

**John Hodgson and Ann Harris**

# **The Many Voices of Dartmouth**

## **1. Introduction**

The month-long seminar of English teachers from the US, UK and Canada held in Dartmouth, New Hampshire in the summer of 1966 was a notable event in the history of the teaching of English. Fifty years later, the concept of 'growth through English', enshrined in the title of John Dixon's report on the seminar, remains significant to the identity of the profession in the UK and abroad (Goodwyn, 2016). Yet the contributions of fifty delegates have been mediated to successive generations mainly through the reports written by John Dixon from the UK and Herbert J. Muller from the US. As several commentators (e.g. Daiches, 1968, p.219; Brass, 2016, p.52) have indicated, these differ widely in their approach and emphases. Dixon acknowledges in the Author's Preface to the first edition of *Growth through English* (1967, p.xi) that his report is inevitably partial: 'a simpler view from a single vantage point'. Muller explains in his introduction to *The Uses of English* (1967, p.vi) that, while he aimed to do justice to the different opinions expressed, he has 'not tried to write a wholly impersonal report'. Reflecting at the distance of a half-century on the seminar, it is natural to wonder about the provenance of these reports, and the process by which the many voices of Dartmouth were represented. What other views of Dartmouth are conceivable?

We offer here a view informed by recently available access to the two volumes of unpublished seminar papers and associated Dartmouth documents (listed in the reference section below), and John Dixon's recent reflection upon the seminar and its impact (Dixon 2017). As British teachers and researchers, members of a professional community shaped in part by *Growth through English*, we focus our attention primarily on Dixon's account rather than on Muller's; but we have tried to bring out the interplay of voices (some not present at the seminar) that produced the historical moment of Dartmouth. We begin our analysis with a brief account of the political context in the US and UK, and conclude with an assessment of the significance of Dartmouth in contemporary English education.

## 2. 1966 and all that

As is well known, US government initial support for the Dartmouth seminar derived in part from the Soviet Union's apparent lead in the space race (Yuri Gagarin had orbited the Earth in 1961), which raised concerns that the west was failing to educate the coming generation. The British government, in turn, was arguably more concerned with the education of the young people whom the Newsom Report (1963) had termed 'half our future'. They comprised the greater part of the school population that (having failed the eleven-plus examination for entry to selective 'grammar' schools) left school at fifteen without any qualification. The US government response with respect to similar concerns had been to bus socially deprived, often African-American, students across towns and cities to more affluent areas where there was ostensibly better schooling. In the UK, the Labour government required in 1965 all local educational authorities to submit proposals to end selection at eleven and to build new neighbourhood 'comprehensive' schools.

This democratic impulse was shared at Dartmouth. The record of group discussions on 'grouping' or 'streaming' students according to their perceived ability states that members of the seminar felt 'repelled' by the practice:

[W]e are demanding a better education all round in which human beings are treated as human beings; everyone concerned with the teaching of English can help to encourage within a democracy the pursuit of excellence. (F1, group discussion, p.15)

While social, economic and educational segregation and deprivation existed (then as now) in many parts of the US, and had ignited the Watts riots in Los Angeles in 1965, the US government proposed no national reform of education. The UK government, on the other hand, was newly committed to provide education on an equal basis not only for 'more academic' grammar school pupils but also for those who had previously, in Holbrook's (1964, p.3) words, been 'rejected' as 'unacademic [and] unexaminable'. In 1971, the UK school leaving age was raised to sixteen for all pupils. Writing out of their personal, social and professional histories, the authors of the two reports on Dartmouth reflected contemporary concerns within these differing national contexts.

## 3. John Dixon's *Growth through English*

John Dixon's report on Dartmouth, *Growth through English* (1967), has to be understood in the light of the experience that led him to a radically democratic Freirian (Freire 1978) view of the purpose and mission of the English teacher. Before Dartmouth, John Dixon had taught in British schools and colleges for several years. His work at a boys' grammar school in Holloway, London, where he joined a Labour teachers' discussion group, convinced him that the comprehensive school would need 'some kind of syllabus that would work for everyone' (Dixon 2017, p.241). In 1956, he became involved with the London Association for the Teaching of English, whose founding secretary, Guy Rogers, was Head Teacher of Walworth Comprehensive School; Dixon later joined Walworth as Head of English. There he co-wrote *Reflections*, his first classroom text, with his colleagues Simon Clements and Leslie Stratta. The title, Dixon reports, was Stratta's:

a very good title because it was reflectiveness that Leslie kept emphasising we wanted to induct the students into, at the age of fourteen or so, to become more reflective about the experience of their social environment and lives. (Dixon 2017, p. 245)

