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Considering that the plea for relevancy has filtered down through the secondary schools to the elementary level, what is the end result that the English curriculum is trying to achieve? What are the weaknesses in the present curriculum being used in the teaching of English? Why should students be bored with a course in which they are learning something of the beauties of proper use of their native language?

The objective of this paper was not to define the teaching of English as might be found in a textbook, but it was an attempt to discover some meaningful answers as to the disenchantment of the majority of students with the study of the English language.

The survey instrument was designed to assess the use to which a selected group of teachers of English have been using new and innovative methods of instruction in their classes. The survey was limited to teachers of English within the State of Montana in order to determine a consensus in this field for this state. The survey was further limited to one hundred questionnaires, feeling that with this number the information gained would not become too unwieldy, and yet it would furnish a representative sampling of the opinion of teachers of English in this particular geographic area.

Conclusions which can be drawn as a result of the study indicate that administrators, in the main, throughout Montana are in favor of modernizing and updating the English curriculum. A majority of the secondary schools across Montana are adequately equipped with media hardware and software. The data seems to support the hypothesis that the obstacle in the progress of English curriculum is the classroom teacher.

In view of the fact that there is an abundance of research available to support various potential changes in the English curriculum the time has come for more definitive action to be taken by all educators. In support of this view, there are two recommendations made. The first being that the time has come for an in-depth curriculum study to be made in an effort to coordinate the study of the English language from Kindergarten to twelfth. The second recommendation or perhaps a suggestion for consideration is to change the name of the course, at least on the secondary level, to something on the order of Communication Skills.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The ferment regarding the instructional methods used in the typical secondary school English class has become increasingly more vocal. Research has shown justification for complaints concerning the relevancy of the English curriculum. Businessmen and colleges, sales organizations, commanding officers, and many others all have a common complaint: many students graduating from today's high school are unable to convey their thoughts and opinions in a suitable linguistic form.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was twofold:

1. To investigate methods for teaching English as a course in communication incorporating the principles of standard English for secondary schools.

2. To institute a survey of teachers of English in the secondary schools in Montana relative to their present teaching methods and their willingness to change concerning grammar, composition, and verbal communication.

NEED OF THE STUDY

Evidence of the need for a change in the secondary school
English instruction was given in the words of Lucille Vaughan Payne (1966):

Perhaps no greater irony exists in American education than its general failure to produce students capable of expressing themselves even reasonably well in written language—a skill that not only determines to an enormous extent their welfare as students but profoundly influences their entire development as thinking and acting human beings.

The need for teaching our students to express themselves both verbally and in written form has never been more vital than it is today.

There have been many so-called methods for teaching English introduced in the past fifteen years. Frank Ross, Associate Professor of English at Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan, cautiously notes (1967):

Some people believe that an innovation is something new, recognizing nova in it. That has come to be a commonsense meaning for the word, but its original meaning and the only one acceptable to the purists is "change." A fine point worth noting is that not every innovation in the teaching of English is strictly new; many are only changes.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED IN THE STUDY

Is there really a need for change in the methods used in the teaching of the typical English course in the secondary schools?

Can an innovative method for teaching standard English be constructed?

Are English teachers ready and willing to accept any major changes in teaching methods used in the typical English classroom?
GENERAL PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

The procedures that were used in this study were formulated into three general areas. The first was a study of evidence that has been brought forth advocating a need for change in teaching methods used for the teaching of English at the secondary school level. The second general area of study was an analysis of the survey instrument which gave further evidence of the need for the study. The third area that was covered in this study was an outline of the construction for an innovative method of teaching standard English in the secondary schools.

LIMITATIONS

The study was limited to methods of teaching standard English in the secondary schools of Montana, incorporating the principles of traditional grammar using new and innovative teaching methods. This study was further limited to one hundred teachers of English in selected secondary schools in the State of Montana.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Communication. Intercourse by words, letters, or messages; interchange of thoughts or opinions.
Curriculum. A general overall plan of the content or specific materials of instruction that the school should offer the student by way of qualifying him for graduation or certification or for entrance into a professional or vocational field.

Grammar. The study of the structure of the English language.

Linguistics. The study of human speech including the units, structure, and modification of language; specifically in the areas: phonetics, morphology, semantics, and philosophical grammar.

Literature. The total of preserved writings belonging to a given language or people. More specifically, that part of it which is notable for literary form or expression and is used for the purpose of study.

Scientific Method. A method generally used by researchers to analyze and solve a problem.

Semantics. The science of historical and psychological meanings as referred to in the signification of words or forms.

Standard English. The phraseology and the semantical word form used habitually by educated people, more commonly, "the language of educated ease."
SUMMARY

The objectives of this paper were not to define the teaching of English by the traditional method as might be found in a textbook but rather to attempt a presentation of some down to earth usable suggestions and applications whereby a teacher of English in the secondary school might be able to make his class more interesting and meaningful.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The English curriculum in any high school is a product of the past. It reflects the prior training and experience of the English teachers on the staff. The content of the curriculum is concerned with the study of a language that has been evolving for hundreds of years. Effective use of language in speaking and writing dates back to the beginning of civilization. Through literature the student comes into contact with the great ideas that form the heritage of our Western culture. Textbooks and other instructional materials were written or prepared at least several years before the student comes into contact with them. And when these materials are based on research, it is usually research conducted with students widely separated by time and space from those sitting in the classrooms of today.

