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ABSTRACT

This thesis argues the legitimacy and usefulness, within the field of Comparative Education, of studies which focus on the comparative description and analysis of a complex concept or subject-model, as established in two Reports, separated widely in time. What is contrasted and analysed is the substantive definition of 'English' emerging from the Reports of Committees of Inquiry, appointed by the Ministers responsible for Education in England in 1919 and 1972, and chaired respectively by Sir Henry Newbolt and Sir Alan Bullock.

The opening chapter demonstrates, in identifying the location of such studies within Comparative Education, that the comparison of documentary sources is a study valid, both at a theoretical and a descriptive level, in contemporary studies in this field. In particular it argues, that especially as comparisons of this type focus on 'change' and 'reform' within the educational curriculum, such studies are fruitful and illuminating in a heuristic sense, and capable of generating explanatory views of how the curriculum of a particular subject comes to be what it is.

Chapter 2 provides an analysis, useful for comparative purposes, of the membership and identity of each Committee of Inquiry. In turn, this analysis is used to illuminate the nature and content of each Report, and in particular to provide a framework appropriate for evaluating the extent to which each definition or model of 'English' was a reflection of the lives and times of the particular individuals appointed to each Committee. Although, in total, more than forty persons composed the Newbolt and Bullock Committees, and although the amount of detailed
biographical information available varies greatly from person to person, it is emerges that there were clearly identifiable groups, representing - or even, in a sense, incarnating - particular interests, which pushed the findings and recommendations of the Inquiries in particular directions. Clues are also thus provided about each Committee's motives for and emphases in prescribing the nature, purpose, and content of 'English' in the ways it did.

After establishing this background and context, in terms useful for comparative analysis, the concept or model of 'English' as each Committee understood it within the generic categories of 'Language' and 'Literature', is examined. The nature, place, and role of each of the constituent parts of 'English' are compared and contrasted, and within the framework of this comparative approach, key elements in each constituent part are scrutinised, assessed and related to the 'identity' of the Committees which produced them. This process of comparative analysis clearly demonstrates that each Committee was, for its time and place, fulfilling a highly significant role related to educational change and reform, as well as to the definition of 'English' in England in 1921 and 1974.

Insights thus emerge which are useful in producing an understanding of the processes of curriculum definition and development. This thesis indicates the extent to which, in England both in 1921 and 1974, the formulation of the aims of 'English' and of its content and teaching, reflected and emerged from 'interests' collaborated in Committees set up by the Government of the day to carry out processes of review and reform. In so doing, it confirms the legitimacy, as well as heuristic value, of studies of this type within the field of Comparative Education.
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CHAPTER 1

COMPARISON IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

Some fifty years separate the presentation to the Ministers in the House of Commons responsible for Education, of major Reports related to English and its teaching. Each Committee of Enquiry worked for some two years, each examined much evidence and numerous witnesses, and each produced a voluminous report: in the case of Newbolt Committee there are 105 principal conclusions and recommendations; in the case of Bullock Committee 333 conclusions and recommendations. The preoccupation of each Committee is with 'English' in its various manifestations, and the central intention of this thesis is to compare the substantive concept or model of 'English' as it emerges from each Report, and to seek illumination and

---

1 (i) Great Britain. Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to Inquire into the Position of English in the Educational System in England, The Teaching of English in England, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921. This Report will be referred to as the Newbolt Report, and the Departmental Committee will be referred to as the Newbolt Committee.

(ii) Great Britain. Report of the Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the chairmanship of Sir Alan Bullock, F.B.A. A language for life. London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1974. This Report will be referred to as the Bullock Report, and the Committee of Inquiry will be referred to as the Bullock Committee.

2 (i) The Newbolt Committee was appointed on May 2, 1919 and reported on April 23, 1921. The Report was made public in November 1921.

(Footnote continued)
clarification of the use of this concept or model. This will include some consideration of the general educational context in which the Inquiries were set, and the role played by each Committee in reflecting that context through its role in setting out, for its time, the substantive 'definition' of the subject.

In undertaking this comparison it is intended that it be seen as primarily an exercise within the 'discipline' of Comparative Education, and the approach to the comparison will be within frameworks and methodological strategies associated with that branch of academic inquiry. In setting this comparison within that context, it has been useful to consider recent material of a theoretical and methodological nature, and in particular to focus on a 1977 overview of 'The State of the Art' (of Comparative Education) in the official journal of the Comparative and International Education Society based in the United States, as an appropriate touchstone for identifying the place of the present study in the

2 (continued)
(ii) The Bullock Committee was announced by the Secretary of State at the National Union of Teachers Annual Conference, April 4, 1972 and reported to the Secretary of State for Education and Science on September 9, 1974.


4 Comparative Education Review. Special Issue: The State of the Art. Vol. 21, Nos. 2/3, June/October 1977. The Comparative Education Review is the official journal of the Comparative and International Education Society based in the United States, and is influential in the field of Comparative Education, and in the remainder of this thesis will be abbreviated to C.E.R.
context of Comparative Studies in Education. In any academic discipline there is continuing discussion of the parameters of the discipline, of fashions affecting models and paradigms, and of theoretical and methodological issues of popular interest. In the Introduction, Andreas M. Kazamias (Editor) and Karl Schwartz (an Associate Editor), affirm that there are still uncertainties about the nature, scope and value of Comparative Education, that "(t)here is no internally consistent body of knowledge, no set of principles or canons of research that are generally agreed upon by people who associate themselves with the field. Instead, one finds various strands of thought, theories, trends or concerns..."5

One of the strands of comparative studies, and one recognised as appropriate in Education studies, is identified in an Editorial in the June 1980 issue of the Comparative Education Review as "document analysis and archival research".6 This is contrasted with the large-scale comparative research, including field studies, and it is within the previous narrower category that this comparison of the concept or model of 'English' falls. It should also be borne in mind that the relevance to Comparative Education of such exercises would be questioned by some comparativists. For instance, in his contribution to The State of the Art, Robert Koehl7 poses the

---

7 Robert Koehl, "The Comparative Study of Education: Prescription (Footnote continued)
question directly by asking "Is historical comparison within a given culture comparative education?" Koehl then goes on to comment that "... it remains a moot question and one not adequately illuminated, much less debated, as to whether (such) internal comparisons in a particular society constitute comparative education." Koehl, himself, sees such studies as among the legitimate aspirations of the discipline in so far as these studies seek to understand the nature of 'change' in education. Observing that such studies are threatened through "the replacement of historical scholarship by that of the social or behavioural sciences", Koehl remarks on the conspicuous absence in contemporary Comparative Education of "historical specialities like textual analysis, comparison of documentary sources, (and) the reconstruction of motives and intentions." In his conclusion he therefore exhorts - "Have done with the naive fear of being 'descriptive' in seeking 'the reasons why': and, as with the life sciences, "do not disdain to collect and classify evidence, subjecting it to the most rigorous tests of authenticity, derivation, accuracy and logic".

Further support for studies of this type is given by Richard L.

7 (continued) and Practice". C.E.R. Vol. 21, Nos. 2/3 1977, pp. 177-194.
8 Ibid., p. 184.
9 Ibid., p. 191.
10 Ibid., p. 191.
11 Ibid., p. 194.
Merritt and Fred (sic) S. Coombs in their contribution on "Politics and Educational Reform".\(^{12}\) It is their view that the 1960's saw a "striking advance" in the area of what concepts signify, and how they may be used in studies on educational reform.\(^{13}\) Aware, however, of the empiricists' criticisms of this approach, they caution that such studies can be deficient if they are too descriptive and insufficiently theoretical, with "too much what" and "too little why," and they point out that "the explanation of why something happens in a given system requires the application of a theory", or a search for significant relationships which can be tested by statistical or other means.\(^{14}\) In studies of a non-quantitative kind, such as those concentrating on what the concept or model of 'English' was, at historical points separated by some fifty years, much of the acceptability of what is undertaken will therefore depend on what is included in 'other means'.

In both 1919 and 1972 the Committees of Enquiry were required to consider what was meant by 'English' and to report, with recommendations, to the responsible Government Ministers of the day. It is reasonable to assume that these recommendations would involve changes leading to some kind of reform. Studies in this area of 'change' and 'reform', in so far as they focus on the


\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 247.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., pps. 252/3.
'content' dimension of models or concepts, involving 'educational facts' and 'historical comparison within a given culture', fit within the parameters of what Koehl identified as the descriptive approach to definition in Comparative Education. These studies are recognised too, by Rolland G. Paulston, in his discussion of conceptual frameworks used in identifying social and educational change, in so far as they investigate "attempts to alter educational systems ... in advanced industrial societies" in areas ranging from "innovation in classroom activities, to large-scale reforms seeking system-wide changes in educational goals, priorities and structures". Clearly the recommendations of the Newbolt Committee and the Bullock Committee fall within this latter category. For the purposes of this comparative study it will be assumed that, in both 1919 and 1974, England was an advanced industrial society, and that the purpose of each Committee was to present 'reform' proposals.

Implicit in any notion or concept of 'reform' is a recognition that there are, in a society, imperative forces or interests which require change in a particular direction. Commenting on recent 'reform studies' in the area of Comparative Education, Paulston complains that most of these "present a narrow, unsophisticated, and largely 'technical' assessment of why and how change takes place", 17

15 Koehl, op.cit., p. 178.
17 Ibid., p. 394.
and that "few students come to grips with the concept of power in either the political or administrative or research and development phases of national reforms". According to Paulston, major changes are always partisan, political processes implying redistribution of power, and that to be adequately understood identification of ideological interest groups associated with the change is necessary. This type of view and approach is supported further, within a Marxist dialectical perspective, by H.M. Levin who asserts that "national reforms will only take place when they are viewed by dominant political and economic elites as defending or advancing their interest vis-a-vis less privileged groups in society".

The central importance of issues of an essentially ideological and non-quantitative nature is taken up by Andreas M. Kazamais and Karl Schwartz in their State of the Art article on "Intellectual and Ideological Perspectives in Comparative Education". Commenting on the strong influence over the past 20 or so years of the structural-functionalist school in Comparative Education and its commitment to a 'scientific comparative education' which "should deal with objective, measurable and concrete levels of reality which, in principle, at least, exist independent of the observer,"

18 Ibid., p. 394.
19 L.M. Levin in Paulston, ibid., p. 387.
21 Ibid., p. 166.
Kazamais and Schwartz claim that "comparative educators have been concerned with developments in (scientific) conceptual frameworks and methods, and not with ideological assumptions and presuppositions." It is their view that, as an outcome of this methodological approach, there is "little if any knowledge" on "how curricula arise, persist and change", and that "this lopsided and restricted purview of comparative education has undermined further its usefulness or relevance to those most directly involved in the process of education, namely, the teachers" (and, it might be added, to any interested in understanding the ideological dynamics of the educational process).

It is this presumption and judgment that studies in curriculum should be useful which justifies, too, the approach to analysis described by Michael Apple in his discussion of the concept of 'hegemony'. 'Hegemony', as described by Apple, is that "organised assemblage of meanings and practice, the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions which are lived". Formal educational structures, policies and practices are thus, as far as such Marxist/neo-Marxist models are concerned, part of the

---

22 Ibid., p. 158.
23 Ibid., p. 168.
24 Ibid., p. 169.
26 Ibid., p. 5.
ideological structure which the ruling or dominant class operates in order to maintain its control of knowledge (and by extension, its own privilege and cultural hegemony). The application of this model of critical analyses to a comparison of the model or concept of 'English' in 1921 with that in 1974 would also produce heuristic insights useful in Comparative Education.

Some twenty years earlier, in 1956, G. Kandel - a father-figure in Comparative Education, and the exemplar of the liberal-humanist tradition - when asked "What do we compare?" replied "The answer should be that the comparison should be of ideas, ideals and forms." As Kazamias and Schwartz point out Kandel's concern was with "the aims and purposes of educational systems" as he consistently sought to grasp "the hidden meaning of things found in schools", believing that men's actions were determined by their thoughts, and that the scientific approach of the empiricists of the mid-1950's was totally inadequate, if not altogether inappropriate for his purposes. Both the Marxist/neo-Marxists and Kandel thus agree on the centrality of 'thoughts' or 'values', and ideology, with neither prepared to accept the sufficiency, for explanatory purposes, of the scientific, 'value-free', approach and criteria of the structural-functionalists. In recognising the importance of the ideological dimensions of proposals for

27 Paulston, op. cit., p. 386.
28 Kazamias and Schwartz, op. cit., p. 154-5.
29 Ibid., p. 154-5.
educational reform each would, in this sense, acknowledge the usefulness of a comparison of the concept or model of 'English' in 1921 and in 1974; each would, albeit from very different pinnacles in the politico-educational terrain, recognise the purpose and value of such a study.

Thus a range of significantly different theoretical frameworks can be identified within which a comparative study in Education might be undertaken, and as the contributions to The State of the Art in 1977 demonstrate, there is much argument, and indeed dispute, about the legitimacy of various topics and methodologies, and about the purposes and uses of such studies. If full cognisance is taken of the complexity of the issues raised in the 1977 review - and accepting that this review of the issues provides an accurate touchstone of expert opinion - any comprehensive comparison of 'English' in 1921 with 'English' in 1974 would, ideally, be best undertaken at the macro-level, and would involve a demonstration of how the concept or model of 'English' is established and used within the prevailing economic, social and political context and climate. However, in a thesis such as this, any such comprehensive approach is not possible. Further, the limitations on research in the area of curriculum are substantial and must be acknowledged. As Ursula Springer observes in commenting on what she describes as "the bleak side" of curricular research, there are "formidable pitfalls" in this methodological "jungle", ranging from the determination of the objective, parameters, and precise questions to be explored to premises, equivalances, and sources from which to obtain relevant
data and control of variables.\textsuperscript{30}

As well, there are methodological issues related to the identity and persona of the particular researcher. In drawing conclusions about the conceptual frameworks used to describe and account for social and educational change, including related proposals for reform strategies, Paulston comments that "personal bias leads people to a number of possible theoretical and ideological orientations from which... logically follow, assumptions about why and when reform should take place".\textsuperscript{31} Thus many unspecified theoretical and ideological axes are likely to be ground in educational change and reform studies, but as Paulston points out, little unfortunately, of this, is ever acknowledged or made explicit.\textsuperscript{32} The importance of recognising the role of the researcher's persona is elaborated by Michael Apple. Assuming, as Apple does, that education is not a politically neutral activity, and that in an advanced industrial economy curriculum arrangements are focussed on particular, and unequal, political ends related to hegemonic control, it has been necessary for Apple, in order to satisfy his own theoretical requirements, to "...document the kinds of personal and political commitment that (he) felt provided an irreducible minimum set of tenets which guided (his) work as an


\textsuperscript{31} Paulston, op. cit., p. 393.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., pps. 393–4.
Accepting further, the view of Gordon, Lawton, and Spittle that "curriculum has now become a central feature of arguments about the kind of society we want and the kind of educational system necessary for that society", such issues associated with the personal identity and commitment of the researcher must be acknowledged as significant. In the case of this thesis therefore some of the 'interests' of the writer will be clear simply in the ordering of material, in the nature of the issues raised, and in the selection of extracts used to develop points. Other predispositions will be implicit in the descriptive and analytical use of vocabulary, and in the rhetorical elements of the presentation, such as the structuring of argument and ordering of evidence.

