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Abstract

The thesis presents a case-study through which the linguistic purpose and historical and social context of the University of London Holiday Course in English Language for Foreign Teachers, is analysed and interpreted. The study foregrounds the context, content and development of one of the smallest academic units, a four-week short course, to contribute to our understanding of how international students of English language were taught and assessed in a particular university context in the early 20th century. The period from 1903 to 1952 is examined in order to understand why the course was successful and the impact of the work of Walter Ripman (1869-1947) who directed the course until 1939. Ripman is better known as a teacher of German and a significant figure in the German Reform Movement, which originated in 19th century Germany, but his approach to culture, phonetics and vocabulary acquisition in English language teaching and learning is less well known. The study goes beyond a history of his methodology to investigate and critically assess the formula that Ripman developed for the design of the short, university English language course and compares it with a similar course run at University College London by Daniel Jones. The changes that were made to the content and purpose of the course, following Ripman’s retirement in 1939, are examined as to how far they reflected the effects of war and the continued desire to internationalise the University itself by aligning the content of the courses more closely to the University programmes. The nature and importance of the web of relationships between staff in the success and longevity of the course are analysed and in particular the contribution of women to better understand their role in the learned world at that time.
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1 Introduction

This thesis is an account of the University of London Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers (1903–1952) which provides a case-study of an early initiative to support English language teachers and students by offering an intermediate level language course in London which had been specifically designed for their purposes. The course took place under the direction of Walter Ripman (1869–1947) and was part of the work of the University of London Board to Promote the Extension of University Teaching (BPEUT) which provided part-time courses in Arts and Social Sciences for members of the public. By 1935, 7,071 English language students, both teachers and those interested in improving their command of English, had participated in the four-week courses which ran from the end of July to the beginning of August every year except during the 1914–1918 and 1939–1945 World Wars. No adequate account of the course exists which treats both its historical and social context and its linguistic purpose.

In common with contemporary educational culture, decisions were taken at various times to change the title of the Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers at the University of London to better reflect its identity, and the aims and the interests of the students. Between 1904 and 1911 the course was titled ‘The Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers’. In 1911 the course title was changed to ‘The Holiday Course for Foreigners’ in order to encourage students who were not teachers. Between 1914 and 1918 the course was cancelled but the title was resumed for the first course which took place in 1919. In 1936 the title was changed to ‘The Holiday Course in English for Overseas Students’ as there was some concern by the Board of Trade over the use of the term ‘foreigners’ which they understood was pejorative in the USA; in 1947 the title was changed to ‘The Holiday Course in English for Foreign Students’; in 1952, the course became ‘The Summer Vacation Course in English for Foreign Students’ as it was felt that the word ‘holiday’ suggested a non-serious content; and finally, in 1963, the course was titled ‘The Summer School of English’ (Cain, 1982). For the purpose of this study, I will use the Holiday Course as a useful shorthand to refer to the courses which were held during the period between 1904 and 1952.

In 1917, Walter Rippmann changed the spelling of his name by deed poll from Rippmann to Ripman (London Gazette, 1917). Although his father Hugo was a naturalised citizen, and technically the children of naturalised citizens were not subject to internment law during the 1914–18 conflict, his decision was probably influenced by the possible impacts on him and his family of the anti-German
atmosphere of wartime London where he lived and worked (Winter and Robert, 2007). The thesis will use the spelling Ripman throughout except when referring to the authorship of his early publications.

This study is positioned at the crossroads of three disciplines: the history of linguistics, the history of language teaching and the history of university education. The history of linguistics has become more widely known through the scholarly work of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas, founded in 1984, which publishes and disseminates studies of linguistics from all historical periods through the journal *Language and History*. Interest in language teaching, especially English language teaching (ELT), has, since the late 1950s, produced a myriad of international scholarly journals and specialist publications on the subject, which have accompanied the growth of worldwide private and public institutions devoted to ELT and the production of commercial teaching materials for an international market. The history of university education has not enjoyed similar popularity. The work of many of these huge and amorphous institutions remains opaque and is often only brought to public attention by funding crises or by discoveries by members of staff which capture the public imagination and bring acclaim. For example, James Watson, Francis Crick, and Rosalind Franklin are known through their work on the double helix, Alan Turing for mathematics, codebreaking and artificial intelligence and Professor Alec Jeffries for his work on DNA fingerprinting, all of whom were university professors who brought their field of study and their institutions to the attention of public forums. However, the lives of less prominent lecturers who teach and research in minority interests and do not discover or develop similar high impact ideas are little known or celebrated. This is particularly true of the field of languages and language teaching and thus in this thesis the narrower evidence of the impact of a course on students, staff and the institution must be traced. However, by its focus on the development of one, short, university course over a period of thirty-five years, this study can also contribute to our understanding of how and why ELT became a part of university education and why the work of early 20th century language teachers and the concerns of their world can have a bearing on our own professional work in English language teaching and learning. The thesis investigates what can be learned from university records of discussions and programmes of study that have been carefully preserved in archives, that is more than just an interest in antiquarianism and has relevance today.

Investigating the history of language teaching is complementary to what we do as language teachers and can have benefits. For the professional English language
teacher to present him/herself as an exponent of novelty or for the theoretician to write as egoist, the highest point in the development of teaching method for whom there is no past, is to fail to understand or acknowledge our own development. Knowledge of the history of language teaching can help us decide what questions we should currently be asking about the purpose and benefit of our teaching practice. The history of language teaching can provide us with a warning as to where our current policies may have harmful effects. However, there are caveats to this approach. Kelly reminds us that judging one period by the standards of another is a mistake (Kelly, 1969). He states,

‘The total corpus of ideas accessible to language teachers has not changed basically in 2,000 years. What have been in constant change are the ways of building methods from them, and the part of the corpus that is accepted varies from generation to generation, as does the form in which the ideas present themselves’ (Kelly, 1969)

In this way, as the development of education tends to be cyclical, each generation of teachers rediscovers and reinvents and, in some cases, improves on what went before. As the subject of this thesis is historical, the researcher has been informed by what has been written about historical investigation in other disciplines. In writing about the use and the usefulness of the history of science, Chang has identified a number of functions some of which are equally applicable to the history of language teaching (Chang, 2016). His study proposes that the functions include: inspiration; the recovery of knowledge and the application of knowledge which can inform current planners and decision makers in public policy.

Inspiration is a quality that can be appreciated by the student teacher and the seasoned professional alike. New entrants to the language teaching profession have often been motivated by inspirational teachers. Knowledge of the lives of those who worked in the same context as ourselves and who faced injustice, indifference or well-deserved success can also be inspirational and mind-broadening as we realise that we were not the first to encounter difficulty or to achieve success. However, life histories of teachers have not been very prominent in the literature of the subject area as the research focus has been on the practice of teaching and not the practitioner (Goodson, 2014). One of the reasons for the lack of detailed information in the historiography of linguistics and language teaching was put forward by John Trim in an interview given in 2012 shortly before his death in 2013, for the University of Warwick Centre for Applied Linguistics. John Trim was a leading member of the Council of Europe modern languages project and made a
seminal contribution to the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (CEFR); he was director of the Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) from 1978–87, and director of the Linguistics department at the University of Cambridge. In this interview, he explained why historical research in linguistics and language teaching has been neglected in more recent studies. In his view, this is because in the twentieth century, historicism was a very strong area in language research but that subsequently interest moved away. As a result, he commented, those who are writing in the field now are keen to show that their research interests are at the cutting edge of recent developments in language teaching and learning and they are reluctant to see to what extent and in what ways current problems and possible solutions are grounded in the experience of the past. In his view, they are even more reluctant to include literature of the earlier part of the last century in their publications. Trim pointed out that in contemporary linguistic studies it is not seen that the experience and findings of past generations are relevant to the problems that we now face and have to solve. He was keen to see historical research open up and explore the periods which, although they are comparatively recent to us, are seen as the ‘dark ages’ by many. (Trim, 2012)

The second of the functions of the history of language teaching, the recovery of knowledge, is an almost natural result of the cyclical nature of educational development where ideas change in response to political and social contingencies and fashionable innovations in technology and techniques are recycled under new nomenclature. In subjecting our past knowledge to critical analysis, we can come to understand how we came to believe what we now believe and train the minds of student to challenge present beliefs. This may also be the place for the teacher-advocate to dispel popular wisdoms and our intellectual subservience to non-evidence based accounts of the past (Chang, 2016). The work of Richard Smith as founder of the ELT archive at the University of Warwick has provided valuable resources for the researcher in applied linguistics to use in critical investigations. In a lecture delivered for the British Council, Smith pointed out that the study of the history of language teaching was of great value in counteracting myths which are prevalent in the language teaching profession today. He identified some of these as: the myth of ‘perpetual progress’, which states that everything that is contemporary in linguistic practice is better than what has gone before; the myth that innovations and changes to teaching practice will always result in improved performance from the students; the myth that the introduction of the communicative method constituted a revolution in language learning and
superseded all that went before; and the necessity that some linguists feel that we should ‘demonise’ past teaching and learning methods. According to Smith, conventional histories of English language teaching often define the development of language teaching method since the mid-19th century as a transition from backwardness to enlightenment (Smith, 2012). The stages in this methodological transition are normally described as firstly, the exclusive use of grammar-translation as a teaching method, which, he comments is often thought to be ‘necessarily bad’; this is followed by the use of the audio-lingual method which is considered limited in its scope; finally, the accounts cite the advent of communicative language teaching and its offshoot, task-based learning. Smith proposed that more detailed studies of historical language publications and language teaching materials can challenge both the linear chronology of these descriptions and the negative views of language teaching and learning in the past (Smith, 2012).

The third function of the history of education, the application of historical knowledge to present day planning, can provide evidence of different ways of approaching the same problems. My own interest in the Holiday Courses was sparked when I discovered that the King’s College London Summer School for International Students in which I was teaching, occupied the same Kensington, London campus that the original Holiday Course had occupied from the 1920s to the 1960s. When a student, who had attended the 1936 Holiday Course, registered for classes on the KCL Summer School, I agreed to trace her original registration. Even a brief glimpse at the University of London records revealed that the Holiday Course had been very successful in attracting students. This was of current interest as the need to increase our own registrations was a primary concern. In addition, planning for the KCL Summer School included the need to establish a broad curriculum of language and culture, a sense of community among our residential students, a university experience which privileged the history of the institution and a programme of excursions which provided value for money. Further research indicated that the Holiday Course had developed an impressive sporting and cultural programme which made use of open-access places of interest in and around London that I had never even considered incorporating in our own programme. As a result, a previously unused tennis court on the Kensington site, which had been a great favourite with the Holiday Course students in the 1920s and 30s, was opened up for use, and a version of the 20th century, university conversazione was instituted as a (new) induction programme. This took the form of a formal ceremony, which took place on the first day of the course, during which
students were introduced to senior university staff and entertained by talks and music. By incorporating these features in our course delivery, we could extend the original Holiday Course into our modern context and discovered that we had more to learn from the past than we discarded as unsuitable.

In relation to public policy, where the commodification of education is a popular model, a knowledge of the past could also be of use, or at least of interest, to present policymakers in informing choices. The Holiday Course operated on a not-for-profit basis and each course was oversubscribed which provides us with an interesting and important model. The course aimed to attract a high number of language students in order to break-even and a commensurately high quality of student experience. This model has been replaced in many institutions by one which is predicated on attracting a high number of language students who generate income for the university by the surplus created in the operation of their course; or by one which generates potential fee income by offering language students preparation courses for university entrance, in some cases language preparation for specific subject areas which helps to improve the sustainability of these undersubscribed areas. The educational model for the Holiday Course is familiar to us in some aspects in that the aim of the course was to improve the spoken English of the participants. Further than that, the course offered a high degree of flexibility for applicants. It provided opportunities for the English language teachers’ professional development by disseminating the new approaches to teaching and learning English language, inspired by the initiatives which were part of the Reform movement in Germany during the late nineteenth century for the teaching of modern foreign languages. There was also, from 1908, the opportunity to sit for a language qualification, the Certificate fo Proficicn in English Language, which would of benefit in certifying the teachers in their own workplaces. At the same time, all the students’ cultural needs, both teachers and non–teachers, would be taken care of as the course included a rich cultural programme which exploited its location in the capital city and aimed to develope intercultural knowledge, interest and competence among the participants. In this way, the course model was designed to recruit high numbers of students with a number of shared interests and competencies in order to ensure viability. Within the course, there were optional classes which would allow students to tailor their programmes of study. The model allowed for economies of scale but with the advantage of flexibility, which is of interest to contemporary course design.
1.1 Objectives and scope

This thesis will address the purpose and content of the *Holiday Course* in order to contribute to our knowledge of the practice of English language teaching and teacher training for international students in a UK university during the first half of the 20th century. The *Holiday Course* is presented as a unique case-study and the thesis will contextualise the course and the people associated with it in the historical context of that century. Although a short course is one of the smallest units in education, it is also a discrete point in the delivery of teaching through which, in this case, to analyse the evidence of course purpose, course design, course content, teaching method, and teacher training which are of intrinsic interest. An interpretation of the findings will provide answers for the research questions.

The research situation will be presented next.

1.2 Research situation

In investigating this historical case-study, it is necessary to critically review the historiography as it relates to the wider context of the UoL at the beginning of the 20th century; to the University Extension movement within which the *Holiday Course* was situated; and to the life and work of Walter Ripman. I will also include a disciplinary analysis of what the historiography tells us of the history of ELT which, as it is a subject for international students and not the home population, was conducted outside of the school and higher education systems in the first half of the 20th century, with the exception of a few university holiday courses, one of which, in London, is the subject of this thesis. English literature and not English language was the discipline offered for degree study at the UoL. It is the inclusion of an ELT course within the UoL Extension programme which makes this case-study of interest as this placed a course for international students inside an educational initiative designed for home students and prompts the research question of who supported the course and why. In order to understand the UoL Extension movement, its ethos, preoccupations and attitude towards the *Holiday Course*, it is necessary to place it in the context of the wider UoL environment and analyse and interpret what has been written about the University itself. It is also useful, at this point, to remind ourselves that UK universities are not state universities as such, although they may receive part funding and that they operate independently of the state. The UoL was established by Royal Charter (1836) and governance was vested in a Board of Trustees. There is, of course, no such thing as *the university* which speaks
and acts with a single voice. As with all institutions, there are complex structures
and relationships behind decision making. The UoL was reconstituted in 1900 to
extend its work beyond providing examinations and qualifications and establish it
as both a teaching and an examining university. It became a federal institution
incorporating all the previous Schools of the University which, to make the
terminology more awkward, had been founded as independent colleges: King’s
College, University College, Bedford College, Royal Holloway and the London
School of Economics were founder members. Goldsmiths College joined in 1904,
Imperial College in 1907 and Queen Mary in 1915. All the Schools reported to the
Senate and Convocation, which was a representative body of graduates, and which
issued statutes, regulations and determined administrative procedures. However,
the sheer size and variety of the institution, the personal lobbying which took place
and the influence of powerful political and academic interests often make the cause
and effect analysis of its historical operations opaque. For this reason, perhaps,
writers of the history of universities have adopted different approaches in analysing
and evaluating historical events. Rothblatt points out that the writing of university
history has been characterised by two literary approaches: first, there are the
composite or collaborative histories which are modelled on discrete themes and
arranged chronologically. An example of this is the history of the University of
Oxford which is written in such a way in order to reflect the complexity of the
institution and the huge number of sources and documents available. However, in
its response to the problem of the volume of documentation, the University of
Cambridge produces a series of volumes covering a longer period of the
University’s history and commissions single authors to write thematic chapters
(Rothblatt, 1997).

The second approach to the writing of university history is that of a house
history, the house being the single university (Rothblatt, 1997). The UoL is a
younger institution with a less extensive documentation than the other two
universities mentioned, and has been treated as a house history by its biographers
with essays contributed by members of staff from the constituent colleges from a
faculty or discipline-based perspective. The biographies which are discussed below
which were written before 1990, record some familiar higher education
preoccupations: the influence of prominent individuals on their subject area, the
imperialism of universities as repositories of knowledge, the changes in the location
of departments in university buildings and the structural expansion of campuses. In
the political history of the institution, what has been of concern has been any actions
or threatened actions of the state which have challenged or influenced university teaching and learning.

The texts which are reviewed below were all inspired by UoL centenary celebrations in a similar tradition to the centenary books which are often produced by private and public schools as a record of the traditions, academic success and sporting achievement of the students. Celebratory texts are unlikely to take a very critical approach to more recent events in a university’s history for sensitive personal or political reasons. For this reason, more modern accounts of a university history may offer a broader view of the university’s history but conversely the distance from past events may mean that much of the detail is lost. There is also what I term a culture of firstness which can be discerned in these texts which is generated by the competitive nature of academic life. This culture privileges and celebrates the individual successes of staff and students and perceived institutional achievement not only as attainments in themselves but because the institution or individual student was the first to attain and thus, it is perceived, this demonstrates their superiority over competitors.