*Reflections* (1963) and the later *Things Being Various* (1967) were not traditional classroom English texts to be worked through. The *Teacher's Book* accompanying *Things Being Various* explains (p.7):

This is not a course book. It is a collection of experiences, and therefore there is no specific order in which to look [...] The book can provide a sort of joint exploration for the group and their teacher [...] A teacher's insight into connections will help him to suggest related material both inside the book and outside; he will judge at what point (in a discussion, a hand-back of writing...) to move from one extract or paragraph to a complementary or opposing passage.

In whole-class discussion of topics relevant to pupils, teachers use their wider textual and experiential knowledge to encourage dialectic ('a complementary or opposing passage'). Dixon had taken from Connie and Harold Rosen 'the idea that you should talk about, you know, everyday events in their lives as a start' (Dixon 2017, p.241) but the classroom conversation implied in *Reflections* and *Things Being Various* was not merely anecdotal. In a talk to the London Association for the Teaching of English, Simon Clements (1965) defined the aim of *Reflections* in terms of a creating a common culture, a 'sensitivity which will be useful in living':

The establishment of values is done by the children themselves in the process of *doing* and looking and reading and talking. Thus the group defines its values by talk. (Clements 1965)

Clements went on to suggest the radical purpose of such discussion:

If the kind of talk and work that goes on in a class re-defines the cultural position, it also re-defines the relationships within the school, and the structures operating within the school. This is what is happening in comprehensive schools and why they are confused and confusing places at present. (Clements 1965)

Given his experience and vision of teaching English, it is hardly surprising that Dixon chose to highlight 'growth' in the title of his report rather than 'skills' or 'cultural heritage', although all three models of the subject had, he states, been widely accepted in schools on both sides of the Atlantic. This is not to suggest, as does Harris (1991, p.631) that Dixon's account of the seminar was 'highly skewed'. The view that language is best learned 'in operation' seems to have been generally accepted at Dartmouth, and Dixon felt that he 'couldn't say a word' about his own practice in teaching 'a very important ancillary side' of spelling patterns: 'nobody had anything like that kind of story to tell' (Dixon 2017, p.247).

In the first chapter of *Growth through English*, Dixon gives an example from a ten-year old boy's diary in which, he suggests, the writer wants to make his experience real again to a sympathetic listener. As he does so, the boy's experience takes on a meaning that he treasures. Dixon comments that this personal, tentative, affective language should be valued in classrooms, which should be places where pupils 'want to talk and write from impulses such as these' (Dixon, 1967, pp 4-6).

It is hard, especially from our current perspective, to take in the radical nature of what Dixon is proposing here. His classroom today seems a utopian space where honest reflection and expression are possible. The teacher, he says (p.7), must be 'more alert and sensitive to average pupils – more concerned with what they have to say, if only they can realise it'. Dixon insists that he is not proposing a simple formula of 'self-expression'. In an English classroom as he envisages it, pupils and teacher combine to recognise all that is challenging, new, uncertain and even painful in experience (p.12). This

is evidently a very different model from that of 'skills' or 'cultural heritage', which both imply a transmission of knowledge from teacher to pupil.

*Growth through English* elaborates the principles that inform the learning activities of an English classroom. Teachers need to help children discover their own meaning through talk and writing, and to include children's stories and poems in the literature of the classroom. Even evaluative writing about literature should be tentative and leave room for connections with personal experience. The study of language similarly involves the affective as well as the cognitive. Pupils should be freed of disabling misconceptions about the 'correctness' of dialect forms, and can learn from both linguistic and literary disciplines ways of organising their experience in the act of reading, speaking and writing. Progression in English will live in new forms of organising experience and in additional refinement or complexity.

In line with the discovery mode of classroom discourse that his book generally advocates, Dixon reports that the Dartmouth seminar advocated a unitary rather than fragmented approach to the English activities of drama, talk, reading and writing.