The intention, in the remaining chapters, is to identify crucial elements in the concepts or models of 'English' in 1921 and 1974, to indicate significant similarities and differences, and to suggest some explanation for these similarities and differences. In order to provide an illuminating and fruitful focal point, an examination will be made of the ways in, and extent to which the views of 'English' set out in each Report reflect not only the personal, professional and public experience of the members of each Committee, but also their hopes and aspirations for the subject. This will

33 Apple, op. cit., p. 1.
involve a consideration, to the extent that the evidence available at a documentatary level will allow it, of how the background and experience of the particular members of each Committee influenced each Committee's views on what 'English' was and should be, and of how, for each Committee, views and considerations related to "ideology, power, and perceived self-interest\(^{35}\) are demonstrably factors influencing that Committee's perception of what 'English' was or should be.

In this thesis, such an analysis must be seen and understood to be seminal only. This attempt to investigate the identity - in terms of their educational background and experience, of their appointments and 'offices' at the time of the Committee Enquiries and earlier, of their connections with various 'interest' or lobby groups, of their publications, and of their identity and standing in the educational world, as well as in the world at large - of the persons and Committees set up to report on the nature of 'English', represents an initial attempt to discover and explain how a subject, or curriculum area, comes to be defined as it is. In this sense, this approach has elements of a theoretical framework, although it is not a framework carefully or elaborately constructed as a model or paradigm in the structuralist-functionalist sense, but rather of the type that Merritt and Coombs recognise as of heuristic value in attempts to understand educational reform as policy change. Merritt and Coombs require such a model to involve considerations of the

\(^{35}\) Paulston, op.cit., p. 373.
conditions under which reform (or change) takes place, those likely to contribute to the success of that reform, and the roles which different actors typically play in the development of that reform.\textsuperscript{36}

This thesis thus attempts to identify, describe and categorise two groups or Committees - one in 1919, the other in 1972 - empowered to provide "an authoritative prescription" for change, and involved, in this sense, in "a direct attempt to control the (future) behaviour of administrators, teachers and pupils".\textsuperscript{37} It also seeks to understand the identity of those public persons commissioned to cultivate a public awareness about the nature of 'English' for their times.

This thesis thus takes its place in Comparative Education studies at that point where, along with descriptive comparison, some attempt is made to identify - in this case for 'English' - reasons for the curricular concepts or models being what they were. In no sense is it intended to provide an exhaustive historical overview or context, but rather by concentrating on the membership of the Committees of 1919-1921 and 1972-74, it aims at clarifying aspects of the relationship between what each defines as 'English', and the identity of the persons and 'interests' responsible for the particular definitions.

\textsuperscript{36} Merritt and Coombs, op. cit., p. 254.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., p. 259.
In seeking to discover how the concept of 'English' was understood, or developed, or changed, or reformed by each Committee of Inquiry, it is fruitful, in the first instance, to consider the terms of reference set out in the Departmental briefs for each Committee. Sir Henry Newbolt and his 13 fellow inquirers were asked, in 1919, "to inquire into the position occupied by English (Language and Literature) in the education system in England, and to advise how its study may best be promoted in schools of all types, including Continuation Schools, and in Universities and other Institutions of Higher Education, regard being had to -

1) the requirements of a liberal education;

2) the needs of business, the professions, and the public services; and

3) the relation of English to other studies."

In 1972, Sir Alan Bullock and his 19 fellow inquirers were asked

"to consider in relation to schools:

a) all aspects of teaching the use of English, including reading, writing, and speech;

b) how present practice might be improved and the role that initial and in-service training might play;

c) to what extent arrangements for monitoring the general level of attainment in these skills can be introduced or improved and to make recommendations." ²

It is clear that these briefs involve substantially different tasks and areas of investigation, and no simple parallelism emerges from the terms of reference. As a method of generating a straightforward comparison, it would be helpful if a template constructed from the brief of the Newbolt Enquiry could be superimposed on the brief of the Bullock Enquiry in order to provide an equivalent pattern of referents for consideration. However, while through the use of this procedure some items would emerge as common to each brief, in other areas unacceptable differences would be obvious, or the overlaps inadequate for heuristic purposes. Each Committee was required by its brief to consider current practice in schools: in the case of the Newbolt Committee, how the study of

English might be "promoted", and in the case of the Bullock Committee, how it might be "improved". Again, each Committee was required to consider the place 'English' occupies in the education system in England, and its relationship to other studies: in the case of Newbolt this is stated explicitly, while with Bullock it is implied in the requirement that the Committee consider "all aspects of the use of English, including reading, writing, and speech". However there are also differences which prevent straightforward mirror-image comparisons. For example, for the Newbolt Committee the terms of reference included English in the universities and higher education, whereas with the Bullock Committee the investigation was restricted to English up to the statutory age for leaving school, thus excluding the sixth form and higher education. Again while the Newbolt Committee was asked to pay regard to "the needs of business, the professions, and public services", the Bullock Committee understood its brief to be much more narrowly focussed, "interpreting it ...as language in education, (ranging) from the growth of language and reading ability in young children to the teaching of English in secondary schools." The most far-reaching difference, however, was that in 1919 the Newbolt Committee was asked to position English in the educational system.

4 Newbolt Report, p. xxxi.
within the broad context of "the requirements of a liberal education", and thus was provided with a rhetorical and political role which the more pedagogically defined terms of reference, in 1972, were incapable of affording to Bullock and his Committee. Their brief, set out plainly in language without political connotations, was to examine "all aspects of the teaching of the use of English, including reading, writing and speech", - a brief which did not permit the wide-ranging canvas of issues available to and taken up by the Newbolt Committee.

Whilst recognising such similarities and differences it is important to bear in mind that each Committee shared a similar, and central, reforming role. Thus the terms of reference for each Inquiry project the Committees in the direction of what Paulston identifies as "large-scale reforms, seeking system-wide changes in educational goals, priorities, and structures": the Committee briefs of 1919 and 1972 initiate what Ursula Springer would describe as "curriculum and reform documents... particularly interesting for the broad insight they provide into the societal goals and assumptions regarding the educational equipment that the young generation will need for the future". Such documents are therefore useful primary sources for inspecting and understanding the dynamics

7 Ibid., p. xxxi.
of and reasons for educational reform: the Newbolt Committee was required to advise on "how (the) study (of English) may best be promoted in schools of all types", while the Bullock Committee was asked, in regard to "all aspects of the teaching of English, ... how present practice might be improved".

In seeking to understand elements in these dynamics, and the reasons for change, it is important, before considering the concept of 'English' itself in some detail, to establish the identity — both as individual members, and as corporate groups — of the Committees responsible for the particular 'definitions' of 'English' in 1921 and 1974. If as Merritt and Coombs argue, "...the evidence is now incontrovertible that in most nations virtually all educational decisions, certainly (those) including efforts at major reform, are highly interrelated with concurrent events in the cultural, social, economic, and political realms", then information about the identity of the persons selected (or at least approved) by the Government of the day — by the President of the Board of Education in 1919, and the Secretary of State for Education and Science in 1972 — will be illuminating, and serve a heuristic purpose in this comparison of the concepts or models of 'English'. Further, if one also accepts Merritt and Coombs view that a reform "...is simply an

attempt to change things for the better..., (which) signals a plan of some scope... for refashioning at least some parts of the education system, a policy change aimed at ameliorating ills perceived to exist",¹³ then it is productive to examine the experience, values, and societal 'standing' of those selected to articulate specific measures necessary for a reforming change. This is particularly important when the proposed change - and this is the case with the findings and recommendations of the 1921 and 1974 Reports - is of the type identified by Merritt and Coombs as "including the correction of abuses, the adjustment of the educational framework to meet new goals, the accommodation of new groups, and the reformulation of goals".¹⁴ All such changes will be influenced by the political and ideological views and values of the persons selected to undertake this task.

Before looking however, in some detail, at the background and 'qualifications' of these two expert Committees set up for the task of defining within their society and for their time what 'English' should be, and at their particular membership, some comment on associated methodological issues is necessary. Firstly, from a search of recent literature dealing with theoretical issues in Comparative Education no articulated models or paradigms for this type of comparison emerged. In that sense, there is no 'precedent' with which to operate. Secondly only 'public' documents, including

---

¹³ Ibid., p. 254.
¹⁴ Ibid., pps. 255-7.
books and journal articles by or about or involving members of the Committees, and biographical information in publications such as 'Who's Who' have been used. No attempt has been made to gather unpublished material by contact with persons or organisations associated with the Committees. Plainly, in the case of the Newbolt Committee, except for unpublished biographical material this would not have been possible; while in the case of the Bullock Committee such an approach might well provide valuable new material. The major consideration leading to this decision was the time which would be required to undertake such investigations in any adequate manner. The comparative lack of published information about members of the Bullock Committee, as compared with published material about members of the Newbolt Committee, is also acknowledged. Thirdly, a related problem is the distance from the present, in time, of the two Committees. For a researcher in 1983 there is a sense in which the members of the Bullock Committee are contemporaries, and hence the language, the issues raised, and the subjects under consideration in their Inquiry may well be within the 'lived life and experience' of the writer. However, the members of the Newbolt Committee are, in contrast, 'in the past', so that it is of methodological consequence that the intervening 60 years will have produced considerable shifts and changes in the use and meaning of language, and in identification of educational issues and matters judged important by the society of their day. In this comparison therefore, it should be borne in mind that two generations separate the present day from the Newbolt Committee, whilst only a decade separates the Bullock Committee. If, and the issue raised is
pertinent to this comparison, one accepts Messick's view that reform strategies may be seen as "the implications of research as interpreted or filtered through a particular ideology about the nature of man and society", then these separations in time may well affect or even distort the researcher's capacity to discern the educational imperatives of the political, economic, social and cultural systems under consideration.

Recognising such constraints, who then were the persons who made up these Committees? What, as corporate groups, did they represent as they undertook the tasks of identifying and defining, within the terms of reference set out for them, what 'English' was? Firstly, they were persons officially appointed by the members of the British Cabinet responsible for Education in 1919 and 1972: the 1919 Committee was announced by H.A.L. Fisher, President of the Board of Education in the Asquith Liberal Government, whilst the 1972 Committee was established by Mrs Margaret Thatcher, Secretary of State for Education and Science in the Heath Conservative Government. Secondly, they were made up mainly of persons prominent or at least influential, in Education. In order to understand more clearly their approaches to and findings on what

15 Ibid., quoted in Paulston, op.cit., p. 372.
16 This point is discussed by Michael Apple, Ideology and Curriculum, London, 1979, p. 5.
17 See Appendix A, The Newbolt Committee, and Appendix B, The Bullock Committee, for the membership of each Committee as listed in the respective Reports: Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 2; and Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. vi/vii.
constituted 'English' pertinent elements in their identity will be elaborated, and an attempt made to ascertain the 'representative' nature of each group, in order to suggest significant differences between those appointed in 1919 and those appointed in 1972. As well, particular matters associated, either with individuals or recognisable 'interest' groups, within each Committee, in so far as these affect the definition of 'English' which emerges in the Reports, will be explored. The intention is that this examination should help illuminate the analysis of 'English' in Chapters 3, 4, and 5, of this thesis and provide clues as to why 'English' was described and defined in the way it was, and what it was that the Committees intended for 'English' in the future.

The Committee appointed by H.A.L. Fisher, President of the Board of Education, on May 2, 1919 had 14 members. As its Chairman it had Sir Henry Newbolt, who had previously chaired a Government Committee - the Ministry for Information Committee on the Distribution of Books Abroad - and who had been Controller of Wireless and Cables, and knighted in 1915 for his war services. 18 For the previous eight years he had been a Professor of Poetry at Oxford, 19 and at the time of his appointment as Chairman of the Committee, he was President of the English Association, 20 an Association set up in 1906 to, inter

19 Ibid., p. 491.
20 Nowell Smith, The Origin and History of the (English) Association, English Association Chairman's Address 1942, p. 5.
alia, "promote the due recognition of English as an essential
element of national education". 21 Shortly after the Report was
finished he was made a Companion of Honour "for conspicuous service
of National importance". 22 Although he identified himself as a
Liberal, it was as a Liberal above narrow party politics: writing of
his years as editor and proprietor of the Monthly Review
(1900-1904), he declared himself as having been "free from political
bias of a partisan kind", as one whose "Liberal opinions should not
be pressed with anything like party spirit". 23 Such was the man
selected in 1919 to head the Committee of Enquiry into English.

The Committee appointed by Mrs Thatcher in 1972 included, over
its two years, 20 different members. Its Chairman was Sir Alan
Bullock, who at the time of his appointment was in his fourth year
as Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, 24 the University at which he had first
been appointed as a lecturer in History some 25 years previously, 25
and at which he was, in 1960, the founding master of St Catherine's
College. 26 Unlike his counterpart Newbolt, Bullock had no formal
background in English or its teaching, but was, rather, an historian.

21 Ibid., p. 5.
22 Edited by his wife Margaret Newbolt, The Later Life and Letters
23 Memoirs of Sir Henry Newbolt 1862-1932. My World as in My
26 Ibid., p. 182.
and administrator. He had been, from 1961-1964, a member of the Arts Council,\textsuperscript{27} from 1966-1969 a member of the Schools Council,\textsuperscript{28} and from 1963-65 a member of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers.\textsuperscript{29} While no clues are given about Bullock's political standpoint or affiliations in 1972, it is interesting to observe that he joined the Social Democratic Party in 1981.\textsuperscript{30}

Of Newbolt's 13 fellow Committee members at least 5 had held official appointments in higher education: at the time of the Inquiry Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch had for seven years been a Professor of English Literature at Cambridge, and as if credentialled in advance for the Committee he had, in 1910, been knighted "for services to literature, to the Cornwall education committee, and to Liberalism in the county (sic);"\textsuperscript{31} Mr F.S. Boas had from 1901-1905 been Professor of History and English Literature at Queen's College, Belfast;\textsuperscript{32} Professor C.H. Firth had been Professor of Modern History at Oxford since 1904, had been for more than 25 years an active innovator in higher education, and of

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p. 182.
\textsuperscript{28} Who's Who 1975-6, p. 431.
\textsuperscript{29} Who's Who 1975-6, p. 431.
particular significance in his selection for this Committee, had been instrumental in building up an honours school in Language and Literature at Oxford;\textsuperscript{33} J. Dover Wilson had been from 1909-12 a Lecturer in English Language and Literature at Goldsmith's College, University of London;\textsuperscript{34} while Professor Caroline F.E. Spurgeon was from 1901 to 1913 a Lecturer in English Literature at Bedford College for Women, London.\textsuperscript{35} This representation of the interests of 'English' in the Universities, and in particular through the presence of two prestigious Professors of Poetry - Newbolt from Oxford and Quiller-Couch from Cambridge - guaranteed that, in the definition of 'English' in 1919, the voices of 'English' in Academia would be clearly heard.

