whether composition instruction should focus on writing clearly and correctly about ordinary events or on the production of literature; concludes that conflict on the issue runs rampant.

---. "The Undergraduate Study of English Composition." *The School Review* 10.5 (May 1902): 317-331.

Offers a report of the Pedagogical Section of the MLA based on a survey of college and university teachers across the country concerning the value of having freshmen steadily write essays throughout the year.

Moore, Robert H. *Effective Writing.* 2nd ed. Rinehart, 1959.

Emphasizes the use of function over form in selecting proper grammatical usage, though it primarily acts as a traditional grammar text; deductive logic is addressed.

Murray, Lindley. *An English Grammar, Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners.* York: Wilson, Spence & Mawman, 1795.

This famous grammar text sets forth the notion that grammar is the art of using language properly.

Newman, Samuel P. *A Practical System of Rhetoric.* New York: Mark H. Newman, 1843.

Suggests the use of outlines and instructor grading and encouragement; his view of the necessity of correctness is adapted from Campbell.

Reed, Alonzo, and Brainerd Kellogg. *Higher Lessons in English*. New York: Clark and Maynard, 1877.

Presents diagram practices, drills, and exercises; suggests that grammar is necessary but must be serviceable.

Reid, Ronald F. The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, 1806-1904: A Case Study in Changing Concepts of Rhetoric and Pedagogy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 45 (1959): 239-57.

Details changes in American colleges and universities in the 18th century and suggests that tutors began to specialize during that period.

Roberts, Paul. *Patterns of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1956.

Roberts' collegiate level textbook incorporates structural linguistics.

Scott, Fred Newton and Joseph Villiers Denney. *Elementary English Composition*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1900, rev. 1908.

Combines grammar and rhetoric so that pupils begin to understand the advantages of correct usage to their writing; students are, among other things, asked to combine sentences based on a rhetorical passage.

Searing, Annie E. P. "Why College Graduates are Deficient in English." *Educational Review* 16 (Oct. 1898): 244-53.

Calls for a more thorough and advanced teaching of English language; seems to find the current state of English instruction deplorable and so seeks reform among instructors in grading and among colleges in emphasizing English over Latin and Greek.

Shaw, Harry, et al. *A Complete Course in Freshman English.* 5th ed. Harper, 1959.

This complete course textbook for freshman composition presents information on semantics, communication, and grammar, and also readings.

Smith, J. Harold. "A Plan for Presenting Grammar." *English Journal* 48 (Oct. 1959): 404-06.

Presents a plan establishing the noun and the verb as the two basic parts of the sentence, thereby reducing the intimidation of grammar on the student.

Smith, Roswell Chamberlain. *English Grammar on the Productive System: a method of instruction recently adopted in Germany and Switzerland.* New York: Collins and Haney, 1831.

Presents exercises requiring students to build their own sentences; admits being influenced by the inductive and productive systems as described by Pestalozzi.

Swinton, William. *Language Lessons.* 1873.

This popular textbook popularized the phrase, "Language Lessons."

Thurber, Charles H. "English as It is Taught." *The School Review* 6.5 (May 1898).

Reports the findings of a survey of business and professional men to detect what studies in high school are considered "fundamental"; English was easily chosen as the most crucial element.

Tower, David B. *Gradual Lessons in Grammar.* Boston: Sanborn, Carter, Bazin, 1846.

Includes a definition of grammar as knowledge allowing us to write and speak correctly.

Tupper, Frederick, Jr. "The Study of the History of the English Language." *The School Review* 14.3 (March 1906): 191-203.

Details the history of the "scientific" study of English, the history of the language itself, and that history's impact on appreciation of literature.

Tuttle, A. E. "The Study of the English Language." *The School Review* 14.3 (March 1906): 204-211.

Suggests that teachers are the crucial factor in determining student performance in the English classroom; emphasizes the use of correct enunciation, pronunciation, terminology, and the study of English masterpieces.

Warfel, Harry R. "Structural Linguistics and Composition." *College English* 20 (Feb. 1959).

Proclaims that a revolutionary change must take place in composition instruction due to the development of structural linguistics.

Wendell, Barrett. *English Composition*. New York: 1908.

Emphasizes the need for accuracy in communication; suggests that problems of usage can be divided into two categories: barbarisms (the use of words not in our language) and improprieties (the misuse of words in our language).

Wells, William H. "Methods of Teaching English Grammar." *Barnard's American Journal of Education* 5 (1865): 148-49.

Bemoans the fact that memorization of textbook grammar rules will not help students make better speeches or automatically acquire a control of the language.

Withey, Elizabeth Aborn. "Sub-Freshman English."

Educational Review (Dec. 1897): 468-95.

At the request of A. S. Hill of Harvard, Withey presents the written exams of admission candidates to Harvard in 1896; the plethora of mistakes made are carefully and exhaustively reprinted.

Wooley, Edwin C. *Handbook of Composition: A Compendium of Rules*. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1907.

Offers 350 prescriptive, error-based rules of grammar to help prevent writing mistakes.

1960-1980

Ashida, Margaret E. and Leslie T. Whipp. "A Slide-Rule Composition Course." *College English* 25 (Oct. 1963): 18-22.

Details their method of asking students to describe and imitate the structures found in professional writing.

Bamberg, Betty. "Composition instruction Does Make a Difference: A Comparison of the High School Preparation of College Freshmen in Regular and Remedial English Classes." *RTE* 12 (1978): 47-59.

Reports surveys that indicate that time spent on learning grammar in high school is less important than eight other factors in determining regular from remedial writers in college.

Barton, Thomas L. and Anna M. Beachner. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. Menlo Park, CA: Cummings Publishing Co., 1970.

Examines English composition in American two-year colleges, with special emphasis on the remedial programs within them and suggestions for improving them.

Bateman, D. R. and F. J. Zidonis. *The Effect of a Study of Transformational Grammar on the Writing of Ninth and Tenth Graders*. Champaign, IL: NCTE Research Report No. 6, 1966.

Discovers that students studying transformational grammar improved sentence development skills as opposed to students in non-grammar classes.