The UoL provided three qualification routes: it provided degree courses for full-time students at King’s College, University College and the other Schools of the University; it provided External degree examinations for students who studied part-time or independently at home or in some locations overseas; and Extension certificates which were awarded for members of the public who followed a sequence of classes. These latter were regulated by the Board to Promote the Extension of University Teaching (BPEUT). The London University Extension classes, operated independently of the University and also carried out some secondary school inspections in the London area to monitor standards in schools which provided applicants for UoL degree courses. It was this schools’ inspection work that Walter Ripman was originally engaged in. The critical analysis of the following accounts of the UoL focuses on information relevant to the aims and impact of the Extension movement before the 1914 war, the interwar years and the years immediately after World War 2, information which is used to address the research question of who supported the Holiday Course and why.

The most informative account of the work of the BPEUT is John Burrows’ centenary account University Adult Education in London: A Century of Achievement 1876–1976. Burrows writes as a witness historian who worked for the University for thirty years. The description begins with the disbanding of the voluntary society, the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching (LSEUT), which had originated in a mid-Victorian women’s campaign for
education, the Ladies Education Circle. The BPEUT was established on 5th December 1900 and placed under the supervision of R. D. Roberts, the first External Registrar. The Extension classes provided a programme of lectures, tutorials and coursework based on public demand in the liberal Arts, Humanities and later Social Sciences that, if successfully completed, could lead to the award of certificates or diplomas. In response to public demand, the classes were organised locally all over London in public halls, church buildings, schools and libraries with the aim of encouraging a Victorian-era belief in the role of education in self-improvement and cultural advance. Classes were established in even the poorest neighbourhoods of the city. In addition to the insecurity which was regularly caused by commissions of enquiry into the work of the University, Burrows focuses on the petty and not so petty quarrels of the university environment. All the Extension courses lecturers had to be approved by BPEUT in an application process that was quite mysterious. Walter Ripman was a very early teacher registration at no.107. The register of lecturers in the early days of operation includes many people who went on to become well-known literary figures of the day but there are also some inexplicable rejections, for example the poet T. S. Eliot, and no true pattern of selection emerges (EM1/14). Although the registration requirements dictated that only approved Extension staff could be used on Extension courses and prohibited access to a more general pool of lecturers, this pattern of employment provided Walter Ripman with a group of highly reliable and committed staff who, by reason that they did not teach on the internal degree course and did not take a long summer vacation, could be guaranteed to be available. Burrows records that there was also bickering and sniping from full-time University lecturers over the quality of the work of Extension lecturers. One full time lecturer insisted,

‘Most lecturers have not been university teachers…and the students have not been prepared to do serious work’ (Burrows, 1976, p. 54).

Other criticisms were aimed at the status of Extension lecturers who, because they made their living by part-time lecturing and were not full-time staff at the University were, in the opinion of the full-time staff, inferior teachers. Writing in the 1950s, Barbara Wooton, herself an Extension lecturer and later Head of the Social Sciences Department and a Member of the House of Lords, commented,

‘It is a great satisfaction [teaching] when you pull it off but a miserable evening when you fail.’ (Burrows, 1976, p. 56)
Wooton observed that Extension lecturers were particularly sensitive to their students’ needs. If their classes were boring, the students would vanish and with that the lecturer’s fee. However, inside the University, she observed, there was a snobbish indifference to pedagogy (Burrows, 1976). The Extension lecturers were also defensive of their students’ ability, one claiming that lecture and tutorial diploma students were quite capable of moving on to first class research (Burrows, 1976). Albert Mansbridge, a founding member of the Workers Education Association (WEA), which offered courses in association with BPEUT, also took issue with the elitist approach to education that he discerned among UoL staff. The WEA was concerned with extending the knowledge of economics and economic history to working class students with the aim of empowering their representation in public life and it collaborated with lecturers from the LSE to do so. Mansbridge stated,

‘Our plan is for a highway of education – we do not like the term ladder’.  
(Burrows, 1976, p. 39)

It is evident that the drive behind the Extension movement was both egalitarian and intellectually ambitious. According to the statistics which related to the provision of classes in local centres between 1900 and 1939, the Extension lecturers were hard working: Allen. S. Walker, a regular lecturer on the Holiday Course for thirty years, taught 18 short courses and delivered 90 lectures in the academic year 1938–39 (Burrows, 1976). Burrows account is significant in that he presents the range and detail of the Extension workplace from the experience of those who worked there. A short history of the Holiday Course is included in his account which is largely drawn from Knowles course anniversary account as evidence of the importance with which the course was regarded by the Extension (EM7/38). He also corrected the impression that the value of the Extension courses could be expressed and understood from a social science approach in purely statistical and instrumental terms without an appreciation of the personal experience of those involved.

‘The culture of a summer school is a distinct if fleeting phenomenon, happily, it might be thought, unresearched by the social scientist. Yet the patterns of relationships, behaviours, mores and so on of this unique social institution is long overdue for the sensitive treatment by an imaginative writer.’ (Burrows, 1976, p. 59)
Two sesquicentennial University histories were compiled for the period 1836–1986 which provide further context for the way that people within the University saw the institution. The first is F. M. L. Thompson’s the University of London and the World of Learning 1836–1986. This history is made up of a series of essays written from the perspective of each of the University faculties. The writers describe the internal preoccupations of their disciplines and their perception of the influence that their work had on the world outside the University. This text illustrates the difficulties of writing narratives of a large and disparate institution, such as UoL which is fragmented across a number of city sites. In his account of the Faculty of Humanities, Thompson draws on Burrows’ account of the establishment of the Extension Board and in particular of the work of the WEA previously referred to (Thompson, 1986). A reproduction of women graduates receiving their degrees from the Vice-Chancellor in 1891 is included (Thompson, 1976, Fig. 24) together with photographs of pre-1900 female students. Thompson notes that,

‘The influence of women, as teachers and as students has been very considerable. It would be wrong to claim, however, that it was decisive in propelling the Arts onwards and upwards, for women did not begin to move into positions of power and authority in the academic structure until the 1930s.’

(Thompson, 1986, p. 73)

No further explanation ensues and as centenary works are clearly not the place for debate the narrative moves on. However, the remark is significant. In terms of the openness of access to the University the histories of the UoL are always careful to point out the decision, taken in 1878, to allow women to take degree examinations, some forty-two years before the decision to admit them was taken at the University of Oxford and seventy years before they were admitted to examinations at Cambridge. This thesis does not dispute the justice that the University of London displayed in admitting women undergraduates to degree courses, although Sutherland reminds us that the campaign lasted for fifteen years before it was successful (Sutherland, 1990, p. 35) and thus it was not an overly enthusiastic conversion. What is of interest here, is the length of time that it took from admission as undergraduates for academic women to achieve any progress in their academic careers. According to Sutherland, writing in the same publication, in 1984, one hundred and six years after the decision to admit women, only 2.4% of professors in the UoL were female, 6.9% were Readers or Senior Lecturers, 17.5% were lecturers and 34.2% had ‘other’ academic duties (Sutherland, 1990, p. 55). The figures show a high preponderance of women in the lower grades. We must also
assume that in the period of this study in the first half of the 20th century that the overall percentages were lower making women a rarefied group.

The second text to celebrate the period 1836–1896 is Harte’s centenary work *The University of London 1836–1986: An Illustrated History*. Harte’s approach is significant in that he chose to reach out to a wider less specialised readership, to include a number of illustrations and some new information. Harte uses photographs of the staff, the University buildings and campus as vehicles to explain the development of the University’s aims and to encourage an understanding of events by privileging the people who worked for the University and the space they inhabited. The power of these images provokes a response not entirely possible through narrative descriptions. One photograph, taken in 1908, probably in the back garden of the Imperial Institute, Kensington, shows the forty-four central office Extension staff who worked there who have been arranged for a group photograph. In the front row, in academic dress, is the Principal, Arthur Rücker; the Academic Registrar, Sir Philp Hartog; R.D. Roberts, the Extension Registrar; Walter Ripman and other academic staff. Ranged behind them in tiers, in a pattern familiar to school end-of-term photographs and the commemoration of sports teams, are the rest of the staff, male and female. Those of graduate status signify this by wearing academic dress. As an office photo, it expresses all the confidence of the reconstituted federal university whose mission, while it remained domestic at that time, was expressed in Statute as follows:

‘The purposes of the said University of London are to hold forth to all classes and denominations both in the UK and elsewhere without any distinction whatsoever an encouragement for pursuing a regular and liberal education to produce research and attain the advancement of science and learning and to organise, improve and extend higher education within the appointed radius.’(EM7/38)

The metropolitan role of the University radiated for thirty miles around London (Harte, 1990). Harte picks out some of the fundamental shifts in student population at London, notably the explosion of interest in Internal, and External degree registrations that took place from 1945 with the return of military service people (Harte, 1990). Figures for the Extension course registrations more than doubled from their 1941 base (Burrows, 1976) and this goes some way to explaining the impetus that forced a reconsideration of the University’s post-war aims and as a result a reconsideration of the purpose of the Holiday Course in 1948 which is discussed in Chapter 5.
In a further move away from narrative, discipline based university history, Christine Kenyon Jones lavishly illustrated, celebration account ‘The People’s University: One Hundred and Fifty Years of the University of London and its External Students’ is compiled by using accounts of the experience of individual learners at the University. It places the graduates of the External degree programme at UoL at the centre of a presentation which focuses on what their studies meant for them and the impact of their External education in their subsequent professional lives. The text includes biographies of the senior academic staff in the Extension and External branches of the university, and biographical and autobiographical sections on many of the famous graduates of the University both from the UK and those who were examined at the international centres overseas. The history is significant in that it differs from previous house histories by providing detailed information from the University archive on the impact of both World Wars on the university for example, the engagement of university staff in providing study materials for POWs in the second World War. Kenyon-Jones also notes the continuity in the life of Arthur Clow Ford who became Secretary to the Extension Board in 1919, Registrar in 1921, and director of both the Extension and External Service in 1946. Disappointingly, the Holiday Course, which Clow-Ford also directed from 1948–1950, is identified by its 1963 title of the Summer School in English and merits only a few lines. The periodisation of the centenary texts is, of course, random and based on the date of the founding of the University or its federal colleges and not on national or international events. The subject discipline or faculty narratives follow the individual chronologies and preoccupations of the writers in establishing continuities that support the wider theme of the nature of the contribution of the University to higher education. In his review of the writing of university histories, Rothblatt observed that although they may appear to be insular and inward looking, university historians will eventually start to write about issues that are thought to be of current relevance. He cites the example of a developing interest in the relationship of universities to capital cities (Rothblatt, 1997).

The Kenyon-Jones text broke the silence that has accompanied academic histories on the subject of the World Wars, by identifying some aspects of what the UoL and its students were actually doing during the periods of total war. Winter and Robert’s Capital Cities at War: London, Paris and Berlin, 1914–1919 Vol 2 takes the analysis further in a collection of essays which explore the social and cultural themes of how the First World War clarified individual, national and urban identities in the three capital cities in a trans-national history. In her essay on universities, Elizabeth Fordham examines how the war impacted on universities
and how they responded. She selects University College and King’s College as representing the UoL; the Sorbonne in Paris; and the Friedrich.Wilhelms-Universitaet and some smaller but significant higher education institutions in Berlin. Her findings are that the conflict narrowed minds and hardened national rivalries but that while some academics refused to adapt to war culture, the period was actually one of scholarly innovation. As an example, she identifies the UoL, which she reports was developing new academic enterprises in languages, engineering and in international relations and where there was a drive to recruit more foreign students post-war and to influence government policy (Fordham, 2007). According to Fordham, London recruited more foreign students in the early part of the 20th century than any other English university and actively pursued international contacts (Fordham, 2007). Furthermore, Fordham cites the inauguration of the School of Slavonic Studies in 1915, the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1917 and new departments of Scandinavian Studies, Dutch and Italian language at UC as evidence of the importance attached to the teaching and learning of foreign languages. She recounts how the loss of male students and members of staff to the battlefields was compensated for by more female undergraduates and how these were welcomed at the time, certainly in London. In her analysis, although the finances of the University of London were seriously undermined by the war, the University was strengthened by a recognition of what could be achieved in the future in academic exchanges particularly in areas where it was already active, such as in science and in international relations. The tension that resulted in the institution during wartime, she suggests, was created between the desire to innovate in some quarters and the drive to preserve national and university culture against external pressures in others (Fordham, 2007).

War, so the truism goes, is good for business, but Fordham’s findings have to be balanced by an understanding of the multiple identities of metropolitan institutions. The Extension movement at the UoL, which offered tutorial and diploma classes to weary civilians during the war years had a different experience to the Schools of the University which taught degree courses. The Minutes record that numbers fell across the Extension courses as many members of the public who would otherwise have continued their studies were involved in war work of various kinds (EM1/4/1/1915). With the threat of air raids, the streets became difficult to traverse and classes became less appealing for students. The BPEUT minutes contain references to the requisitioning of buildings for war use and the regular casualties among former members of staff who had enlisted. Unusually, there are also brief and sober references to the dedication of staff (EM1/3/1915–18). The
reason for a degree of reticence with regard to the war on the part of the Board may have had its origin in the need for patriotic and selfless attitudes among staff which would reflect wider feelings of sense of duty at the time (Playne, 1931). There was also an acute awareness of the precarious financial situation under which they worked which had been considerably undermined by wartime shortages. In an uncertain future, it is argued, the decision to continue their work in as normal a way as possible as the best means of resistance in a conflict situation is illustrative of the culture of a university. In a similar situation, in the Spring of 1940, eight hundred copies of the Holiday Course prospectus were distributed explaining that the course had relocated to Royal Holloway University just outside London, to a site where ‘first class air raid facilities’ were a feature (EM 3/2/1/1940). Proposed excursions included Windsor and places of interest along the Thames valley. In reality, from the end of June 1940, the South East of the country including the Thames corridor was under severe air attack until October 1940. The course never took place and the efficiency of the air raid precautions were not tested but the University determination to continue teaching is indicative. Only a university, determined to continue with the important work of education regardless of the physical and political environment in which it operated, could present superior air-raid precaution facilities as a selling point for a holiday course.

The Holiday Course was delivered under the supervision of BPEUT and in the early days an Advisory Panel, composed of the Principals of the federal colleges of the University which had an interest in teacher training and education, met annually to discuss course content and other matters. However, this study proposes that this was not the only support for the Holiday Course but that as suggested by Burrows, other patterns of relationships existed on which the success of the courses depended. Within the patterns of relationships, three women, Sophie Bryant, 1850–1922, Helen Reynard, 1875–1947, and more briefly, M.J. Sargeaunt from 1951, were associated with the Holiday Course and research question 1 requires a deeper consideration not only of the significance of the women on the Holiday Course but in establishing how far they conformed to what we know of the experience of women in universities in the first half of the 20th century. For this reason, it is necessary to critically review the historiography which concerns women in the learned world in the first half of the twentieth century.

Blakestead, in her study of the Domestic Science courses at King’s College from 1908–1939, points out that feminist historians in the 1970s and 80s have tended to define feminism and those who are classified as feminists in very narrow terms. The feminism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century has become
rigidly collocated with the suffrage and the struggle for the franchise; women who occupied the ‘domestic sphere’ in family life are assumed to have been oppressed or unfulfilled in some way; women working in education are perceived as struggling for ‘equality’ with men and as participants, or victims, in the establishment of women’s university colleges and the long campaign to allow women into degree courses at Oxford and Cambridge Universities (Blakestead, 1994). As discussed in the context of the UoL, the entry of women into degree courses ceased to be an issue for those who could reach the required academic requirements from 1877, although there were still barriers created by the weaknesses in girl’s education. The pressure for improved facilities for the higher education for women and girls and debates over what exactly this should entail continued throughout the 19th century and well into the 20th. Jane Robinson, in a composite of life histories written by female students, Bluestockings – the Remarkable Story of the First Women to Fight for an Education, focusses on the opposition which formed to the admission of women to degree courses which raged in the University of Oxford until 1920 and Cambridge until 1948 from the point of view of women who were experiencing academic life, as well as recounting and celebrating the achievements of female undergraduates in the academic and domestic circumstances of the first decades of the 20th century. The work confirms the experience of Helene Reynard which is discussed in Chapter 4. In No Distinction of Sex? Women in British Universities 1870–1939, Carol Dyhouse examines how much substance there was in the rhetoric which claimed that women enjoyed equal opportunities in universities. She analyses the experience of female staff and students at four of the older institutions which were established before the Second World War and interrogates the evidence which pertains to the role of the women as students; as tutors to female students; as lecturers; and as Wardens of women’s colleges paying attention to evidence of distinctions and discrimination; gendered institutions; feminist strategies and separation and integration (Dyhouse, 1995). Dyhouse’ findings refer to the term duality which in Howarth and Curthoys (1987, cited in Dyhouse, p. 82) and (Bradley,1989) is used in descriptions of women’s experience (Dyhouse, 1995). The duality initially included the necessity of choosing between marriage and academia, then between family life and academia, and then between a full-time or a part-time role in what was a gender-segregated employment market. From the female students’ point of view, duality also referred to whether the student was seriously following an academic career or whether she was acquiring accomplishments for example, in knowledge of a foreign language, musical or artistic proficiency, for her future position as a woman
of high social class. Dyhouse’s findings on the position of Wardens of women’s colleges, stressed the lack of academic opportunity in these positions and the expectations that the Warden would act in a social and disciplinary role (Dyhouse, 1995).