In this respect the contrast with Bullock's Committee is marked. Although at least 7 of the 20 members of the 1972 Committee had held official appointments in higher education none, at the time of the Committee's appointment, were from English Departments in institutions of higher education - either in the University or the College sectors. The three University Professors on the Committee - J.N. Britton, J.E. Merritt, and J. Wrigley - were professors of Education at the University of London, the Open University, and the University of Reading respectively.\textsuperscript{36} Although Britton had always

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Dictionary of National Biography 1931-40, Oxford, 1949, p. 278.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Who's Who 1927, op.cit., p. 3192.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 2784.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. vi/vii.
\end{itemize}
worked in the field of English teaching, while Merritt's academic qualifications were in educational psychology, while Wrigley's initial training was as a mathematics teacher. In the case of the other members holding positions in higher education Miss J. Derrick came from the Language Teaching Centre at the University of York, W.K. Gardner from the School of Education at University of Nottingham, and Mrs V. Southgate Booth from the School of Education at University of Manchester. One only came from the College sector - J.J. Fairbairn, Head of the Education Department at St John's College, York. Thus, in contrast to 1919, when Oxford and Cambridge 'English' interests clearly dominated the Committee, in 1972 the academic backgrounds of and positions held by the Committee members were not specifically related to academic 'English'. Rather the members of the 1972 Committee from higher education were preoccupied with the application of 'English' to learning in schools.

It is also productive to compare the composition of each Committee for indications of the level of representation granted to the interests of schools, ranging from schools involved in initial teaching to those involved with school leavers. From the

39 Ibid., p. 2440.
40 Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. vi/vii. The positions held by each member at the time of the Committee's appointment are listed.
information available it is possible to identify only one person on the Newbolt Committee who is clearly experienced as a practising teacher of English in schools - George Sampson. George Sampson had been trained as an elementary school teacher and in 1910 had become headmaster of a higher-grade school. According to S.C. Roberts, his Dictionary of National Biography 'assessor', Sampson as a schoolmaster, worked for the improved teaching of English "in the spirit of a crusader", basing his "passionate plea for better teaching" on two principles: firstly that "it is the purpose of education, not to prepare children for their occupations, but to prepare children against their occupations", and secondly that "a sound education system must be based upon the great means of human intercourse - human speech in spoken and written word". This, too, was the credo which he elaborated in his English for the English published in 1921, the year the Newbolt Report was completed. Two members of the Committee - Miss K.M. Baines and J. Dover Wilson - as well as the Secretary to the Committee, J.E. Hales, are listed at the beginning of the Report as being members of His Majesty's Inspectorate. J. Dover Wilson had been appointed in 1912 as "a Special Inspector in English, History, and Economics to the Technological Branch of the Board of Education (with particular responsibility to continuation schools and adult classes in the North of England)" and in fact, according to Harold

42 Ibid., p. 757.
Jenkins' account of his life in the Dictionary of National Biography 1961-70, had written the sections of the Newbolt Report on those areas of Education. Jenkins describes Dover Wilson as living, at the time the Committee was carrying out its investigation, in Leeds, and doing "a perpetual round of evening schools throughout the northern counties, his ideal of culture for industrial workers (being) strengthened by (this) experience".\(^{45}\) As well, F.S. Boas had been, during the previous 15 years, "a London County Council Education Department Inspector of English Language and Literature, etc." (sic)\(^ {46}\) and so may be assumed to have been thoroughly familiar with English teaching in London schools. As a group these inspectors would have provided the Committee with much knowledge and experience of 'English' in schools.

It may also be, given the presence of practising teachers on the Committee is likely to have been sought and guaranteed, that three persons - Miss H.M. Davies, Miss D. Enright and Miss L.A. Lowe, otherwise unidentifiable from the source material considered in terms of their qualifications, publications, or current appointments - were persons providing such a presence and voice. Another woman on the Committee - Miss Perrie Williams, held a Doctorate de l'Universite Paris and is listed\(^ {47}\) as having edited one book: La Bel

\(^{44}\) Who's Who 1927, op.cit., p. 3192.


Inconnu: roman d'aventures, which was published in Paris in 1929.

No additional information on Miss Perrie Williams has been located, and so no further comment about her likely role or influence on the Committee can be made, or whether she was a teacher in schools.

In 1972, the 'interests' of schools are very clearly identified: of the 20 persons who sat on the Bullock committee six were heads of schools, two Local Education Authority (LEA) Advisers, one a LEA Chief Education Officer, another the Chairman of the Schools Council, and yet another the Director of Studies of the Schools Council.\textsuperscript{48} As well Professor Britton had been Director of the Schools Council Writing Research Project from 1965-70.\textsuperscript{49} Those members from the teaching profession represented a range of infant, junior and secondary schools in both the Government and non-Government sectors.\textsuperscript{50} It is interesting to observe, however, that there were none from either the grammar schools sector or the independent public schools. Covering too, a wide and diffuse geographical area - London, Bristol, Carlisle, West Sussex, Surrey, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire\textsuperscript{51} - it might be argued that this group of school-focussed educators was purposely selected to ensure a broad range of views from throughout the country. Given this

\textsuperscript{47} In the Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne.
\textsuperscript{48} Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. vi/vii.
\textsuperscript{49} The Academic Who's who 1975/6, op.cit., p. 81.
\textsuperscript{50} Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. vi/vii.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., pps. vi/vii.
balance on the Bullock Committee in favour of members who held, at
the time of the Inquiry, appointments in a range of schools it is
likely, too, that the view of 'English' emerging from this Committee
would be indicative of what these schools regarded as fundamental.
This balance, in 1972, in favour of the schools stands in
substantial contrast to the balance within the Newbolt Committee,
where the membership was weighted in favour of authoritative figures
and leaders especially from the Universities at Oxford and
Cambridge. In the perception and fashioning of what should be
central in 'English' the 'institutional' balance of influence, at
the level of membership of the Committees, has thus moved in 1974 as
compared with 1921, from the universities and what they viewed as
important, to the schools and what they viewed as important.

Any consideration or analysis of the identity of these
Committees must also take into account the view of 'English' which
the members would be likely to bring from their association with and
commitment to the professional bodies to which they belonged. In
the case of the Newbolt Committee the influence of the English
Association is both central and crucial: according to Nowell Smith,
"of the 14 members of that Committee, 9 were members of the English
Association, including Sir Henry Newbolt, who was Chairman to both
bodies, (8) John Bailey, an ex-chairman of the Association..."52
According, again, to Nowell Smith its "motive power at the start was
the desire... to put English studies on the map of English school

52 Nowell Smith, op.cit., p.6.
education... and this was... without doubt the great work which the
Association did in its early years, culminating or at least
proclaiming itself most effectively in the Report of the Teaching of
English in England". At and from the time of its establishment in
1907 the objects of the English Association were

(a) to afford opportunities for intercourse and co-operation among
all those interested in English language and literature

(b) to maintain the correct use of English, written and spoken

(c) to promote the due recognition of English as an essential
element of national education

(d) to discuss methods of teaching English and the correlation of
school and University work

(e) to encourage and facilitate advanced study in English language
and literature. The effectiveness and increasing strength of the Association, as
it pursued these objects, is indicated in its membership numbers.
By 1911 it had some 2000 members, and after a drop during the War, its numbers increased again: by 1922 - that is, at the time of the

53 Ibid., p. 6.
54 Ibid., p. 5.
publication of Newbolt's Report - there were some 5000 members.\textsuperscript{55} In 1915 it had published "a handy and inexpensive volume called Poems of Today", which, as if in token of the Association's impact, was by 1917 in its 13th edition (and in 1927 in its 35th edition).\textsuperscript{56} According to Nowell Smith, in cultural and influential circles in London and the provinces and also overseas, the Association's impact was great and by 1918 its confidence was such that it "took the initiative of suggesting... the appointment of the Departmental Committee".\textsuperscript{57} Commenting on Fisher's invitation in May 1919 for him to chair the Committee Newbolt, then Chairman of the English Association, wrote that "the choice is due to Fisher's liking for my New Study of English Poetry and the views on education therein expressed".\textsuperscript{58} - views of the President which one may assume were applauded by the membership of the Association.

The English Association was also prolific in its publication of pamphlets, many of which were as sermons preaching its gospel. Between 1907, and the date of the appointment of Newbolt's Committee, the Association had published some 43 pamphlets.\textsuperscript{59} This

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., pps. 7-9.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p. 8.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p. 7.
\textsuperscript{58} Margaret Newbolt (ed.) - op.cit., p. 264.
\textsuperscript{59} See Appendix C for a list which indicates the range of subject matter and preoccupation of these pamphlets. These pamphlets represent a gold-mine of material seminal in the 'definition' of English.
series of pamphlets clearly reflected the concerns of the English Association and its anxiety to secure the place of 'English' in the school curriculum. Most of the pamphlets were prescriptive as well as richly seminal of what 'English' should be, and intent on propagating the gospel of 'English'. As well, the specific issues addressed and the very practical suggestions for the classroom set out in many of the pamphlets no doubt ensured the Association of the confidence and support of teachers in schools, a confidence and support testified to by the membership of 5000 in 1922. Running through and common to all the English Association publications is the assumption, stated directly in the summary title of Section 13 of the General Introduction of Newbolt's Report that "English (is) the essential basis of a liberal education for all", and again in the summary title of Section 10, "a liberal education, in however elementary a form, is both desirable and attainable... for all English children". Responding in 1918 to the immediate context of the times, W.M. Childs, Chairman of the Association for that year, asserted in his annual address that the "moral of the war was, not that they (England) should develop trade, but that they should develop humanity. A chief burden in maintaining and keeping uppermost the spiritual element must rest" Childs said, "for a variety of reasons, more upon the teaching of English and English literature than upon any other subject". Such then, was the

60 Newbolt Report, op. cit., p. iii.
61 Ibid., p. iv.
62 English Association Pamphlet No. 43, edited Edith J. Morley. A (Footnote continued)
Immediate professional and intellectual, and indeed cultural, context and milieu to which at least 9 of the 14 members\textsuperscript{63} of the Newbolt Committee belonged. Such were the educational and broader 'political' commitments and beliefs of an Association which had "enlist(ed) the leadership of well-known University professors, famous men of letters, and public men of literary distinction."\textsuperscript{64}

Fifty years later, within the Bullock Committee there are few signs of any similar homogeniety of view, or of a strong and sustained mutual voice representing the views and pedagogical commitments of English teachers. The National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE) did not, in 1972, manifest itself as a strong crusading presence in the Bullock Committee in a manner comparable to the manner the English Association manifested itself within the Newbolt Committee in 1919. From the evidence available it has not been possible to determine the proportion of the membership of the Bullock Committee with direct connections with NATE. For some members however, as was the case with the Newbolt Committee and the English Association, the connections are clear. Of particular significance, and this was the case also in 1919, the President of the Association representing English teachers was a member: Professor James Britton was, from 1971 to 1973, President of

\textsuperscript{62}(continued)
\textit{Series of Papers. The Teaching of English in Schools, 1919, p. 3.}
\textsuperscript{63} Nowell Smith, op.cit., p. 6.
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., p. 6.
NATE,\textsuperscript{65} and, to that extent it can be argued that NATE members were guaranteed continuing access to and presence in the Inquiry. As well, other members of the Bullock Committee, who were members of NATE at the time of the Inquiry, can be identified. For instance, Michael Marland from Woodberry Down Secondary School in London, had, some years earlier in 1967, published an article — "Z cars and the teachers"\textsuperscript{66} — in The Use of English, a NATE journal, in which he argued the legitimacy within the English classroom of subject-matter dealing with contemporary social issues, and in support of the place of 'English' within an integrated approach to humanities studies. David Mackay,\textsuperscript{67} from the Inner London Education Authority's Centre for Language in Primary Education, and Mrs V. Southgate Booth,\textsuperscript{68} from the University of Manchester's School of Education were also members of NATE.

Compared with the substantial contribution made to the English Association pamphlets between 1907 and 1919 by members of the 1919 Committee as prominent as Fowler, Boas, Dover Wilson and Spurgeon,\textsuperscript{69} comparable contributions by members of the 1972 Committee to NATE publications in the 1960's and early 1970's are fewer in number and

\textsuperscript{65} The Academic Who's Who 1975-76, op.cit., p. 81.
\textsuperscript{67} Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of English, New York, 1967, p. 192.
\textsuperscript{68} The Academic Who's Who 1975/6, op.cit., p. 67.
\textsuperscript{69} See Appendix C.
less significant. NATE-inspired input by NATE members within the Bullock Committee must be measured as inconsiderable compared with the input of English Association members within the Newbolt Committee. Indeed in the years immediately prior to the appointment of the Bullock Committee, and particularly following the 1966 Anglo-American Dartmouth Conference—an invitational seminar for some 50 participants on the Teaching of English, held at Dartmouth College, Connecticut—there was anxious debate, among English teachers about the nature, and as well, the present and future role and function of English, particularly in schools.70 This debate, at times "acrimonious... concern(ed) the exact relationship of language and literature (and whether this relationship was) central or peripheral"71 in determining what 'English' should be. This Dartmouth Conference had been co-sponsored by the Modern Language Association of America, the National Association for the Teaching of English (United Kingdom) and the National Council of Teachers of English (United States).72 In the opinion of David Allen—writing in 1980—discussion and debate in England, after 1965, about the nature of English was heavily influenced by the reports of this Conference, particularly by John Dixon's Growth Through English, which Allen judged to be "an avowedly 'partial report'".73 Further,

70 The nature of this debate is indicated clearly in reports such as Herbert J. Muller's: The Uses of English, New York, 1967 and John Dixon's Growth Through English, NATE, Oxford, first published in 1967.


72 Muller, op.cit., p. iv.
according to Allen, "those assembled were 'the progressive cutting-edge' of English teaching... Virtually all the major figures influential since then were present and were influential there. The seminar was not revolutionary, but it can be seen now to have had a substantial effect on the drift of change." Of particular importance for the Bullock Committee was that two of its members - James Britton and David Mackay - had been among those invited to attend.

That, at the time of the Bullock Inquiry, there was no shared, common view among the NATE membership - as there had been none among the Dartmouth participants - about the nature of 'English' or about what was central in the study of language and the study of literature, and about the relationship between the two, is clear. The differences in views were reflected in associated issues raised at the NATE Conference on 'Language Across the Curriculum' in 1971, and elaborated, from the time of the Dartmouth Conference, in articles published in the NATE journals - The Use of English, and English in Education. The very choice of those members of NATE

73 David Allen, op.cit., p. 29. This view that this Conference and Dixon's Growth Through English are central to Allen's discussion is borne out by a consideration of the Index to his book. There are references to Dartmouth, and references to Dixon - no other items or persons have more.