The goal of the English curriculum, on the other hand, is to prepare students to communicate more effectively and to respond more perceptively to language and literary experiences in the future. The past is significant, but the future is vital. To reach this goal, curriculum designs must be continually evolving and flexible. They must be built on accumulated knowledge which sets the most recent innovations and studies into perspective (Bennett, 1967).

This study was conducted in an effort to examine what has been done in the field of English curriculum and what is being done. It
has been found that there are a number of problems that have arisen because many of the innovations and many of the curriculum inventions, so to speak, are practiced by thoroughly knowledgeable grammarians. These curricular inventions have great meaning, but to the uninitiated secondary school student they are extremely irrelevant, unrealistic and confusing.

Many fine teachers stay abreast of current research in English and change what they can of their teaching independently of the curriculum of their school system. Many principals, supervisors, and curriculum consultants pull their teachers screaming and kicking into a modern approach to the myriad facets of teaching English. Whether the teacher leads the system or the system sets the pace for the teacher, there is the ever present danger that both groups in an effort to stay au courant will grasp at unsound programs or programs already tested and discarded.

While many changes in English are made each year, quite a number of them are mainly a return to former good practices which fell into disuse. To illustrate, the universities are reviving courses in rhetoric, which then sift down to the high schools. Likewise, leaders in English curriculum are stressing the depth study of literature, a line by line analysis, rediscovered by the new criticism of post-World War II. Both approaches to teaching English are echoes of a long gone but properly respected past. For several years school
administrators, supervisors, and curriculum specialists have been increasingly aware, sometimes directly, sometimes by illusion of rumblings and grumblings in the field of English and language arts. In print and in speech, they have heard the term "new English" as the undefined symbol of what was to solve the problems of teaching English and marvelously produce some kind of pedological utopia (Allen, 1967).

The researchers, investigators, and the university professors may expound for hours on end about what ought to be done in the language arts curriculum at the secondary school level. However, implementing their ideas and putting them into practical use, in the final analysis, is up to the secondary classroom teacher.

Virginia F. Allen (1966) says:

Few people today need to be told that standard English is virtually a second language for millions. Almost every teacher knows students who cannot speak, read, or write the sort of English that educated persons will consider standard, even though some variety of English may be the students' mother tongue. Not only is the problem prevalent; it is also old. It dates back past the days of Huck Finn and Topsie to the 18th century and even beyond.

During the last several years, there are facts that appear to come as new. First is that some teachers are developing a fresh and clearer view of what is involved in learning a type of standard English in the school when some other dialect is spoken at home.

Secondly, that these new concepts have suggested some practical classroom procedures that are being tried with encouraging results.
Standard English is defined here as the variety of English generally used by the educated members of the American community. Statistically speaking, there is reason to suspect that the number of Americans who say, "You was" will exceed the number who say "You were." This fact does not establish "You was" as standard usage, however. It must be borne in mind that standard English is what the majority of educated speakers habitually use.

Teachers may start the definition and then go on to link it up to their students' experience and observation. They should point out that the kind of English they have in mind is the sort used on the radio and television by announcers, sportscasters, civil rights leaders, and news commentators, as well as by practically all television heroes including those in "Bonanza," "The Virginian," and "Captain Kangaroo." It is the English heard in public statements of astronauts, bankers, Congressmen, and movie stars. It has sometimes been called the language of educated ease because it is used by people who know they sound educated but do not have to think about their usage. When the target language is defined in these terms, even the younger children will know what the teacher means by standard English.

Thus far this study was concerned with bringing out the fact that methods involved in changing the English curriculum are not new. The study was an attempt to identify the kind of English the teachers should be helping their students learn to use.
It has become almost common knowledge that the standard dialect, this variety of language habitually spoken by educated Americans, has no inherent virtue of its own unpossessed by other dialects. In addition to this, language problems are very different from arithmetic problems, though for centuries this difference has traditionally been ignored. Standard English is not a set of right answers like the answers found at the back of an arithmetic textbook, hence in good programs for students of standard English the terms "right" and "wrong" may not often be used. When they are "right" it means "appropriate to the situation" and "wrong" means likely to put a speaker at a disadvantage, much as one might say it is "wrong" to chew gum while being interviewed for a job.

Undemocratic and unfair as it may seem, the fact is that standard English could be considered "front door" English and American schools seem to be committed to the task of making it possible for every citizen to enter by the "front door" if he wishes to do so.

Just as candor and a clear view of the facts are essential to the fact of defining what standard English is, so also one needs to be factual and frank in saying why the standard dialect ought to be learned. The student needs to understand that a command of standard English is vital to any American who aims to associate with speakers of the standard dialect on anything like an equal footing.

Note the phrase "a command of standard English." To command
something is not merely to have a vague notion of it, but rather to be able to summon it up at will. The student must be given the ability to summon up the standard dialect whenever he himself wants to use it in any situation where fluency in that dialect would be to his advantage.

A comprehensive curriculum for the study of English as a method of communications at the secondary school level should involve an in-depth study of three fields. First is the field of verbal communication; second, the study of written communication; and third, the study of semantics.

The teacher who attempts to inculcate principles of this style of teaching of English at the secondary school level should remember that the role of the teacher more or less fades into the background since he becomes more of a guide than a teacher. This teacher must, of necessity, become an expert in the inquiry-centered approach to the teaching of his class. In such a class, both the teacher and the student will perform new roles. Generally speaking, the teacher will work as a planner in that he will have to carefully plan learning activities for a specified period of time, anywhere from a week to a six-week period. The teacher will also, of course, have to act as manager performing such routine management tasks as recognizing students, making announcements, maintaining reasonable order, and keeping attendance records. In this capacity, he must also make
available any and all resource materials, concepts, and techniques to assist the students in planning these inquiries on their own. The next major role of the teacher will be as a questioner or investigator. In this role, he will have to very strongly apply the scientific method in teaching the students how to perform their assigned tasks. By virtue of those activities, the students will be encouraged to activate their new roles which include readings, talks, reports, and themes relating to their thoughts, opinions formed, and decisions they have made through having applied the scientific method to their research.