‘Many intellectually well-qualified women or able women took advantage of these posts to try to establish themselves in academic life, but the combination of academic and pastoral duties could be onerous, leaving little time for scholarship or personal research…and there were a number of casualties, particularly in the 1920s and 1930s’ (Dyhouse, 1995, p. 84).

Her account is contrasted with the experience of Sophie Bryant in Chapter 2, Helene Reynard in Chapter 4 and M.J. Sargeaunt in Chapter 5.

In examining the contribution of Walter Ripman to the Holiday Course, it is important to note that until recently there has been a lack of information on his life and work. There was no entry for him in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB) until 2010 when McLelland, who had encountered Ripman’s work during her research into German linguistics of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in an examination of the legacy of Otto Siepmann (1861–1947) (McLelland, 2010). Siepmann had left Germany in 1885 and in 1890 became the head of modern languages at Clifton College, Bristol where he reformed the method of teaching in French and German with success. In her biography of Ripman, McLelland points out that he was an early adherent of the German reform movement, a published author of text books, a correspondent in international phonetics discussions through his membership of the International Phonetics Association (IPA), a long-term editor of the journal Modern Language Teaching and a founder member of the Modern Languages Association. He knew Wilhelm Vietor (1850–1918), the main initiator of the late 19th century Reform Movement in modern language teaching, and was a formative influence on many other eminent linguists including Daniel Jones. Information on Ripman in this thesis has been gathered from a number of new sources. Initially, however, it is important to point out a work which, although it does not mention him by name, is relevant to his life and educational philosophy.

Ripman was typical of middle-class scholars of his generation who for the first time were able to enter professional life as a result of their success at public examinations and this achievement and the expansion of the qualifications system may have coloured his attitude to the value of personal study and examinations in achieving success. In Public Examinations in England 1850–1900, Roach provides
a lucid account of the complex chronology of the 19th century reforms which explains how these initiatives took place and how the culture of examinations in England developed and influenced academic life. According to Roach, successful state incursions into the world of educational privilege occurred in 1870 as the reforms created a more open access route to jobs in the Indian Civil Service by setting up entrance examinations for candidates in an attempt to break the connections between elite families and their demands for preferment for their sons (Roach, 1971). However, Roach explains that these examinations were not universally approved of as, from some points of view, they produced successful graduates but that these men had only a superficial knowledge and a tendency to plagiarism (Roach, 1971). Nevertheless, once initiated, the examinations continued.

Further reform broke the monopoly of higher education held by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and made them partners with London in the creation of Local Examination Boards for secondary school students throughout England. The reforms also required Oxford and Cambridge and London, to produce examination papers for Lower and Higher levels of proficiency in the curriculum subjects, and to provide examiners to mark the papers. The aim was to drive up standards in schools, particularly middle-class schools, by a positive washback effect which would create a link between instruction and assessment. However, the scheme worked two ways in that subjects which were not offered to schools, could not be offered at university level, for example, phonetics, which was not a subject on the Cambridge Higher examinations syllabus (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013). Early in the operation, there was concern that in order for the scheme to succeed, examiners should confer with teachers at the school level, particularly in girl’s schools where the curriculum was often limited, in order to improve the standards of both the examiners and the examinees, (Roach, 1971). This 19th century history of the development of public examinations is more than a topos as by examining the origin of the slow and involved process of creating valid and reliable tests at school level under university auspices, the assumptions and culture on which these were based can be perceived and the heavy reliance of university teaching and assessment on providing a continuum from schools’ curriculum and syllabi. This is particularly relevant to Chapter 4 where the suitability of the UoL Certificate of Proficiency in English Language examination as a certification for the Holiday Course teachers is discussed. In the case of this examination, there appears to have been a problem in designing content for the papers which would be appropriate for an intended international candidature even though phonetics was taught at university level at UCL.
The following texts contain specific reference to Walter Ripman in the early years of his teaching career and this will inform a critique of his lived experience. From 1896–1912, Ripman worked as Professor of German at Queen’s College London, a school for girls, which was co-founded by the Christian socialist, academic theologian F. D. Maurice, together with Charles Kingsley a celebrated author. The most recent centenary account of the school, Elaine Kaye’s *A History of Queens College, London 1848–1972*, provides an appraisal of the school and its staff and pupils which is expressed in some parts by contemporary reports from the girls and the reminiscences of past pupils, Queens was the first institution for the higher education of women to be established in the nineteenth century and included prominent champions of the education of girls and the promotion of women among its alumni. Neither Maurice nor Kingsley were products of nineteenth century boy’s public schools, which were characterised by an emphasis on teaching the classics and the reliance in teaching methodology of rote learning. At the time of its opening in 1848, Maurice was teaching at King’s College in central London, as were many of the first professors at Queens and determined that Queens was not to be a girl’s version of a boy’s public school but would follow a broad and liberal curriculum which included Literature, History, Languages, Mathematics and Music. Education would be based on the principle of eliciting and leading the girls rather than instructing them in a rigid manner. It was to be a College for individual achievement, rather than competition, and for educational development both for staff and students. (Kaye, 1972) (Grylls, 1948).

Kaye’s text is especially valuable in three ways: it establishes a historical context to Ripman’s tenure which includes a description of the circumstances which applied to middle-class girl’s education and their career prospects; it provides an insight into his classroom practice and his early methodology; and it is a source of information on how he was perceived by his pupils and colleagues. Kaye also puts forward a view of the relationship between Ripman and his student Katherine Mansfield (Kathleen Beauchamp) the novelist, which informs the debate that has developed over their relationship and the extent of his influence on her career.

Katherine Mansfield (KM) joined the college as a boarding student with her two sisters in 1903 and left in 1906. Mansfield’s attraction to Ripman, who Kaye describes as young and ardent in comparison to other more senior lecturers at the school (Kaye, 1972) was recorded in a letter she wrote to her cousin,
‘I am ashamed at the way in which I long for German. I simply can’t help it. It is dreadful. And when I go to into class I feel I must just stare at him the whole time.’ (Kaye, 1972, p. 135).

Mansfield was one of the select students who chatted with Ripman after class about art and literature. The group were introduced to the works of Oscar Wilde, Walter Pater, Ibsen, Tolstoy, and Bernard Shaw and visited Ripman at his house in Ladbroke Grove for tea and conversation. According to Kaye, visits to the homes of teachers and pastoral staff were regular occurrences at the school for groups of pupils, who were always chaperoned (Kaye, 1972). In fact, it was not the visits that have ignited debate but the effect of the conversations which Ripman and Mansfield had on the topic of Oscar Wilde.

Joanna Woods in her essay *Tall (and short) Dark Strangers, KM and Foreign Men* accuses Ripman of being ‘dangerously handsome’ and having no ‘sense of responsibility towards his class of impressionable teenage girls’ and directly attributes Mansfield’s ‘most wayward behaviour’ at Queens and in later life to his influence (Woods, 2005). The essay presents a cliché of Edwardian gender relations, casting Ripman as the dangerous, handsome and unscrupulous male foreigner who perverts the innocent female student. It is illustrated by a portrait photograph of Ripman, taken during his time at Queens, in which he is gazing dreamily into the middle distance in a philosophical pose, head on hand, but without, it should be said, any sign of flowing scarves and gardenia buttonholes.

The accusations are ill-founded. It was Wilde who held the ideas of decadence and artifice as a lifestyle to be adopted, not Ripman. In a grudging reference to Ripman’s language legacy, Woods points to the superiority of KM’s linguistic skills in her writing and her fluent German. ‘Ironically’ she states ‘he [Ripman] was not included in KMs anti-German sentiments’. This of course is not irony. Ripman was a teacher of German, not a German teacher. As an English man, he might perhaps be considered ‘other’ to KM’s New Zealand heritage but he should not have been included in an essay on ‘foreign’ men at all. This is an example of what Chang (2016) describes as fitting the past into present assumptions. In her review of ‘*Katherine Mansfield’s Men*’, Mary Paul suggests that the essayists in the collection appear to be concerned with countering some of Mansfield’s negative critical legacy by viewing her life through current colonial literary preoccupations in order to ‘make everything better’ (Paul, 2005). The book, she states,

‘…gives these critics a welcome opportunity to dramatize their own thoughts and feelings about gender relations’ (Paul, 2005, p. 122).
According to Paul, the essay ‘The Boyfriends’ is

‘A girl’s gossip evening in which the whole range of attractive men in Mansfield’s life are given walk-on parts’ (Paul, 2005, p.125).

Paul points out that in Mark Williams essay in the same collection, ‘The Pa Man: Harold Beauchamp’, he suggests that it was Mansfield’s relationship with her father and her colonial upbringing in New Zealand that was the source of Mansfield’s rebellion throughout her life, even though it was Harold Beauchamp’s money that financed her education, paid for her later return to London and supported her writing, her relationships and lifelong travels in Europe (Paul, 2005). The relationship between Ripman and Mansfield cannot be dismissed out of hand but it is possible that it was far more subtle than that presented by Woods as will be discussed in Chapter 3. Ripman was a product of his own educational experience at Dulwich College where he had been an enthusiastic editor of the school magazine. More significantly, he believed in the power of school and college publications as development areas for young writers. Mansfield showed signs of great imagination, an ‘imagination bordering on untruth’ her New Zealand teachers commented acidly (Tomalin, 1987) but, nevertheless, Ripman encouraged her exploration of art and literature in her writing at Queens as she progressed from Assistant to Editor of the school magazine.

Claire Tomalin, in her biography of Mansfield, comments that Ripman had rather an episode of fin de siècle melancholy at that time, which probably accounted for his sentimental approach to literature and his posturing over the Wildean views of beauty and art. (Tomalin, 1987). The Queens’ verdict on the period is rather more matter-of-fact as given by Kaye who writes:

‘Altogether, her [KM] stay at Queen’s proved a liberating experience for Katherine Mansfield, if a disturbing and frustrating one for some of her contemporaries’ (Kaye, 1972).

The ‘disturbing’ element of Mansfield’s behaviour should not be read as aggressive or disruptive. Isobel Ambrose, a contemporary of KMs recalled that ‘Kathleen [sic] always seemed reserved and different … like the deep notes of the cello that she played’ (Kay, 1972).

It appears to have been Mansfield’s detachment that seemed to have disconcerted her contemporaries.

Certainly, it was Mansfield who in her adventurous spirit set the forces of rebellion in motion in her life, forces which eventually overcame her. However, to
suggest that her life was formed entirely under the dominance of Walter Ripman or of other men and that all her subsequent actions were a result of their influence ignores her talent, her ambition and her courage and is unworthy of an appreciation of her life.

In her comparative study of Walter Ripman and his contemporary, Otto Siepmann (1861–1947), as Reform Movement German language textbook authors, McLelland concluded that Ripman’s attempts to make phonetic study part of every course in language learning failed. However, she proposed that the general approach in his textbooks which, in the spirit of the German Reform Movement, centred on spoken language in the classroom,

‘...ultimately determined the direction of travel in language teaching in the later twentieth century’ (McLellan, 2012, p. 139).

This analysis of the principles of Ripman’s language teaching philosophy and practice is also relevant to his English teaching and to his English language texts. McLellan points out that in addition to Vietor (1850–1918), the major influence on Ripman’s practice was Sines Alge (1847–1909) a Swiss linguist, pedagogue and proponent of object lessons which included the use of everyday items such as coins and picture charts to stimulate language learning (McLellan, 2012, p. 127). Ripman was an enthusiastic member of the Modern Language Association and a regular correspondent in Modern Language Quarterly, which he co-founded with Karl Breul, and then as editor of Modern Language Teaching. The debates were spirited. McLellan quotes Ripman’s remark which he is said to have made at a meeting of the Modern Language Association that ‘no language should be attempted before [the age] of twelve’ which is taken as an indicator of his target age range for his German language teaching texts (McLelland, 2012). Ripman’s *First English Book for Boys and Girls whose First Language is not English* was first published in 1904 is heavily illustrated and clearly juvenile. However, the text presupposes a good reading age which makes it more likely that Ripman had the real ages of nine to twelve years old in mind given the wide of range of reading proficiency among children. By 1917, when this remark was reported, he had left Queens where he had been teaching girls of between 13 and 18 years for over sixteen years. By that time, he had been an inspector of languages in secondary schools for seventeen years and had considerable observational experience of secondary classes. He was also the father of four children whose language development he observed and later noted in his introduction to phonetics (Ripman, 1922). His advice on a minimum age must surely have been intended for formal language instruction. What he might
have been implying by that remark was that twelve years of age was the best age at which to begin formal language learning i.e. according to his experience in secondary school.

Although the Holiday Course ran for many years, it has escaped the detailed attention of researchers in the history of English Language teaching. Howatt and Widdowson’s A History of English Language Teaching (2000) takes a chronological approach to the pedagogy and divides the history into three sections: Part One 1400–1800; Part Two 1800–1900; and Part Three 1900 to 2000. Part Two, 1800–1900, includes information on the German Reform movement and the teaching of English language in Europe and the British Empire. Part Three, is entitled The Making of a Profession. In this Part, Phase One, the years 1900–1946 is entitled Laying the Foundations. This is followed by Phase two, 1946–1970, entitled Consolidation and Renewal, which is a description of English teaching in Africa, following the independence of former colonies, and the launch of the post-war mission of the British Council (Howatt, 2000). The problem with this approach is the problem of periodicity, which affects all historical accounts, as to whether such neat, one hundred year divisions are useful temporal approaches to the history of ideas, or where the emphasis should lie where the periods overlap. Teachers and students will bring their historical bodies and minds across the turn of each century and a history of ideas with this in mind, would be perhaps more informative, if such a history is also focussed on the form of language instruction as well as on significant theorists as is Kelly’s approach (Kelly, 1969). The title of Phase One, 1900–1946, suggests that this long period was actually a preparation for something else and part of an upward trajectory, one of the myths identified by Smith (Smith, 2012). There is also a problem of the relationship between theorists, writers and the dissemination of ideas to class teachers through publications. This is illustrated by the description in 1900–1946 Laying the Foundations. English language teaching is divided into four contexts each with their own representative figure: The contexts are: Secondary Schools in Europe; Adult Education in Europe; Basic Schooling in the Empire and Adult Education in the UK. These are represented by: Daniel Jones (1881–1967), Harold Palmer (1877–1949), Michael West (1888–1973) and C.E. Eckersley (1892–1967) respectively. The description of the extent of English language instruction in Adult Education is defined as,

Howatt goes on to state that although little is known of the context of adult education in the UK,

‘…it is likely that most of their activities were focussed in or near London. Apart from schools like Berlitz (which had opened three London schools by 1903) the most common locations seem to have been municipal adult education centres such as the commercial institutes which provided courses at all levels and prepared students for recognized exams. The multilingual composition of these classes encouraged the use of Direct Method but there is also evidence from some of their textbooks …that phonetics was popular as well.’ (Howatt, 2000, p. 236).

There are a number of deficiencies in this description of the classes available for post-compulsory education the first being the term ‘adult education’ which has a modern connotation of state provision. The examples included included in Howatt’s description are private schools. The English language classes held in universities in London, Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh and Exeter which began at the beginning of the 20th century and continued throughout it, are omitted in his classification. Secondly, the profile of the students is narrow and vague. The origin of refugees during this period and the reference to the 1930s is similarly unexplored. Thirdly, the correlation of English language teaching in the UK with Berlitz and Direct Method is probably misleading. Smith comments that Direct Method has suffered from a limited understanding in the UK of what the approach entails and has been thought to be a rigid method in which no translation into the mother tongue is allowed and instruction is solely in the target language. This, Smith asserts is a misunderstanding as when Direct Method emerged at the beginning of the 20th century it was as a broad approach used by non-native speaking teachers in Europe and was not based on such narrow strictures (Smith, 1999). Eckersley, who Howatt identifies as an influential practitioner at the time, was working in London using English as his medium of instruction in a plurilingual context but this does not automatically equate with the use of Direct Method. To be a Direct Methodist, Smith points out:

‘did not necessarily involve the exclusive use of the target language, and could involve other principles’ (Smith, 1999, 2.3).