74 Ibid., p. 27.

75 Muller, op.cit., p. 190.

76 Allen, op.cit., p. 56.

77 See Appendix D for examples.
who were appointed to the Bullock Committee may be regarded as strong evidence of a shift of balance within NATE on what issues should preoccupy the teachers of English, especially in schools. Thus while Britton, Marland, and Mackay - advocates of the 'new' role of 'language in education', and the centrality of each child's own language - were made members of the Bullock Committee, there is no evidence that any advocates of the centrality of literature - either from among teachers of English, or from the membership of NATE - were appointed to represent that 'interest' and sustain that view. That voice and position had been regularly and consistently presented through the NATE journal, *The Use of English* by its editor for the 21 years from 1958 - Denys Thompson. David Allen points out that Thompson, until his retirement in 1969, "saw the English teacher's main task as the teaching of literature, very much in terms of countering the effects of a mass society".78 Denys Thompson and the group of which he was part, were preoccupied with 'English', and in particular with Literature, as a weapon to be used in the fight against what they understood to be the uncivilised aspects and values of the contemporary industrial society.79 The NATE voices on the Bullock Committee were not, however, those presenting this view of 'English', but rather those of an increasingly influential group broadly associated with 'language in education' and

78 David Allen, op.cit., p. 9.

79 This latter view is exemplified in works such as Denys Thompson (ed.), *Discrimination and Popular Culture*, London 1973, a view first set out by Denys Thompson in 1933 in F.R. Leavis and Denys Thompson, *Culture and the Environment*, London, 1933.
applied linguistics. The appointment in 1963\textsuperscript{80} of Andrew Wilkinson, as Editor of the NATE Journal \textit{English in Education}, signalled this change. His appointment indicated the change of balance within NATE in favour of the protagonists of 'language in education' to the disadvantage of missionaries and preachers of culture proclaiming the centrality of literature. In his 'retirement' editorial in 1969, Wilkinson argued for a "communication model" of English teaching: "a model based upon the communication situation, where the addressor, the addressee, subject, context and language outcomes receive appropriate attention".\textsuperscript{81} Wilkinson, who at the time was a Reader in Education at Birmingham University, made no reference to either literature, or its significance in his final editorial.

In comparison, then, with their 1919 counterparts, the voices of the English teachers in the 1972 Committee, identified as voices from the Association of English teachers, are not only fewer in number but are voices speaking without the 'authority' arising from the united support of the Association's membership which their 1919 counterparts had enjoyed. Although appointments such as Wilkinson's within NATE represented a highly significant change of direction, the late 1960's and early 1970's remained a time of continuing debate among English teachers about what was central and indeed legitimate in 'English' and 'English' classrooms. However, it may

\textsuperscript{80} Andrew Wilkinson, Editorial, \textit{English in Education}, Vol. 4, No 1, 1970, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., p. 3.
be argued that in the selection of Britton, Marland, and Mackay to the Committee the die was purposely cast in favour of 'language in education' at the expense of 'Literature'. Commenting on the critics, from within the band of 'English' teachers who contested the newer theories of 'English' language learning and their centrality in Education, Allen observes that "the general tone of their remarks (had) become increasingly defensive..., sometimes even strident, as if the audience (had) moved away."82

In addition to those Committee members directly linked with NATE - the Association specifically representing teachers of English - it is important to recognise that, in this redefinition of 'English' in the early 1970's, additional although related specialist 'interests' were almost prominent. Professor J.E. Merritt was, in 1969-70, the President of the United Kingdom Reading Association,83 as was Mrs V. Southgate Booth in 1971-2.84 As the Committee reported, its "terms of reference allowed (it) ... to base (its) Report on the important principle that reading must be seen as part of a child's general language development and not ... a discrete skill ... (to) be considered in isolation from it"85 and so such representation on the Committee must be seen as intentional, and indicative of a change of emphasis in the role to be played by

---

82 David Allen, op.cit., p. 88.
various traditionally-associated elements in the teaching and learning of 'English'. The Committee had "in fact, interpreted (its) brief as language in education", and in that sense had chosen to interpret the concept of 'English' in a very broad sense. A key difference between the 1921 Report and the 1974 Report is that in selecting the membership of the latter Committee from a wider range of individuals and 'interests' the Secretary of State for Education and Science in 1972 ensured that a broad not a narrow view of 'English' was taken: the purposes and uses of 'English' were thus seen to be different in Mrs Thatcher's England, than in the England of H.A.L. Fisher.

It is to be noted as well, that the membership of Bullock Committee did include at least one person unsympathetic to those views of 'English' in the ascendant within the National Association for the Teaching of English. Stuart Froome, who attached a Note of Dissent to the Report, was, later, a contributor to the Black Paper of 1977, one of the series initiated in 1969, and the publication of which had been described by the Labour Minister of State for Education and Science of that year, as "one of the blackest days for education for 100 years". Froome's view may be regarded as sympathetic to a position attractive to the Conservative Party, and indeed one of the 1977 editors of the Black Paper, Rhodes

86 Ibid., pps. 556-9.
Boyson was at that time Opposition (Conservative) spokesman on Education.\textsuperscript{88} It might be argued, in turn that yet another 'lobby group', perhaps for 'balance' - the unionised teachers - had a measure of representation, albeit not directly. Dame Muriel Stewart, Chairman of the School Councils when the Committee was established, had been, from 1964/5, President of the National Union of Teachers\textsuperscript{89} - the largest teacher organisation in the United Kingdom. It is reasonable to assume that the concerns and views of these teachers about the concept or model of 'English', and the related matters which arose from the brief of the Committee, would have thus been available to the Committee.

Another aspect fruitful in attempting to identify the underlying commitments of each Committee is the extent to which members of each Committee were writing, and being published, particularly in areas associated with 'English'. Of the members of the Newbolt Committee at least 8 had published such works prior to the formation of the Committee. For the most part these publications dealt with recognised literary texts, topics, or genres.\textsuperscript{90} Newbolt, Bailey,

\textsuperscript{89} Who's Who 1982, op.cit., p. 2217.
\textsuperscript{90} It has not been easy to obtain exhaustive listings of the publications of various members of the Committee. It is also difficult to establish from the listings in various Library catalogues the date of the initial publications, and so to ascertain to any conclusive degree the 'range' of interests of members of the Committee in 1919, as these interests were demonstrated in their publications to that date. No account has been taken of post-1919 'literary' publications of members of the Committee.
Boas, Firth, Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson each had, by the time the Committee commenced its Inquiry in 1919, at least 10 books published, and to that extent they were prominent "men of letters", and perhaps even, a literary coterie. Professor C.H. Firth, although an historian and at the time of the Inquiry a Professor of Modern History at Oxford, had written an English Association pamphlet (No. 11) in 1911 on John Bunyan, and as well had published a collection of American ballads. George Sampson, too, was on the eve of having his English For the English published - this book has recently been appraised by David Shayer, as "in its way almost as important a publication as the 1921 Report, for it was not just a very good method book but a method book which... provides us with a further account of the development of the subject up to 1920".

In comparison, the members of the Bullock Committee had, in the main, written and published very little by the time of their appointments to the 1972 Inquiry. The chairman himself was well-recognised for his contribution to contemporary history in Hitler: A Study in Tyranny, published in 1952. Of the others James Britton had published two seminal works promoting the study of 'language in schools' - in 1969 with Douglas Barnes and Harold Rosen, Language, the learner and the school, and in 1970, Language and Learning - and each of these works has clearly been influential.

91 It was published in 1921.
in the composition and content of associated chapters in the Bullock Report. David Marland had published several books for English teachers including, in 1966, *Pictures for Writing*, and in 1970 *The Practice of English Teaching*. Professor J. E. Merritt had edited, in 1971 *Reading and the Curriculum*, and in 1972 *The Reading Curriculum*. Mrs Southgate Booth had been prolific in the publication of children's reading books with more than 60 titles to her credit between 1959-72, and she had published, in the two years prior to the appointment of the Committee, *Reading - Which Approach, i.t.a.* (initial teaching alphabet); *What is the Evidence, Beginning Reading*, and, as well, had edited *Literacy At All Levels*. Compared, however, with the literary and critical output and publications of members of the Newbolt Committee that of the members of the Bullock Committee must be described as 'limited'. Further, the publications of members of the earlier Committee deliberately proselitize and cultivate in terms of tastes and values, whereas, in contrast, the 'publishing' members of the Bullock Committee, in the main, 'merely' explicate and present findings arising from survey and research, both theoretical and 'workface'. Generally the tone and style of their own and associated research-based publications appear detached and certainly less fervent than that of their counterparts on the Newbolt Committee, but it could be demonstrated that the positions set out in these more recent publications also reflect considerable hidden and undeclared commitments to educational and ideological attitudes and values. 

Further clues, useful in assessing the 'background' out of which the views expressed in the Reports arise, emerge from information about the social and economic 'standing' and education of the members of the Committees. In the case of the Newbolt Committee, nothing was found about the educational background of the five 'unidentifiable ladies', or on J.H. Fowler. Of the remainder, with the exception of George Sampson who, because of illness received no formal secondary schooling, the remainder had public school backgrounds with four coming from the "same stable" - Clifton College. As Newbolt himself observed, it was "odd that out of the eight men were four old Cliftonians, and one a Clifton Master: none of them proposed by me". It is also pertinent that seven had undertaken their University studies at Oxford, and one - J. Dover Wilson - at Cambridge. Although George Sampson had

---


95 Miss K.M. Baines, H.M. Inspector; Miss H.M. Davies; Miss D. Enright; Miss L.A. Lowe; and Miss G. Perrie Williams. D. de l'Universite, Paris (altogether there is one book - *La Bel in Inconnu: roman d'aventures*, listed in her name in the Baillieu Library).


trained as an elementary schoolteacher at teachers' colleges at Southwark and Winchester, he too had "joined these ranks": he was awarded, in 1921, an honorary M.A. at Cambridge. From evidence of this nature it might also be assumed that the majority of members of the 1919 Committee came from a background of comparative wealth and influence. In fact, both John Bailey and Sir Charles Firth are specifically described as persons of "private income", while Newbolt himself was of sufficient means to leave editing The Monthly Review when he was 38 "to devote himself entirely to creative writing". Given the apparently low profile of most of the women members of the Newbolt Committee - the exception being Professor Caroline Spurgeon - the general ambiance and the hegemonic context of the Newbolt Committee may be described as that of men born to report and lead.

From the published material available, much less is revealed of the background of the members of the Bullock Committee although

97 (continued)

98 Margaret Newbolt (ed.), op.cit., 264.

99 The sources are the same as set out in footnote 97 of this chapter.


101 Ibid., (i) p. 29, Bailey, (ii) p. 278, Firth.

their curricula vitae, and appointments held at the time of their Inquiry suggest that, beyond reasonable doubt, they had "worked" their way into any positions of influence or power which they held. Bullock was a graduate of Oxford, as was Alistair Burnet, and David Marland was from Cambridge, while Mrs V. Southgate Booth, Dame Muriel Stewart, and Professor J. Wrigley respectively are listed as graduating from Birmingham, Durham and Manchester,\(^{103}\) while Professor James Britton is listed non-specifically as having gained "a teaching qualification in English in 1930".\(^{104}\) About the remaining 12 no information relating to their educational background or qualifications, nor to their "personal" circumstances or interests, has been found. Based then mainly on the evidence of the professional positions and appointments held by its members, it would appear that the ambiance and hegemonic identity of the Bullock Committee is that of experienced professionals working in the public sector of Education. Of the two non-Education members other than Bullock himself, Alistair Burnet was prominent in journalism being, at the time of his appointment, Editor of The Economist,\(^{105}\) while David Gadsby was Managing Director of A and C Black, the publishers of Who's Who - ironically, not a word appears

---

\(^{103}\) (i) Mrs V. Southgate Booth - The Academic Who's Who 1975-6, op.cit., p.67.


---

\(^{104}\) The Academic Who's Who 1975-6, op.cit., p. 81.

about him in its current edition.  

Such, then, was the composition and membership of the Committees of Inquiry into 'English', set up in 1919 and 1972. In considering what they reported in 1921 and 1974 about the nature and content of 'English' it will be seen that, to a very large extent, they 'represented' their times, and that the views and values they held to be important reflected and emerged from their hegemonic identity, that is from "(their) whole body of practices and expectations, (their) assignments of energy, (and their) ordinary understanding of man and his world", and from their personal commitments, their professional experience, and their place and role in the educational, political, and cultural worlds of their day. Within this framework and context what each of the Committees understood as 'English' will be analysed and compared.

---

106 Ibid.,

CHAPTER 3

THE NATURE OF 'ENGLISH'

For the members of the Newbolt Committee there was, in 1921, no doubt: "The belief which inspires each paragraph of the present Report is that (the) much desired spiritual unity in the nation and the equally necessary uplift in the whole level of the popular imagination can only come through a general acknowledgement of the paramount place which the native speech and literature should occupy in our schools and in the common life of our people".¹ They spoke as preachers of culture, and with the voice of assurance. In contrast, the members of the Bullock Committee in 1974 reported rather as informed investigators and analysts, drawn in the main from a broader world of Education. As a group the Bullock Committee were sceptical of oversimplification and overstatement, and determined to make clear that, for them, "perspective is important, and a realistic assessment the best point from which to move towards improvement".² Their view was formulated only after relevant data had been gathered in a Survey, and after consideration of available research, and following reflection on "an accumulation of experience" drawn from expert witnesses - "the evidence obtained


² Bullock Report, A language for life, London, 1974, p. 3. For full citation see footnote 1(ii) in Chapter 1 of this thesis.
from all these sources was the foundation on which the enquiry was built". After considering this huge body of data the Bullock Committee reported that there was a "variety of practice..., that (contrary to what was frequently asserted), no one set of attitudes (had) virtually swept the board", and that "it is a characteristic (of 'English') that it does not hold together as a body of knowledge which can be identified, quantified, and then transmitted".

The approach and style of the Newbolt Committee is, throughout its Report, deliberately imperative and declamatory. With missionary fervour, it asserts that teachers at all levels must "be grounded and confirmed in the idea of a liberal education", and that they must as teachers and as citizens "who have already received their inheritance" make their contribution "to the unity and harmony of the nation". In contrast, the findings of the Bullock Report are presented in the language and style of thoroughly briefed official inquirers, careful at all times to set their conclusions and recommendations in the context of the evidence before them. In this sense, David Allen's judgment that "the Bullock Report was not

---

3 Ibid., pps. xxxiii/xxxiv. These pages include an extensive listing of these sources, including the Survey compiled from questionnaires sent to 1515 primary schools and 392 secondary schools; the 66 individuals and 56 organisations requested to submit written evidence; and the "several hundred individuals and organisations" which "respond(ed) after a public invitation to anyone interested to submit written evidence".

4 Ibid., p. 4.

5 Ibid., p. 5.

just news to those who were not on the Committee, it... was the attempt of the Committee to tell itself what it thought is accurate, although misleading to the extent that it fails to acknowledge sufficiently the fact that some of Bullock Committee's members held firm views on the areas under investigation. Their views were not presented, however, in an equivalent form of the "belief underpinning every paragraph" referred to by the Newbolt Committee. In keeping too, with the Newbolt Committee's convictions, was its response to the changes taking place in England after World War I, as it urged reforms of a heavily meliorative kind, set out and argued in quasi-religious terms, which appealed as much to the heart as the head. In contrast stands the Bullock Committee's response some 60 years later. As Britain adjusted to its role as a middle-level power in Europe, it indicated, in prudent measured paragraphs arising from careful consideration of the evidence presented to it, the directions English teaching should take in order to meet the educational requirements of England in the 1970's.