The more active a part pupils are given, the more difficult to predict all they will find and uncover; thus the need for a flexible teaching strategy rather than rigid lesson plans, and for teachers confidently able to move with a class for instance from reading [Gorki's] *My Childhood* to discussing old people they know or acting encounters of youth and age. (Dixon, 1967, p.33)

What unifies these classroom activities is the theme of human experience on which drama, talk, reading and writing centre. Teachers organise activities in the hope of effecting insight into experience. In his 2017 interview, Dixon makes clear that this 'experience' can be mediated in various forms:

If you're interested in the kind of English that (say) *Reflections* represented, and in working class development through English (and more than working class development) ... then it was inevitable that you get into the fringes of Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology. In other words, other human stories told in different ways. (Dixon, 2017, p.250)

This emphasis on experience clearly privileges the content of written or spoken communication rather than its form. There is no specific suggestion in *Reflections* or

*Growth through English* that work should include analysis of such features as genre, literary form, medium or mode. Even the mass media, according to Clements (1965), should be approached 'as we approach literature – in a spirit of exploration'.

## 4. Herbert Muller's *The Uses of English*

The author of the US report on Dartmouth, Herbert J. Muller, taught English at Cornell and Purdue Universities and in 1959 was named Distinguished Professor of English and Government at Indiana University. His career, like Dixon's, attests to a spirit of broad intellectual inquiry (Carter *et al.* 1980). He published a number of interdisciplinary works, and was one of the signers of the Humanist Manifesto II (AHA 1973). As David Daiches (1968, p.219) has noted, Muller's title *The Uses of English* implies a rather more utilitarian view of the subject than Dixon's *Growth through English* – although Muller's subheadings, variously, *A blueprint for a new direction in the teaching of English in the Anglo-American countries* and *Guidelines for the teaching of English from the Anglo-American conference at Dartmouth College*, suggest he did have aspiration for the ideas included within the report. Muller, however, unlike Dixon, did not seek a synthesis in his version of events but rather chose to highlight the range and variety of perspectives, including his own:

I should emphasize all these issues are highly debatable (a gentle way of saying controversial – a word frightening to some Americans) and that I am not in fact uncommitted or free from bias. Naturally I have tried to do justice to the different opinions expressed, but I have not tried to write a wholly impersonal report. (Muller, 1967, p.vi)

This was at least in part because:

[T]he disagreements grew out of the complexity of the problems besetting the profession. This report might be justified if it gives readers nothing but a fuller awareness of the complexities. (Muller, 1967, p.9)

Reflecting on 'what is English?', Muller viewed the subject as being in a 'state of hopeless confusion' and referred to English teaching as being 'not a profession but a predicament' (p.4). He acknowledged that some of the disagreements in Dartmouth stemmed from the differences between the American and British 'educational systems, traditions and problems' (p.11). Nonetheless, his book represents the seminar

discussions under themes that concerned Dartmouth more broadly. Like Dixon, he discusses democracy in the classroom; the development and growth of the child; 'good' English; writing, talking and other issues. Overall, Muller's book supports Dixon's consensus on key issues, most notably the agreement that literature in the classroom should include television and children's writing. His conclusions, although acknowledging 'confusion' (p.171) to the 'bitter end', were more positive than might have been inferred from the initial discussion. As he noted in the final chapter: 'Fluidity is after all a healthier state than stagnation' (p.171) - although he could not resist observing that the seminar was: 'not bolstered by optimism over the prospects of its recommendations being acted on promptly and decisively' (p.172). 'External factors' had 'haunted' every discussion, and Muller admitted that 'the System and behind it Society' undermined some of the ambient utopian zeal (p.172). In Muller's view, the British were somewhat naive in their aspirations for a growth and workshop subject; the American experience had suggested that the acquisition of skills, knowledge and understanding would remain paramount; yet:

. . . the British were saying what most needs to be said in our technocratic society. They were defending the all-important human values that are being neglected in the interests of economy and efficiency. (Muller, 1967, p.176)

His final comment, however, reinforced his pragmatism in an all too utilitarian way:

English as the seminar proposed it to be taught would be more liberal and humane than English as it is taught in most schools, but it would also be riskier, possibly unsettling, certainly less likely to turn out students well-adjusted to a highly commercialised society devoted to efficiency and affluence. Readers might ask themselves: are they willing as taxpayers willing to foot the bills for better English teaching of English? Do they as parents really want their children to become developed individuals with minds of their own?' (Muller, 1967, p.187)

While many of us might give a resounding yes to the final question, Muller's view of the role of education in a 'highly commercialized society' has a depressing resonance today.