Reference to the Berlitz schools, which are also normally collocated with Direct Method, is a further complication as it is perhaps more likely that their clients were
learning modern foreign languages for business and professional use and whether the schools were relying on this market or for teaching English is not clear.

In Phase One, *The Making of a Profession*, the publications and university appointments of the four representative men previously identified, are displayed under the headings of: Reform; Direct Method and the Empire in Figure 16.1. (Howatt, 2000). This is intended to communicate the strands of development in English language teaching in a similar way to an old-fashioned school history text where examining the reigns and pronouncements of the monarchs was the method by which it was thought that we could best understand the past, only in this case the monarchs are the four selected linguists and their realms are the geographical areas where it is felt their influence was strong. The subjects of these rulers are thus the age groups of English language learners for whom their work is considered most appropriate and these are also listed. The publication dates of the works of each of the writers are listed chronologically to provide evidence of the smooth development of ideas in teaching English language, much as in the early history books, the appropriate legislation and Acts would be dated and linked to the king or queen’s reign for easy reference and memorisation. Such histories appear tidy, controlled and systematised but they are unconvincing in the assumptions that they make. The social and cultural history of the period from 1900 to 1946, or any period, is not easily or perfectly reduced to periodicity and tables. The date of 1946 is also evidential of an uncontextualised approach as it appears to have been chosen to mark the publication of the *English Language Teaching Journal* which was sponsored by the British Council but not the end of World War 2. The purpose of the text was to show the growth of what is termed the ELT profession but a history of English specialists’ attempts to gain professional status in an educational environment cannot be placed in a social vacuum. The complex and overlapping theoretical and educational beliefs which surrounded the teaching of English language in the UK during the first half of the twentieth century lack elucidation and the history proposes a certain inevitability of events, based on the beliefs, careers and publications of the selected applied linguists.

In the final chapter, however, Howatt reflects on what the preceding chronological history has proposed and includes a caveat as to how it should be interpreted,

‘There is then always a gap between the different movements in the development of ELT ..., and what actually goes on in classrooms. The actuality of practice is for the most part unrecorded, and indeed to a large extent...’
unaffected by the shifts of thinking that have been charted here.’ (Howatt, 2000, p. 369).

It is argued here, that it is inevitable that where the historical approach is that of periodisation and classification to present a picture of progressive intellectual development and the building of a profession, that the day to day complexities of teaching English language in methodology, materials, aims and purpose are minimised or neglected. Widdowson also qualifies the historical approach by confirming that he shares the disquiet over describing the development of English language teaching as:

‘an upward path of development from weaker methods to more modern teaching’ (Howatt, 2000, p. 369)

However, writing later in ‘Defining Issues in English Language Teaching’ (2003) Widdowson returns to the historical theme again and, while noting that the presentation of old ideas as new can be irritating and that there is a lack of continuity in the intellectual development of language teaching, he suggests that the repackaging of older initiatives is a natural form of human enquiry and that it is not important what the origins of ideas are. He states that

‘...a knowledge of how they [ideas and issues in English language] figured in the past can provide insights that can be drawn upon in their new-found reformulation in the present. But this does not depend upon explicit acknowledgement. It is the appropriation that counts.’ (Widdowson, 2003, x1)

This is a puzzling contradiction as, if current practitioners fail to acknowledge the contribution of the past in the development of their work then they are eradicating the history of language teaching. Why would acknowledgement, which is commonplace in the rest of academia, be out of place in applied linguistics? This attitude is perhaps an explanation of what Trim was referring to in the reluctance of contemporary writers to even cite past publications (Trim, 2011).

Howatt’s text indicates that there was some difficulty in establishing who the learners of English in the UK in the early part of the 20th century actually were and where they studied. This question is addressed in Sheila Rosenberg’s A Critical History of ESOL in the UK, 1870–2006. The term English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) in this context requires some examination: Robinett sets out the domains of ESOL in terms of the divisions over the methodology used in teaching the group:
‘In reality, there have not been real differences in methodology which have characterized EFL teaching as distinct from that of ESL. Any distinction which may have been assumed simply reflects the many variables inherent in different programs: the student population involved, motivational factors, time available for teaching, materials used, teachers, trainers of these teachers, administrative organization, and so forth. And these variables exist in any program in ESOL.’ (Robinett, 1972)

According to Robinett, from a British perspective, the ESOL domains include English as a Foreign Language whose students are engaged in competency for personal or professional purposes, and English as a Second Language where English is used as a medium of instruction in schools or as a lingua franca (Robinett, 1972).

ESOL is also a term which came into use in the UK during the 1960s and described the classes which were arranged in colleges of further education and evening institutes, normally with local government support, for adult migrants who spoke little or no English. The term ESOL was also intended to differentiate the UK students and the materials and methodology which would be used in teaching them from other learners and assumed some political resonance by the insistence that adults learning English in this country should be taught in a different way based on their perceived needs and issues of income, social class, culture and ethnicity. In the USA, ESOL developed from language programmes which were attended by large numbers of students who could not be described as foreigners. Further subdivisions have ensued based on a classification of students devised by Wallace Lambert, as to whether the learners aim at an instrumental use of the language, in obtaining a working competency or an integrative use in wishing to learn more of the culture (Robinett, 1972). These divisions were deepened in the following decades by government involvement in financing ESOL language programmes and the need to develop acronyms and typologies to describe the student base that would conform to these economic and political priorities. However, today, ESOL is increasingly popular as a term that does not discriminate by the students’ purpose in learning the language but clarifies the linguistic position of the learner.

The point in this description of terminology is that the term ESOL, as it is used by Rosenberg, cannot easily be backdated to the late 19th and early 20th century and neither can the historical and social culture which is associated with it. Foreigners was a common term which was used to describe newcomers to the UK from the 1860s to well after the second World War; the term was used in the Holiday Course
without a pejorative sense and was only changed as a result of pressure from the USA. (Cain, 1982).

Rosenberg’s account is of interest as it covers the period of the *Holiday Course* and describes the educational opportunities which were available in London for teachers and students of English. Rosenberg sets out to illustrate a continuity in the experience of these students and their teachers and to identify what, in language learning terms, distinguished this group of learners. She discusses how their needs influenced their teachers, the production of teaching and learning materials and the response of the state to the arrival of refugees. Her difficulty in projecting a modern political and linguistic classification of a group of learners into the past is that the historical account provides disappointing evidence of this continuity. Rosenberg’s text is divided into seven chapters and covers the period from 1870 to 2006. The date 1870 is significant as it was the beginning of state funded education in England and Wales. Two chapters are of interest in the context of this thesis: The first chapter covers the period from 1870 to 1930 and is entitled ‘The New Era’; and the second which is entitled ‘Refugees and Allied Armies’, analyses the teaching offered in the 1930s and 1940s. It is interesting that Howatt’s ‘Laying the Foundations’ becomes ‘A New Era’ from the perspective of Rosenberg’s UK learners. Rosenberg’s consolidation chapter is dated from the 1980s as opposed to Howatt’s selection of the period of 1946–1970, a difference of twenty-four years yet both histories discuss the impact of the same text books.

In the first half of the twentieth century, Rosenberg identifies two large groups of adult language learners both of which are composed of refugees: Yiddish speaking Jewish refugees from Russia, who began to arrive in the East End of London in the 1870s, and Belgian refugees who arrived in London in 1915, following the invasion of their country in 1914. She focuses on the status of these groups as refugees as determinants of how they will or will not approach language learning and critiques the classes and materials available to each. Rosenberg is censorious of the inadequacies of the teaching and learning materials prepared for and by the Yiddish speaking groups. In 1915, in response to the presence of numbers of refugees in his classes, Philip Blackman, an East London schoolteacher wrote ‘*A Textbook of Language for Yiddish Speakers*’ followed by ‘*English in Yiddish*’ in 1919 in which he used a dual–language approach where English was printed on one side of the page and the translation in Yiddish on the other. According to Rosenberg, Blackman,
‘...showed little influence of the newly developing theories of language
teaching’ (Rosenberg, 2006, p. 8–9).

As an illustration of these theories, she cites classes which were held in the 1890s
and which resulted in a dual language manual, ‘The Yiddish English Manual
compiled for the English Evening Classes Committee in connection with the Russo-
Jewish Community’. This approach finds favour with Rosenberg perhaps because
it illustrated a form of Community Language Teaching, an activity favoured by the
modern ESOL community which makes use of the first language of the learners.
However, the critique appears unjust as there seems no reason why Blackman, the
school teacher, should have heard of the Evening Classes Committee movement
and its classes which were held twenty years or so before his own, or felt this
material or method was appropriate for his learners.

Rosenberg analyses a number of the published language instruction materials
that were available at the time and the multiplicity of purpose that these texts reveal
goes to illustrate the wide net that publishers were casting in order to capture the
maximum learner clientele and their perceptions of the myriad of purpose that these
learners had. In Rosenberg’s account, which goes some way to qualifying Howatt’s
brief description, the clients for English language classes in the UK in the early
twentieth century were not only refugees but vacation students, transient visitors,
business professionals from France and Germany seeking courses in business
English at commercial colleges, and short–term migrants among others. The sheer
variety of language needs and aims, and the variety of institutions and private tutors
which existed would militate against an ordered and clearly discernible
development of new ideas in each teaching scenario and one which could be
classified around individuals.

As refugees and migrants in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were not
identified by using contemporary documentation, they could be indistinguishable
in a class from short stay visitors, students and native speakers who wished to
improve their English. The language level of the study texts varied widely. The
preface of Marshall and Schaap’s 1914 Manual of English for Foreign Students
includes instruction in the International Phonetic Alphabet and acknowledges that:

‘Most foreigners resident in this country are engaged in commercial pursuits
and are anxious to get a working knowledge [of English] as quickly as possible’
(Rosenberg, 2007, p. 35).
However, the target group cannot have been beginners given the complexity of the text.

Rosenberg identifies a second group of refugees, the quarter of a million Belgian refugees who arrived in 1915 and constituted one of the largest immigrant groups to come to the UK. However, they made few demands for language classes in the municipalities where they settled. The group was composed of large numbers of professional and skilled workers and they swiftly made arrangements for their children to learn English and to find work for themselves in London, Wales and Bristol. As Rosenberg suggests, the group may have had a working proficiency in English language on arrival, which explained their comparative disinterest in language classes. Most returned to Belgium after the war, demonstrating how quickly migrants’ fortunes may change. The development of teaching materials and the pattern of instruction in adult education between 1870 and 1940 varies considerably according to context but it is significant that it is the class teachers who are writing and publishing their own materials which arise out of their individual experience with certain groups of learners. Commercial colleges made use of Hachette’s 1935 *Modern English Reader* which contained English, French and German annotations suggesting that these speakers were present in the same class (Rosenberg, 2007). Rosenberg commends Harold Palmer’s 1938 work, ‘*New Method Grammar*’ in which she finds a methodology which would be appropriate for the modern ESOL context. In examining Eckersley’s work, ‘*An Everyday English Course for Foreign students*’, published in 1937 and ‘*Brighter English*’ published in 1941, which Eckersley had developed for the foreign students in his own classes at the Regent Street Polytechnic, Rosenberg cites Eckersley’s failure to understand new ideas. C.E. Eckersley, like Philip Blackman and Harold Palmer, was drawing on his own classroom experience to create a new approach of his own in a synthesis of school materials and foreign language approach, as is analysed in Chapter 3.3.4. The publication dates alone would suggest that Eckersley would have had difficulty in immediately assimilating and reflecting on Palmer’s work. Rosenberg overestimates the spread and impact of new methods of English language teaching and learning in the UK in the early part of the 20th century and evidences the difficulty of periodisation referred to in the content of Howatt’s text discussed above. It is not so much a case of,

‘The past is a foreign country, they do things differently there’ (Hartley, 1953) as it is that the past is a foreign country and they will not do as the researcher would have liked them to have done.
Rosenberg finds some frustration in the slow dissemination of language teaching ideas but perhaps a point to consider in this respect is that the dissemination of new ideas and approaches in English language teaching and learning in the twentieth century required a parallel development in the publishing industry. The lack of publishing power in the early part of the twentieth century may go some way towards explaining why the teachers of Rosenberg’s migrant communities and those in commercial colleges and adult education in the UK, such as Philip Blackman and C.E. Eckersley, were producing their own texts using their preferred methodology and why this does not make them representative of all the language teaching contexts. The context of the publishing industry and the dissemination of ideas in the work of Walter Ripman is discussed in Chapter 3 but it is important to note here that it was not until the 1930s that Longman Green began to dominate language teaching publishing for the overseas market making use of their long experience in educational publishing (Feather, 1988, p. 204). The authors who were most favoured by publishers from 1933 were Michael West, whose *New Method Conversation Course* (1933) was largely inspired by his work in secondary schools in Bengal during the 1920s and Harold Palmer who returned to the UK in 1936 from his formative experience in Japan and wrote *New Method Grammar* (1938), *New Method Practice Books* (1938–9), *A Grammar of English Words* (1938) and collaborated with Michael West on *A New English Course* which was published in 1949, the year of Harold Palmer’s death. All these texts were published by Longman Green. These dates are recorded in Howatt’s chronology without further comment but it would be reasonable to suggest that given the chaos produced by total war, and the orientation of the publishers to the overseas market, the impact of this writing on the domestic market for English language could not fairly be estimated until the late 1940s at the earliest and more likely the 1950s.

The historiography reveals that there are difficulties in taking a general and widely spaced chronological approach to the history of English language teaching and learning. There are also difficulties in describing developments in teaching and learning in terms of the careers of individuals who have achieved prestige in the field in an approach redolent of the *culture of firstness* referred to earlier. The early 20th century world which was the context of the *Holiday Course* was a world of private tutors, commercial classes, evening institutes and summer courses. An exploration of the history of the small-scale context in which English was taught and learned at UoL will add to our knowledge of how English language teaching was conducted at a university at that time. Evidence of the difficulty in measuring the impact of individuals on the dissemination of new approaches to language
teaching methodology, referred to in the introduction, and further developed here, is important in the assessment of Walter Ripman’s career in Chapter 3.

1.3 Research problem

The study sets out to answer two questions from which a number of secondary questions are derived as explained below:

- Research Question 1: Who supported the University of London Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers course and why?

To answer this question, it is necessary to analyse the support for the course over the period of fifty years which have been selected for this thesis. So, the question of who supported the course and why in the early stages of the course is repeated in the context of the University in the post- First World War period, and the pre- and post- Second World War periods as attitudes were impacted by external events and by developments in ELT. The study queries the presence and role of women as supporters of the course.

- Research question 2: How and why did Walter Ripman’s educational philosophy and experience influence his design for the structure of the Holiday Courses?

This question requires that the formative influences in Walter Ripman’s life and his early practice as a teacher, writer and schools’ inspector are identified and analysed. In addition, an evaluation of Walter Ripman’s work necessarily involves an analysis of what made the Holiday Course successful during his period as director, how to define that success and what might have been the weaknesses of the course. In order to situate this course analysis, a comparison between Ripman’s approach to the structure and operation of the UoL Holiday Course and that of Daniel Jones, the professor of Phonetics at University College, to his Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners is made.

1.4 Methods and sources

In this thesis, the Holiday Course is treated as a unique case-study.

“We study a case when it is of itself of very special interest. We look for the detail of interaction with its contexts. Case study is the study of the particularity
and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances.’ (Stake, 1995, p. xi)

The events of this case take place in particular circumstances and the aim of the thesis is to provide an opportunity to learn about the case rather than to claim representativeness (Stake, 1995). The research design of the study is heuristic in seeking to generate hypotheses and assertions from the data and use and develop frameworks to further understanding. It is holistic in that there are a number of contexts to examine, for instance, spatial, temporal, economic and social, which are all connected with the case in some way and interdependent. The historical analysis of the case-study takes into account ‘that past acts took place in a present and that human subjects were historical beings’ (Thomas, 1996). The case-study analysis has been used over a timespan that would be long enough to detect changes in emphasis in the Holiday Course and responses to major events, notably two World Wars, and that these reactions and responses could be interrogated to answer my research questions. London, the location of the course, is presented not just as a backdrop to events but as a living environment where Ripman worked and with which he and his colleagues interacted.