Dominating the whole of the Newbolt Report are the propositions set out as its "General" Principal Conclusions and Recommendations:

"1. That our national education needs to be perfected by being scientifically founded as a universal, reasonable, and liberal process of development (and)"

---

2. That for such an Education the only basis possible is English." 8

Newbolt and his Committee regarded it as central to their task to argue the importance of this kind of Education since "neither by tradition nor by effective instruction has the general body of citizens any clear idea of the benefit to be conferred." 9 The lack of any Education "worthy of the name of a national culture", 10 and the fact that "the idea of a liberal education is either altogether ignored or struggles for the right of existence" 11 meant, for them, that the importance of English had to be recognised. As the means of filling this cultural void its role was "absolute and unchallengable" and so 'English' had to become "the basis of school life... and the lesson in English... not merely one occasion for the inculcation of knowledge, ...(but rather) an initiation into the corporate life of man". 12 In contrast, by the time of the Bullock Report the place of 'English' as a subject in the contemporary curriculum was undisputed and secure. As was indicated in the questionnaires filled in by more than 1800 schools as part of the 1972 Survey, the debate was rather about what its identity should be. 13 The Survey clearly indicated that "the variety of practice is

8 Newbolt Report, p. 348.
9 Ibid., p. 5.
10 Ibid., p. 6.
11 Ibid., p. 12.
12 Ibid., p. 57.
wide" and that, contrary to what was sometimes asserted, neither "one or another set of attitudes (about English had) virtually swept the board".\textsuperscript{14} The Committee was also determined that the right sort of questions be asked in order for it to "decide what kind of English is right for our pupils".\textsuperscript{15} Following consideration of a mass of evidence, the Committee did not so much seek to set aside what was being done, but rather stated its conviction that there should be, in the interests of improved performances in 'English', a redefinition of what is involved, so that "standards of writing, speaking, reading can be raised".\textsuperscript{16} What was particularly significant about this redefinition in 1974, as compared with the definition of 1921, is that it contained no substantial affirmations about the centrality of literature and its capacities for effecting change at the personal or national level, nor was there, in the body of the Report, evidence of any substantial or orchestrated lobbying on 'Literature's' behalf. Although no simple formula was developed to provide the 1974 redefinition the pivotal emphasis is clear: all teachers should have "an explicit understanding of the operation of language" in order "to help (each) child improve the technical control of his work... as a means of communicating with his audience in the most appropriate and satisfying way".\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{13} Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. 359-510. Many of the tables illustrate this point.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 7.
The central issues about the nature of 'English', with which Newbolt and his Committee had to grapple in 1921, were intrinsically different from those facing Bullock and his Committee in 1974. In terms of the categories of change identified by Merritt and Coombs, it may be argued that the Newbolt Committee, with the support of the English Association, was concerned mainly with what it understood as the correction of abuses, including the lack of a secure and recognised place for 'English' in the curriculum of all schools, and with consequent adjustments to the educational framework to provide this place. On the other hand the Bullock Committee, made up principally of persons identified with influential groups or 'interests' from the educational workface – the schools, and institutions preparing teachers or involved in applied educational research – was concerned more with what Merritt and Coombs identify as the accommodation of new pressures and groups – in this case post-Dartmouth and 'language in education' protagonists – and with the substantial reformulation of goals in the teaching of 'English'. The Newbolt Committee was certain that, in England, the study of 'English' and not of the Classics should be the basis of Education, and that fundamental adjustments should be made to the educational curriculum to ensure a central place for

17 Ibid., p. 8.
19 Ibid., pps. 254-7.
'English', particularly in schools. In 1972 the Bullock Committee was able to assume that 'English' had an assured position in the curriculum. Its business was to provide a redefinition of its nature, role and function. In focussing on the importance of the language of the learner, in all its aspects, rather than on the 1920's ideal of the pursuit through the study of literature of a liberal education with its vaunted personal and national advantages, the Bullock Committee was involved in a fundamental reorientation, in the early 1970's, of the identity of 'English'. The breadth and depth of this reshaping and readjustment is demonstrated by the pervasive insistence throughout the 1974 Report on studies linking language and learning rather than, as in the 1921 Report, on constant reference to the advantages of the study of literature. Thus, both in 1921 and 1974 the critical fulcrum in the determination of what was required, both of and in the 'English' curriculum, was moved sufficiently - through the accommodation and political recognition of newly emerging interests, in appointments to official Government Committees of Inquiry - for significant reform to be sought in the 'English' curriculum.

In order to provide a context for setting out what each Committee understood 'English' to include in its component parts, and for considering the reasons for such inclusion, some further indication of the historical location of the Inquiries is required. The Committees and their members, of necessity, emerge from their times: the members of each Committee were who and what they were because of their personal, public or professional experience in the
areas judged as relevant, by those responsible for their appointment to the Committees. They were chosen to work on these Committees principally because their established expertise and status gave them the requisite identity to perform this powerful public service in the societies of which they were part.

Inevitably, there are considerable methodological difficulties in providing, or satisfactorily indicating, an adequate historical context in which to place the Committees, and certainly no full-scale historical context can be developed. Further, depending on which "facts" or events or trends or contemporary analyses or commentaries are selected to construct the framework considered most useful for this particular heuristic purpose, so the exercise may become dialectically self-fulfilling. Clearly, for comparative purposes, it would be helpful to be able to take an existing 'model' of historical explanation used for a particular place or time, in this case England 1919-21, and to construct its mirror-image with matching information or data for the place and time with which the initial model is being compared, in this case 1972-4. A brief consideration of two possible models for this purpose demonstrates the difficulties. Firstly, in elaborating on his judgments about the Newbolt Report's findings, Terence Hawkes explains that "after a series of shocks and challenges to an inherited sense of settled Englishness – they include the Dublin rising, the First World War, industrial unrest, major police strikes, and the impact of the Bolshevik revolution – it is hardly surprising that the Newbolt Report of 1921 offered 'English' as a kind of field-dressing to bind
the wounds". 20 Secondly, in establishing, for different heuristic purposes, an "equivalent" historical context, Margaret Mathieson, comments on the "very sympathetic... mood of post-war England... to the need for educational reform", in which Newbolt and his Committee worked, explaining that "one of the war's results was to produce not only a sense of the military and economic benefits enjoyed by Germany because of her educational system's freedom from irrelevant traditionalism, but also an awareness of our working-class' cultural inferiority". 21

If, for comparative purposes, an attempt is then made to replicate, for 1972-4, either the model of explanation used by Hawkes, or the model used by Mathieson, the goal remains elusive. In 1972-74, there is, for instance, neither a heuristically useful equivalent of Hawkes' "series of shocks and challenges" nor of Mathieson's "post-war moods" of 1919-21, and so no equivalent historical paradigm can be constructed. The Bullock Report was the product of a very different set of historical events and circumstances, and may more fruitfully be understood in terms of changing educational attitudes and expectations, rather than as a radical or innovatory product of political and 'historical' events and moods. Thus, for instance, The Times editorial in 1972, commenting on the appointment of the Committee, regarded it as a


necessary and sensible response to the findings of a National Foundation for Educational Research Report that, since the mid-60's reading standards in schools had not improved, findings which suggested to The Times "that all (was) not well with the schools' approach to this elementary skill". 22 No attempt was made to place it in any broad or substantial historical framework, or to identify pertinent 'moods' or 'shocks' or 'challenges'. Following the release of the Bullock Report in 1974 The Times, again in an editorial, restricted its remarks to a limited 'educational' context, although it did comment that "the subject (literacy) was one that bears extended treatment, of course, although it may be asked whether a major official enquiry was really the best means of investigating a theme whose implications ravel out into the haziest distances of philosophy, sociology and linguistics". 23 Thus while 'English' in the Newbolt Report has been fruitfully 'located' in the context of historically-described events and developments, the same has not yet been done for the Bullock Report. Perhaps because less than 10 years have passed since its publication, it is still too soon to 'place' it historically in the way Hawkes and Mathieson 'place' the Newbolt Report. Or it may be that the Bullock Report, being focussed more on curriculum development, and less on the justification of the subject in the educational curriculum, is less susceptible to 'placement' within that type of historical context which is described in terms of 'moods' and 'events'.

22 The Times, April 5, 1972, p. 13.
23 The Times, February 19, 1975, p. 15.
A view such as this of the differences in the 'historical' character of these Reports would be consistent with the function, composition, and style of membership of the Committees which produced them. Whereas Newbolt and his commissioners were preaching on the place and significance of 'English' in the national life and culture, Bullock and his Committee were concerned more with the review and redefinition of central aspects of an existing curriculum.

For the purposes of this comparison it is now useful to consider, and to compare and contrast, the views of each Committee on the central conceptual components of 'English', broadly identified as 'Language' and 'Literature'. While recognising the strength of arguments for a holistic consideration of the concept or model of 'English', and acknowledging that any separation of 'English' into component parts may be contentious, this separate 'component' approach will be used for the purposes of this comparative thesis. In considering similar issues in 1921, the Newbolt Committee concluded positively, if somewhat obscurely, through resort to metaphor, that these two aspects might be considered separately "as the chemical analysis of water can be separated from the observation of the sounds and colours conveyed by it".24 The Bullock Committee, in its comments on ways in which 'English' might be viewed, cautioned that "it is a characteristic of English that it does not

24 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 11.
hold together as a body of knowledge which can be identified, quantified and then transmitted... (and that) to attempt to draw in the boundaries, and to impose shape on what appears amorphous, rigour on what appears undisciplined" 25 may lead to a concept of the subject which merely answers certain formal requirements. For the purposes of this thesis the conventional categories of 'Language' and 'Literature' will be used to develop the analysis.

CHAPTER 4

'ENGLISH': THE PLACE AND ROLE OF 'LITERATURE'

For the members of the Newbolt Committee, reporting in 1921, "the true starting point and foundation from which all the rest must spring... (the) incontrovertible primary fact... (is) that for English children no form of knowledge can take precedence over a knowledge of English, no form of literature can take precedence over English literature: and that the two are so inextricably connected as to form the only possible basis for a national education". ¹ This 'English' was to be not only "the means of communication for all the common purposes of life... but English in the highest sense, that is as the channel of formative culture for all English people, and the medium of creative art by which all English writers of distinction, whether poets, historians, philosophers, or men of science, have secured for us the power of realising some part of their own experience of life". ² Such an "education in English is (then), for all Englishmen, a matter of the most vital concern, and one which must, by its very nature, take precedence over all other branches of learning": ³ it is "the one indispensable preliminary and foundation of all the rest". ⁴ In 1921 the Newbolt Report reported that access

² Ibid., p. 12.
³ Ibid., p. 10.
to this formative culture, through a liberal education, is "either altogether ignored or strugg(ing) feebly for the right of existence". And worse, "there is a singular depreciation of English literature for such a purpose". Such was the "spirited credo" on behalf of literature in 1921, the sort of faith which the Bullock Report acknowledged as necessary in English teaching. But by 1974 such assertive confidence in support of the study of literature had been much diminished. The Bullock Committee recognised that although "to many teachers (literature) is the most rewarding form of the child's encounters with language". the notion that it was "the task of every English teacher... to take every pupil up to a permanent relationship with the great classics has increasingly drawn contention", and further, that there was now "an equal polarity of view on what should be done with literature in the classroom" between the 'heritage' school and those who argue that "many pupils can never be expected to take literature into their lives in any such sense". The English Association representatives on the 1919 Committee would have stared in disbelief.

4 Ibid., p. 10.
5 Ibid., p. 12.
6 Ibid., p. 12.
8 Ibid., p. 130.
9 Ibid., p. 130.
10 Ibid., p. 130.
at this assessment of the changing status of literature in Education, while in turn, the group of experts chosen in 1972 to consider all aspects of teaching the use of English would have stared back at such apparent faith and naivety on the part of their counterparts in 1919.

Not only were the circumstances and contexts different in 1919 compared with 1972, but so too was what was perceived as possible in the study of literature, and of its end-results. A principal claim for the 'English' advocated by the Newbolt Committee, and for its 'Literature' component in particular, was that it should be an agent of national unity: "for all English children... whatever their position or occupation in life... a liberal education ...in however elementary a form", a liberal education in which English was "now manifest as the starting point, ...is both desirable and attainable."¹¹ Such studies "would have a unifying tendency, ...they would be a bond of union between classes, and would beget the right kind of national pride, ...and furnish a common meeting for great numbers of men and women who might otherwise never come in touch with each other".¹² Such studies would have the potential to meet the perceived need to bridge "the chasm of separation between 'nations' and classes, associated with 'the old education'",¹³ and "the true purposes of social life" would thus be served by more than

¹² Ibid., p. 22.
¹³ Ibid., p. 21.
"sport and games"!\textsuperscript{14} About the function of 'English' as an agent of national unity and in particular about the capacity of 'Literature' to serve it, Bullock and his Committee made no such claims. While arguing that each child, as a young citizen, needed to acquire a level of competence which would enable him to meet his needs as an adult in society when he leaves school,\textsuperscript{15} the Bullock Committee did not include the inculcation of a sense of national unity in its list of the values arising from the study of literature, and for which "much is claimed".\textsuperscript{16} In fact, in its chapter on Literature, the Bullock Committee makes no mention of the 'national' role of literature, focussing rather on its role in the life of the individual, and asserting that "in Britain, the tradition of literature teaching is one which aims at personal and moral growth, and (that) in the last two decades this emphasis has grown".\textsuperscript{17}

Further, the 'structural' evidence emerging from the constrasting ways in which the Reports are presented, re-inforces this view of fundamentally different assessments of the potential of the study of 'Literature' on the part of each Committee. For instance, claims and assertions on behalf of 'Literature' permeated the Newbolt Report, being both firmly established as cornerstones in the rhetorical framework set up in its Introduction, and then

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., p. 22.
\item Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 116.
\item Ibid., p. 124.
\item Ibid., p. 125.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
exemplified in full in the 25 pages of its chapter on 'Literature and Adult Education' - one of the 10 chapters of the Report. In contrast, in the Bullock Report the study of 'Literature' receives little even random discussion, covering only 12 pages of more than the 550 pages in the body of the Report - and this limited discussion is relegated to that Part of the Report associated with Reading, making up one only of the ten chapters in that Part. No equivalent supporting or advocacy documents on behalf of 'Literature' were presented in 1972 to match those of 1919 - either from 'interests' associated with the Schools Council, the Reading Association, or the National Association for the Teaching of English. Nothing in the lead-up years to 1972 matched English Association pamphlets such as those of C.H. Herford in 1910 on The Bearing of English on the National Life, nor of Caroline F.E. Spurgeon in 1917 on Poetry in the Light of War, nor of the Marquess of Crewe, the President of the English Association in 1916, who wrote on War and English Poetry. In each of these pamphlets the case for Literature was fully and enthusiastically argued.