**Verbal Communication.** Man's ability to communicate thought has long been recognized as his distinguishing characteristic. The survival of the species depends on man's ability to demonstrate the effectiveness of dialogue as an alternative to mass destruction. New developments in secondary school speech education reflect this social climate.

William Work (1967) maintains:

Teachers utilizing concepts from communication theory try to develop in their students functional understanding of the similarities and differences between the modes of expressing (speaking and writing) and the modes of response (listening and reading). Such teachers are less concerned with delivery and more concerned with the message as an element common to both the speaker and listener. They tend to place primary stress on the principles and skills of public speaking. They also place stress on the theory and techniques needed to assess critically the output of the mass media. Finally, they want their students to understand the influence of varying cultures on communication.
At present there is a stronger emphasis on rhetoric—subject matter, arrangement, and style in oral discourse. The superficial aspects of verbal communication (delivery) are being subordinated to the substantive aspects (content). There is relatively less emphasis on formal speechmaking and relatively more on group discussion and other forms of interpersonal communication.

The division of the English language into narrow disciplines seems to be more an administrative and academic convenience than a natural outgrowth of the organic and functional use of the language itself. Team efforts of speech and English teachers are not limited to working with colleagues in the field of English; they may work equally well with teachers of history, social studies, and the sciences. These collaborative efforts are especially effective and productive when they involve teachers who are concerned with the exploration of contemporary problems in their courses.

**Written Communication.** The promise of many new approaches to teaching composition (written communication) is reducing tensions that stem from a variety of conflicting opinions.

Robert J. Lacampagne (1967) said:

There is the cry of the outraged professional writer who claims, "writing can't be taught." School principals are more aware of the louder cries of employers, college professors and the general public who ask, "Why don't schools teach writing anymore?" And there are those who question whether students other than the gifted should be taught writing. "How often do you write in adult life anyway?" The teacher of composition, caught between such diverse opinions, has not been encouraged by research findings in composition. Some still believe that knowledge of the older, formal grammar, will help students write better.
Broadly conceived, motivation resides in the student's sense of human relationship with others and in the ideas and impressions and feelings he wishes to communicate. All students have emotions, opinions, and attitudes that used appropriately can provide the impetuous useful writing experience. But this internal reservoir must be tapped by skillful hands. Faced with a sterile exercise and writing about "My Summer Vacation" or "My Pet Peeve" in five hundred words, a student is motivated at the very lowest level. Quite obviously, the composition he writes will reflect this fact.

Writing is not ordinarily taught as a means of communication, but simply as a method of communication. The difference is hardly known in school. The difference is between reaching a sense of shared understanding and just passing on information. Many young people who leave school are unable to use their native language for little more than servicing impulse.

John Rouse (1968) said:

Somehow all our stress on the utility of language does not seem to produce many good communicators, and it certainly does not produce people who regard the written word as a means of reaching a sense of shared experience and understanding with others.

There is no doubt that children begin their school years with active minds and deep emotional lives and often with a natural ability to put their experiences into language. Soon their tongues thicken and they cease to grow in expressive power. After a few years of lessons in composition— in the "art of effective communication"—reaching out to others through the written word becomes an impossible task. The typical method requires the student to plod through dreary exercises on vocabulary, spelling and parts of speech, followed by the dissection of sentences; next comes the taxonomy of the paragraph and finally the structure of the composition. All along the way the writing is treated not so much as something one does but rather a something one learns about. The composition textbooks in nearly universal use from elementary school through college are compendiums of quaint and curious lore—handbooks on the taxidermy of composition, giving instruction in the art of stuffing handfuls of words into empty forms.
Motivation in writing can be compared to an artist painting a glowing sunset or to a pianist playing a Chopin "Nocturne." The artist knows what he wants to portray on his canvas, the pianist realizes what expression he desires to place into the tonal effects of his instrument, but neither one of these individuals can comprehend what their effect will be on others until they have completed their work or performance. In like manner, the writer of composition has no means of knowing how his work will be accepted until after he has placed his words down on paper.

Teaching a student to write is the same thing as teaching him to think. This, to some extent, is what education is all about. Yet many students remain as innocent of writing skills on the day they leave high school or college as the day they entered.

Until recently the engineers of curriculum seemed to operate on the theory that students would learn to write well if they were: (a) "adequately instructed in grammar" and (b) "sufficiently exposed to literature." The fact that things did not work out this way did not deter them from almost religious belief in the theory.

Generations of students have made this point clear and grammar as a sustained and serious study in the modern English curriculum is being gradually dropped. The theory behind the study of writing would seem to rest on a single proposition: That sufficient exposure to good literature will do the job. Thus, more literature has rushed in to
fill the gap left by grammar. The study of writing remains exactly where it was in the beginning; a subdivision of the literature program.

Lucille Vaughan Payne (1966) said:

The only way that writing can be successfully taught is by teaching it for exactly what it is—writing; not grammar; not reading, but writing. The teacher must begin by deciding what he means when he talks about teaching it. Obviously some things about writing cannot be taught; nobody can "learn how" to be talented. But a number of very important things about writing can be taught, and if they are identified perhaps it will be possible to arrive at a clear and realistic idea of what a high school writing program should accomplish.