My epistemological standpoint, my perception of the way knowledge is understood and acquired as well as how it is produced and communicated, is an interpretation of the course as a socio-cultural phenomenon. There are two ways in which this interpretivism is used: by direct interpretation and by categorical aggregation in collecting instances which added together form a pattern that justifies an assertion, following Stake’s 1995 model. For example, aggregation is used in Chapters 2, 4 and 5 where the contributions of other members of staff to the Holiday Course are pieced together and interpreted.

My research design uses qualitative research methodology. I perceive and identify key events and provide a narrative interpretation which constitutes a vicarious experience (Stake, 1995) and allows the reader to gain an experiential understanding. Although it is important to approach the research with an open-mind and to avoid judging the evidence by present standards, the researcher’s familiarity with holiday course teaching is involved and this subjectivity is an important element in aiding understanding of the case scenario and the human experience (Stake, 1995) (Evans, 1999).

According to Antikainen, the rise of quantitative method and the perception of its superior status as more scientific than qualitative method has suppressed biographical life history research (Antikainen, 2017) However, recent history of education methodological literature, which is intended to foreground the
experiences of teachers from a personal perspective and in this way to challenge the circumstances that it is perceived have removed the personal agency of teachers as curriculum developers, shows that there has been a renewal of interest in the subjectivity of the teacher-narrator in recording their life history (Goodson, 2014). This interest requires that the researcher remains conscious of the risks of the dominance of the narrator-researcher, with whom the teacher collaborates, which may determine the focus and significance of the account (Goodson, 2017). This danger of dominance is especially real in the context of this thesis as in my selection of data I am telling, and re-telling the lives of others without their collaboration. I am also interpreting the evidence, conscious that there is very little written of the subject matter with which to contrast my account.

The life of Walter Ripman is contextualised so that his contribution to the *Holiday Course* can be identified as a result of his personal practical knowledge as a teacher, an educationalist, a writer, and a theoretician. This has required that I research the culture of his time (Miri, 2008). A similar approach is adopted in investigating the other supporters of the *Holiday Course* and where the supporters are women the particular circumstances which may have affected their position in the learned world are analysed and interpreted. Goodson points out that, until recently, personal, social and cultural information on teachers’ lives has been sparse in research literature as teachers have been perceived by researchers as,

‘… a numerical aggregate, a historical footnote or the unproblematic incumbent of a role, interchangeable and unchanged by circumstances or time’ (Goodson, 2014, p. 29).

For this reason, the active agency of the teacher in creating their own history was lost. Goodson argues that with the growth of biographical and life histories this is changing.

‘In understanding something so intensely personal as teaching it is critical we know about the person the teacher is.’ (Goodson, 2014, p. 30)

As far as possible, this thesis will situate Walter Ripman in his lived experience. Lived experience

‘…acknowledges the integrity of an individual’s life and how separate life experiences can resemble and respond to larger public and social themes, creating a space for storytelling, interpretation and meaning making’ (Boylorn, 2012)
Comparative analysis is normally an essential part of case-study research (Mills, 2012) and although this is a unique case-study, some points of comparison with another short English language summer holiday course, the *Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners* at University College initiated by Daniel Jones are analysed and interpreted. The value of this investigation is that although, as the title of the course suggests, the purpose of the UC course was to improve students’ spoken English and this was shared with the *Holiday Course*, the approach to the tuition, the staffing and structure of the course were quite different and this analysis is used to moderate my generalisations and assertions on the *Holiday Course* (Stake, 1995).

In considering how to use the evidence in the University of London collection, I have classified the sources as *indicators* and *testimonies* (following Allasuutari, 1995) and my research is based on both primary and secondary sources. Secondary sources have been reviewed in the historiography and integrated throughout the text. My primary sources are described below: The major source for information on the *Holiday Course* is the UoL Senate House Special Collections Archive. In terms of scope, the documents can be grouped under the following categories given below: those relating to the teaching of students a) – e) and the finance and policy decisions and communication f)– i). The archive extends to 1976 but only records pertaining to the period of the thesis were used.

a) course timetables for the entire two weeks of the course
b) prospectuses 1908–1952.
c) souvenirs 1905–1939. These documents contained the addresses of staff; the entertainments that were provided; the excursions; the lists of staff and the classes they taught; the names and addresses of students grouped by their country of origin; and statistical tables which listed the composition of the classes in gender and nationality for each year. The souvenirs were given or sold to students who attended the course.
d) Certificate of Proficiency in English Language (CPE) examination papers 1906–1952
e) *Holiday Course* attendance certificates and CPE certificates
f) *Holiday Course* Advisory Committee Minutes
g) BPEUT annual reports 1906–1939 From 1928 these were titled the UoL Tutorial Council reports and post–1952 the Extra Mural Department reports.

(Reports to the Senate were normally copies of the annual report that had been made to the BPEUT).
h) letters and correspondence between the *Holiday Course* Secretary, the Director, the Warden and Principal of Queen Elizabeth College.

i) records of staff applications to BPEUT

In my approach to document analysis, I was able to use the records in a process of triangulation to confirm the veracity of what the prospectus advertised would be the content of each course, what the timetable and the souvenir stated had actually taken place and what the annual report included. The findings tallied exactly for each year leading to the conclusion that the organisation of the *Holiday Course* was well planned in advance and meticulously administered and conducted. From 1925 the course was held at King’s College and it was possible to triangulate the data held at King’s College London (KCL) Archive Collection with the course records held at Senate House. The findings corroborated the content of the courses, the events and the personnel involved. The dataset of examination papers which have been drawn from the University of London Certificate of Proficiency in English Language (UoLCPE) have been taken from the mid–1920s to the mid-1930s a time between the World Wars when there was relative stability. They are analysed for their appropriacy as an assessment for the *Holiday Course* students using the criteria of validity, the nature of the constructs and fitness of purpose. Comparative analysis of these papers is made using CPE papers from 1932 and 1936 once again in order to moderate my generalisations and assertions on the *Holiday Course* (Stake, 1995)

The comparison of the *Holiday Course* and the *University College Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners* was informed by research I carried out in the University College London (UCL) library Special Collections: Daniel Jones’ papers. Although the complete archive of Jones’ long and rich academic career at University College is extensive, the materials which refer specifically to the vacation courses are more limited. There are handwritten reports on some of the courses, brief articles authored by Jones which discuss language teaching, some of which were compiled as centenary texts during the period under study; copies of course prospectuses from French, German and English language courses which were held at University College between 1921–1932 and photographs of Summer School students and staff taken during the 1920s and early 1930s.

In this case-study and in my narrative which is the interpretation of the evidence, the process of selecting, interrogating and triangulating the documentary evidence from the archives has been conducted in the knowledge that the archive
records were originally constructed by the universities for university purposes and with an internal university audience in mind. They were closed records and not for external circulation or investigation. Personal information concerning staff and students is limited to that which is relevant to the university context. While this can be a barrier to a full understanding of events, it is not the case that the narrator can simply fill in the gaps and write what she wishes. Even from a distance of over one hundred years, there are ethical considerations in recording and interpreting the lives of others, which may impact on reputations and the living. The archive data on timetables and course content are indicators of uncontroversial records of everyday events. Testimonies are evidenced by the minutes of meetings, by course reports and by photographic images where the reasons for the human agency are more diverse. Assigning possible motive and intention to these testimonies has meant that other external factors need to be taken into account such as the sequence of events that contextualised them or the likely success of other courses of action had they been taken in an attempt to answer the question of why the subjects of study did what they did. Contact with the staff and students on the Holiday Courses and the meaning they constructed in their teaching and learning is made by contact with the records they left. However, the archive documents were, in themselves, a compilation with human agency, that of Ronald Knowles, who selected and preserved the records with, we can presume, a more public audience in mind. In my use of qualitative research method, I have tried to see the world of early 20th century university teaching through the eyes of the people at that time. Although this study is concerned with what we can learn from the past, there are also difficulties in writing history with an eye on the present. As Butterfield stated:

‘The study of the past with one eye, so to speak, on the present, is the source of all sins and sophistries in history, the anachronism’ (Butterfield, 1931).

However, to claim a complete objectivity would be disingenuous as we are all situated in our own present and the past exists only in our contemporary knowledge of it (Evans, 1999). If we are to learn from our research, it follows that it needs to have some present engagement.

In examining the evidence that we have of the life of Walter Ripman, I have consulted census records; street directories, school records at Dulwich College, London; newspaper articles; books; and materials relating to the British Council and First World War internees held at the National Archive, Kew, London. My historical approach to the data is inspired by the methodology of history from below. This is an approach in which historical events and social conditions are viewed
from the perspective of ordinary people rather than leaders and is one which has
stimulated an interest in social and cultural history in general. The subjects of this
group can be diverse but normally include the marginalised in opposition to the
approach which privileges great men. The Marxist historian E.P. Thompson
compiled his classic *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963) using this
social history approach. In France, the *Annales* group of historians led by March
Bloc and Fernand Braudel, demonstrated that by breaking down disciplinary
barriers and recognising the contributions of literature, social science, language and
psychology, they could investigate a total history paradigm within which, they
argued, an understanding of the mentalities of particular historical periods could be
achieved (Braudel, 1987). Cities are obvious places within which to contextualise
the lives of the occupants and as this study is contained within the thirty-mile
circumference of the University of London metropolis and sphere of operation, my
narrative method has also been informed by the work of Winter and Robert (2007)
who in turn were inspired by Michel de Certeau (1925–1986) in examining the
metropolitan context in which people live. In examining Walter Ripman’s
individual identity or identities, I use the metaphorical process, introduced in the
text, of a scholarly perambulation through the streets of London where he lived and
worked, to recreate his working world and understand how he negotiated it (Winter
and Robert, 2007). This accords with the lived experience research method,
outlined above which

…‘concentrates on the ordinary, everyday events, language, rituals, routines
while privileging experience as a way of knowing and interpreting the
world.’(Boylorn, 2012).

I also went physically, to as many of the locations of Ripman’s life and Holiday
Course associations as possible in order to get a sense of place.

‘Human lives thread their way through spaces and in the process our memories
of having-been are localised’ (Thomas, 1996)

In order to analyse Walter Ripman’s publications, I have adapted the framework for
the analysis of historical textbooks proposed in McLellan (2015) which was used
for an analysis of German texts for language learners. The framework is not a set
of criteria for the grammatical and lexical content of the texts, which is discussed
separately in this thesis, but is intended to situate the language teaching texts as far
as possible in their full social and cultural context. The framework has the
following criteria:
a) comment on the author as practitioner and theoretician and links with other authors

b) the contemporary historical context.

c) the geographical and specific context where the teaching and learning may have taken place i.e. public or private circumstances.

d) the intellectual context and the role of literature in the text.

e) the book as a material object: the nature of the illustrations, binding and presentation.

Criteria e) is my own addition and contribution to theory. Using this criteria, I explore the relationship between the reader and the book as a personal possession and as an aesthetic object. I propose that readers and particularly teachers can react strongly to the appearance of a publication in the way that it is bound, the layout of the text, the font size and the number and quality of illustrations and that this reaction may override any consideration of the actual value of the content in their purpose for reading, studying and teaching. I use evidence from the early Edwardian context of Ripman’s publishing career and the publishing objectives of his employers J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd to support my analysis. The instances of textbook analysis in the thesis are necessarily brief as only one of Ripman’s English Language texts was specifically written for adult learners, *An English Course for Adult Foreigners*, and only one was used as a set book for the Holiday Course, *The Sounds of Spoken English 1906*, but his early textbooks for children provide important evidence of the systematic way in which he approached English language teaching and a basic discussion of his methodology displayed in them is informative as to his relationship with teachers and teacher training and his approach to teaching English language in general. The study also contains a critique of Walter Ripman’s contributions to *Modern Language Quarterly* and *Modern Language Teaching* for what they tell us of his philosophy of language teaching.

As commissioning editor for the Dent’s Modern Foreign Languages Series, Ripman had considerable influence and discretion on the content of his texts but worked within the constraints of the ethos and financial position of the company.

In summary, the design and methodology of my research was as follows:

- Epistemology: this is interpretivist and heuristic
- Methodology: qualitative
- Design: a unique case study with intrinsic interest as to what we can learn
- Data Collection instrument: document analysis
Data Analysis approach: Stake’s categorical aggregation and direct interpretation

Data gathering was conducted by using a cyclical approach which meant that I gathered impressions about the case scenario through a number of visits to the archives as I became acquainted with the material. Using Stake’s model, and as my research proceeded, I had to constantly refocus and redefine my research questions as patterns became clear from my analysis and I was able to discard unproductive lines of enquiry. (Stake, 1995). As a qualitative researcher, I also used my own experience to guide me as to what might be important in the source records. The primary source material which I needed to analyse and interpret is held in large archival collections and a sequential approach, i.e. consulting one archive after another, would not have been a useful procedure as the need to correlate and cross-reference information appeared quite early on in the process. For example, the triangulation of information between the UoL collection and the KCL collection was applied from the outset. That did not exhaust the interest of the KCL archive which I had to return to later to analyse the pre-war administration of the Warden of KCHSS and post-war developments with her successor in more detail.

To manage the data effectively, I coded my notes under thematic headings, for example, the location of excursions on the *Holiday Course*, the content of lectures, references to war, references to international students etc. in order to aggregate and evidence my interpretations, and decide if I needed to follow-up these subjects. Furthermore, as the significance of the people who were associated with the *Holiday Course* and events was not immediately evident on first reading, and this was true of references in general in all the archives that I visited, I arranged repeat visits throughout my research as fruitful sources emerged. This was not an indication of some form of inefficiency or disorganisation in my approach but a natural response to an unknown area and I suppressed any emotion of embarrassment at appearing at the archive again (and again) with the knowledge that finding and issuing reference material is part of what archivists do and they do not suffer from any embarrassment in doing so.

The final notes were then assembled for an interpretation that would provide the scenario of the case and the contextual information, and could be interrogated by my research questions.
1.5 Research organisation

The thesis is organised into Chapters. Chapter 2 investigates the nature of the support for the idea of running a Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers in 1904. It begins in 2.1 by identifying the support within the University itself and the arguments that were presented in favour of and against any provision of language teaching under University auspices. Increased communication between scholars, especially in the sciences, and the appearance of scholarly journals written in a number of languages which extended beyond German, French, and English to Russian and Japanese, was making the need for translation in academic life more acute. While some academics were literate in a number of languages, others were not and there was a sense of frustration that more and more languages were appearing in scholarly forums. This debate had filtered down to the very issue of language teaching itself and the views of the Principal of the University of London presented in an address to the Modern Language Association in 1903 in London are analysed for evidence of his support for languages and his commitment to teacher training for language teachers. Whilst he cannot be said to be representative of all views in the University his assertions shed considerable light on the dilemmas which were being discussed in academic forums which related to language teaching.

In 2.2, the origin and ethos of the Board for the Extension of University Teaching is explained with reference to which subjects of study it would be appropriate and stimulating to offer to the public at that time and the typical student profiles for those who actually attended the classes. BPEUT would undertake to organise the Holiday Course and monitor its standards through an advisory panel. The panel was composed of significant figures from the University and one, the Vice-Chair, Sophie Bryant DSc, is discussed in more detail for the seminal role that she played in establishing the course. Sophie Bryant had achieved high office in the University at a time when the employment of women in universities was in single figures and in this section both her academic success and the origin of her enthusiasm for language teaching is explored. Her professional association with Walter Ripman suggests that they had a joint purpose in establishing the course. Section 2.3 presents some examples of English language vacation courses which were contemporaneous in origin to that of the Holiday Course in order to trace some of the influences that may have shaped the BPEUT vacation course in 1904. The first is the course which was held at the University of Marburg in Germany and which Walter Ripman attended in 1898. The course began by offering German and French classes followed by English language on the arrival of the Anglophone
Wilhelm Viëtor (1850–1918). The early days of the course were significant for the excellent relationships between students from many countries, the excitement produced by the opportunity for academic linguistics to debate current issues, the opportunity to take part in practical classes and by the fairy-tale setting of the course. It is suggested that this course had a life-changing effect on Ripman and influenced his vision for the UoL course.

The second model for the course was the University of Cambridge holiday course. This course, together with initiatives at Oxford University was an incentive for BPEUT to undertake something similar in London and the London course resembled that of Cambridge in its structure of lectures, classes and a strong cultural programme. In section 2.4, the final design for the Holiday Course is presented and analysed. The course is illustrated by using a typical timetable of activities based on information contained in the UoL archive. The purpose and content of each of the periods of instruction is critically analysed and an interpretation is provided of how the course was staffed and how it fitted into a residential structure which included evening and weekend instruction. Section 2.5 assesses the appeal of the course for teachers and students, and presents and critically discusses the statistical information on student attendance and the countries of origin of the students.