Bornstein, Diane D. *Readings in the Theory of Grammar, from the 17th to the 20th Century*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1976.

Provides a history of the study of grammar, plus methodology, goals, and readings in the various theories of grammar, including traditional, descriptive, and transformational grammars.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. *Research in Written Composition*. Urbana, IL: National College of Teachers of English, 1963.

Examines five studies about composition--Buxton, Harris, Kincaid, Smith, and Becker. One sentence often quoted from this work had a great deal to do with grammar instruction's demise in the 1960s and '70s: "the teaching of formal grammar has a negligible or...even a harmful effect on the improvement of writing." A qualification of this statement appears earlier in the text but has often been ignored.

Chomsky, Noam. *Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1966.

Offers explanations of generative grammar's workings in response to misunderstandings expressed by others.

Christensen, Francis. "Notes Toward a New Rhetoric: Sentence Openers." *College English* 25 (Oct. 1963): 7-11.

Compares the sentence openers written by professional writers and by a college writer and finds similarities, thereby discrediting devices such as sentence graphs.

---. "The Problem of Defining a Mature Style." *English Journal* 57 (April 1968): 572-579.

Warns that encouraging students to write with increasing maturity may in fact be leading them to write jargonistic prose instead of the prose of professional writers.

Committee on College Composition and Communication Language Statement. "Students' Right to Their Own Language." *College Composition and Communication* 25 (Fall 1974).

Presents the committee's official statement on the necessity for English instructors to accept a variety of dialects and the validity of the student's own language.

Daiker, Donald A., Andrew Kerek, and Max Morenberg. "Sentence-Combining and Syntactic Maturity in Freshman English." *College Composition and Communication* 29 (1978): 36-41.

Using only sentence-combining exercises and essay writing for instructional methods, the authors find that college students significantly increased progress in their writing, including areas of surface structure and punctuation.

Elley, W. B., I. H. Barham, H. Lamb, and W. Wyllie. "The Role of Grammar in a Secondary School English Curriculum." *Research in the Teaching of English* 10 (Spring 1976): 18.

Studies three methods of grammar instruction--traditional, transformational, and no formal grammar--and finds little difference in students after three years.

Estrin, Herman A. "Grammar and Usage in a Composition/Communication Course: A Survey of Eighty Colleges and Universities." *College English* 23 (Oct. 1961): 43-49.

Provides responses to a questionnaire completed by 80 colleges and universities about the incorporation and teaching of grammar in composition courses.

Fichtenau, Robert L. "Some Rhetorical Considerations for Teaching the Young Writer." *English Journal* 54 (Nov. 1965): 720-23.

Suggests breaking up the study of rhetoric into several small pieces to make it more digestible to beginning writers; a study of semantics should follow this study, not precede it, so the student understands semantics' impact on his own writing.

Friedrich, Gerhard. "The English Teacher and the Process of Communication." *English Journal* 55.1 (Jan. 1966): 19-27.

Calls for a fresh sensitivity and a useful inventiveness in composition classrooms to increase economy and clarity in communication; says the teaching of composition should be privileged over literature.

Fries, Charles C. "Advances in Linguistics." *College English* 23 (1961): 37.

Suggests that teachers should assimilate knowledge of linguistic science and take that understanding to the composition class rather than its tools.

---. "Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English." Robert C. Pooley, ed. *Perspectives in English*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.

Suggests that the goal of early grammar study was "*analysis* for the sake of *classification*."

Frye, Northrop. "Elementary Teaching and Elemental Scholarship." Address delivered at the 1963 meeting of the Modern Language Association, Chicago, IL.

Says grammar is of central importance, though the author is unsure of the role it plays in studying writing or when or how much should be taught.

Gleason, Henry A., Jr. *Linguistics and English Grammar.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Describes the school tradition grammar, which is characterized by the importance of the word and the sentence and by the classification of words into parts of speech.

Gordon, Edward J. and Edward S. Noyes, eds. *Essays on the Teaching of English: Reports of the Yale Conferences on the Teaching of English.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960.

Presents 18 essays focusing on the teaching of language, writing, and literature in high schools, all of which were presented as reports at the Yale Conferences.

Greenfield, John and William Woods. "Combining Writing Texts: An Illusion of Progress." *CCC* 25.4 (1974): 310-312.

Describes the method used by Indiana University instructors of incorporating two extremely different texts (one encourages free-writing and the other, structural writing); concludes that a variety of sources can be useful as long as the two different approaches are not put at odds with each other.

Hagstrum, Jean H. "Book Review: *Research in Written Composition.*" *College English* 26.1 (Oct. 1964): 53-57.

Reviews the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer work of 1963 and summarizes the five studies (Buxton, Harris, Kincaid, Smith, and Becker) on which the work is based; none of the five studies are thought by the author to be particularly definitive or persuasive.

Harris, R. J. "An Experimental Inquiry into the Functions and Value of Formal Grammar in the Teaching of English, with Special Reference to the Teaching of Correct Written English to Children Aged Twelve to Fourteen." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1962.

Examines writing samples from ten classes of high-school students written over a two-year period; classes studying formal grammar did not perform as well as those studying common composition errors and using sentence generation practice.

Hunt, Kellogg W. *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels*. Champaign, IL: NCTE, 1965.

Isolates "growth buds" of writing maturity in 4th, 8th, and 12th grade writers, determining that the increased presence of clause and non-clause structures may be produced by sentence combining exercises.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. "New Perspectives on Teaching Composition." *College English* 23 (March 1962): 440-44.

Describes two model courses in learning to teach composition to college freshmen; finds instructing teachers in the composing process is often necessary before the teachers can then help students.

---. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

Reports findings of the Dartmouth study of student writing in American colleges; concludes reforms need to be made in teacher-training, in awareness of linguistic developments, in faculty attitudes across campuses toward the quality of student writing, in textbooks, and in remedial courses, and the author seems hopeful at the development of programmed learning and structural linguistics.

Leggett, Glenn. "What are Colleges and Universities Doing in Written Composition?" *College English* 23 (Oct. 1961): 40-42.