## 5. The Many Voices of Dartmouth

As we suggest in the Introduction to this chapter, Dixon and Muller's very different reports cannot fully represent the many voices of Dartmouth. In this section, we explore the

unpublished conference materials and consider several of the Working Papers and accounts of delegate discussions, relating these where possible to the published reports discussed above.

At Dartmouth, the different working groups addressed what were perceived as key concerns in English teaching at the time. Working Party 1 started with the fundamental question: 'What is English?', which in itself provided a range of responses and opportunities for discussion and contention. Albert Kitzhaber in his initial address positioned the subject as 'central in education' (WP1, p.1) and yet in a 'chaotic' state of 'confusion and a lack of identity' (WP1, p.4). While choosing not to suggest answers himself, 'since it is not my responsibility to do so but that of the seminar as a whole' (WP1, p.9), he established a challenging agenda. Douglas Barnes responded to this by celebrating the multifaceted and diverse nature of English, and acknowledging that 'The discussion papers imply conceptual frameworks each of which supplies a completely different answer to this question' (A1, p.1). James Britton in his response was even more forceful: 'I can see no possibility of defining English, or, if that is putting it too strongly, I can see no useful way of defining it without considering its place in the total structure' (A1, p.2). The question, Britton declared, 'assumes that English is something, and it makes the very large assumption that if we find out what it is, it follows that this is what the English teacher should be teaching'. Britton suggested strongly that delegates should rephrase the question, 'and not say "What is English?" but, more simply, "What ought English teachers to be doing?"' (A1, pp. 5/6). The seminar had been divided into multinational groups addressing each of the key topics; each, however, came back to 'What is English?', although the group assigned to this pondered its validity as a topic.

Addressing the question: 'What is continuity in English teaching?' (WP2, pp. 1-27), Frank Whitehead argued that it was not possible to derive a rational sequence for the teaching of English, as there is no agreement as to the nature of its internal structure and the emphasis would be on knowledge as opposed to use. In view of the largely unconscious nature of linguistic development, the evidence points to a flexible teaching strategy in which the teacher's wider perspectives nudge pupils along the directions in which they are already moving. The growing child will adapt their vocabulary, accent, syntax and style to different audiences and contacts and learn to vary the mode or register of their writing. As the young person turns to literature appropriate to their stage of

development, the teacher will draw on a sound sense of literary values, and help the pupil to develop contextual knowledge about the author and the time in which they wrote.

It is evident from the seminar papers, which contain not only Whitehead's paper but also an eighteen-page record of discussion (B3), that Whitehead's contribution was a significant element in the seminar proceedings. Its rejection of an anthropological approach to literary themes and forms would have appealed to the thirteen representatives of 'Cambridge English' (Gibbons, 2017, p.20), while its approach to nurturing children's natural development in language use, contextual awareness and reading maturity will have appealed to the professional experience of most, if not all, of the delegates. It is, we think, equally easy to see why Dixon chose not to foreground Whitehead's developmental sequence in his presentation of growth through English. It comes from a different world of discourse than Dixon's democratic classroom.

As Whitehead's discussant, Berenice Christenson drew attention to the importance of 'an interdisciplinary approach to teaching of English, combining knowledge of the human growth and development with an understanding of the use of the English language' (PS 2, pp. 3-4). In discussion, John Dixon asked provocatively 'Was it common ground within the group that we were not concerned with a line or model?' (B3, p4), but delegates moved on to debate a presentation by James Moffett:

The emphasis, in the search for continuity, should be placed on the discourse of the student – on the progression in his modes of depicting and organizing experience. (Moffett, E2, p.1)

Ways of thinking and modes of discourse interact, Moffett argued, in the child's verbal development:

The various narratives ... (and the term is meant to include all the chronological genres, plays and narrative poems as well as myths, tales, fables, etc.) may offer a continuum of cognitive and verbal growth. (Moffett, E2)

Moffett's ideas on continuity do not seem (from the papers) to have provoked as much discussion as Whitehead's, but they were prescient, as will be indicated in the final section of this chapter.