Chapter 3 analyses and interprets Walter Ripman’s contribution to the Holiday Course. In this Chapter, Ripman’s family, his early education and his achievements at University are interpreted as evidence of his motivation as a language teacher, and his talent and ability. The Chapter is divided into an analysis of events in his life before the First World War in section 3.1, in which his early teaching career provides further evidence of the formidable energy that he possessed, which all of his contemporaries and friends noted. This is followed by section 3.2 which is an examination of his education philosophy. The influence of the Reform Movement on Ripman, which began with the publication of ‘Language Teaching Must Change Completely’ (Der Sprachunterricht muss unkehren), written by Wilhelm Viëtor in 1882 to challenge what he perceived as the rigid and ineffective method of language teaching in Germany, is traced through analysis of Ripman’s contributions to the journals The Modern Language Quarterly and its successor Modern Language Teaching. Ripman’s general principles on teaching which these contributions illustrate are presented. Section 3.3 investigates how the First World War impacted on Ripman and his family, his working environment and career.

In 3.4, a selection of his English language textbooks for children, adults and students of spoken English are critiqued for what they tell us of his language
teaching methodology, choice of content and the presentation of his teaching material. This section includes a comparative analysis with a text from one of his contemporaries in English language teaching, C.E. Eckersley. In section 3.5 *Let’s Talk English. Everyday Conversation for the Use of Foreigners*, which was written by Constance Ripman, Walter Ripman’s wife, is examined in some detail. Constance was also the author of popular children’s books for a very young readership and in 1938 she broadened her audience by writing a book of situational dialogues which was designed to help foreign students with their spoken English. The text is introduced and transcribed into phonetic script by Walter Ripman. *Let’s Talk English*, is a barely disguised description of the Ripman family home life in which Constance has changed the name of the family and the names of their children but, it appears, little else. The dialogues were later recorded with the help of her daughter Pamela (later Caryl Jenner, the theatre director) and distributed as audio-lingual products. This text is analysed for what it may tell us about Constance’s approach to language teaching and learning, Walter Ripman’s home life, his adherence to phonetic methods of improving students’ pronunciation and his belief in personal preparation for public examinations.

Chapter 4 is a comparison between the *Holiday Course 1923–1924* and the *University College Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners 1923–1924*. In section 4.1 the nature of the relationship between Daniel Jones and Walter Ripman is examined in so far as it influenced their work on summer courses. The two men had been colleagues and collaborators since 1907, when Jones first joined the BPEUT Advisory Panel for the Holiday Course. They worked together on various linguistic projects and remained in touch throughout their lives. As the Head of the Phonetics department at University College, Jones operated without an advisory panel for his summer courses, which he had initiated himself, and had a far more experimental style in his direction of the teaching. In this section, some of the reasons for the lack of interaction between the two directors in the summer short courses is proposed. The structure of the UC course is outlined in more detail in section 4.2 with a view to identifying the significant differences between the courses in terms of length, number of teaching hours, purpose, student accommodation and the inclusion of social and cultural activities in the course programmes. In section 4.3 the key similarities and differences between the courses are discussed. In section 4.4, the University of London Certificate of Proficiency in English (UoLCPE) is discussed in order to discover how appropriate it was in terms of its content and emphasis for the students of the *Holiday Course*. From the earliest courses, the *Holiday Course* prospectus had advised students that they could take
advantage of their time in London to sit for the UoLCPE. However, success rates on the London course throughout the first half of the 20th century were very low. The Holiday Course was never advertised as a preparation course for the examination and was primarily intended to develop students’ spoken English. Thus, very little preparation was available for the Elementary Phonetics paper or the demands that the essay writing section in the paper would place on the students’ writing proficiency. In spite of this, the UoLCPE remained an option on the course and the papers for the examination were not revised. This section investigates possible reasons as to why this was so.

In section 4.5, Helen Reynard is introduced and discussed in terms of her background and her position in the learned world, her relationship with Walter Ripman and the Holiday Course, and her financial expertise as Warden of KCHSS which ensured that the accommodation costs for the Holiday Course were kept at a minimum for over ten years. The financial management of the Holiday Course is analysed in order to interpret the premise on which the financial model for the course was based and the reasons for its longevity. Although the two administrations, the Holiday Course Secretary, Ronald Knowles, who took care of the academic side of admissions, course materials, staffing excursions and examinations and the Warden of King’s College of Household and Social Science (KCHSS), Helene Reynard, who took care of accommodation, facilities and fees, were separate, the relationship was symbiotic. There would be no rental income generated for the summer vacation period without the Holiday Course and the course would have a quite different shape and nature without the residential facility provided in Kensington at KCHSS. Both administrations had an interest in keeping their costs down in order to successfully compete for students with language vacation courses both in the UK and in Europe.

Chapter 5 examines the impact of post-war changes on the Holiday Course from 1945–1952. Ripman had retired through ill-health before the war and a test of how robust his Holiday Course model was and how much of this model survived in a new structure and under a new management, is evaluated by examining the post-war circumstances which faced the University, the University Extra-Mural Department (EMD), as the Extension Board had become, and the Holiday Course, which had been renamed The Holiday Course in English for Foreign Students. The 1939 Holiday Course had been the last to take place before the War and the courses were not resumed until 1947. Arthur Clow-Ford, the veteran administrator, took over as director for the period of 1947–1949, chiefly because of the problem in finding a new director with the time and energy to spare, although this was in
addition to his work as External Registrar. In 1951, Professor Bruce Pattison of the Institute of Education, took over the directorship and set out to tackle the post-war problems of the course. The main problems were centred around the estate and staffing in that the University was still in the process of repairing damaged buildings and waiting for lecturing staff to return to work from their military deployment overseas. In section 5.1 the choices that faced the Extra Mural Department in the recruitment of students; the balance of course content between culture, language and social history; staffing; the integration of preparatory work for the UoLCPE into the course timetable and the financial structure of the course, are outlined and discussed. In section 5.2, the first two years of Professor Pattison’s directorship are analysed to demonstrate how each of these issues was treated in Pattison’s plan to make the course fit for a new purpose. His decision to build on the successful performance of the course that he had observed is presented and interpreted as evidence of the strength and linguistic logic of Walter Ripman’s original formula for the Holiday Course. In this section, the support of the new Principal of Queen Mary College, as the KCHSS had been renamed, Patricia Sergeant, is analysed and presented as further evidence of the importance of the cooperation of the staff of the residential and domestic side of the Holiday Course in its success.

Section 6 is the conclusion to the thesis which interprets the findings of each of the sections and addresses each of the research questions. The impact of the thesis in the possible parallels between Ripman’s work and the incidence of the Holiday Course, and our contemporary practice in English language teaching and learning are discussed. Recommendations for further research are proposed and supported.
2 What was the purpose of the Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers and why was it supported?

In this Chapter, the reasons for the decision to begin a course which would recruit international students will be investigated. The work of the University Extension board in the early 1900s was to extend opportunities for education to members of the public who would not otherwise be able to access it to enhance their working lives and prospects. The courses were divided into tutorial classes and diploma preparation. A diploma qualification could be achieved by aggregating the student’s attendance on the tutorial classes and taking a final assessment. The requirement that BPEUT classes led to a form of certification was applied to the Holiday Course as well and this led to the adoption of the UoLCPE which would provide a professional development opportunity for the teachers and bring the course into line with other Extension courses.

In the wider university sector, summer courses and summer schools for various disciplines including English language were in operation in Edinburgh, Cambridge and Oxford and so there was a degree of pressure for London to keep up with innovations. However, the competitive aspect of the argument would be unlikely to ensure approval for the course and arguments would need to be presented as to the value of the course in a specifically London and metropolitan context. In this section, the position of the University with regard to the use and value of language teaching and the individual view of Sir Arthur Rücker; the principal of the University, Sophie Bryant, the Vice-Chair of BPEUT, and Walter Ripman are compared and evaluated. This is followed by an analysis of the design of the model which was selected for the syllabus, structure and objective of the Holiday Course.

2.1 The University support

To explain why the University became involved in an English language course, it is necessary to look back briefly at the criticisms that were aimed at the role of universities before 1900 and how they responded. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge had been criticised not only for their institutional wealth but for their role in privileging the sons of aristocratic or wealthy parents and failing to respond to a rapidly changing society (Burrows, 1976). Dissatisfaction with the standard of education available to largely
middle-class children in British schools and the lack of training for teachers began a movement for the greater involvement of universities, principally Oxford and Cambridge in raising standards, The University of London received its royal charter in 1836 and pioneered major improvements in students’ access to its External degree examinations which demonstrated an ethos and character that differentiated it from Oxford and Cambridge. For example, religious tests, which were required at Oxford and Cambridge, were not required for London degrees (Roach 1971) and the university was open to all applicants without exception. The barrier to the only group which had been refused, women, was removed in 1877 when London opened degree examinations to women. In 1899 the UoL Graduates Association stated their objective:

‘…and to keep the degrees and distinctions of the University open to all comers on terms of equality and impartiality.’ (Dunseath and Miller, p. 99).

From 1876, the university’s mission to encourage working people into higher education had been conducted by LSEUT (the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching). Cain (1982) explains that the funding for the lectures and classes was raised by charging fees, and by grants from the City Livery companies and the Trustees of the London Parochial Charities. When, in 1900, the University of London was reconstituted to offer teaching as well as acting as an examination board, it incorporated LSEUT and set up a new board, the Board to Promote the Extension of University Teaching (BPEUT) with the aim of providing more areas of study. Using a similar pattern as the LSEUT, the BPEUT set up lecture and tutorial classes throughout London. The topics were those which it was felt would interest working citizens of London and would have an educational impact and fees were set at the lowest level possible based on the number of students attending. The reasons why, in 1903, the University supported the Holiday Course for foreign teachers requires some disentangling. As well as the knowledge that other universities were active in this area, the decision may have been related to an exchange in 1902 between Professor Perry and Sir Arthur Rücker (1848–1915) which was reported in the Times newspaper, and in Modern Language Quarterly (1902, p. 72). It took place at the prize-giving ceremony at the Royal School of Science. Perry was a distinguished scientist and a member of the University of London Senate; Rücker was the first Principal of the reconstituted University of London. Perry spoke first and stated that:
‘He had been told that German must be made compulsory for chemists and biologists, but that he doubted. With such a large number of publications of translations, no kind of physicist or engineer needed French, German, or any foreign language so much as to make it necessary for him to study it. In his own case, he had given a great deal of time to French and German, but he would give the preference to translations instead of to any production of his own.’

Perry went on to describe himself as representative of the average man, ‘to whom it might be harmful to be compelled to learn a foreign language’ (The Times, 1902).

He went on to say that he was looking forward to the time when he would have the opportunity of,

‘pricking the compulsory foreign language bubble’ (Times, 1902).

Rücker was stung to reply immediately. A man of great personal charm and humanity and an excellent public speaker, according to his biographer (Howarth, 1916), he disagreed with Professor Perry saying that,

‘The University thought it was advisable that such students [physicists and engineers] should know something of the languages to which the professor had referred. In future, questions would be set to test a student’s knowledge of such languages, but this would not be compulsory. The student, however, would be given an opportunity of answering questions, if he desired, in foreign languages’ (The Times, 1902).

In his response, Rücker was defending the principle of the University of London that a broad general education for all should take into account culture and knowledge as well as specific professional training. Rücker’s exchange with Perry illustrates all the linguistic frustration that was felt by scientists in the early part of the twentieth century. This frustration and the results of it are analysed by Gordin in his examination and explanation of the rise of the English language as the dominant form of international scientific publication and oral communication (Gordin, 2000). Gordin refers to some of the reasons why English became the preferred language for scientific discourse, publication and communication, a situation which he suggests was by no means inevitable but which was influenced more by political events than the particular linguistic advantages of English. In his text, Gordin analyses the statements made by Leopold Pfändler, the Austrian
physicist. In 1910, Pfaundler commented that even if it were assumed that scientists were proficient in German, French and English i.e. the three important scholarly languages which, together with a grounding in Latin, had facilitated the communication of science, and Pfaundler assured his readers that this was certainly not true of the French and the English scientists, more and more languages, Danish, Russian, Polish, Hungarian, Dutch, Spanish and many more were appearing in scientific discourse (Gordin, 2000). Pfaundler concurred with Perry that in order to keep up to date with scientific findings and discussion, scientists would need to be polyglots and in order to learn so many languages they would need to spend more time on language learning than they did on science. Rücker, on the other hand, championed multilingualism. According to Gordin, later in the century, the nationality movement, championed by the Danish linguist Otto Jespersen (1860–1943) in 1928, supported the rights of numerous countries to publish scientific papers in their own languages. This continued to undermine the dominance of German in scientific publishing in particular, largely as a result of the antagonism aroused by the First World War and compounded by the Second. Seemingly inexorably, the hegemony of English in published papers and scientific discussion grew until in the 1980s it became almost the only language used in scientific scholarly works, publications and conferences (Gordin, 2000).

On the 22nd December 1903, Professor Sir Arthur Rücker delivered his first speech as President of the Modern Language Association and in a lengthy address he continued his theme of the importance of languages in higher education. Rücker’s address ranged over many of the problems associated with language learning at that time. Pointing to the circumstances that prevailed in London schools, he decried the failure to demand high academic qualifications from language teachers, whilst insisting on them from teachers of Classics. Commenting on language teaching methodology, he insisted on the value of all four systems of language, reading writing, listening and speaking. He criticised a ‘post mortem’ approach to language teaching which was insistent on finding abnormalities or inconsistencies in a language and then presenting these as the most significant aspects of the language. On the best preparation for a language teacher he pronounced that,

‘The future teacher of English in France or Germany should be a Frenchman or German who has studied in England. The English teacher of a foreign language should have studied abroad. It is hoped that with this object adequate
arrangements may ultimately be made between different countries for the interchange of teachers in the earlier stages of their careers’ (Rücker, 1904).

In this recommendation, Rücker’s expectation was that language teaching was not necessarily to be conducted by a native-speaker of the language but even given that, exchanges of language teachers would be especially valuable. In this respect, it is likely that he saw the Holiday Course as one of the first steps in a programme of language teacher exchanges. In championing the opportunity for language learning, he went on to say:

‘Thus, the belief has sprung up that there is something antagonistic between the power to speak a language and the ability and knowledge to study it as a scholar. An eminent authority on education, now dead, once said in my hearing that,

‘A University had nothing to do with the purely commercial art of speaking a language.’ (Rücker, 1904).

Here, it is evident that Rücker perceived that the debate on the status of language teaching was divided between the essential of scholarly study, in the style of classical education, on one side, and achieving proficiency in spoken language on the other, and that these were separate spheres. Rücker returned to his earlier disagreement with Professor Perry regarding the value of languages to the scientist by giving the example of a young student who was studying at the Mechanics Institute, an organisation which provided part-time study on the fundamentals of science for working men.

‘If he won a national scholarship, he would have found, up to about four or five years ago, only professors of science (of whom I was one) at the Royal College of Science, and a steady refusal on the part of the Government to supply the teaching in modern languages which these professors declared to be necessary for the advance of their students in the sciences they professed. At no time in their careers would the majority of such lads have had a chance of learning to speak French and German, and it was much to their credit that in many instances they picked up enough to read foreign memoirs’ (The Modern Language Quarterly, 1904, Vol 7, No 1, p. 42).

This was a typical University of London response which criticised the elite attitudes to education that it was perceived prevailed and which stood in the way of education for the less privileged (Rothblatt, 1997, p. 157). Rücker went on to
develop his plans for language training and proposed to the Association that given that teacher exchange programmes were not available at that time, one of the more efficient means of securing high standards in language teaching and cultural exchange was the provision of short courses which would help to refresh teachers’ knowledge of their specialist language. At the end of his address, Rücker confirmed that in order to deal with the shortage of good modern language teachers, the University intended to run its own holiday course for teachers. His description suggests that in 1903 it was intended that the proposed holiday course might consist of more languages than English.

‘Abroad the University of Grenoble has taken an honourable lead in the provision of holiday courses for foreign teachers of French - provision all the more acceptable in that it is made amid charming scenery and close to the playground of Europe...Arrangements for the provision of similar courses in London were being made by the Teachers’ Guild but ...the members of the Guild have placed all their knowledge and machinery at the disposal of the University of London; For this reason, the University intended to provide a course, under the direction of Walter Rippmann , which he was confident would be a ‘useful programme of work’ which would have the support of foreign educational authorities. (The Modern Language Quarterly, 1904, Vol 7, No 1, pp. 39–40).’