The schools do have other obligations to instruct all students, to the limit of their intelligence, in the effective use of language. This means teaching them three things: how to organize their thoughts about a central idea, how to test those thoughts for logic, and how to express them in a clear and concise language in a unified piece of prose.

**Semantics.** The third and final segment, and perhaps in many ways the most important, because semantics is a field or a substudy of the English language that is peculiar to not only written but verbal communication. Language is a powerful instrument for controlling men's thoughts and moving men to action. To see it in operation this way one need only to read or listen to language that one knows is being used to influence behavior. This means the language of political speeches, or advertising, or organizations that have a special interest to serve, or demigods striving to achieve positions of leadership, or persons trying to get out of trouble, as well as that of the statesman attempting to bring about a better world. You have only to turn to
your daily newspaper or turn on a television set to be confronted with
language of this kind.

L. M. Myers (1967) wrote:

The power of language lies mainly in the choice of words that are used and secondarily in the arrangement of words in a way that they will achieve their most telling effect. The manner in which words are used is wise and varied. First of all we have the problem of meaning. One word may have two or more different meanings.

Generally speaking, we can find that almost every statement made may have three kinds of meanings. The first of these three tells what the speaker intends to indicate; second, what meaning is suggested to a particular listener; and third, what is in keeping with our theory of using the standing English dialect, we must form a more or less general habit of using a given word to indicate a given thing. Far too many writers on the language completely neglect the first two of these, and treat the third far too rigidly, as if the connection between the word and the thing were absolute.

It must be borne in mind that words with the same meaning may have a different connotation. For example; the Atlantic City Weather Bureau officially changed the wording in forecasts from "partly cloudy" to "partly sunny." Do these mean the same thing? Would you rather buy a "second-hand car" or a "pre-owned car?" Words may have suggestiveness and an emotive force, in addition to their ordinary dictionary meanings.

As is seen in the foregoing paragraph, bias is being used. In this sense, we are making the English language say something or we are making it sound like something that has just a slightly different intonation or connotation than the way the words are normally used.
In English to put bias or slant into a sentence or statement is using the word metaphorically when an effort is being made to slant one's judgment, either for or against an issue or commodity. Bias words will tend to creep into speech and writing when a feeling of forcefulness or emotions come into the written or spoken picture. The writer who uses bias words will do well to consider what readers of his words are likely to find, because the references of these words change in different times and places.

The use of semantics in this inquiry-centered method of teaching of English is one of the most important concepts, to be sure. But it must be remembered that the teacher must be aware of the divergence of backgrounds from which his students come.

That there is some progress being made in bringing the English curriculum into line and up to date with mathematics, the sciences, and social studies is shown in the many ways in which, mainly, the National Council of Teachers of English has instituted and in some cases provided funding for curriculum studies.

Dana Wall, Division Head, English Language Arts, Sioux City Community Schools (1971) says:

If we are to believe the professional literature, textbook consultants, and myriads of English workshop and convention speakers, then any kind of grammar drill is out, and traditional grammar drill is so far out that it is gone. After all, no research has been able to show a carry-over from a knowledge of grammar to an ability to write and speak, but should we believe that grammar drill is out just because professional literature, consultants, and speakers say so?
The majority of students never have felt a need to know grammar intricacies beyond test day, and the majority of adults are unable to pass a grammar test. Students are right. There is no need. None beyond acquiring a useful residue of understanding of our language, something like the residue of scientific knowledge left by having once learned the periodic chart of elements.

Why not teach students to write by writing? Include usage, stylistics, levels of diction, and appropriateness at every grade level, and offer a one semester course in the grammar of English at some secondary level that may seem best.

Since, as Mr. Wall has brought out, no evidence has yet shown that grammar drill carries over to composition skill, why not teach students to write by teaching writing and include a grammar course once in their schooling as we do chemistry or algebra? In this way, the teaching of grammar could be justified as a body of knowledge worth knowing instead of being repeated every year with no believable purpose.

Instructional Media. With the advent of World War II, the armed services discovered that they could teach draftees the intricacies of aircraft spotting and other vital necessities for making war faster and more efficiently through the use of slides, filmstrips, and training movies. The result of this has been that, although expensive, the use of audio-visual aids to teaching is with us and their use is increasing every year in every field of study.

The teaching of English is making some inroads toward the use and utilization of audio-visual methods of presenting course content.
It seems as if the value of audio-visual aids has to be "discovered" by each individual teacher of English.

This is shown by Doris P. Miller (1968) when she describes her experiences with sound filmstrips:

For years I was a holdout against the onslaught of educational gadgetry designed to make button-pushing, switch-flicking robots out of creative teachers . . . .

Our first surprise attack was against the giant of the audio-visual world, Walt Disney. Now I had no quarrel with Disney but what I didn't like was the filmstrip made from his movie of Johnny Tremain, Esther Forbes novel of Revolutionary Boston because his film stressed plot. I wanted my students to understand the book's theme, our indebtedness to our forebearers for this great country of ours.

I needed pictures, color, music, sound effects. What to do? I went to Boston where I walked the Freedom Trail and took a boat tour around the harbor. Then I went to Concord and Lexington and took colored slides of all the historic sites. Standing before the graves of James Otis, Paul Revere, and Sam Adams . . . I suddenly felt like Keats looking into Chapman's Homer.

From the slides our local photographer made quite an impressive filmstrip. With taped commentary, musical background, and special sound effects we came up with a production that was quite moving.