Offers suggestions to rescue freshman composition from being the stale, unappreciated service course it has become.

Meckel, Henry. "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature." *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Nathaniel L. Gage, ed. Chicago: Rand, 1963.

Reveals that questions still exist about the teaching of grammar, especially its long-term study and its capability of teaching editing skills, among other things.

Mellon, John C. *Transformational Sentence-Combining: A Method for Enhancing the Development of Syntactic Fluency in English Composition.* Urbana, IL: NCTE Research Report No. 10, 1969.

Uses sentence combining exercises to help students learn transformational grammar; hypothesizes that the combination of the two should make students better writers.

Muir, James. *A Modern Approach to English Grammar: An Introduction to Systemic Grammar.* London: B.T. Batsford, Ltd., 1972.

Describes the systematic linguistics model, working from morpheme to sentence.

NCTE and CCCC Joint Committee. *English in the Two-Year College.* Samuel Weingarten, Chairman. Champaign, IL: NCTE, 1965.

Represents the findings of questionnaires completed by 187 English department heads and 292 instructors at two year colleges across the country; the survey reveals

that few instructors were abreast of linguistic developments at the time.

Neuleib, Janice. "The Relation of Formal Grammar to Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 28.3 (Oct. 1977): 247-50.

Reviews the five studies which summarize what was then believed about the study of grammar instruction, and describes strengths and weaknesses of the Harris, Bateman-Zidonis, Mellon, Braddock et al, and the New Zealand studies.

O'Hare, Frank. *Sentence Combining: Improving Student Writing without Formal Grammar Instruction.* NCTE Report No. 15. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1973.

Studies 7th grade writers exposed to sentence combining exercises and finds their T-Unit count higher than that of a 7th grade control group.

Ragle, Thomas and the Committee on Grammar. "What About Grammar?" Edward J. Gordon and Edward S. Noyes, eds. *Essays on the Teaching of English: Reports of the Yale Conferences on the Teaching of English.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960; 34-58.

Suggests that language changes and instructors should not continue instructing a static grammar but should more thoroughly examine linguistics.

Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations.* New York: Oxford UP, 1977.

Develops an error analysis approach to the study of grammar in order to better help her basic writing students.

Sherwin, J. Stephen. *Four Problems in Teaching English: A Critique of Research*. Scranton, PA: National Textbook Co., 1969.

Asserts that research conclusions would indicate that the teaching of formal grammar does not help students write better.

Sherwood, John C. "Grammar with Tears: Seventy-One Composition Texts." *College English* 21 (April 1960): 426-38.

Reviews 71 composition texts published in 1958 and '59, analyzing available "complete course" texts, readers, controlled research books, handbooks, rhetorics, and grammars, and workbooks.

Shugrue, Michael F. *English in a Decade of Change*. New York: Pegasus, 1968.

Examines trends in English teacher preparation, English curriculum, and administrative organizations on all levels of English instruction.

Silber, Kate. *Pestalozzi: The Man and His Work*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.

Presents the biography of Swiss educator Johann Friedrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827) whose work began to influence American education in the 1830s and '40s.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1977.

Discusses Black English issues including the history of Black English structure, the structure of present-day Black English, black-white language attitudes, and social policy and educational practice.

Stevick, Robert. "Is English Composition Only for Americans?" *CCC* 12 (1961): 237-38.

Suggests that writing instruction should focus on the paragraph, the sentence, and the word and on rhetoric rather than on the mechanics of standard English.

Stone, George Winchester, Jr., ed. *Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Offers 15 essays devoted to tackling issues and problems in the teaching of English; sections include language and writing, literature, and a program for action.

Strom, Ingrid M. "Research on Grammar and Usage and Its Implications for Teaching Writing." *Bulletin of the School of Education,* Indiana University, 36 (1960): 13-14.

Reviews over fifty studies of grammar instruction and concludes that rote memorization, drills, and diagramming are less efficient in teaching sentence structure, usage, and punctuation than other methods more dependent on writing activities.

Tate, Gary and Edward P.J. Corbett. *Teaching Freshman Composition.* New York: Oxford UP, 1967.

Thirty essays on various aspects of the teaching of writing are presented along with a list for further readings; literary, linguistic, and rhetorical approaches to composition are examined, as well as theme assignment and grading, stylistics, and attitudes.

Thompson, Stith. "1930: A National Survey of Freshman English." *College English* 22 (Nov. 1960): 78-80.

This repeat of an earlier article states that information channels in the composition field are weak and that many trial and error studies could be avoided if communications among scholars were improved.

Tibbetts, A. M. "Were Nineteenth-Century Textbooks Really Prescriptive?" *College English* 27 (Jan. 1966): 309-315.

A survey of college composition, rhetoric, and grammar textbooks available between 1776 and 1925 lead to conclusions that those books were less prescriptive in usage matters than is generally known.

Weathers, Winston and Otis Winchester. *The New Strategy of Style*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1978.

Proposes that students can write creatively and with vitality using thought, practice, and careful emulation.

Westerfield, Hargis. "Superstitions of College Freshmen." *College English* 26.4 (Jan. 1965): 311-12.

Reports the writing superstitions held by 39 college freshman students.

Whately, Richard. *Elements of Rhetoric*. Douglas Ehninger, ed. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1963.

Emphasizes the narrowing of the thesis and correctness and style over content in this practical text.

Zidonis, Frank. "Generative Grammar: A Report on Research." *English Journal* 54 (May 1965): 405-09.

Reports on a two-year experiment of 9th and 10th graders studying generative grammar; concludes that the grammar knowledge was easy to obtain, led to an increased proportion of well-formed sentences, and could help students reduce error occurrence in their writing.

1980-1990

Allen, David. *English Teaching Since 1965: How Much Growth?* London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1980.

Examines the history of English teaching from 1965 to the Dartmouth Seminar of '66, the effect of the seminar and linguistics, and particularly the shifting focuses on literature English instructors had made through the book's publication.

Bamberg, Betty. "Making Research Work for the Composition Teacher." Paper presented at the Meeting of the Southland Council of Teachers of English, 10 October 1981, Los Angeles, CA. ERIC Doc. No. 208408.