In this way, the Holiday Course would demonstrate two principles: the University’s commitment to modern languages as an essential part of a general education which would include instruction in the spoken language. Secondly, the University’s belief in educational teacher exchanges and the benefit of establishing international connections. The founding principles on which the Holiday Course was based were familiar University of London tenets: that people from all walks of life should have the opportunity to study a broad range of subjects, which included languages; that the training of teachers was a part of the University’s responsibility in the London metropolis area and that, given there was evidence of other universities taking the initiative in teacher exchanges, then there was an obligation on UoL to be active in this area. Although Rücker was a Professor of Physics, and clearly the debate on scientific communication exercised his interest, his responses to the language learning issue during 1903 and 1904 were concerned less with science communication and more with the important concerns of the University which were the opportunity and encouragement which members of the public were given for part-time study in order to advance themselves and the influence that the University
could have on the standards of school teaching in the Metropolis, by which he meant London and its suburbs, which was exerted through the BPEUT schools inspectorate system. By giving the example of the boy at the Mechanics Institute in his address, Rücker illustrated the first concern and followed his description with an illustration of a boy from a typical well–to–do family who after a reasonable grounding from his foreign nurse and a ‘good governess’ in French or German, enters formal education and ‘goes steadily backward’ in languages through boredom and neglect. The anecdote suggests that the wealthier boy is able to neglect his inheritance of knowledge through poor language teaching and the working boy cannot aspire to it through lack of good language teachers. In answer to the second concern, the poor quality of language teaching in school and the need to train teachers more effectively, Rücker reassured the Modern Language Association that the entire annual budget from the London County Council of £10,000 was to be invested in the promotion of the German language through lectures, a seminar, specialist professors and library resources. This would be followed by a French language course as soon as finance were available. He also announced that the Technical Education Board of the London County Council had asked for a report on the teaching of modern foreign languages in about forty of its schools and that Walter Ripman and R. E. Edwards, the schools inspectors would be carrying these inspections out.

It is significant that the arguments put forward by Sir Arthur Rücker in favour of the University supporting language teachers and language teaching at the beginning of the 20th century were entirely academic and egalitarian in their aim of raising standards in schools, ensuring wide access to tuition, enhanced teacher training and the opportunities for forums where language professionals could meet. There was no strong distinction made between native-speakers or non-native speakers of the language, to use a conventional shorthand, and no sense of the specific expertise of an English-speaking teacher of English. Rücker’s significant concern was to improve the ability of language teachers but, ironically, after a brief experiment in French language in 1911, the only language offered on the Holiday Courses was English. The finance, which it had been envisaged would come from German or French sources, was not forthcoming and the War in Europe set back any aspirations for closer contact between language teachers.
2.2 Support from the BPEUT

The urgency of the BPEUT meeting which Vice-Chair Sophie Bryant called in Kensington in December 1903 to discuss the *Holiday Course* proposal for Senate was caused because Principal Rücker was due to announce to the Modern Language Association in the next two weeks that the plan for the *Holiday Course* had been adopted and he would not be able to do this unless it was swiftly approved. So rushed was the arrangement, that the meeting was inquorate (EM1/1 641.830). The Registrar to the Board, Dr R. D. Roberts reported that he had been informed that a foreign government was anxious that a Holiday Course for Foreigners should be arranged in London under the auspices of the University during the next long vacation, the course to last three weeks to a month. The Teacher’s Guild had already taken steps to arrange such a course but he was given to understand that the arrangement of a course by any other body other than the University would not satisfy the requirements of the foreign government in question. The Teachers’ Guild was represented at the meeting by Walter Ripman and his colleague John MacDonald. Miss Bryant went on to say that the proposal should go before Senate who would,

‘…consider the influence which this movement is likely to have in showing students of other lands the great advantage of the Metropolis as a centre of study.’(EM1/1/1904)

In proposing the course, the Teachers’ Guild and their representative Walter Ripman may have been anxious to act quickly in view of the competition from other universities at home and abroad in establishing language courses. The initiative may well have been the result of Ripman’s contacts with supporters of the course in institutions in France and Germany but the influence of the Guild alone would not have ensured that the course ran without the facilitation provided by Sophie Bryant. Her comment suggested a more wide-ranging view of the purpose of the course. Her choice of words in describing language teaching as a *movement* is interesting and may demonstrate her passion for reform that she espoused in many of the areas of education and public life in which she was involved. Her identification of the metropolis, the University of London thirty-mile circumference, suggests that she might have been considering that students who came to London to study would experience, or should experience, more than an improvement in their language skills but would be present in a city with much to offer in educational and cultural terms. Perhaps, so much to offer that they might
make it their centre of study for rather longer than the four-week course. At the October meeting of the Board, shortly after the first course had been launched, she concluded that,

‘This is most useful work which is likely to grow in extent and importance’

(EM1/1/1904)

Once again, her language is significant. Arthur Rücker also referred to ‘a useful programme of work’. Useful was an adjective much favoured by the UoL with its practical sense of the active use of knowledge. Bryant’s statement seems prophetic in view of the subsequent rise in the importance of English language worldwide over the century. Sophie Bryant was an active member of the UoL and an extraordinary woman in every sense of the word. Her name is listed in every history of the UoL in which she appears in her many capacities as an exponent of feminine firstness and several portraits and official photographs were made of her in formal robes and in her teaching context. By 1903, at the time of the December meeting, she had been Headmistress of the North London Collegiate School (NLC) for eight years having taken over from one of the most well-known headmistresses of the 19th century, Frances Mary Buss, the pioneer of girl’s education. Bryant had married a Hampshire doctor and surgeon at the age of nineteen but was widowed one year later, which left her free to take up an occupation according to the social understandings of her day. However, she also retained the enhanced status of a married woman. Bryant supported a number of reformist educational initiatives and was a member of the London County Council Board for Secondary Education and the Board for Technical Education. One of her achievements, which won her entry to the higher echelons of academia was her graduation as a London External student with a BSc in Mental and Moral Science and Mathematics in 1881, followed by a DSc in 1884, the first woman to achieve the award (Fletcher, 2004). She was awarded an Honorary DLitt from Dublin University, her home town, in 1904. Bryant was a welcome guest at the University Club for Ladies, a rather elitist establishment in New Bond Street, from which other senior teachers were excluded (Dyhouse, 1995). As a married woman, she was eligible to enter the University Senate and became the first woman to become a member serving there from 1900–1907.

However, hers was not an easy path to success. Born in the last half of the nineteenth century in an age when women did not go or were not accepted in universities, she had been one of three women to be funded by the Gilchrist Educational Trust to study for a degree (Dyhouse, 1995). Under the encouragement
of Miss Buss, her degree study took her nine years to complete while at the same time she worked as a mathematics teacher at the NLC. She taught herself Latin, a qualification which was a requirement for entry to the London examinations. As a child in Dublin, one of six children of a mathematician and clergyman, she had never attended school but was privately tutored at home studying mathematics, and German and French language. After the family moved to London and her father took up a University position, she entered Bedford College to complete her education and gained first class honours in the Senior Cambridge Local Examinations.

Bryant’s opinion was welcomed everywhere. She contributed to discussions of whether women should have separate universities (she disagreed) (Dyhouse, 1995) and in 1911, in her position as a headmistress, she contributed to the debate on whether female officials should be responsible for the supervision of women University students (she agreed, but with qualification) (Dyhouse, 1995). She was a passionate supporter of the Female Suffrage Movement and of Home Rule for Ireland and a notable Celtic scholar. Her portrait and the many photographs which were taken of her in her private home and at school show a smiling woman without the distant severity that is normally evident in male and female academic portraits. Her biographers write of her warmth, charm, moral purpose and culture (Fletcher, 2004) (Harte, 1986) (Watson, 2000). Her pupils were also unanimous in their approval of her relaxed class teaching style, and her Irish sense of humour. Miss Buss spoke admiringly of Bryant’s open personality, her energy and vital force (Watson, 2000).

Sophie Bryant’s career outlined the progress women could make but possibly it also undermined this ideal by the singularity of her achievements, and the number of personal attributes that seemed to be required at that time to cross gender and social class boundaries and enter the male dominated world of higher education. There is no convincing explanation of her success that can be based purely on her academic achievement and a more convincing explanation must rely both on this and on her particular charm and ability to work with her university colleagues. In her work as Vice-Chair for BPEUT between 1900 and 1918, it is clear that she was an important friend and supporter of the Holiday Courses and Walter Ripman’s directorship. They had much in common. Both Bryant and Ripman were UoL External degree graduates who had profited from the opening up of study routes to university qualifications. Both were the children of migrants. Both were fluent in French and German and both taught German language. Both were energetic education reformers. Ripman was a supporter of women’s education and had
lectured at Bedford College where Bryant had studied. Both were renowned for their charm. Although Ripman represented the Teacher’s Guild at the BPEUT December meeting, it was Bryant who, with others, had helped found it in 1883 (Watson, 2000). Ripman’s school inspection remit covered the North London Collegiate School where Bryant was Headmistress and they had had many opportunities to discuss teaching method, assessment and education. Sophie Bryant was a fortunate addition to the Extension movement as without the active support of a fellow language teacher, and the support of the Board, the Holiday Course might not have been accepted and funded for its experimental first year. Their collaboration continued throughout Bryant’s career and the NLC continued to welcome Holiday Course students to the school for the next thirty years.

2.3 Models for the Holiday Courses

In response, to the nineteenth century demand for universities to play a more active role in their communities, the University of Cambridge held a series of conferences between 1885 and 1900 to discuss how to extend and coordinate an education programme for adults and to create a University Extension programme. The result was the creation of a number of short courses and day lectures on literature and subjects of contemporary interest to the public which were delivered by university lecturers and made use of university buildings which would be vacant during the long vacation (BEMS 14.2). One of the initiatives that was taken up was English language tuition to international students. However, it is important to note here that the Cambridge courses were not specifically for foreign teachers of English. In August 1900, a Class on the English Language for Students from Foreign Countries was advertised in the local Press and held in a university building (BEMS 14.2). The students were introduced to the history of English language by a lecture from Walter Skeat (1835–1912) the eminent professor of Anglo-Saxon at Cambridge and author of an etymological dictionary, who discussed Chaucer’s Knight’s Tale and the Nun’s Priest’s Tale. R.J. Lloyd, a lecturer in phonetics at University College Liverpool, lectured on English speech sounds including single sounds and sounds in combination, followed by reading and writing exercises, in a method familiar to many language teachers today. S.S. Fletcher gave a talk on ‘Six Great Poets of the Century’ which possibly focused on the Romantic poets of the previous century. There was an opportunity for ‘conversazione’, and the students would be greeted at the beginning of the course and entertained in a space where they could relax informally together at the end of the day, greet guests and invited speakers and
discuss matters of interest. Excursions were organised to places of beauty and interest around Cambridge, Bury and the town of Ely, and there was boating and bathing on the river Cam. However, in 1903, the courses were interrupted as all the university extra-mural classes were cancelled in Cambridge due to an epidemic, possibly diphtheria, in the town (BEMS 14.3). As a result, in 1904, it was considered advisable to hold the classes in another location and the course was moved to Exeter University. This experience may have stimulated staff at Exeter to run their own vacation courses for foreign students which they later achieved.

Academic and social connections with other parts of Europe were clearly efficient: Exeter proved a good location as students travelling from Bremen in Germany could dock at Southampton and proceed along the south coast, an indication that Germany supplied a number of the students. A second recruitment area was France and the course organisers prepared a letter for the Ministry of Education in Paris describing the course and asking for assistance in publicising it to French speakers. They also appointed a Miss Montgomery, who was fluent in French and German, to join the staff and take conversation practice classes. As in the previous years, there were lectures on the history of English, English literature and four lectures on aspects of phonetics which focused on the speech organs, the standardisation of vowels and consonants, and a comparison of these with the sounds of French and German.

Henry Sweet’s (1845–1912) *A Primer of Spoken English*, published in 1890, was the recommended reading for students. The course was attended by 162 students, 130 of whom were teachers of English. The largest groups of nationalities were French, German, Dutch and Americans. American students were also to be found on the *Holiday Course* for many years until a separate course was organised; as in spite of the fact that they were first language speakers, it was considered that there was enough of linguistic and cultural content to make the classes interesting (EM 1/3). The Cambridge summer course model was based on a set of pre-requisites: recruitment would be conducted by formal approaches to national education authorities who it was felt might be interested, and by informal contacts; accommodation for the classes could be found in buildings vacated by the university students; holiday accommodation and a tourist infrastructure already existed in the town which the course organisers could take advantage of. The students, seventy two percent of whom were teachers, would be motivated by the perceived demand for professional development and the desire for travel and tourism among the profession in the early 1900s (BEMS 14.4).
What the course lacked was a powerful administration, international guest lecturers and the opportunity for the teachers to observe language classes, in part because the organisation of the English school year meant that no classes were running in July and August. On the positive side, the course was entirely under the control of the university and independent of state or municipal influence. The lectures and classes were conducted by university staff who had some time to spare during the summer vacation and who found the work enjoyable; their work was supported by temporary, part-time teachers who were recruited locally. The purpose of the course was articulated more clearly by the committee in August 1902 as,

‘…to afford a meeting place for students of different nationalities on the ground of common intellectual interest and thus indirectly to promote friendly relations between different people’ (BEMS 14.3)

The Cambridge course was designed to offer language interest but it was also intended to be a contribution to international relations among students and although it marked a larger scale and more organised approach to course design, it was not the model on which the Holiday Courses were ultimately based.

Walter Ripman joined the International Phonetic Association (IPA) in 1897 and in the same year was one of twenty-eight teachers from England who attended the German-French language course at the Philip University of Marburg, Germany (McLellan, 2012). The courses, were the result of the pioneering work on the training of teachers by the German universities of Marburg, Jena and Griefswald and the course in Marburg was led by Eduard Koschwitz (1851–1904). Information on the Marburg course comes predominantly from Norbet Nail’s centenary account of 2000 which traces the history of the Marburg vacation course from its inception in1897 until 1939 (Nail, 2000). The Philipp University of Marburg in Hesse, was established in 1527 and the language department was launched in 1896 by the Romance philologist Eduard Koschwitz, with a commitment to the training of language teachers. The university and the town were a centre of Prussian administration in the region and the Marburg Summer Courses were unusual in that they set out to challenge what was perceived as the conservative and largely ineffective language teaching methodology at that time in line with Reform principles of language teaching.

Marburg was and is a pretty market-town with Gothic castles and ancient churches, picturesque narrow streets and romantic vistas across the river valley and it is now part of the touristic deutsche-maerchenstrasse (fairy-tale route) with its associations with the tales of the brothers Grimm. Rapunzel’s Castle is not far away.
In the early 20th century, some of the inhabitants commonly wore *trachten* or regional dress and tours of local landmarks and trips into the countryside were part of an active cultural programme which was a strong element in the course. The first course in 1897 was a French-German culture and language programme and attracted 363 participants and 68 foreign philologists including 28 Britons. In 1898, there were 350 participants and for the first time the course included English language, in addition to German and French. Koschwitz was joined by the Anglist Wilhelm Viëtor (1850–1918) phonetician and reformer of language teaching, who began to impress his view that it was students’ practical use of the target language in the form of phonetic training, correspondence with pen friends, student exchanges, recitations and performances which was most effective in developing language fluency with the more philosophical and descriptive forms of study taking second place. This led to a disagreement with Koschwitz, who according to Nial, also emphasised the historical and philological aspects of language (Nail, 2000). In 1901, Koschwitz left Marburg, possibly as a result of this disagreement. The Parisian professor Paul Passy (1859–1940), who was later to have such an influence on Daniel Jones, contributed to the course as did a number of specialists in physics, medicine, theatre and music who all supported the scientific study of phonetics, the new, young discipline. In 1893, Viëtor had built what was called a ‘phonetic cabinet’ which he used to record speakers of different languages and dialects. He brought this equipment to Marburg and used the recordings in class together with exercises which were intended to improve pronunciation and demonstrate how languages and dialects are spoken. The students then read aloud from passages in the appropriate language. The content of lectures and discussion was broad and stimulating. Nail reports that the topics included national literary history, questions of linguistic history, teaching methods, school systems, educational psychology, the history of art and religion, school hygiene, recent history and key figures in the history of science (Nail, 2000).

There were peculiarly German aspects to the drive of the Marburg course. With the presence of Viëtor, the German language Reform movement was the background to the courses, a movement which in response to Viëtor’s pamphlet of 1882 emphasised the need to teach and learn foreign languages as living, spoken languages and not to emulate the dry translations and analysis which he perceived characterised the teaching of classical languages. The new science of phonetics was part of this reform and according to one participant there were also spirited discussions among Marburg school participants of the use of the direct method technique in teaching and of the planned ‘Duden’ spelling reforms to German
language which were agreed in Berlin in 1901 at the Orthographic Conference (Nail, 2000). These scholars from Germany, France, Scandinavia, Italy and England were the first generation of professional modern language teachers who, although they did not always agree with each other, intended to shape the future of language learning.