Virginia FitzPatrick (1968) "discovered" the value of using a tape recorder for making the critique on student papers by recording her comments on tape:

If I could only talk to the student about this paper. These written comments don't mean a thing. There are times when every English teacher feels that if he had the time to talk individually with each student about his paper, there would be better understanding and livelier response on the part of the student. This individual instruction can be accomplished by using a simple tape recorder.
Adele H. Stern (1968) speaks of "discovering" the use of films in teaching English composition:

Film is its own reason for being. It's an art form as much a part of our daily lives as literature, architecture, painting, or sculpture. We are focused on a screen... and we feel, we hear, we see an all encompassing tangle of emotions and senses which no other art form demands.

All of the forms of writing—exposition, literary criticism, narration, dialogue, description, even poetry, can be found in parallels in film and provide stimulation for a composition program.

If the film is exciting and dramatic, if the student has been personally touched by it, it will give him something he needs to say. And the composition will reveal the feelings and emotions of the writer. This is a far cry from the teacher's imposition of a topic. "Discuss the nature of good and evil in Billy Budd." Students will find their own theses, and they will use film, much as they have used the book in the past, to support their contentions.

During the past twenty years, television has become increasingly important to the field of communication and education. The potential of this medium of communication is explained by Charles B. Stenberg, Vice President of CBS (1968), in his comments on television and the teacher:

The failure to put television to use by the teacher is a result of many factors—inaertia, uncritical acceptance of many academic attitudes toward the television medium, failure to recognize the opportunities which television offers for application in the classroom, the library, and the home.

Were there criticisms applicable only to a few institutions of higher education, there would be no point in mentioning them here. The plain fact is, however, that they have equal relevance to teachers in the elementary school, and certainly to teachers of English in the secondary school, where television viewing plays so momentous a part in the daily life of the student.
It is an undeniable fact that students watch television avidly and persistently. They watch it before, during, and after their home studies. And most watch it with no meaningful relationship between what goes on in school and what is assigned for the home or library. We know, from available studies, that television has served as a spur to reading, to vocabulary building, and to a greater desire for knowledge about world affairs.

This casual attitude fails to take into account the enormous potential of television in the whole spectrum of elementary, secondary, and even higher education. It is a roadblock to the proper use of the most exciting and challenging medium of communication man has had at his disposal since the invention of printing.

Despite neglect by the educator, however, television will not go away quietly and disappear. The medium is very much with us and its popularity as entertainment and information grows larger as the electronic age grows more sophisticated. Meanwhile, surveys of viewing habits continue to be published, and educational sociologists and psychologists continue to venture hypotheses on the effects of mass media on student study habits, reading, and political action. The foregoing statement by Charles Stenberg would seem to indicate that every effort has been made, except a positive effort on the part of the teacher to seek out television as an educational and cultural tool.

The world of television as a medium of mass communications is too much with us to be ignored. Its contributions are too significant to be brushed aside.

The teacher who does nothing effects no change in the student's viewing habits or attitudes. The teacher who seeks out television's infinite possibilities can make a positive contribution to the education
of the student. It is a matter of choice, but the possibilities for good are infinite.

Carole Masley Kirkton (1971) reported to NCTE/ERIC to the effect that:

We literally live and breathe in a "mediatmosphere" and we have accepted nonchalantly this phenomenon (film) without really perceiving it because it is a part of our environment . . . . With that awareness comes a conviction that perhaps education and the concept of "literacy" ought to include more than the printed page, that if teachers are to help equip students for the future, they would do well to take the leap beyond that linear line.
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PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Considering that the average secondary school student has been speaking and writing some form of the English language for at least ten years, there is only one word that can describe perhaps the greatest of many problems facing the teaching of English today—relevancy. Is the course of study being presented by the teacher of English today germane in the fact of the fast and ever changing race of today's society? It is hoped that this study will contribute a part of the answer to the dilemma facing the teacher of English today.

The survey instrument (Appendix A, page 41) was designed in order to assess the use to which a selected group of teachers of English throughout the State of Montana have been using new and innovative methods of instruction in their classes. The object of the instrument was primarily to emphasize the need for a change in the methods used by the majority of teachers of English in their classes as was brought out in the preceding chapter.

Population. The population used in this study was drawn from the official list of secondary school teachers of English in the State of Montana for 1969 as provided by the State Department of Public Instruction.

One hundred teachers of English (Appendix B, page 45) were drawn so as to assure an equal distribution of the samples throughout
both the public and private secondary schools, as well as an equal
distribution in both large and small school districts.

The Instrument. The instrument was instituted to find out if
teachers of English are making an attempt to update and modernize their
teaching methods as well as to disclose the teaching methods and curric-
ulum emphasis now in use. It has been written also to determine the
commonness of the use of audio-visual aids.

The instrument used in this study was designed with four
objectives in mind. The first objective was an attempt to discover
whether or not the schools in question had a basic or minimal media
program with respect to the hardware required for both the audio and
visual presentations, as recommended by the Joint Standards Committee
of the American Library Association, and the Department of Audio Visual
Instruction, NEA in 1969. The second objective was to discover the
frequency with which teachers of English use audio-visual teaching
aids. It was felt that this indicator of the use of audio-visual
teaching aids may give some data which can support the hypothesis
that, as a group, teachers of English are not making any visible effort
to update their individual classroom teaching methods, audio-visual
teaching aids being considered by many authorities to be the most
efficient method of dispensing information. The third objective of
the instrument was intended to determine what method Montana teachers
of English use in the classroom and the method of instruction preferred
by the various schools. The fourth and last objective was an attempt to determine the willingness of teachers of English to change their style of instruction if they were provided new and innovative materials, which are available for use, in the classroom.