Working Paper 3, 'English: one road or many?', by Wallace Douglas, elicited much debate around streaming and segregation; it reached what Muller calls a 'startling consensus' by 'unanimously condemn(ing) the practice' (Muller, 1967, p.27). This was surprising because then (as now) streaming is a polemical topic. Muller himself was not, however, won over, stating in *Uses*: 'It seems to me clearly undesirable to do away with all groupings under present conditions' (Muller, 1967, p.33). The key phrase here, however, is 'under present conditions', and both the British and the North Americans advocated better environmental and working conditions that would allow greater flexibility in pedagogy and practice. It wasn't so much 'one road or many' as 'one way and many' (Muller, 1967, p33). Harold Rosen was later to highlight what was happening at Dartmouth when he asserted: 'Dialogue inside grows out of dialogue with others. This is how society penetrates our thinking' (Dixon 1967, p.14).

Denys Thompson's Working Paper 4 introduced discussion of the nature of knowledge and proficiency in English by arguing that external pressures in both the US and the UK produced similar effects: 'a distortion of the curriculum, a pseudo-content, a fragmentation of a unified subject into separate skills'. In the best UK primary schools, Thompson declared, doubtless with the anticipated findings of the Plowden Report (1967) in mind: 'English is not separately taught as a subject; it is an activity which pervades the lives of children in and out of school; it is inseparable from their own experiences and social relationships.' Knowledge and proficiency in English develop pupils' capacity in the various language modes through a rich experience of talk, reading and writing; they are not developed the discrete testing of language 'skills' which Thompson blamed for the current situation:

(Examinations) exert an extremely powerful influence in determining the English curriculum of many schools, and they kill much of the joy that can be had in learning and teaching (WP4, p.3)

In his paper on creativity in the English classroom, David Holbrook offered a response to mechanical teaching and testing. Reiterating his colleagues, he emphasised the value of experience and its place in English and in writing:

What we are concerned with in English, essentially, is literacy in its deepest and widest sense - the capacity to use words to deal with inner and outer experience. (SGP3 p.2)

In Holbrook's approach, creativity often seemed identified with personal writing, a view supported by Miriam Wilt in her paper on how children learn English:

Children will find many ways to tell their stories . . . . Let him tell where he is in this mainstream of life and learning. Listen to the songs he sings . . . (SGP4, p.7)

Much of the discussion around creativity fed into what Dixon was able to explore in *Growth through English*, a society in which not only children's voices were valued but where every voice could be heard. Holbrook had seen creativity in this radical and unsettling way:

One last important point: since creativity is an uncertain and often disturbing activity, it can only be done in a school in a school in which there is courageous and liberal minded approval of its value and worth. [...] Is our society yet capable of tolerating the open sympathy creativity demands? (SGP3, p.16)

For Muller, however, this account of creativity was problematic. While recognising that Holbrook claimed a rarified notion of 'creative living', Muller feared that, in the hands of 'ordinary teachers', creative writing would become 'another assignment that may oppress youngsters, especially the diffident ones' (Muller, 1967, p.117).

Working Paper 5, 'Standards and Attitudes', by Albert Marckhardt, was a reflective account of the value of linguistics to the English teacher. Marckhardt declared that a grounding in linguistics should demonstrate 'that the concept of original sin, linguistically speaking, is untenable; children are not born with an innate tendency towards multiple negation or the lack of agreement between subject and verb'. It should also, Marckhardt suggested, encourage the teacher to find a way of teaching the standard forms 'without stigmatising those which represent the folk speech of the community' (WP5, p.25).