Urges the inclusion of ungraded writing with formal essays to lessen teachers' grading loads; peer revision and grammar instruction at the editing stage are also suggested.

Bartholomae, David. "The Study of Error." *CCC* 31 (1980): 253-69.

Concludes that basic writers often correct their errors in writing when reading them aloud without being conscious of the substitution.

Berkowitz, Diana and Linda Watkins-Goffman. "Putting Grammar in its Place in the Writing Curriculum." Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. 8-13 March 1988, Chicago, IL. ERIC Doc. No. 304012.

Promotes the integration of grammar at the editing stage of process-writing courses so that students can apply grammar with a greater sense of its meaning to their own writing.

Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985.* Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1987.

Details the history of writing instruction, and especially rhetoric, in this century with attention to the 19th-century background, the major schools of rhetoric in the 1900-'20 period, the progressive education influence, the communications emphasis, and the major rhetorical changes since 1960.

---. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges.* Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1984.

Details the changes brought about in American composition, rhetoric, and grammar instruction in the 19th century by foreign influences, American imitators, and sweeping social movements.

Boiarsky, Carolyn. "When More is Less." *Illinois Schools Journals* 61.1-4 (1981): 44-49.

Describes three methods being used at all levels in Atlanta schools to help increase students' writing skills: 1) small group work; 2) journals to help develop fluency; and 3) lessons in grammar and punctuation based on students' own papers.

Bryant, Paul. "A Brand New World Every Morning." *College Composition and Communication* 25 (1974): 30-33.

Likens composition teachers to geese who refuse to learn from experience; he suggests that composition instructors should become more scientific in research and should build upon former studies rather than repeat them.

Chadwick, Bruce. "Writers and Grammar: An Image Problem." *English Journal* 71.4 (April 1982): 54-55.

Implies that the de-emphasis of grammar instruction has been due to the social upheaval of the 1960s; asserts that grammar instruction should be included in the teaching of writing.

Clark, William G. "Formal Grammar: Does It Help Improve Writing?" *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 7.2 (Winter 1981): 133-38.

Says traditional grammar instruction has only marginal, and possibly harmful, effects on the teaching of writing students.

Connolly, Paul and Teresa Vilardi, eds. *New Methods in College Writing Programs: Theories in Practice.* New York: MLA, 1986.

Presents 28 descriptions of college writing programs across the country to show changes that have been made and to show that effective teaching methods have finally replaced myths.

Connors, Robert J. "Grammar in American College Composition: An Historical Overview." McQuade, Donald A., ed. *The Territory of Language: Linguistics, Stylistics, and the Teaching of Composition*, 3-22. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1986.

Traces the history of traditional grammar in America and the development of modern linguistics to determine how grammar has impacted writing instruction.

DeBeaugrande, Robert. "Forward to the Basics: Getting Down to Grammar." *College Composition and Communication* 35.3 (Oct. 1984): 358-67.

Says that grammar as it is typically taught is much too technical; proposes a learners' grammar that is accurate, workable, economical, compact, operational and immediate.

---. "Yes, Teaching Grammar Does Help." *English Journal* 73.2 (Feb. 1984): 66-69.

Argues for teaching a learners' grammar and not a teachers' grammar.

Dick, John A. R. "Basic Writing Workbooks, Sentence Style Books, and Copybooks: A Review." *TETYC* (May 1985): 140-153.

Reviews basic writing workbooks ranging in size from compendious texts to standard workbooks to brief workbooks, as well as rhetorics, sentence style workbooks, and copybooks; offers a convenient list of texts and works cited as conclusion.

Dixon, Kathleen G. "On Not Teaching Sentences and Paragraphs." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northwest Regional Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, 25-27 April 1985, Seattle, WA. ERIC Doc. No. 261376.

States that basic writers are systematic speakers and writers who are intellectually very much like their instructors--they merely lack sophistication.

Elgin, Suzette Haden. "The Great Grammar Myth. Occasional Paper No. 5." Berkeley, CA U: 1982. ERIC Doc. No. 251843.

Suggests that formal grammar instruction's usefulness has not been adequately tested; after reviewing research, shows two experimental composition classes that use only in-class essay writing and grammatical problems.

Epes, Mary, Carolyn Kirkpatrick, and Michael G. Southwell. *The Comp-Lab Exercises*. Prentice, 1980.

This basic writing workbook uses tapes to explain grammar and usage.

Fawcett, Susan and Alvin Sandberg. *Grassroots: The Writer's Workbook*. 2nd ed. Houghton, 1983.

A basic writing workbook.

Fortune, Sarah D'Eloia and Barbara Quint Gray. Experience to Exposition: A Guide to Basic Writing. Harper 1984.

A basic writing workbook.

"Four Comments on 'Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar.'" *College English* 47.6 (Oct. 1985): 641-650.

Four instructors--Joe Williams, Richard D. Cureton, Carole Moses, and Edward A. Vavra--respond to Patrick Hartwell's article; he, in turn, offers a rebuttal to their responses.

Friedmann, Thomas. "Identification, Rewriting, Mastery: Alternative Exercises for Basic and Introductory Students." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 17-19 March 1983, Detroit, MI. ERIC Doc. No. 238005.

To help developmental students learn correct grammar, the author suggests that nonerror based exercises emphasizing only one specific skill should be used instead of traditional exercises.

Gorrell, Donna. "Controlled Composition: An Alternative to Grammar Instruction." *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 8.2 (Winter 1982): 125-29.

Presents an alternative to grammar instruction by asking students to rewrite passages and constantly alter those passages with difficult transformations.

Graves, Donald. "The Enemy is Orthodoxy." *Highway-One* 8.1-2 (Winter-Spring 1985): 153-63.

Says teacher effectiveness is decreased by orthodoxies such as the idea that spelling, grammar, and punctuation are not important.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47.2 (Feb. 1985): 105-27.

Questions reviews by Neuleib and Kolln and defines five meanings of grammar, adapted from W. Nelson Francis' Three Meanings of Grammar.

Hillocks, George Jr. *Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching.* Urbana, IL: NCTE and ERIC, 1986.