Organization of Data. The data derived as a result of the survey instrument (Appendix A, page 41) were tabulated on tables and graphs; it being felt that a preponderance of verbage would tend to make the explanation of the results of the study awkward for clear understanding of the problem involved.
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FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

There was a 65 per cent return on the survey instrument. Of the sixty-five respondents, there was one who stated that his district had rulings prohibiting him from answering a survey. Three others were no longer teaching English (Appendix B, pages 45 through 50).

In an effort to make the data easier to analyze, the instrument has been divided into four parts or objectives. The results were tabulated only on the respondents answering the survey in detail. All results were recorded as relating to the percentage of respondents submitting the data.

The first objective referred to included only the first question in the survey instrument.

Table 1

Does your school have what could be considered a minimal instructional media program?

i.e., one overhead projector per teaching station
one 16 mm. projector per five teachers
one 35 mm. filmstrip projector per five teachers
one record player per ten teachers
one tape recorder/player per ten teachers

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An affirmative answer in this high percentage seems to indicate that school boards and administrators throughout Montana feel that the use of instructional media is an effective way to modernize and update the teaching methods and curriculum in their schools.

The second objective to which the survey instrument had reference dealt with frequency of use of the instructional media services. The portion of the instrument dealing with this area encompassed five questions.

In this discussion, the first question was:

Table 2
How frequently do you take advantage of the instructional media services offered by your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a semester</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 mm. projector</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 mm. filmstrip projector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 mm. film projector</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overhead projector</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>record player</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape recorder/player</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I TV</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of all media</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second question in the survey dealing with frequency of use was:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected chalkboard</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared transparencies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question in this objective relating to frequency of use was:

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher made</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Made</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially made</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth question dealing with the frequency of use of instructional media services was:

Table 5

Do you use your bulletin boards as teaching tools?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last question in the survey relating to the use of instructional media was:

Table 6

Do you feel that the use of audio-visual aids for teaching has any marked effect on the quality of your teaching

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third objective of the instrument related to the teaching method actually used in the classroom and the method which is preferred by the school district. This part of the instrument included three questions. (See Table 7, page 31)
Table 7
What approach do you use in teaching your English classes?
(a) traditional  
(b) linguistic  
(c) structural  
(d) semantical  
(e) other (explain)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantical</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question relating to classroom teaching methods was:

Table 8
What method (lecture, discussion, etc.) do you use generally in conducting your classes? Explain briefly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last question relating to the third objective of the survey asked:

Table 9
How much importance does the English curriculum of your school attach to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Literature</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Composition</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Oral communication</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Traditional grammar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth objective of the survey was to determine the willingness of teachers of English to change their style of instruction. In pursuit of this objective, the question was asked:

Table 10
Would you favor changing your teaching style in any extent in order to use the new teaching aids that are available, if your district would or could furnish them.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The content of this study, up to this point, has been directed toward bringing out the weaknesses in the teaching of English. There have been several recognized authorities referred to who all were in agreement in that they had the opinion that the teaching of English must be updated and modernized. There have been some rumblings among the students and some of their teachers to the effect that the curriculum now being used in the secondary schools for the teaching of English is not relevant; it has not kept up with the times. Some of the problem, as we have seen, is the fault of the teachers of English. Many of these teachers will not accept and use new and innovative teaching methods and materials. Some of the problem has to be accepted by the administration for neglecting to provide the necessary funds with which to purchase materials, construct study centers, and institute curriculum studies.

Available literature seems to indicate that there is and has been considerable research and experimentation done with curriculum in the teaching of English. However, as was brought out in the survey instrument, the greatest stumbling block for the implementation of any innovative, relevance seeking curriculum would seem to be the teachers of English themselves.
Until either the State Department of Public Instruction or one of the more progressive school districts in Montana should institute an in-depth curriculum study with the objective in mind of formulating an English and Language Arts Curriculum Guide for grades kindergarten through twelfth and then purchase the necessary books and instruction materials to put the guide into use, all the research and experimentation that has been done in the past and that undoubtedly will be done in the future will be completely useless.

Conclusions

The four stated objectives to have been achieved by the survey instrument seem to have created a paradox to some degree in that on one hand teachers of English claimed that they do not use the latest style of teaching devices available, yet the majority of schools in which they are teaching are apparently adequately equipped. On the other hand, a majority of teachers of English in Montana conduct their classes in a traditional manner, while an even heavier majority of the schools involved indicate that they would prefer to get away from the traditional manner of approaching the teaching of English and have gone so far as to supply their schools with the equipment and materials with which teachers of English should be able to update their classroom methodology. As indicated concurrently with this, the survey instrument showed that teachers of English in Montana are more than willing to update their classroom teaching methods. Although
the remarks made in reference to the last question in the survey demonstrate a reluctance on the part of teachers of English to make the necessary changes that would be required to revise their teaching methods in an effort to make their classes more interesting and challenging to the students.

The first objective referred to in the survey instrument showed that, of those teachers of English who responded to the survey, there were 57 per cent who said their school did not have a basic instructional media program. An affirmative answer in this high percentage seems to indicate that school boards and administrators throughout Montana feel that the use of instructional media is a most effective way to modernize and update the teaching methods and curriculum in their schools.

The second objective of the survey instrument, relating to frequency of use of the instructional media services, seemed to indicate that while school boards and administrators have willingly accepted new innovations and teaching methodology, that teachers of English, as a group, have not shown such a propensity for using the new methods available through instructional media.