Discussion of Marckhardt's paper and those appended to it showed a balanced apprehension amongst the participants of the largely unconscious and cultural processes of language learning and of the teacher's need to intervene in a way that supports the pupil's growth. Miriam Wilt suggested:

One of the most intimate possessions of a person is his dialect ... The identification of the child with his community and his relationship to it must be protected. (SGP4, p.5)

In the secondary school, she argued, the explicit study of language becomes urgent; but the only important aspect that concerns us is: 'Does the study of language help us to use it more effectively?' As Wilt herself admitted, there was room at the seminar for some difference of opinion on this. She clarified the question by suggesting that language study should make explicit what is already in operational use or subject to direct observation (S1, p.5). Discussion tended to accept this definition but to doubt the use or efficacy of current practice in teaching English language, which, according to Harold Rosen, suggested that 'language is a matter of yes-no questions, and not a matter of more-less, partly-partly, questions' (S2, p.2) James Britton addressed this by recognising the value of creative and imaginative experiential writing:

Whenever a student writes successfully he shapes the experience and he also gets a bit better at doing so next time. . . He has shaped experience - entered into and altered and shaped experience - and also improved his skill, his ability to read difficult passages. Now we have consistently given our attention to the second of these and ignored the first. (A1, p9)

Dixon picked up this point when he wrote in *Growth through English* (1967, p.11) that the majority of the seminar valued the kind of language knowledge that helped pupils perceive themselves as the organisers of their experience.

## 6. After Dartmouth

When John Dixon came to write the concluding chapter of the second edition of *Growth through English*, 'In the perspective of the seventies' (1975), the political and social tensions of the preceding nine years inflected his account. After the student rebellions of the late sixties, the power relationships of the classroom and institutions needed to be addressed. Learners may be 'born free but [they] are everywhere in chains,' he wrote, and 'the social models built into us consistently pressurise and distort' the attempts to create productive relationships (Dixon 1975, p.111-112). If the social relationships of the classroom then appeared increasingly problematic, language also appeared less of a transparent window on experience. Dixon asked at this late stage (1975, p.113) what he termed an elementary question: what processes of selection and organisation are going on, and what constraints are inevitably imposed, when we try to get experience into words?

In response to this question, Dixon returned to James Moffett's contribution to Dartmouth and extended the account of this given in the first edition of *Growth through English*. Moffett's later *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* (1968) elaborates ideas about the social origins of language and thought (reminiscent of Bakhtin [1981]) that may have offered Dixon a bridge between his sense of the primacy of individual pupil experience and realisation that 'development is always within social structures and that you've got to look at the interaction between the two' (Dixon 2017, p. 251):

If schools wish to influence how students think and speak, they must take account of all the language contexts which have determined how the individual already thinks and speaks, then create a new language community that will induce what is missing. (Moffett 1968, p.69)

Dixon was also attracted by Moffett's theory of the various levels of abstraction in which experience is handled (Dixon 1975, p.114). In the final chapter of the 1975 edition of *Growth through English*, Dixon described a progression in pupils' thinking and writing from 'living through' to 'written with hindsight', and declared that English is 'centrally concerned with the elementary levels of abstracting from experience, with enacting and narrating'. The need to grapple with experience in these ways was, he wrote, 'not simply child's play, but a challenge for life' (Dixon 1975, p.117). Moffett's ideas influenced the London Institute of Education's thinking about writing in the following decade (Britton *et al* 1975), and his holistic view of the relation of English to the curriculum – the intuition that in a sense English was the whole curriculum – was taken up by writers such as Peter Medway (see, for example, Medway 2005) who have developed the philosophy of English teaching in the years since Dartmouth.

Dartmouth was prescient in many ways. The participants shared much common ground in their debates on the language of the child, the concepts of continuity and creativity, the place of linguistics in the curriculum, and the significance of technology in the development of the subject (which we have not had space to outline here). They all wished to ensure that English teaching and learning would produce expressive and democratic individuals. Many of the voices even admitted the importance of examinations and the enduring desire of stakeholders, government, employers and parents for an educational environment that produced young people capable of 'accurate' English. What those voices at Dartmouth could not have imagined was the political and

economic circumstances that would drive the educational agenda into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In *Growth through English*, John Dixon created a blueprint for the English teaching of the 1970s, but there was an inevitable backlash. Dixon has shared his own reflections on time passing (Dixon 2017) and has acknowledged some elements of the first edition of *Growth through English* that have been especially tested by time. In darker moments, we may well think that Muller's questioning at the end of *The Uses of English* whether this new radical 'workshop' English was suited to 'a highly commercialised society devoted to efficiency and affluence' (Muller 1967, p.187) was prophetic of the neo-liberal agenda which currently dominates the 'results' based educational systems of both the US and the UK. However that may be, Dixon's *Growth through English* articulated a genuine synthesis of the Dartmouth debates that remains an inspiration to those many teachers who still believe in a practice of English teaching that aims to develop children's language for personal growth and democratic progress.