Briefly details the research concerning sentence combining in the 1960s and '70s, weaknesses with some of the studies, and questions that sentence combining research raises.

Holbrook, Hilary Taylor. "ERIC/RCS Report: Whither (Wither) Grammar?" *Language Arts* 60.2 (Feb. 1983): 259-63.

Reviews the history of grammar instruction in America in the twentieth century by citing articles available in the ERIC system.

Holloway, Dale W. "Semantic Grammars: How They Can Help Us Teach Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 32.2 (May 1981). 205-18.

In attempting to help students better communicate with their readers, teachers might approach the teaching of writing by using one of three semantic theories--case grammars, the "given-new" contract, and cohesion.

Hood, Michael D. "Teaching Freshman Composition: The Language of Oppression vs. the Language of Liberation." Paper presented at the 37th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 13-15 March 1986, New Orleans, LA. ERIC Doc. No. 278045.

Describes the differences between mechanical literacy (an oppressive view that privileges textual over student authority and that emphasizes disproportionately correctness) and critical literacy (a liberating view

encouraging interpretation and sequential thought in students).

Hudson, Tate. "Great, No, Realistic Expectations: Grammar and Cognitive Levels." *English Journal* 76.7 (Nov. 1987): 82-83.

Argues against formal grammar instruction in middle school because of the low cognitive development of students at that age.

Hurley, Michael C. "Symphonies of Statement: Approaching an Audible Writing Style." *Curriculum Review* 19.1 (Feb. 1980): 38-40.

Says writing instruction should focus on developing eloquence and style and not on grammar.

Hylton, Jaime. "Response to Robert deBeaugrande, "Forward to the Basics: Getting Down to Grammar." *CCC* 36.3 (Oct. 1985): 340-343.

Sees deBeaugrande's article as a disappointment because he overlooks the 50 years of research which devalue the use of grammar instruction; says deBeaugrande offers no proof that his methods can help students improve anything but their grammar test scores.

Kearns, Michael S. "Basic Grammar and Freshman Composition." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Wyoming Conference on Freshman and Sophomore English, 6-10 July 1981, Laramie, WY. ERIC Doc. No. 210697.

Advocates breaking grammar instruction into four modules: syntax, free sentence combining, directed sentence revision, and theory; a course outline and sample exercises are included to help instructors incorporate these devices.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900.* Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1990.

Details the nineteenth century trends in American higher education applicable to rhetoric, including prominent rhetoricians and influences.

Kolln, Martha. "Closing the Books on Alchemy." *College Composition and Communication* 32.2 (May 1981): 139-51.

Interprets the findings of the Braddock et al and Meckel publications of 1963, each of which reached different conclusions based on the same research studies; asserts that we must give students some basic understanding of their language.

---. "Rhetorical Grammar for Students." Paper presented at the 35th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 29-31 March 1984, New York. ERIC Doc. No. 243109.

Suggests that teachers use a rhetorical grammar to help students recognize choices available in writing and the stylistic impact of those choices.

Kurata, Marilyn. "An Idea for Argumentative Writing." *Exercise Exchange* 28.2 (Spring 1983): 4-5. ERIC Doc. No. 241923.

Says students with considerable exposure to basic grammar in high school are bored by its review in college; emphasizes the need to provide interesting topics for writing assignments.

Landwehr, John. "Generative Rhetoric-Sentence Combining: A New Approach to Expository Writing." Paper presented at the 31st Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 13-15 March 1980, Washington, D.C. ERIC Doc. No. 185582.

Describes the freshman composition course at Mayville State College, in North Dakota; the course moves from a brief review of grammar to sentence combining to generative rhetoric.

Larson, Deborah Aldrich. "'Snow White' and Language Awareness." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 6.1 (Spring 1987): 171-79.

Notes that a knowledge of grammar rules does not necessarily lead to correctness in one's own writing; describes a summer workshop program where students produced "Snow White" in standard and in black dialect.

Licklider, Patricia. *At Your Command: A Basic English Workbook*. 2nd ed. Little, 1983.

A basic writing workbook.

Marting, Janet. "The Power of the Past: Inquiries into the Old Pedagogy." Paper presented at the 38th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 19-21 March 1987, Atlanta, GA. ERIC Doc. No. 280071.

Argues that composition instructors should not view their courses as a service or grammar course but should instead look at student errors as a step in the process of learning to write.

McClelland, Ben W. and Timothy R. Donovan, eds. *Perspectives on Research and Scholarship in Composition*. New York: MLA, 1985.

Includes 13 essays concerning the field of composition instruction; pertinent articles deal in topics such as error and correction, linguistics and writing, and empirical research in composition.

Meade, Richard A. "The Language Curriculum: Past, Present, and Future." Paper presented at the combined Annual Meeting of the Conference on English Education and the Secondary School English Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, March 1980. ERIC Doc. No. 173789.

Cites Dora V. Smith's 1932 article that describes the rationale viewed before 1900 behind studying grammatical concepts: grammar instruction increased mental discipline and correctness in speech, among other benefits.

Meyer, Charles F. "Improving Instruction in Grammar." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 5.1 (Spring 1986): 17-31.

Says we should examine how grammar has been taught in the past and, avoiding the pitfalls of the past, refine old methods and, especially, encourage the production of more effective handbooks.

Neuleib, Janice and Irene Brosnahan. "Teaching Grammar to Writers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.1 (Spring 1987): 28-35.

Suggests that the work of Henry Meckel should perhaps be examined and adhered to more closely than that of Braddock et al; states that teacher knowledge is crucial and reports the findings of a survey of English teaching candidates who failed to understand grammar as they thought they did.

Noguchi, Rei R. "Transformational-Generative Syntax and the Teaching of Sentence Mechanics." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.2 (Fall 1987): 26-36.

Says instructors' lack in exploiting students' language ability and circuitous, difficult grammatical terms too often result in otherwise skilled writers' mechanical mistakes. Proposes a method of identifying grammatical categories, independent of other grammatical terms, via transformational-generative grammar.

North, Stephen. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1987.