A further principal claim made on behalf of 'Literature' in 1919 was that it should be studied as that form of Art, most readily available, having a "direct bearing upon practical life and

18 Newbolt Report, op.cit., pps. 252-277.
19 Caroline F.E. Spurgeon was also a member of the Newbolt Committee.
equipment for it", 21 which could be "handled from the first as the most direct and lasting communication of man with man". 22 In the confident, assertive language which characterised all that the Newbolt Committee argued, the Committee declared that English related to "the ultimate purpose of education, which we have called guidance in the acquisition of experience, or the giving of a wide outlook on life". 23 Such education was directly applicable to life, and thus to be contrasted with much education to that date which the Committee characterised as "turning aside from life and reality". 24 Straining its rhetoric to match its "high seriousness" in these matters, (and as if to gladden the heart of Matthew Arnold) the Committee argued that they had "given 'English' a very wide significance... call(ing) it the very stuff and process of thought". 25 Being linked, then, with quasi-religious and pedagogical responsibilities of this order the literature lesson could therefore be 'no mechanical matter', no mere 'imparting of information'. 26 Moving beyond the classroom, into the wider community, and as if to incarnate their gospel on literature, the Committee suggested "the enrolment of a fraternity of itinerant preachers on English Literature - a panel of men and women who are

21 Ibid., p. 9.
22 Ibid., p. 9.
23 Ibid., p. 54.
24 Ibid., pps. 54/55.
25 Ibid., p. 56.
26 Ibid., p. 24.
recognised authorities on their own subjects and are willing to lecture upon them". 27

Such was the faith and fervour of the senior priests of 'English' drawn so substantially from the membership of the English Association - that committed band responsible, in the words of Coxhead and Valentine, who initiated the idea of an English Association, 28 for the "foster(ing of) the study of English, and the teaching of that subject in schools... (and) the dissemination of right ideas on the teaching ". 29 In contrast, the Bullock Committee was much more tentative, and much more reserved in its faith in and judgments on the ameliorating potential of 'Literature'. Unlike the Newbolt Committee which unashamedly preached its gospel, the Bullock Committee presented its case in the context of data and evidence gained from research and survey, so that its assessment of the evidence emerges from a bureaucratic and managerial rather than clerical model. However, it should be borne in mind that, as the analysis of the membership of each Committee has indicated, that the members of each Committee were both purposely chosen for their task, and committed, in the most part, to particular views about the nature and role of the study of 'Language' and 'Literature'. The

27 Ibid., p. 25.

28 Nowell Smith outlines the initiatives taken by Coxhead and Valentine in 1906 to form an association for the teaching of English. See Nowell Smith, The Origin and History of the (English) Association, 1942, p. 4.

29 Ibid., p. 1.
ideological views of those appointed in 1919 may be more immediately obvious than those appointed in 1972, but it may also be observed that it was not unfashionable in the early 1970's for many missionaries and preachers to exchange their clerical garb for that worn by the laity, in order to demonstrate the practice rather than the preaching of their gospel. What is clear is that, by 1974, beliefs and opinions had changed about the efficacy and power of the study of literature, and that the 1974 Committee clearly signalled its reservations. "Much", they comment, "is claimed for it (Literature)" but "we lack evidence of (its) civilising power", and they add, "some of the claims made for it (Literature) have seemed over-ambitious".

As far as the Newbolt Committee was concerned English teachers were to be required, given that English literature was the most readily available form of Art for this purpose, to perceive its practical bearing on Life. Thus the study of literature was never to be "thought of, or represented as an ornament, an excrescence (sic), a mere pastime or an accomplishment", or "as a field of mental exercise remote from ordinary life". Rather it should be treated as "a possession" to be used, as "a source of delight, (of)

30 It is not within the scope of this thesis to explore this observation further, but certainly it would be illuminating to examine both the theoretical and ideological assumptions underpinning the published texts and statements of members of the Bullock Committee.

31 Bullock Report, op.cit., pps. 124/5.

personal intimacy, (of) the gaining of personal experience, and an end in itself", and as "at the same time, ...an equipment for the understanding of life". Such an understanding would result from the use of literature as "a means of contact with great minds, a channel by which to draw upon their experience with profit and delight, and a bond of sympathy between members of a human society". Again, for this reason, it should not be used for "conventional appreciations, historical details, and a minute examination of words and phrases". At all times its application to life needs to be taught, and "in no case must the real or practical bearing of the experience be neglected or avoided". In this context the Report asserts that literature's "relationship to human life and welfare (is) not sufficiently understood", and that it must be treated as "the self-expression of great natures, the record and rekindling of spiritual experiences, and in daily life for every one of us, the means by which we may, if we will, realise all our own impressions and communicate them to our fellows". Such study will not only be character-building, but will provide its participants with a "liberal education, an education which is aim(ed) at producing the good citizen, possessed of sound judgment in practical affairs...".

33 Ibid., p. 19.
34 Ibid., p. 15.
35 Ibid., p. 15.
36 Ibid., p. 17.
37 Ibid., p. 20/21.
In 1974, no such advocates on behalf of 'Literature' were at hand. In contrast, in one sentence and without elaboration, the Bullock Report summarised five "claims" made on behalf of literature: "it helps to shape the personality, refine the sensibility, sharpen the critical intelligence, ...it is a powerful instrument for empathy, (and) a medium through which the child can acquire his values".\(^{39}\)

Such claims belong to what these 're-viewers' of 1974 described as "spirited credos", and who commented further that "what was a matter of self-evident truth in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" – and they could have added, to the cultural exegetists of Matthew Arnold who dominated the 1919 Committee and who wrote the 1921 Report – "is not longer exempt from question... Few (now) would subscribe to the simple view that it offers models for living which the reader lifts from its pages".\(^{40}\) Neither were there, in the years leading up to the 1972 Inquiry in the journals of the National Association for the Teaching of English or elsewhere, advocates of the order of F.S. Boas (a member of the Newbolt Committee), who wrote in 1919, of the value of 'Literature' in providing model character-types "familiar and endeared to successive generations of boys and girls", and of his view that the provision of such contact

---

38 Ibid., p. 29.


40 Ibid., p. 124. In the Bullock Report these comments refer to the writing of Nowell Smith (1917), and to the Newsom Report (1963), but they are equally accurate in reference to the Newbolt Report (1921).
was "no mean or inglorious service to the commonwealth, and to the continuity of national ideals". 41 Nowhere, either, in the Bullock Report was there reference to the role of 'Literature' as an agent of national unity, nor were there in the early 1970's, publications or articles within the 'English' community to match that of C.H. Herford in which he claimed that "literature is the clue to an understanding of the national life of a unique kind". 42

Neither was there the same confidence, or ring of urgency in the Bullock Report about what the Newbolt Committee understood as 'Literature's' "practical bearing on life". In the Bullock Report the tones were much more muted and subdued as it affirmed "that every good teacher is concerned with the social and psychological development of his pupils", that "of course (sic), it is part of the English teacher’s task to develop social awareness and responsibility", and that the Committee "is not contesting the place of social concern in the curriculum". 43 Unlike the Newbolt Committee, the Bullock Committee did not, as if instinctively, turn to the study of literature as the means by which such an outcome might be accomplished.

In analysing the stresses and strains which emerge in the

---

41 Dr F.S. Boas in A Series of Papers (ed. Edith J. Morley), 1919, No. 3.


English teacher's cultural and political identity in the England of the 1970's, and which, in turn, she sees reflected in the 'English' curriculum and its teaching, Margaret Mathieson comments that the area "most profoundly affected by the conflicting views was the teaching of literature".\textsuperscript{44} Further, she argues that "the early certainty about the worthwhileness of attempts to disseminate liberal culture as widely as the teacher's skills and school conditions permitted... was severely shaken".\textsuperscript{45} Gone, in her view, is the Newbolt Committee's enthusiastic faith and optimism in the ameliorating potential of the study of literature, and in those fruits of a liberal education which were to follow from "a general acknowledgment of the paramount place which the native speech and literature should occupy in our schools and in the common life of our people".\textsuperscript{46} So far as the Bullock Committee was concerned, 'Literature' was still to be, in the teaching of 'English', one of the sources of 'experience',\textsuperscript{47} but in contrast to the position set out for it by the Newbolt Committee it was no longer to hold the same pre-eminent position, or play the same strategic role in Education as was set out for it in 1921. 'Literature' was joined, in 1974, by "immediate and first-hand experience"\textsuperscript{48} as a proper

\textsuperscript{44} Margaret Mathieson, \textit{The Preachers of Culture}, London, 1975, p. 198.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 197.

\textsuperscript{46} Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 277.

\textsuperscript{47} Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 7.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 7.
provider of appropriate content for the English classroom. As well as identifying 'Literature' as a source of personal experience, the Bullock Committee also stressed the need to cultivate the child in its enjoyment. In the concluding paragraph of its chapter on Literature the Committee stated that they "can sum up by saying that whatever else the pupil takes away from his experience of literature at school he should have learned to see it as a source of pleasure, as something that will continue as part of his life". The Committee rejected, too, the view that 'Literature' should be seen primarily as "a source of material for personal response to social issues... (as something) experienced largely in the form of extracts... filleted for (its) social yield". No evidence emerges either that the Bullock Committee shared the Newbolt Committee's confidence that a study of literature will cultivate "the greatest benefit that can be conferred upon any citizen of a great state" that is, a sense of social and political unity. Thus Mathieson comments that 'it will be recalled that for Arnold, and his successors who contributed to the Newbolt Report, education's primary responsibility was the dissemination of culture, particularly literary culture", but that by the 1960's and 1970's this 'concern... has undergone considerable revision', a revision demonstrated in the fact that 'literature, usually the major part of

49 Ibid., p. 137.
50 Ibid., p. 7.
51 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 15.
52 Mathieson, op.cit., p. 196.
English in grammar schools, has received the most severe overhauling". 53

The fifty years between the Newbolt Report and the Bullock Report have thus produced a significant 'redefinition' of the place and role in that component of 'English' described as the study of 'Literature'. The confidence and faith in the predicted outcomes of its study which permeated the Newbolt Report are replaced in the Bullock Report, partly as outcome of the experience of the intervening fifty years, by a much more guarded, and more tentative estimate of its 'powers', as these affect both the life of the individual and the life of the nation. The assertion of the Newbolt Committee that 'Literature' is "not just a subject for academic study ... but one of the chief temples of the human spirit, in which all should worship", 54 and that the study of poetry might "once more bring sanctification and joy in the sphere of common life" 55 are the assertions of the men and women associated with the English Association of the 1920's, assertions which would have been, if matched with their own assertions, considered anachronistic, and even embarrassing, by the men and women asked to report on the uses of English in the 1970's. It was a gospel proclaimed by those who saw themselves as missionaires and assistant missionaires, 56 and as

53 Ibid., p. 196.

54 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 259.

55 Ibid., p. 256.

56 Ibid., p. 259.
"accredited ...ambassador(s) to every important capital of industrialism in the country",\(^{57}\) roles at no time claimed by their 1972 counterparts. In 1921 the voices of the professors and teachers of English in the Universities - in particular, Newbolt, Quiller-Couch, Boas, Spurgeon, and Dover Wilson as they chorused the praise of 'Literature', - represented and promulgated views held, too, by the English Association. By 1974 the professors and teachers from higher education and their influential colleagues from the schools were preoccupied with other issues. The Bullock Committee displayed none of the Newbolt Committee's evangelistic zeal on behalf of 'Literature', and while not dismissing the worthwhileness of its study, made few claims for it, or for its inherent capacity to shape the life of the individual or the nation.

\(^{57}\) Ibid., p. 260.
CHAPTER 5

'ENGLISH': THE ROLE AND PLACE OF 'LANGUAGE'

For the Newbolt Committee the test to which "educational theory and practice must constantly be put... is the test of application to life".¹ Just as this ultimately utilitarian criterion was applied in 1921 to the place and role of 'Literature', so it was also applied to the place and role of 'Language' in the curriculum of the 1920's. To the Newbolt Committee the relevance of such studies was obvious - "It is impossible to teach any subject without teaching English; it is impossible to teach English without teaching something else,"² And so, by extension, the Committee affirmed that "every teacher is a teacher of English because every teacher is a teacher in English".³ To the Newbolt Committee "it is self-evident that until a child has acquired a command over the native language, no other educational development is even possible",⁴ because such command is necessary "for all the common purposes of life".⁵ This was the view, too, of the English Association, a view exemplified in the dictum of George Sampson - a

¹ Newbolt Report, The Teaching of English in England, 1921, p. 55. For full citation see footnote 1(i) of this thesis.
² Ibid., p. 63.
³ Ibid., p. 63.
⁴ Ibid., p. 10.
⁵ Ibid., p. 12.
member of the Newbolt Committee - that "a sound education system must be based upon the great means of human intercourse - human speech in spoken and written word". The Newbolt Committee saw its brief as, in the words of Merritt and Coombs, "the reformulation of goals... (by means of) a policy change aimed at ameliorating ills perceived to exist", a reformulation required because of the Newbolt Committee's view that "in many schools of all kinds of grades... (language study) was regarded (in 1919) as being inferior in importance and hardly worthy of a substantial place in the curriculum".

Some fifty years later the Bullock Committee was re-iterating the central importance of 'language in education', emphasising in particular, the relationship between language and learning. That Committee reported that "if standards of achievement are to be improved all teachers will have to be helped to acquire a deeper understanding of language in education" and if "a teacher is to control the growth of competence he must be able to examine the verbal interaction of a class or group in terms of an explicit understanding of the operation of language". To the Bullock

---


8 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 10.

Committee "it became clear... in the early days of the inquiry that (they) could not do justice to the first term of reference [viz "to consider in relation to schools all aspects of teaching the use of English, including reading, writing and speech"]

The Newbolt Committee's proposition that "every teacher is a teacher of English because every teacher is a teacher in English" is thus re-affirmed, and elaborated. In 1974, the concept of 'language across the curriculum' is set out, both in terms of the need for each school to adopt a policy on 'language across the curriculum', and of the need for an awareness on the part of each teacher of the implications of such a policy for his/her teaching.

In the case of the Bullock Committee the recommendations emerged from a group highly experienced in Education, purposely selected to report on the use of 'English' in schools. As has been demonstrated in the analysis of the background of the membership of each Committee, the Bullock Committee was made up, in the main, of academics broadly qualified in Education 'disciplines' (including areas such as reading, testing, and measurement); of researchers, writers, and teachers responsible for various aspects of 'language in education'; and of teachers from a wide range of schools, well-informed on what was actually happening at the work-face of

10 Ibid., p. xxxi.
11 Ibid., p. 188.
education. This membership in 1972 was thus, by its very nature, tailor-made to develop a case on behalf of 'language in education'. In contrast, because the educational background of the 1919 Committee was predominantly literary and academic in bias, it is not surprising that their case on behalf of 'language in education' is comparatively underdeveloped.