## References

AHA (1973) *Humanist Manifesto II*. <https://americanhumanist.org/what-is-humanism/manifesto2/> (accessed 2 January 2018).

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., Rosen, H. (1975) *The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18*. London: Macmillan.

Brass, J. (2016) Re-reading Dartmouth: an American Perspective. *English in Australia* 51 (3).

Carter, B., Gaither, M., and Gray, D. (1980) Memorial Resolution: Herbert Joseph Muller. *Bloomington Faculty Council Circular BO8-1981*. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana. <http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/bfc/view?docId=B08-1981> (accessed 2 January 2018).

Clements, S. (1965) '*Reflections and After*': an examination of the role and relevance of the *Walworth English Course*, and of our future needs in the education of the adolescent. Reported by Nancy Martin. Talk to autumn conference of the London Association for the Teaching of English, 16-18 October 1965.

Clements, S., Dixon, J. and Stratta, L. (1963) *Reflections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clements, S., Dixon, J. and Stratta, L. (1967) *Things Being Various*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clements, S., Dixon, J. and Stratta, L. (1967) *Things Being Various: Teachers' Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daiches, D. (1968) 'Dartmouth questions on teaching English'. *Universities Quarterly*, vol. 22 (2) 217-228.

Dixon, J. (1967) *Growth through English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, J. (1975) *Growth through English: set in the perspectives of the seventies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, J. (2017) A conversation with John Dixon. Edited by John Hodgson. *English in Education* 51 (3) 238-254.

Freire, P. (1978) *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Gibbons, S. (2017) *English and Its Teachers: A History of Policy, Pedagogy and Practice* London: Routledge.

Goodwyn, A. (2016) Still growing after all these years? The resilience of the "Personal Growth model of English" in England and also internationally. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, 15 (1). pp. 7-21. ISSN 1175-8708

Harris, J. (1991) After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict in English. *College English* 53 (6) 631-646.

Holbrook, D. (1964) *English for the Rejected: Training Literacy in the Lower Streams of the Secondary School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Medway, P. (2005) Literacy and the idea of English. *Changing English* Vol. 12, 19-29  
Published online: 21 Oct 2010.

Moffett, J. (1968) *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mufflin.

Muller, H. (1967) *The Uses of English: A blueprint for a new direction in the teaching of English in the Anglo-American countries*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Wilson.

Newsom, J. (1963) *Half Our Future: a Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. London: HMSO.

Plowden, B. (1967) *Children and their primary schools: a report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. Bridget Plowden, Chair. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

**Cited unpublished papers from Dartmouth conference**

WP1: Working Party Paper 1: *What is English?* (Albert Kitzhaber)

A1: Response to Working Party Paper 1 (Douglas Barnes, Chair; James Britton, discussant)

WP2: Working Party Paper 2: *What is Continuity in English Teaching?* (Frank Whitehead)

PS2: Response to Working Party Paper 2: Plenary Session 2 (Berenice Christensen, discussant)

B3: Response to Working Party Paper 2: Record of Group Discussion

E2: Response to Working Party Paper 2: *Toward a Model of Continuity* (James Moffett)

WP3: Working Party Paper 3: *English: one road or many? Some historical reflections* (Wallace Douglas)

F1: Group discussion

WP4: Working Party Paper 4: *Knowledge and Proficiency in English* (Denys Thompson)

WP5: Working Party Paper 5: *Standards and Attitudes* (Albert A. Marckwardt)

I1: Response to Working Party Paper 5

SGP2: Study Group Paper 2: *Drama in English Teaching* (Douglas Barnes)

SGP3: Study Group Paper 3: *Creativity in the English Classroom* (David Holbrook)

SGP4: Study Group Paper 4: *How Does a Child Learn English?* (Miriam E. Wilt)

S1: How Children Learn English I (Miriam E. Wilt)

S3: How Children Learn English II (Harold Rosen)

SGP5: Study Group Paper 5: *Response to Literature* (James Britton)