An indicator as to reasons for this reluctance was disclosed by several teachers who responded:

... I feel that my style of teaching is basically freelance and teaching aids are not that necessary to my style.
I know of no aid that will replace me in doing the
time consuming work that an English teacher must do—correcting
papers, finding materials, and encouraging people to learn.

We have plenty of teaching aids available, I just do
not feel they have as much value as the teacher himself.

I need more paperback books, magazines, newspapers,
money for field trips. "Teacher aids" are usually gimmicks of
limited worth.

It was interesting to note the results of this survey indicated that
an average of 35.9 per cent of the respondents never use instructional
media services furnished in their school.

The respondents' reply to the question of whether or not the
use of audio-visual aids to teaching had any marked effect on the
quality of their teaching was indicative in that 89 per cent showed
that they felt that audio-visual aids did have a marked effect on
the quality of their teaching. However, the responses presented a
contradiction in that while a majority of them do not use instruction
media services, as was brought out in the second objective, they do
feel that they would like to use these services and that they are
an excellent teaching "tool." The inconsistency of the responses to
this part of the survey made it rather difficult to place any positive
realization regarding the responses given to the instrument.

The third objective covered in the survey related to teaching
methods actually used in the classroom and teaching method preferred
by the various schools. It should be carefully noted, however, that
a majority of these teachers had responded as using the traditional approach to teaching their English classes. Many of the respondents made a point of being concerned with boredom in an English classroom, although many teachers of English throughout the State of Montana are innovating to quite a high degree in order that they make their classes meaningful to the students.

A significant result noticed in the study of the third objective was that while 48 per cent of the schools attach little importance to the teaching of traditional grammar, 48 per cent of the instructors are using the traditional approach in teaching their classes, which would seem to indicate that the administration is modernizing and updating faster than the instructors.

The fourth objective of the survey was to determine the willingness of teachers of English to change their style of instruction. In pursuit of this objective, 66 per cent of the respondents said that they would favor changing their teaching style to use new teaching aids. However, a surprising 34 per cent said that they would not. In fact, one individual carried his "no" answer a step farther and said, "... I feel I do an above average job."

Recommendations

More and more frequently, research and reports of experimental and innovative programs in the teaching of English are indicating that
now is the time for a definitive study to be made to coordinate the curriculum for the English and language arts program from kindergarten through the twelfth grade.

All of the reports of research and experimentation which the researcher has had the privilege of reading during the course of this study seemed to have been dealing with only one grade level. That is to say, they were concerned with just primary, intermediate, junior high, or senior high school with only a minor reference to the fact that English and language arts are being taught at some other grade level than the one with which the writer is dealing.

Therefore, it is the recommendation derived from this investigation that further study be instituted to formulate a comprehensive English and language arts program for use from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. This program or study guide will, of necessity, have to be extremely detailed in content. The reason for this being that teachers of English and language arts will have to change their classroom methodology in order that they may adopt the new teaching style.

Research and experimentation have indicated that a basic knowledge of grammar is needed at the elementary level, but that the maturational level of the student is not great enough for the individual student to understand an in-depth study of traditional grammar until he is in senior high school.
Possibly, another recommendation that might be in order with a major overhaul of the English and language arts curriculum would be to change the name of the course to something like Communication Skills.
APPENDICES
Dear Fellow English Teacher:

I am working toward my Masters Degree and would appreciate it if you would take the time to answer the enclosed questionnaire.

I am interested in your comments on the questions. If you wish to elaborate on your "yes" and "no" answers, it will be most helpful.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

John S. Piatt

Enclosures: Questionnaire
Stamped envelope
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Does your school have what could be considered a minimal instructional media program?
   i.e., one overhead projector per teaching station
   one 16 mm. projector per five teachers
   one 35 mm. filmstrip projector per five teachers
   one record player for 10 teachers
   one tape recorder/player per 10 teachers
   ____ yes  ____ no

   If no, explain:

2. How frequently do you take advantage of the instructional media services offered by your school.

   daily  once a week  once a month  once a sem.  never
   a) 16 mm. projector  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
   b) 35 mm. filmstrip projector  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
   c) 8 mm. filmstrip projector  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
   d) overhead projector  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
   e) record player  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
   f) tape recorder/player  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
   g) ITC  ____  ____  ____  ____  ____

3. If you use the overhead projector, do you use it as:

   a) a projected chalkboard  ____ yes  ____ no
   b) with prepared transparencies  ____ yes  ____ no
4. Are the transparencies you use:
   a) teacher made (with overhead pen)    yes    no
   b) school made (by thermal process)    yes    no
   c) commercially made                  yes    no

5. Do you use your bulletin boards as teaching tools?  yes    no

6. Do you feel that the use of audiovisual aids to teaching has made any marked effect on the quality of your teaching?  yes    no

   Explain:

7. What approach do you use in teaching your English class:
   a) traditional    c) structural
   b) linguistic    d) semantical
   e) other (explain):

8. What method (lecture, discussion, etc.) do you use generally in conducting your classes? Explain briefly:
9. How much importance does the English curriculum of your school attach to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a great deal</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Traditional grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain briefly:

10. Would you favor changing your teaching style in any extent in order to use the new teaching aids that are available, if your district would or could furnish them to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Explain:
### APPENDIX B