It is plain then, that about one key element of 'English' — that related to the role of language, or 'English', in learning at all levels of schooling — the premises underlying the statements, assertions, and recommendations of the Newbolt and Bullock Committees, when placed side by side, match. It is rather in the relative emphasis given to this facet of 'English' in each Report, that pertinent differences lie. As previously demonstrated the main energies of the Newbolt Committee were directed to guaranteeing the study of literature within the educative process, whereas in contrast, the focus and commitment of the Bullock Committee is on securing the recognition of the centrality of language use and language development in all learning experience. Whereas the "belief which inspired each paragraph of the (Newbolt) Report" focussed on "the spiritual unity of the nation" and "the uplift... of the popular imagination", the pivotal brief of the Bullock Committee was "interpreted... as (the role of) language in education".

Thus it was that each Committee, while recognising, at the time of its Inquiry, the diverse nature of the 'English' terrain, deployed the force of its assertions, arguments, and evidence in significantly different directions. In fact, these directions were sufficiently apart and distinct to entail, when the 'English' terrain came to be remapped in 1972, what amounted to the 'rediscovery' of the 'language in education' and, 'language across the curriculum' components of the Newbolt Report. It may well have been that, if the thrust of the 1921 Report had been towards 'language' development - one of the possibilities inherent in the Newbolt Committee's declared positions on the nature of 'English' - rather than towards the promotion of literature, the history of 'English' over the fifty years to 1974 would have been significantly different. What therefore appeared in 1974 - to use again Merritt and Coombs' category,\textsuperscript{15} - to be a major reformulation of the goals of 'English', involving substantial adjustments to its curricular framework in order to strengthen the 'language' components, might more accurately be understood as the accommodation of 'interest' groups committed to a component of 'English' largely undeveloped, as a result of the directions taken following the 1921 Report. In that sense, the 1974 Report should not be seen as a radically new definition of 'English'. What is clear and demonstrable is that the realignment of 'forces' in the 1974 Committee was heavily supportive of the 'Language' advocates, at the expense of those protagonists.

\textsuperscript{15} Merritt and Coombs, \textit{op.cit.}, pps. 254/257.
associated with the 1921 succession, who remained committed to the proclamation of the centrality of literature.

In further comparing and contrasting the 1921 and 1974 views of the 'Language' component of 'English' the focus will be on the three strands identified specifically for report in section (a) of the terms of reference of the Bullock Committee - that is reading, writing, and speech. While, in this type of documentary analysis of a concept as broad and diffuse as 'English', it is not possible to undertake any complete or exhaustive examination of all the elements and contributing dimensions, it is possible, nevertheless to identify components which are both representative and pervasive. While the heuristic advantages accruing from a consideration of all the elements contributing to the description and definition of 'Language' in the Reports is not questioned, such wide-ranging consideration is not possible for two Reports which together produce almost 500 recommendations, and which emerge from some 920 densely argued "paragraphs", (and supported, in the case of the Bullock Report, by detailed Survey evidence). For the same reasons, it is not possible to consider the particular modifications and variations within the 'Language' model, set out in the Reports, following from its application to 'English' in a range of educational institutions including elementary, secondary, public, evening, continuation, commercial, and technical schools, the universities, and initial and in-service teacher education bodies.

What will be compared and contrasted are those broad areas recognised by the Inquiries to be the indispensable components of 'English' - that is, reading, writing and speech. While each will be examined separately, it is essential to bear in mind that each Committee stressed the interconnectedness and interdependence of these components. For instance, the Bullock Committee "believes that language competence grows incrementally, through an interaction of writing, talk, reading, and experience, the body of resulting work forming an organic whole," \(^{18}\) while the Newbolt Committee requires that the holistic nature and value of 'English' be recognised, and that 'English' not be regarded as simply "a specific and limited subject, or worse, as collection of detached subjects." \(^{19}\)

With Reading, the first of the 'Language' components taken up by the Bullock Committee, that Committee explained that although its appointment was "announced shortly after the publication" of the N.F.E.R. \(^{20}\) Report *The Trend of Reading Standards* its Inquiry was not

---

\(^{17}\) Nor is it possible to examine other variations and modifications to the model set out in the Reports, as these arise the application of the model to business and commercial life, to the education of immigrants, and to the field of drama.

\(^{18}\) Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 7.

\(^{19}\) Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 58.

"solely into reading", and that its Report was based "on the important principle that reading must be seen as part of a child's general language development and not as a discrete skill which can be considered in isolation from it". The Newbolt Committee too, regarded Reading as one of "the component parts... (of) English... (parts which together) must form the essential basis of a liberal education for all English people", and explained that "under this head ('training in reading') will be included reading aloud with feeling and expression, the use of books as sources of information and means of study, and finally, the use of literature... as a possession and source of delight, a personal intimacy and the gaining of experience, an end in itself and, at the same time, an equipment for the understanding of life". The views of Reading set out by each Committee thus reflect the assumptions and preoccupations of the membership of which they were constituted. The Bullock Committee, including, as it did, a strong representation from the schools and from the Reading Association, emphasised that reading was one of the interrelated skills basic to the general language development which the Committee regarded as synonymous with the type of 'English' necessary in the 1970's. In contrast the

23 Ibid., p. 19.
24 For instance, Professor J. E. Merritt was President of the United Kingdom Reading Association in 1969-70, and Mrs. V. Southgate Booth was President in 1971-2. No information was found detailing the membership of other Bullock Committee members in the U.K.R.A.
focus for the Newbolt Committee was not so much on skills but rather on the knowledge, experience, and values required for initiation, grounding, and confirmation in the idea of a liberal education. 25

In the view of the Newbolt Committee "all reading is experience - an indirect form of experience, but a peculiarly powerful one, and for many minds the most varied and fruitful in the whole of life". 26 The Newbolt Committee was anxious therefore that young people, through their reading, should have access not only to an "abundance of good literature interesting enough to satisfy the appetite of youth", but also to "the sanest of voices... and the greatest of observers of Life", in order that the "dangers" of the printed word in its popular forms - in "ephemeral novels" or newspapers, which portray the "sentimental", "sensational" and "unwholesome" - might "more and more easily be repelled, as the germs of disease are repelled by vigorous growth". 27 Reading, in this sense, was indispensable to realizing what a Times editorial on the Newbolt Report commended as that Report's "liberalising, civilising and humanizing" aims for 'English'. 28 The Bullock Committee also stressed the importance of the printed word, arguing that it "will continue to occupy a position of the highest importance in the education process". 29 However the confident, even zealous, tones of

26 Ibid., p. 336.
moral and spiritual advocacy which permeated the 1921 Report are, by 1974, much more muted and restrained. No longer is the emphasis primarily on Reading as part of an initiation into a particular (and desirable) culture, but rather it is on the capacity of Reading to provide access, for each individual, to sources of "personal and moral growth", and to that "circle of consciousness... (where) the thoughts, experiences, and feelings of people who exist outside and beyond the reader's daily awareness" are presented. Thus the "individual will read most rewardingly when he has a personal reason for reading, for he will then carry his own attitudes and values to the text and not passively respond to it". Re-inforcing this view, the Bullock Committee declared that the content of what is read "should not be passed through a kind of ideological or ethical scanner...; and children's experience should not be confined to a restricted range of reading matter presenting a narrow range of attitudes". The proponents of a liberal education in 1921, and in particular those English teachers who supported the English Association, would have gazed wide-eyed as the implications of this position became clear. In contrast, the members of the 1974 Committee, with the advantage of 50 years hindsight, were unable to endorse the hope and confidence of their 1921 counterparts that a significant improvement in attitudes and behaviour - both for the

29 Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 299.
30 Ibid., p. 125.
31 Ibid., p. 120.
32 Ibid., p. 105.
individual and the society - would result, as though by osmosis, from participation in properly determined reading experiences.

As for the skills and competencies to be gained from learning to read, both Committees were in agreement. Each Committee stressed that mastery of the reading process should not be - to use the words of the 1921 members - "a mechanical process.... or routine", but "a means of getting ideas", and of "understand(ing) and feel(ing) what (is) read".\(^{33}\) Or again, in the words of the 1974 Report, "to read intelligently is to read responsively; it is to ask questions of the text, and to use one's framework of experience in interpreting it".\(^{34}\) What is markedly in contrast between the two Committees is their understanding of the methods by which the process of reading is learnt. The notion, in 1921, of the reading process as mastery in the "recognition and use of symbols\(^{35}\) had been replaced by 1974, by a carefully researched understanding of a complex process,\(^{36}\) the description and explanation of which provides clear evidence of the strength of the 'Reading' experts and interests represented in the

---

33 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 81.
34 Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 129.
35 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 81.
36 Part 3 of the Bullock Report is titled Reading, with three chapters - The Reading Process; Reading in the Early Years; and Reading: The Later Stages - describing the process of Reading. 'With the voice of the preacher', they demand that attention be paid to the information and insights which are set out. The importance of the Reading Association members is clear; and the elaboration, in lay terms, of extensive research findings, is obvious. These chapters cover pps. 77-123.
Bullock Committee. As an extension of its position on 'language across the curriculum', the Newbolt Committee would have concurred, too, with Recommendation 308 in the Bullock Report which asserted that "all teachers in training, irrespective of the age-range they intend to teach, should complete satisfactorily a substantial course... in reading".\(^{37}\) For each Committee the importance of the reading process was integral to their concept and model of 'English'.

There was agreement by each Committee too, about the central importance of Writing in the concept and model of 'English'. As the opening sentence of the section of the Bullock Report on Writing remarked "writing has always been accorded a high prestige in (England's) educational system, ...due in a large part to its traditional use as a means by which students put on record what they have learned".\(^{38}\) In indicating this same view some fifty years earlier, the Newbolt Committee argued, further, that for Writing of this sort, the highest form was the Composition, and that "composition cannot be regarded merely as a subject. It is the measure of all that has been learnt, and of the habits of mind that have been formed".\(^{39}\) In the view of the Newbolt Committee, it was the teacher's task "to teach the pupil to ...write clearly, forcibly and correctly",\(^{40}\) and to ensure that the pupil had competency in

\(^{37}\) The Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 549.
\(^{38}\) Ibid., p. 162.
\(^{39}\) Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 19.
that 'English' which was "an instrument of thought and the means of communication".\textsuperscript{41} In advocating 'English' of this type the Newbolt Committee was also accepting and satisfying the requirements of the world of employment. As Sir Stanley Leathes, a senior civil servant indicated in evidence to the Newbolt Inquiry, "mode of expression, order, arrangement, lucidity, (and) phrasing (are) valued (by the Civil Service)... as well as the knowledge or argument put forward".\textsuperscript{42} And further in support, the Newbolt Committee also indicated that "leading firms of the country" require "sound spelling, punctuation, vocabulary and sentence-structure".\textsuperscript{43}

Throughout this Report the focus was on both what was useful and what was recognised by the community as "bear(ing) directly on life".\textsuperscript{44} Clearly, so far as the Composition was concerned, the priority was firmly fixed on that kind of writing useful in the public sphere. In spite of the presence of 'creative' writers of the stature and popularity of Sir Henry Newbolt and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch\textsuperscript{45} on the Committee, issues related to 'personal' and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. i24.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 23.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p. 294.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid., p. 132.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid., p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{45} (i) Who's Who 1927, p. 2170. Sir Henry Newbolt has 26 titles of poetry, prose, fiction and patriotic writing listed as published prior to 1919.
\item (ii) Who's Who 1927, p. 2430. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch has more than 40 titles, mainly poetry, prose and fiction, with some critical writing, listed as published prior to 1919.
\end{itemize}
'creative' writing were not taken up in any systematic way, and the emphasis remained on writing of a public nature for public purposes.

By way of contrast, the Bullock Committee, while acknowledging that "the changing pattern of employment is making more widespread demands... on writing skills", that writing "standards need to be raised to fulfil the demands being made", and that "deficiencies", which had escaped attention in the past, must be remedied", approached its consideration and 'definition' of Writing from a radically different perspective. Central to its discussion of the writing process was the proposition that recognition must be given to the variety of forms and uses of writing as these relate to and affect the individual child. "Pupils should (therefore) be given the opportunity to write for a variety of readers and audiences. They should be faced with the need to analyse the specific task, to choose the language appropriate to it, and to establish criteria by which to judge what they have achieved". Writing, as far as the Bullock Committee was concerned, had to focus on the child, and on the child's needs "to experiment with new forms (of writing) and to do so with security". By way of corollary, the Bullock Committee then required that "the teacher's first response to a piece of writing should be personal and positive. Only after responding to what has been said is it reasonable to turn attention to how".

46 Bullock Report, op.cit., p.4.
48 Ibid., p. 167.
The individuality of each child had therefore to be paramount, and a context provided in order for that child to look closely at his/her own language, and what that language might do. In the judgment of the Bullock Committee the traditional view of the teaching of written language within 'English' was "prescriptive", in that it "identified a set of correct forms... that should be taught... and mistakenly assumed an unchanging quality in both grammar rules and word meaning in English". In its view such an attitude "often inhibited as child's utterance without strengthening the fabric of his language or his knowledge of what to say". In rejecting, in this context, the view that language exercises in themselves could improve ability to write, the Committee concluded that "competence in language comes above all through purposeful use, (and) not through the working of exercises divorced from context".

Thus, for each Committee, just as that part of the concept or model of 'English' described as Reading was crucial, so also was that component identified as Writing. But, whereas the Newbolt Report, written by avowed evangelists and proselytes on behalf of the study of 'Literature' and English Literature in particular, re-iterated in chapter after chapter, its confidence and faith in 'Literature's' efficacy in the life of the nation and people, that

49 Ibid., p. 167.
50 Ibid., p. 167.
51 Ibid., p. 170.
52 Ibid., Conclusion and Recommendation 128, p. 528.
same Report did not present its case on behalf of Writing with any matching zeal or enthusiasm. The Committee, while acknowledging the importance of Writing in constructing its model of 'English', set out no case for Writing equivalent in argument or rhetoric to its case on behalf of 'Literature', nor did it elaborate on what it meant in declaring that 'English is not merely the medium of our thought, it is the very stuff and process of it... (and that as) our discoveries become successively wider, deeper, and subtler, so should... control of the instrument (writing)... become more complete and exquisite, up to the limit of artistic skill'. However, the progression within this sentence from "the stuff and process of thought" towards the creation of an "artistic" product is illuminating, and should not be seen as accidental. It reflects and exposes the preoccupation of the members of the Newbolt Committee with the fruits of the 'art' of Writing as these were manifest in Literature or Art. In contrast to the Bullock Committee and its members, there is no indication of preoccupation on the part of the Newbolt Committee with the educational and pedagogical implications of personal development or 'discovery' through Writing.

For the Bullock Committee personal development and 'discovery' through Writing were of crucial importance. Their interest in, and indeed witness to, its significance could be held to be of a similar order to the Newbolt Committee's interest in and witness to the importance of Literature. For instance, one member of the Bullock

Committee - Professor James Britton had written two texts elaborating and arguing this case, and 'language in education' was a matter of constant, if sometimes contentious, discussion in the National Association for the Teaching of English, of which Professor Britton was President at the time of the Inquiry. Further, the Schools Council - of which Dame Muriel Stewart was Chairman, and another member of the Committee, Professor J. Wrigley was Director of Studies - was advocating similar approaches in various projects and publications. Other members of the Bullock Committee, including Miss J. Derrick, the Organizer of a Schools Council Project in English for Immigrant Children, and Mr D. Mackay from the I.L.E.A. Centre for Language in Primary Education, were involved in Language research projects. Thus it is possible to identify, in terms of the background and experience of members of the Bullock Committee, a clear commitment to the importance of Writing in association with 'language in education', in the way that there was an clear commitment to the importance of particular


55 See Appendix D for a list of articles relevant in this debate.


approaches to 'Literature' implicit in the membership of the Newbolt Committee.