Attempts to examine the "modes of inquiry" used by various scholar types in the composition field (i.e., how they arrive at the claims they make).

Papay, Twila Yates. "From Fairy Dust to Mental Discipline: A Journey Via the Grammar Text." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 17-19 March 1983, Detroit, MI. ERIC Doc. No. 230943.

Says students can improve their writing skills by working with transformational and structural grammars because they help develop mental discipline.

Rizzo, Betty. *The Writer's Studio: Exercises for Grammar, Proofreading, and Composition.* 2nd ed. Harper, 1982.

A basic writing workbook.

Romano, Tom. "Breaking the Rules in Style." *English Journal* 77.8 (Dec. 1988): 58-62.

Suggests allowing students to break the standard writing rules in order to increase their creativity.

Rose, Shirley K. "Down from the Haymow: One Hundred Years of Sentence-Combining." *College English* 45.5 (Sept. 1983): 483-91.

Asserts that sentence combining practice, though not the term, has been existent in college textbooks since the turn of the century.

Rosen, Lois M. and Marian E. Wright. "Supporting the Process of Change: It Takes More Than a Workshop or Two." 1986. ERIC Doc. No. 278013.

Presents the Flint Middle School Writing Project study and concludes that more teachers need to be reached and that institutions must allow teachers ample time to incorporate new knowledge about the process approach to writing.

Rosenberg, Ruth. "Demythicizing Grammar." *Exercise Exchange* 28.2 (Spring 1983): 44-46.

Presents a lesson that, rather than advocating the memorization of grammatical rules, encourages students to examine the structure of the language.

Rouse, John. "Scenes from the Writing Workshop." *College English* 47.3 (March 1985): 217-36.

Details results of a basic writing night course based on peer interaction and the use of grammar on an as-needed basis.

Sedgwick, Ellery. "Alternatives to Teaching Formal, Analytical Grammar." *Journal of Developmental Education* 12.3 (Jan. 1989): 8-10, 12, 14, 20.

Offers alternatives to formal grammatical analysis such as sentence combining, expansion, modelling/imitation, transformation exercises, and inductive grammar.

Shaw, William E. "A Self-Paced Program in Freshman Composition." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Regional Conference on English in the Two Year College, 6-8 Oct. 1983, Bossier City, LA. ERIC Doc. No. 244291.

Describes the self-paced freshman English course at Brazosport College, Texas, where students use an instructional resource center and a writing laboratory and take weekly self-instruction units in grammar.

Shinkle, Carl R. *Grammar. English Language Arts Concept Paper No. 6.* Salem: Oregon State Dept. of Education, 1987. ERIC Doc. No. 287177.

Defines grammar, reviews research on grammar instruction, and concludes that grammar instruction should not be substituted for writing nor be seen as a panacea for writing problems.

Skurnick, Blanche. *The Heath Basic Writer: Proofreading and Revision.* Heath, 1983.

A basic writing workbook.

Smitherman, Geneva, ed. *Black English and the Education of Black Children and Youth: Proceedings of the National Invitational Symposium on the King Decision.* Detroit, MI: Harlo Press, 1981.

Presents speeches and papers presented at the Symposium; pertinent articles include "Linguistic Diversity, Teacher Preparation, and Professional Development," "Black English and the Media," and "Black Language and Communication Skills: Recycling the Issues."

Stygall, Gail. "Politics and Proof in Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 7.2 (Fall 1988): 28-41.

Defends the basic writing program at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis and shows its success rate improved after a shift to a process course.

Sullivan, Sally. *Helpbook for Student Writers*. Random, 1984.

A basic writing workbook.

Swonk, Joseph. "Personality According to Structure: A Composition Unit Just for Fun." *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 8.1 (Fall 1981): 29-32.

Describes a technique for introducing grammar basics into freshman composition courses; correlates structures of grammar with the students' personalities.

Tate, Gary, ed. *Teaching Composition: Twelve Bibliographical Essays*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian UP, 1987.

Presents essays on various aspects of composition instruction; topics include basic writing, writing across the curriculum, language varieties, and literacy and linguistics.

Tate, Gary and Edward P.J. Corbett, eds. *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. New York: Oxford UP, 1981.

The editors, working within the three broad categories of general, theory, and practice, present 32 essays on composition, including works on grammar, textbooks, and error; additional reading suggestions are offered within each section, and an annotated bibliography list is offered as well.

Trimmer, Joseph F. "Basic Skills, Basic Writing, Basic Research." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.1 (Spring 1987): 3-9.

Details the recent history of remediation in college writing programs and reports the findings of a survey of all the U.S. colleges and universities' basic writing programs. Concludes that textbooks (and pedagogies) need improvement and issues warnings to that effect.

Vavra, Ed. "A New Method and Curriculum for Teaching Writing and Grammar." Paper presented at the 10th National Conference of the Society of Educators and Scholars, 4 Oct. 1985, Teaneck, NJ. ERIC Doc. No. 277003.

Suggests that Kellogg Hunt's findings were misinterpreted and that Hunt never concluded that grammar should not be taught or studied.

Viera, Carroll. "The Grammarian as Basic Writer: An Exercise for Teachers." *College Composition and Communication* 39.2 (May 1988): 224-27.

States that formal grammar instruction is not effective in improving student writing; exercises based on a brief, hypothetical grammar help prove the author's point.

---. "Helping Students to Help Themselves: An Approach to Grammar." *CCC* 37.1 (Feb. 1986): 94-96.

Describes an exercise designed to help students realize the importance of mechanical proficiency to their careers; students present a mini-lesson on their worst grammatical problems to a group of their peers.

Vik, Gretchen N. "What We Need to Teach in a Basic Writing Skills Course." *The ABCA Bulletin* 44.1 (March 1981): 25-28.

Describes the procedure established to test students in business writing skills courses at San Diego State University; common errors are reviewed.

Witte, Stephen P. and Lester Faigley. *Evaluating College Writing Programs*. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1983.

Examines four college writing programs--No. Iowa, San Diego, Miami, and Texas--and then develops a more effective framework for evaluation.

Woods, William F. "Composition Textbooks and Pedagogical Theory: A Review Essay." *College English* 43 (1981): 393-409.