**TEACHERS OF ENGLISH IN MONTANA SURVEYED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public High Schools</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Malborg, Anaconda High School, Anaconda</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Brookshire, Billings Senior High School, Billings</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Clawson, Billings Senior High School, Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Jensen, Billings Senior High School, Billings</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Nesbit, Billings Senior High School, Billings</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Black, Billings West High School, Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Clark, Billings West High School, Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Estes, Billings West High School, Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Hicks, Billings West High School, Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda McCleve, Billings West High School, Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Thiel, Jefferson High School Boulder</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Baker, Bozeman High School, Bozeman</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Micka, Bozeman High School, Bozeman</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Pace, Bozeman High School, Bozeman</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Ferguson, Powder River County District High School, Broadus</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Walker, Browning High School, Browning</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Foley, Butte High School, Butte</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Gilmore, Butte High School, Butte</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angeline O'Leary, Butte High School, Butte</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Alice Paxton, Butte High School, Butte</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Fredericksen, Charlo High School, Charlo</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rose, Choteau High School, Choteau</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stanton, Circle High School, Circle</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Giacomino, Columbia Falls High School, Columbia Falls</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Schilling, Columbia Falls High School, Columbia Falls</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Nierstheimer, Columbus High School, Columbus</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Moen, Corvallis High School, Corvallis</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Munson, Cut Bank High School, Cut Bank</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Scott, Drummond High School, Drummond</td>
<td>** yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Sullivan, Ennis High School, Ennis</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Meredith, Fort Benton High School, Fort Benton</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dockstader, Geraldine High School, Geraldine</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Simonsen, Glasgow High School, Glasgow</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dillabough, Great Falls High School, Great Falls</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ojala, Great Falls High School, Great Falls</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Stende, Great Falls High School, Great Falls</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Anderson, Charles M. Russell High School, Great Falls</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Molland, Charles M. Russell High School, Great Falls</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public High Schools (continued)

Stanley Morse, Charles M. Russell High School, Great Falls  yes
Betty Browne, Havre High School, Havre  yes
Douglas Stephenson, Helena High School, Helena  yes
David R. Lester, Helena High School, Helena  yes
John Elwood, Flathead High School, Kalispell  * yes
Terrance McCourt, Laurel High School Laurel  yes
Travis Chevallier, Park High School, Livingston  yes
Michael Odden, Red Lodge High School, Red Lodge  yes
Robert Hammer, Sidney High School, Sidney  yes
Bruce McMorris, Whitehall High School, Whitehall  yes

COUNTY HIGH SCHOOLS

Frank Hull, Beaverhead County High School, Dillon  yes
Carabel Juergens, Beaverhead County High School, Dillon  no
June Quane, Beaverhead County High School, Dillon  no
William Flechsenhar, Broadwater County High School, Townsend  yes
Curtis Wilson, Carter County High School, Ekalaka  yes
Harold Boe, Custer County High School, Miles City  yes
Jon Dahlberg, Dawson County High School, Glendive  yes
Ronald Risdahl, Fergus County High School, Lewistown  ** yes
Harriet Anderson, Garfield County High School, Jordan  no
### County High Schools (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Thompson</td>
<td>Lincoln County High School</td>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Whalen</td>
<td>Hellgate High School</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Briton</td>
<td>Sentinel High School</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Salmonson</td>
<td>Seeley-Swan High School</td>
<td>Seeley Lake</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Alger</td>
<td>Powell County High School</td>
<td>Deer Lodge</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Conwell</td>
<td>Sweet Grass County High School</td>
<td>Big Timber</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Puccinelli</td>
<td>Anaconda Junior High School</td>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sandler</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark Junior High School</td>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McLeod</td>
<td>Lincoln Junior High School</td>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Fox</td>
<td>Riverside Junior High School</td>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. France</td>
<td>Bozeman Junior High School</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Combo</td>
<td>East Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connole</td>
<td>East Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisela Gramling</td>
<td>East Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hughes</td>
<td>East Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Jany</td>
<td>East Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cavanaugh</td>
<td>West Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rosa</td>
<td>West Junior High School</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Durocher</td>
<td>Glasgow Junior High School</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Junior High Schools (continued)

Jack Mattingly, East Junior High School, Great Falls ** yes
Rudy Preite, East Junior High School, Great Falls no
Gladys Johnson, Paris Gibson Junior High School, Great Falls no
Morris Myxter, Paris Gibson Junior High School, Great Falls yes
Carol Millet, North Junior High School, Great Falls yes
David Blaquiere, North Junior High School, Great Falls yes
Larry Sietz, West Junior High School, Great Falls yes
Donneatta Steffani, West Junior High School, Great Falls yes
Garland Cline, Hardin Junior High School, Hardin no
John Hanley, C. R. Anderson Junior High School, Helena no
Ronald Dooley, Helena Junior High School, Helena no
Gary Carver, Kalispell Junior High School, Kalispell yes
Ronald Duncan, Laurel Junior High School, Laurel yes
Karen Timberman, Libby Junior High School, Libby no
Walter Hansen, Livingston Junior High School, Livingston yes
Ruth Iversen, Sidney Junior High School, Sidney yes

PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOLS

Sister Leo Therese Mendel, Central Catholic High School, Billings yes
Maureen Mee, Catholic Central High School, Butte yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private High Schools (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorraine Bronson, Central Catholic High School</td>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref. R. David Bielefeld, St. Leo High School, Lewistown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father David Konecny, Sacred Heart High School, Miles City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE HIGH SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley Madsen, Mountain View High School, Helena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernest R. Everingham, Pine Hills School, Miles City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL HIGH SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koy Sheets, Busby High School, Busby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Busby</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Returned unanswered
** No longer teaching English
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