The third area specifically singled out in the terms of reference for the Bullock Committee was 'speech' which, for the purposes of this comparison, will include its 'audience' dimension, 'listening'. As was the case with 'English' in its Reading and Writing components, so with Listening and Speaking - the 50 or so years separating the Inquiries led to changes and developments which significantly altered the emphasis on, and balance of, these components within 'total' construct of 'English'. In this way, changes in the concept or model of speech contributed to the reshaping and re-ordering of the identity of 'English'. What the Newbolt Committee understood by 'oral' English should, the Committee declared, "be brought to the front as the most indispensable part of the (elementary) school course",\(^{59}\) as it is the "foundation upon which proficiency in the writing of English must be based".\(^{60}\) Similarly, fifty years later the Bullock Report, in its chapter on 'Oral Language', stressed the importance of spoken language, claiming for it a similar position of central importance, especially since the Committee perceived that the emphasis in the classroom had changed from teaching to learning.\(^{61}\) As a produce of this change, the Committee reported that "attention has been focussed on spoken

---

60 Ibid., p. 71.  
61 Bullock Report, p. 144.
English with more organised purpose than ever before". In calling, in Recommendation 119, for "further research into the development of children's spoken language and the best means of promoting it", the Report re-inforced its importance, and again testified to the influential presence of the 'interests' of applied linguistics and 'language in education' within the Committee.

The Newbolt Committee, in 1921, was anxious that spoken language should be one of the promotional agents of the national unity, and listed it as one of the benefits to be conferred "on the general body of citizens" by Education. In deploring what it described as "the chasm of separation" between "the two nations" in England, the Committee identified as one "cause (of this "chasm of separation") a marked difference in their modes of speech... (claiming that) if the teaching of the language were properly and universally provided for, the difference between educated and uneducated speech, which at present causes so much prejudice and difficulty of intercourse on both sides, would gradually disappear". No doubt the Bullock Committee would have admired the political and social optimism implicit in this view, and the faith of the Newbolt Committee in the

62 Ibid., p. 155.
63 Ibid., p. 527.
64 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 5.
65 Ibid., p. 22. It should be noted that the Committee was careful to distinguish between 'uneducated speech' and dialect, recognising that dialect was a legitimate, if local, form of speech.
meliorating potential of Education. H.A.L. Fisher, the President of the Board of Education to whom the Newbolt Committee reported, was described by Newbolt as "fresh and keen" about the Report, and maybe he shared the political and social optimism of its findings. The Times of November 4, 1921 applauded the Report for "explain(ing) and expos(ing) one of the fundamental causes of (England's) present troubles and imperfections" - that is, flaws in the Education system - commenting that "in so far as it lies within the power of an education system to offer a remedy for social ills... (this Report) offers in a profoundly natural and eminently reasonable form such a remedy". Some fifty years later, Bullock and his Committee recognised, too the importance of differences in speech with their implicit social and political connotations, commenting that "there is a marked social element in the 'aesthetic' assessment of accents, in which the researchers have found a hierarchy". However, in 1974, no panaceas was offered, no high political hopes raised about the capacity of Education to effect significant improvements in the social and political fabric.

For the Bullock Committee the point of focus was the individual,


68 Bullock Report, op.cit., p. 143. At the top the Bullock Committee placed Received Pronunciation, followed by certain foreign and regional accents, with industrial and "town" accents occupying the lower rungs.
and not, as with the Newbolt Committee the condition of the nation at large. "The point to be emphasised is that the child's speech should be accepted... To criticise a person's speech may be an attack on his self-esteem, and the extent to which the two are associated is evident from the status accorded to accent in the society at large".  

The commitments of the men and women of 1974, drawn as they were from the schools, and from sections of Academia directly associated with teacher education, were centred on the rights of the young people at the workface of Education. It was their view, too, that the language of each child had to be the accepted starting point for further language development, a view in marked contrast to that of their 1921 counterparts, who complained and lamented that teachers in the elementary schools of their time "have to fight against the powerful influence of evil habits of speech contracted in the home and street. The teacher's struggle is thus not with ignorance but with a perverted power".  

The Bullock Committee, in reversing the Newbolt Committee's position, declared that teachers, "in assisting children to master Standard English, which is in effect the dialect of the school, should do so without children feeling marked out by the form of language they bring with them and to which they revert outside school". Speech, in a range of forms, was to be an essential ingredient in the language (and hence learning) experience of all children. Exploratory talk, in

---

69 Ibid., p. 143.


71 Bullock Report, op. cit., p. 287.
particular, was identified as a central agent of the child's "journey into thought", and part of "the gradual and growing extension of (the child's) powers of language to meet new demands and situations". No similar role and function for the spoken word had been set out in either the body or the recommendations of the Newbolt Report.

The majority presence on the 1972 Committee of 'language in education' advocates experts, in contrast to majority presence the 'literature' advocates and experts who dominated the 1919 Committee of Inquiry, does much to explain the difference in emphases in the two Reports. It also illustrates, at least in part, the altered nature of the identity of the dominant 'English' elite of 1972, compared with that of 1919. Hence the description and analyses of those elements of the 'Language' component of the concept or model of 'English' set out in the Bullock Report, reflect several fundamental changes in perceptions, about what should be of central importance so far as Reading, Writing and Speech are concerned. They also reflect altered understandings of what the learning process should involve, and responses to the inevitable increase in knowledge and the findings of research, gathered over half a century.

Thus each Committee asserted and emphasised the central and crucial importance of 'English' in all learning. As the Bullock

---

72 Ibid., p. 143.
Committee indicated in 1974, in order to "do justice to (its) first term of reference" which involved the consideration of all aspects of the teaching of English, it was necessary for it to "direct (its) remarks to all teachers, whatever their subject". In so doing it was concurring with the view of its counterpart in 1921 that "the undue isolation of English has often made the teaching, not only of English, but of other subjects ineffective", and with its "wish to see English overflowing its own compartment, and penetrating into all the rest". Either Committee could have made either statement.

What differences there were within 'English', and in particular in the perceptions, emphases, and treatment of the component parts of its 'Language' section in 1921 and 1974, arose not only from the inevitable increase in knowledge, and in theory and practice associated with Education, but from changed political and ideological stances about the role of 'English' in Education. These changed stances were reflected, as has been demonstrated, in the appointment to the 1972 Committee of persons and 'interests' with radically different backgrounds and commitments from the persons and 'interests' appointed in 1919 Committee. The nature of the changes is further demonstrated in the redefinition and reform of what was understood to be of central importance in 'English' in 1974, as compared with 1921. In its major renovation and reconstruction of the 'English' edifice in 1974, the Bullock Committee selected

73 Ibid., p. 188.
74 Newbolt Report, op.cit., p. 63.
'Language' and associated studies as the keystone around which to design its renovations. In so doing it authorised changes which led to the downgrading of 'Literature' and associated studies, the studies which had been of prime importance in the model of 'English' set up by the Newbolt Committee in 1921, and which had been highly influential for the following fifty years.
A major purpose of this thesis has been to demonstrate, by comparing and contrasting the concepts or models of 'English' as set out in official Reports in England in 1921 and 1974, that such studies are both legitimate and fruitful within the discipline of Comparative Education. Further, in order to provide an instrument for the clarification and illumination of why these definitions or models of 'English' were what they were within each Report, an analysis has been made of the membership of each Committee, in so far as that has been possible given the 'documentary' material available. This analysis has involved an examination of the backgrounds, appointments, commitments and public roles of members of each Committee, especially as these relate to 'English', and in so far as they are useful in generating explanatory insights into the concepts or models of 'English' set out by each Committee. The underlying methodology used, in matching Report against Report and Committee against Committee, has been comparative, although at times there has been clear advantage in using analytical tools more usually associated with the study of the sociology of knowledge or of history. The justifications for the approaches used in this thesis lie in their heuristic capacity and power, as this is demonstrated in the illumination of issues, and in insights which arise from their use.
Because this thesis has been treated as a micro-study in that area of Comparative Education identified by Philip G. Altbach as "documentary and archival research"\(^1\) it has focussed, in order to initiate fruitful comparisons and contrasts, on matching the issues reported on in 1921 with those reported on in 1974, and with matching the membership of the Committee appointed in 1919 with the Committee appointed in 1972. Because the briefs for each Inquiry required that a number of similar matters, in relation to the nature and function of 'English', be investigated and reported on, some direct and specific comparison have been possible, leading, in turn, to the identification of pertinent similarities and differences. This has then enabled consideration, within a comparative context, of issues associated with curricula and, in the words of Kazamais and Schwartz, of how curricula "arise, persist, and change","\(^2\) and to some extent, of matters alluded to by Kandel in his reference to "the hidden meaning of things found in schools".\(^3\) The use of this approach has thus provided clarification and illumination of the nature and processes of curriculum change and reform in a way which establishes the relevance and usefulness of such studies in understanding curriculum development and policy-making in Education.

---


3 I.L. Kandel is quoted by Kazamais and Schwartz, op.cit., p. 155.
In particular, it has demonstrated the explanatory potential inherent in the identification of elements—whether these elements be intellectual, educational, societal, or political—in the lives and experience of members of the Committees, which were pertinent in determining their role as inquirers into the nature and function of 'English'.

As well, the use of this model for generating explanation has made it possible to provide an explanation, through the isolation of significant generative motives, beliefs, and principles, of why the definitions of 'English' were what they were, in 1921 and 1974. These definitions have then been compared. In particular, the use of this model has indicated clearly both the extent to which the Committees accommodated, in 1919-1921 and 1972-1974, 'reform' groups whether from influential 'English' circles or from other sources, and the degree to which appointments to the two Committees predisposed those Committees towards certain findings and recommendations. The pertinence of these relationships has been elaborated further through a consideration of the relationship between the subject associations functioning on behalf of 'English' teaching, and the Committees.

Useful too, in seeking to discover, and then to compare, what each Committee understood 'English' to be, has been a comparison of the 'voice' and 'tone' used in the presentation, both of evidence and of argument. Moved by hopes similar to those of the English Association of "placing English on the map as a substantial subject"
in the curriculum, with teachers conscious of (its) aims and importance", the Newbolt Committee presented its case in a confident, serious and urgent rhetoric. In contrast the 'voice' and 'tone' of the Bullock Committee was much more muted and, in words of The Times, its Report was "voluminous, meticulous, full of reservations, and sceptical of simple conclusions", - adjectives and phrases which, with the exception of 'voluminous', were the very antithesis to those which could be used to describe the rhetoric and 'tone' of the Report of the Newbolt Committee.

Within the broad framework, then, of comparative studies, and more particularly within a context emerging from an analysis of the membership of each Committee, it has proved both fruitful and illuminating to compare similarities and differences in the nature and function of 'English', in 1919 and 1972, within its two generic categories - 'Language' and 'Literature'.

The Report of the Committee presented in 1921 was written in order to assert, both consistently and constantly, the pre-eminence of studies associated with the "native speech and literature", studies which, if introduced and pursued as recommended by the Committee, would provide bases of great strength and advantage in the lives both of individuals and of the nation. In marked contrast

---

4 Nowell Smith, The Origin and History of the (English) Association, 1942, p. 4.

to this "spirited credo" lauding, in particular, the role of the study of 'Literature', the Bullock Committee made only incidental and passing reference to the place of 'English' in "the life of the nation", and in relationship to "citizenship", and "the formative culture", and "national unity", and "spiritual uplift" - concepts which permeated the earlier Newbolt Report.

As has been made clear the preoccupations of the 1972 Committee were elsewhere, and notably focussed on the place and role of 'language in education'. This shift is both signalled and epitomised in the Bullock Report's elaboration of its position on 'language across the curriculum', and in its assertion that "if standards (in language performance) are to be improved all teachers will have to be helped to acquire a deeper understanding of language in education". Whereas in 1921 the preoccupying context was the Committee's understanding of and commitment to the concept of a liberal education, with its ideological connotations of values and proper content, the context of 1974 arose from commitments and understandings which emphasised access to and provision of a broad range of personal experiences and language skills. As has been demonstrated in the analysis and comparison of each Committee's


7 Newbolt Report, The Teaching of English in England, London, 1921, hic et ubique, as demonstrated in Chapter 3 and 4 of this thesis. For full citation see footnote 1(i) of Chapter 1 of this thesis.

arguments, findings, and recommendations the Bullock Committee focussed on the development of language competencies which would empower the learner in his world, rather than, as was the case with the Newbolt Committee, on cultivation of the individual as a particular cultural product. As has been argued and demonstrated throughout this thesis, many of the 'forces' motivating the men and women of 1919 - whether expressed in educational or ideological terms - sprang from fundamentally different sources than from those motivating the men and women of 1972.

Thus this thesis claims to demonstrate the place and value of studies such as this within the discipline of Comparative Education. Because it has proved fruitful, illuminating, and capable of generating clarifying explanations, this type of historical comparison should hold a place, without requiring further justification, among other heuristic models in the field of Comparative Education. This comparison has focussed on an analysis of the identities and memberships of two Committees of Inquiry in England and on their views of the nature, place, and function of 'English' in the educational worlds of their day. In so doing it has provided explanatory clues about the nature and role of powerful 'interests' in policy development and formulation in a key area of the educational curriculum. Further, the systematic consideration and comparison of the concepts or models of 'Language' and 'Literature' has led to an identification of seminal sources contributing to each Committee's definitions. It has also enabled a relative assessment of the weight and significance given to
component parts in 'English', and hence of the nature and extent of intended 'reforms' within this area of Education in 1921 and 1974. For those attempting to understand more about the nature and role of 'English' - now, and in the past, or for the future - what seems especially valuable about this type of comparison is that it uncovers information about and reasons for shifts of balance and emphasis within the total 'model' of the subject. Its capacity to generate insights and understandings should confirm the view that such an approach to comparative studies, in areas investigating change and reform in Education, is both justified and useful within the discipline of Comparative Education.
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2. English in Education

1970 L.E.W. Saith: 'Creative Writing and Language Awareness' in Vol. 4/1 Spring. This particular issue of the journal deals with Principles and Practice relating to English in Education.
James Britton: 'Their Language and Our Teaching' in Vol. 4/2, Summer.
Esmor Jones: 'The Language of Failure: Retrospect' in Vol. 4/3, Autumn. This particular issue of the journal deals with the Language of Failure.

Eileen Haggitt: 'The Teacher's Role and the Teaching of Language' in Vol. 5/1, Spring.
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Peter Doughty: 'Pupils also use language to live: a defence of a linguistic approach to language study for the classroom' in Vol. 6/1, Spring.
Alix Pirani and Harold Smith: 'The English teacher and the social context' in Vol. 6/2, Summer.
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