Proposes a practical taxonomy for categorizing textbooks intended for college writers.

---. "The Cultural Tradition of Nineteenth-Century 'Traditional' Grammar Teaching." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 15.1-2 (Winter-Spring 1985): 3-12.

Identifies the "cultural roots" of traditional grammar, focusing on the 19th century in America and on earlier centuries in Rome.

---. "The Evolution of Nineteenth-Century Grammar Teaching." *Rhetoric Review* 5.1 (Fall 1986): 4-20.

Describes the dominant theories and practices in nineteenth-century grammar instruction in America.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Ashida, Margaret E. and Leslie T. Whipp. "A Slide-Rule Composition Course." *College English* 25 (Oct. '63): 18-22.

Bamberg, Betty. "Making Research Work for the Composition Teacher." Paper presented at the Meeting of the Southland Council of Teachers of English, 10 October 1981, Los Angeles, CA. ERIC Doc. No. 208408.

Barton, Thomas L. and Anna M. Beachner. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. Menlo Park, CA: Cummings Publishing Co., 1970.

Berkowitz, Diana and Linda Watkins-Goffman. "Putting Grammar in its Place in the Writing Curriculum." Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. 8-13 March 1988, Chicago, IL. ERIC Doc. No. 304012.

Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1987.

---. *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1984.

Boiarsky, Carolyn. "When More is Less." *Illinois Schools Journals* 61.1-4 (1981): 44-49.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. *Research in Written Composition.* Urbana, IL: National College of Teachers of English, 1963.

Bryant, Paul. "A Brand New World Every Morning." *College Composition and Communication* 25 (1974): 30-33.

Chadwick, Bruce. "Writers and Grammar: An Image Problem." *English Journal* 71.4 (April 1982): 54-55.

Chomsky, Noam. *Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1966.

Christensen, Francis. "Notes Toward a New Rhetoric: Sentence Openers." *College English* 25 (Oct. '63): 7-11.

---. "The Problem of Defining a Mature Style." *English Journal* 57 (April '68): 572-579.

Clark, William G. "Formal Grammar: Does It Help Improve Writing?" *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 7.2 (Winter 1981): 133-38.

Committee on College Composition and Communication Language Statement. "Students' Right to Their Own Language." *College Composition and Communication* 25 (Fall 1974).

Connolly, Paul and Teresa Vilardi, eds. *New Methods in College Writing Programs: Theories in Practice.* New York: MLA, 1986.

Connors, Robert J. "Grammar in American College Composition: An Historical Overview." McQuade, Donald A., ed. *The Territory of Language: Linguistics, Stylistics, and the Teaching of Composition*, 3-22. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1986.

DeBeaugrande, Robert. "Forward to the Basics: Getting Down to Grammar." *College Composition and Communication* 35.3 (Oct. 1984): 358-67.

---. "Yes, Teaching Grammar Does Help." *English Journal* 73.2 (Feb. 1984): 66-69.

Dick, John A. R. "Basic Writing Workbooks, Sentence Style Books, and Copybooks: A Review." *TETYC* (May 1985): 104-153.

Dixon, Kathleen G. "On Not Teaching Sentences and Paragraphs." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northwest Regional Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, 25-27 April 1985, Seattle, WA. ERIC Doc. No. 261376.

Elgin, Suzette Haden. "The Great Grammar Myth. Occasional Paper No. 5." Berkeley, CA U: 1982. ERIC Doc. No. 251843.

Estrin, Herman A. "Grammar and Usage in a Composition/Communication Course: A Survey of Eighty Colleges and Universities." *College English* 23 (Oct. '61): 43-49.

Fichtenau, Robert L. "Some Rhetorical Considerations for Teaching the Young Writer." *English Journal* 54 (Nov. '65): 720-23.

"Four Comments on 'Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar.'" *College English* 47.6 (Oct. '85): 641-650.

Friedmann, Thomas. "Identification, Rewriting, Mastery: Alternative Exercises for Basic and Introductory Students." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 17-19 March 1983, Detroit, MI. ERIC Doc. No. 238005.

Friedrich, Gerhard. "The English Teacher and the Process of Communication." *English Journal* 55.1 (Jan. '66): 19-27.

Gorrell, Donna. "Controlled Composition: An Alternative to Grammar Instruction." *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 8.2 (Winter 1982): 125-29.

Graves, Donald. "The Enemy is Orthodoxy." *Highway-One* 8.1-2 (Winter-Spring 1985): 153-63.

Hagstrum, Jean H. "Book Review: *Research in Written Composition.*" *College English* 26.1 (Oct. '64): 53-57.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47.2 (Feb. '85): 105-27.

Holbrook, Hilary Taylor. "ERIC/RCS Report: Whither (Wither) Grammar?" *Language Arts* 60.2 (Feb. '83): 259-63.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47.2 (Feb. '85): 105-27.

Holbrook, Hilary Taylor. "ERIC/RCS Report: Whither (Wither) Grammar?" *Language Arts* 60.2 (Feb. '83): 259-63.

Holloway, Dale W. "Semantic Grammars: How They Can Help Us Teach Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 32.2 (May 1981). 205-18.

Hood, Michael D. "Teaching Freshman Composition: The Language of Oppression vs. the Language of Liberation." Paper presented at the 37th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 13-15 March 1986, New Orleans, LA. ERIC Doc. No. 278045.

Hudson, Tate. "Great, No, Realistic Expectations: Grammar and Cognitive Levels." *English Journal* 76.7 (Nov. 1987): 82-83.

Hurley, Michael C. "Symphonies of Statement: Approaching an Audible Writing Style." *Curriculum Review* 19.1 (Feb. 1980): 38-40.

Kearns, Michael S. "Basic Grammar and Freshman Composition." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Wyoming Conference on Freshman and Sophomore English, 6-10 July 1981, Laramie, WY. ERIC Doc. No. 210697.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. "New Perspectives on Teaching Composition." *College English* 23 (March '62): 440-44.

---. *Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900*. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1990.

---. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

Kolln, Martha. "Closing the Books on Alchemy." *College Composition and Communication* 32.2 (May 1981): 139-51.

---. "Rhetorical Grammar for Students." Paper presented at the 35th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 29-31 March 1984, New York. ERIC Doc. No. 243109.

Kurata, Marilyn. "An Idea for Argumentative Writing." *Exercise Exchange* 28.2 (Spring 1983): 4-5. ERIC Doc. No. 241923.

Larson, Deborah Aldrich. "'Snow White' and Language Awareness." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 6.1 (Spring 1987): 171-79.

Leggett, Glenn. "What are Colleges and Universities Doing in Written Composition?" *College English* 23 (Oct. '61): 40-42.

Marting, Janet. "The Power of the Past: Inquiries into the Old Pedagogy." Paper presented at the 38th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and

Communication, 19-21 March 1987, Atlanta, GA. ERIC Doc. No. 280071.

Meade, Richard A. "The Language Curriculum: Past, Present, and Future." Paper presented at the combined Annual Meeting of the Conference on English Education and the Secondary School English Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, March 1980. ERIC Doc. No. 173789.

Meyer, Charles F. "Improving Instruction in Grammar." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 5.1 (Spring '86): 17-31.

Muir, James. *A Modern Approach to English Grammar: An Introduction to Systemic Grammar*. London: B.T. Batsford, Ltd., 1972.

NCTE and CCCC Joint Committee. *English in the Two-Year College*. Samuel Weingarten, Chairman. Champaign, IL: NCTE, 1965.

Neuleib, Janice and Irene Brosnahan. "Teaching Grammar to Writers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.1 (Spring '87): 28-35.

Neuleib, Janice. "The Relation of Formal Grammar to Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 28.3 (Oct. '77): 247-50.

Noguchi, Rei R. "Transformational-Generative Syntax and the Teaching of Sentence Mechanics." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.2 (Fall 1987): 26-36.

North, Stephen. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1987.

O'Hare, Frank. *Sentence Combining: Improving Student Writing without Formal Grammar Instruction*. NCTE Report No. 15. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1973.

Papay, Twila Yates. "From Fairy Dust to Mental Discipline: A Journey Via the Grammar Text." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 17-19 March 1983, Detroit, MI. ERIC Doc. No. 230943.

Romano, Tom. "Breaking the Rules in Style." *English Journal* 77.8 (Dec. 1988): 58-62.

Rose, Shirley K. "Down from the Haymow: One Hundred Years of Sentence-Combining." *College English* 45.5 (Sept. 1983): 483-91.

Rosen, Lois M. and Marian E. Wright. "Supporting the Process of Change: It Takes More Than a Workshop or Two." 1986. ERIC Doc. No. 278013.

Rosenberg, Ruth. "Demythicizing Grammar." *Exercise Exchange* 28.2 (Spring 1983): 44-46.

Rouse, John. "Scenes from the Writing Workshop." *College English* 47.3 (March 1985): 217-36.

Sedgwick, Ellery. "Alternatives to Teaching Formal, Analytical Grammar." *Journal of Developmental Education* 12.3 (Jan. 1989): 8-10, 12, 14, 20.

Shaw, William E. "A Self-Paced Program in Freshman Composition." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Regional Conference on English in the Two Year College, 6-8 Oct. 1983, Bossier City, LA. ERIC Doc. No. 244291.

Sherwood, John C. "Grammar with Tears: Seventy-One Composition Texts." *College English* 21 (April '60): 426-38.

Shinkle, Carl R. *Grammar. English Language Arts Concept Paper No. 6.* Salem: Oregon State Dept. of Education, 1987. ERIC Doc. No. 287177.

Stygall, Gail. "Politics and Proof in Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 7.2 (Fall 1988): 28-41.

Swonk, Joseph. "Personality According to Structure: A Composition Unit Just for Fun." *Teaching English in the Two Year College* 8.1 (Fall 1981): 29-32.

Tibbetts, A. M. "Were Nineteenth-Century Textbooks Really Prescriptive?" *College English* 27 (Jan. '66): 309-315.

Trimmer, Joseph F. "Basic Skills, Basic Writing, Basic Research." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.1 (Spring 1987): 3-9.

Vavra, Ed. "A New Method and Curriculum for Teaching Writing and Grammar." Paper presented at the 10th National Conference of the Society of Educators and Scholars, 4 Oct. 1985, Teaneck, NJ. ERIC Doc. No. 277003.

Viera, Carroll. "The Grammarian as Basic Writer: An Exercise for Teachers." *College Composition and Communication* 39.2 (May 1988): 224-27.

Westerfield, Hargis. "Superstitions of College Freshmen." *College English* 26.4 (Jan. '65): 311-12.

Witte, Stephen P. and Lester Faigley. *Evaluating College Writing Programs*. Carbondale, IL: So. IL UP, 1983.

Woods, William F. "The Cultural Tradition of Nineteenth-Century 'Traditional' Grammar Teaching." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 15.1-2 (Winter-Spring '85): 3-12.

---. "The Evolution of Nineteenth-Century Grammar Teaching." *Rhetoric Review* 5.1 (Fall '86): 4-20.

Zidonis, Frank. "Generative Grammar: A Report on Research." *English Journal* 54 (May '65): 405-09.

VITA

Gina Smith Claywell was born in Glasgow, Kentucky on December 31, 1964. She attended elementary and high school in the Cumberland County, Kentucky, school system and graduated Valedictorian in May 1982. She attended Western Kentucky University on an Award of Excellence Scholarship, maintaining a 4.0 GPA. She graduated in May 1985 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Broadcast Communications; she was named Scholar of the Potter College of Arts and Humanities and received the Ogden Scholarship Award at commencement exercises.

She worked as a television producer with the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources and as a commercial writer with WBKO-TV in Bowling Green, Kentucky before entering the University of Tennessee in January 1990. She served as a Graduate Assistant with the English Department during the 1990-'91 academic year and received a Master of Arts degree in English in May 1991. She was awarded a Hilton A. Smith Graduate fellowship and a Bain T. Stewart Fellowship at the University of Tennessee for the 1991-'92 academic year.