The timing of the school year in that part of Germany gave participants the opportunity, with special permission from the education authorities, to go into local schools to observe teachers’ methodology. This practical training was coordinated by the headmasters and grammar school teachers of the boys’ and girls’ schools which had been chosen for the exercise. The cooperation of the university and the municipality was essential to the smooth running of the course and the organising committee was composed of distinguished representatives of the government, the university, local schools and the municipal authorities in Marburg. In order to achieve a high academic standard, the organisers of the Marburg course were also advised by a committee of scholars which included the professor of philosophy and education Paul Natorp (1854–1924) and the headmaster of the Oberrealschule, Dr Karl Knabe (1856–1923?). According to Nail’s account it is argued that the huge popularity of the course was based on the following factors:

- A cohesive programme of study based on phonetic training but not limited to it
- A programme primarily for language teachers but not excluding interested linguists
- The practical use of the target language and the provision for three languages
- A strong administration organised as an advisory committee and supported by the involvement of the host university, state and school representatives and the local community
- Advice and participation from internationally known academics in linguistics and other disciplines
- Opportunities for language class observations
- An attractive social programme in a culturally rich location
- Moderate pricing for tuition and accommodation

In addition to the intoxicating intellectual atmosphere, the modest financial cost of the tuition programme which included meals and accommodation provided locally in homes, hotels or guest houses is likely to have been a very significant factor,
without which economy possibly large numbers of the participants would not have been unable to attend.

However, the model of the Marburg Summer Courses had a fatal flaw which became painfully evident after the 1914–18 war and even more evident after 1932. The courses were closed for the duration of the First World War but the involvement of the state in the university itself and in the administration of the course meant that in 1922 languages other than German were excluded. The course was re-designed to receive students living in territories lost after the Treaty of Versailles whose needs, it was decided, would be exclusively German language. The course administration was transferred out of the university and into the town to the Institute of German Culture where it could be supervised. During the 1920s and 30s the course was able to maintain its popularity despite competition from other similar courses in the region. However, after these brief periods during which there were attempts to revive a more international outlook and attempts to reassert university influence over the course content, it fell under the control of a National Socialist agenda and an exclusively German orientation until the outbreak of war in 1939 (Nail, 2000).

Ripman was fortunate to attend the early years of the course and its inspirational beginnings. The lively atmosphere of the course, the presence of leading phoneticians and advocates of language teaching reform, contact with schools and the opportunity to converse with other students in the three course languages had a life-changing effect on Walter Ripman and it was the Marburg Summer course which became the model that he used for the *Holiday Course*.

### 2.4 The design of the Holiday Course in English Language for Foreign Teachers

The structure which Walter Ripman instigated in 1914 remained largely unchanged for the following thirty years. The characteristics of the *Holiday Course* were:

- An energetic and innovative administration.
- Support from an academic advisory board with relevant expertise.
- A varied programme of lectures, classes and excursions.
- Opportunity to socialise and converse in the target language with native-speakers as part of the course.
- Use of the students themselves as ambassadors for the course (Honorary Correspondents).
– Entry for both language teachers and those interested in English language for other reasons
– A financial requirement to break-even only.

In January 1904, the first meeting of the Advisory Panel took place in Kensington at the University Central Office to establish a course budget and a programme of study. The Board was composed of: Sophie Bryant, Professor John Adams, Dr Frank Heach the first Professor of Education at the UoL, Dr Kimmins, the Chair of Convocation, a committee of Graduates of the University with electoral and executive powers, Mr H.B. Garrod and Mr John Russell of the Teacher’s Guild. It was agreed that the course would be given a grant for set up costs which would be recoverable from the course. The list of requirements is given in Appendix One: Holiday Course Start-Up-Costs. The requirements can tell us a great deal about the actual course by simple arithmetic: there were 120 hat pegs and given that everyone, both male and female, wore a hat, this indicates that the students would be seated at the 12 tables. There were 10 blackboards for the teachers to use. This indicates 10 students per table and that they were working in groups rather than sitting individually. This is indicative of a class for adults rather than the lines of chairs associated with children and suggests that the teaching style was not teacher-centred but encouraged the students to communicate freely with each other around the table in a method of instruction and learning which is used in language teaching today. This arrangement was possibly the first lesson in classroom practice for the teachers who were unfamiliar with the style of teaching. The screens indicate that the classes were insulated from each other, perhaps in a large room, and the extra chairs and the piano suggest that one of the rooms could be laid out for concert or recital purposes and that the intended audience might be more than the Holiday Course students. The prospectus stated that the course would be run from July 18th to August 13th 1904 under the Direction of Walter Rippmann (sic), M.A (EM1/4/1904). The membership of the Advisory Panel changed over the years but was always composed of senior academics in the University and in language teaching. The meetings took place twice a year, first to present the course for approval and later, in October, to report on the reception of the course and to present financial reports to the Extension Board.

In adapting the Marburg model for the UoL course, Ripman benefitted from the independent status of the UoL which would preclude state interference in the classes. He was also able to call on friendly colleagues among the Extension lecturing group who could provide a series of lectures over the four weeks of the
course. In this way, he was not reliant on importing external academics whose lecturing ability was unconfirmed and with the extra expense that would involve. Here, there is a question as to whether the Extension lecturers, who would normally be addressing members of the public in their sessions around London, were able to tailor their delivery, vocabulary and style to make their topics intelligible, and valuable to the foreign teachers. There is no evidence that the lectures were badly received and there is evidence that the course was appreciated and so the balance of the argument suggests that the Holiday Course lecturers who returned year after year became accustomed to their audience and made some adaptations in their language and vocabulary. The first group of lecturers in 1904, included G.E. Fuhrken, a phoneticist and specialist in English pronunciation, who lectured on Kipling and G.B. Shaw, the latter was, incidentally, a friend of Sophie Bryant; Dr Graham Wallas from LSE was a specialist in Economics and lectured on the social history of this topic. Mr Hall Griffin, an English specialist from Birkbeck College, lectured on *Browning’s Ring and the Book*; Mr Alan. S. Walker, an authority on London and architecture, lectured on places of interest and Francis Storr, the Vice President of the Modern Language Association also contributed. Ripman also accepted an offer from Dr R. D. Roberts, the Registrar, to conduct a Lantern slide show, an early precursor of a film projector, for the evening *conversazione* which would feature photographs from Robert’s recent trip to Egypt.

The idea of enlisting the help of students as ambassadors for the course was an improvement on the Cambridge model which relied for the promotion and marketing of the course on contacts made with international education representatives, although this was also part of the Holiday Course marketing activity. Souvenirs were printed which were actually copies of the course programme, detailing the staff, the timetable, the visits, the reading list and the names and addresses of all those students who had agreed to become Honorary Correspondents i.e. they had agreed to promote the course in their own city, town or village by accepting advertising material before the next course. From the souvenir copies in the archive it would seem that many students agreed to this arrangement perhaps with the secondary advantage that they could then correspond with each other and keep in touch with friends that were made on the course. In administrative terms, however, some efficiency was required as the souvenirs had to be printed before the last day of the course so that they could be distributed to students. This practice continued throughout the life of the *Holiday Course* until the post-war period. In the disruption of that period, it was not possible to be sure which of the *Honorary Correspondents* were alive or living at the same address or
whether the address existed. Although the proportion of language teachers to other students declined during the decades that followed, teachers remained a strong group of participants on the course and were specifically referred to in the prospectus. School based class observations, so much a feature of the Marburg course and so valuable in illustrating the progressive methods of selected language teachers, were not a possibility. The Holiday Course was planned to run from mid-July to mid-August but by the end of July in London schools, the teaching was nearing its end. Instead, Ripman used a great deal of ingenuity and the help of his many associates in schools, he sourced school events, which although they were not class teaching, could still give the teachers an insight into the teaching establishment which provided them and the talents of the schoolchildren. The NLC was prominent in inviting *Holiday Course* participants to end of term functions. Over the decades, and facilitated by Ripman’s extensive school contacts, participants were able to attend swimming galas, prize giving ceremonies, dancing displays, plays and recitations at schools all over London (EM 3/2/1).

The marketing and promotion of the course becomes more apparent from the financial account which was presented to Senate on October 24th 1904 after the first course. Appendix 2 Income and Expenditure is a record of income and expenditure for the 1904 course. It refers to postcards as an item of expenditure on the course. The purpose of the postcards, which Ripman had printed with a pen and ink drawing of what is now Imperial College but was then the Imperial Institute, was that students would be able to buy these postcards and send them home with their comments on the back, thus advertising the course, the University and London. The financial profile of the course was much improved by inviting educational publishers, possibly Dents, Ripman’s own publisher to exhibit their language learning material to the students. The booksellers, W.H. Smith were provided with a space near the classrooms from which they sold books and periodicals to students; this arrangement became permanent and W.H. Smith were present at every *Holiday Course*. In addition to the free cultural programme, concert tickets were raffled to ensure equal opportunity for all and perhaps to encourage students to actively seek out culture and entertainment rather than passively submitting to a compulsory programme.

In the inside page of the prospectus, and every succeeding one, was an excerpt from parts of the description of London by William Fitzstephen who died in 1190 and was a clerk of Thomas a Becket who was murdered in Canterbury Cathedral, making it clear to students that their visit would be a pleasurable one.
‘Among the noble cities of the world that Fame celebrates, the City of London, is the one seat that pours out its fame more widely, sends to farther lands its wealth and trade, lifts its head higher than the rest. It is happy in the healthiness of the air, the clemency of the skies. Above all other citizens, everywhere, the citizens of London are regarded as conspicuous and noteworthy for handsomeness of dress and in way of speaking. I do not think there is a city with more commendable customs.’

Text courtesy of Senate House Library, University of London (EM3/2/1)

The first excursions included a modest programme: a tour of the University’s Colleges and a trip up the river Thames to Hampton Court Palace. The students’ accommodation, which was separated into male and female lodgings, was taken care of by private households before the move to Kensington in 1925. Ripman was careful to stress to prospective students that that no more than one of each nationality would be allocated to the same accommodation thereby eliminating a common feature of student accommodation where same language speakers who are accommodated together have no incentive to use the target language and thus cultural exchange is limited (EM 3/2/1/1904). This is evidence of a carefully planned approach to immerse students in the target language and indicative of his experience as a language teacher that he did not disregard this important opportunity to manage the students’ experience and respond to their needs. Each course opened with an address by a senior member of the University such as the Principal or the Academic Registrar. This representative would welcome the students and deliver a homily on the University, its international purpose and history. All the academic staff wore academic dress. Refreshments were provided followed by a musical solo and conversazione.

The linguistic core of the timetable was phonetic instruction, reading and discussion. Conversation classes confirmed the emphasis on spoken English and the influence of Reform teaching. The timetable was designed to provide a variety of classes and activities throughout the week, which included Saturday: From 9.20 –10.15, students could attend a lecture. The variation of content in the lecture programme was quite sophisticated: Some of the lecturers delivered a sequence of three or four talks which covered the first two weeks of the course and were then followed by another lecturer with a different specialism whose sequence would cover the final two weeks thus allowing for variety of voice and content. English literature, history and the history of London, social science, art and economic developments in Britain were the standard topics, although the selection of period
and particular subjects changed according to the preoccupations of the day. In addition to the opportunities for discussion in English, which students could take advantage of with their fellow students in class and in the Hall of Residence, the literary and cultural emphasis of the programme was designed to make the most of the London location and the selection of highly experienced lecturers guaranteed quality and was likely to impress the students with their display of knowledge and familiarity with contemporary thought and literature.

From 10.15–10.45 Walter Ripman led a class on phonetics. The students attended on alternate days according to their language family which was determined as speakers of Romance, Germanic, Slavic, Nordic etc. This grouping into same language speakers was probably so that common errors in pronunciation could be addressed but left open the division of the student by language level. From 11.20 a.m., there were group reading classes followed by discussion, and conversation classes. Afternoons were taken up with lectures or visits and on Wednesdays or Saturdays there was an all-day excursion to a destination outside London such as Cambridge or Stratford upon Avon. Over forty-six destinations inside and outside London had been explored by the end of the course in 1976.

As a residential course, the social programme and the domestic arrangements for catering and accommodation were equally as important as tuition in ensuring a happy experience for the students. What is notable is that no meal, and there were four each day, lasted longer than 45 minutes, perhaps because of the British tendency to eat quickly or perhaps because the course was closer to a college style than to a holiday style of living and food was served promptly in a refectory. Tea was served at 3.30pm and supper at 7.00pm. In the early evening, there might be a lecture, for example Walter Ripman’s delivered a talk on Freedom and the School Environment, every year. He was also available on most evenings to talk to students and answer questions. From 8.30pm there was singing or musical solos from guest musicians, dance displays from professional dancers, or a recitation; from 9.30 on several evenings during the course there was dancing until 11.20pm. Once the course moved to residential accommodation in Kensington in 1925, curfew was set at 3.00am indicating that the atmosphere was not intended to monitor and control the student closely. Students dressed formally for dinner in evening wear and academics wore academic dress. Towards the end of the course, the students organised their own concert evening and in the final week, the staff entertained the students. A Certificate of Attendance for those who could demonstrate that they had attended 75% of the course was available in a simple form as follows,
‘Certificate of Attendance: (name) has attended a course of instruction in English arranged for Foreign Students by the University of London from __ to __. Signed by the Registrar and the Director.

Text courtesy of Senate House Library, University of London (EM1/18)

Walter Ripman’s report to Senate in 1904 expressed surprise at the success of the course,

‘...numbers [were] far in excess of what had been anticipated...a spirit of friendly fellowship throughout the course with no tendencies to split into cliques’

Text courtesy of Senate House Library, University of London (EM1/4/1904).

At the very beginning of the Holiday Course in 1904, Ripman had experimented with designing his own certificate assessment but swiftly discovered that oral assessment of large groups was more difficult than it had appeared. He designed a three-class grading category for the twenty-minute oral examination, similar to a degree classification, in which first class was described as 1.1 faultless practice; 1.2 excellent, 1.3 very good; second class ranged from 2.1 very good, 2.2 fair and 2.3 very fair; and finally, third class consisted of 3.1 fair, 3.2 poor and 3.3 very poor. The test itself was designed to assess comprehension, phonetic dictation, intonation, fluency and accuracy of grammar and idiom. Clearly this was a hopelessly ambitious aim to achieve in the time allowed. The experience prompted Ronald Knowles, the Course Secretary, to remark wryly many years later that he could not understand why students would wish to have a certificate in the last two classifications (EM7/38/1). The washback from this experience was clear and the test was amended for the second course and discontinued, perhaps gratefully, when the UoLCPE was adopted in 1908.

2.5 The appeal of the Holiday Course

The appeal of the Holiday Course was due both to Ripman’s generous commitment of his own time and the fact that the Extension classes were not part of a university department but a section dedicated to short courses and administered by staff who were experienced in this pattern of study and understood the needs of the adults from different countries who for a very short time became students of the university. It is significant that in the list of Honorary Correspondents, the names, cities and
countries of each of the students are meticulously spelled in their local forms complete with the correct accents and speech marks and that no name or address is Anglicized. In a contemporary assessment of the course, the practice of dressing for dinner and wearing academic dress at the opening *conversazione* may seem formal. However, the practice of providing your own entertainment in the evenings with music and recitations was commonplace in the pre-television decades and popular and characteristic of the age. Also from a contemporary perspective, the content of the course might be considered Anglo-centric and, of course, it was and was intended to be, given the purpose which had inspired it. More than that, it was London-centric designed quite deliberately to exploit the features and resources of the University metropolis. The history and prevailing culture of the city of London, it was perceived, was an integral part of the attraction of the course and was what teachers and students had come to learn about and experience and, in return, to bring news and views from their own countries and culture to exchange with others. This, according to Fordham, was one of the features of universities, to provide a forum for cultural exchange (Fordham, 2007). In the class teaching, the lectures and readings were not inserted solely as vehicles for the analysis of grammar and vocabulary or as aural skills development in note-taking but carried meaning, both social and cultural, in a contribution to intellectual development.

The opportunities for cross-cultural interaction among students were high even from the first course as a result of a wide response to the initial marketing of the course. Appendix 3 Nationalities and Gender 1904 shows the spread of nationalities among the students who attended the 1904 course and the gender balance. Fifteen nationalities are represented with the largest groups of students originating in the nearest neighbours, France and Germany. Male students made up 60% of the total on the course, although later in the century, female enrolments formed a higher percentage.

Appendix 4 Holiday Course Enrolments 1904–1935, shows the pattern of enrolments from the fifty-three nationalities who attended the course between 1904 and 1935. In spite of its success, recruitment to the course was vulnerable to economic and political pressures both domestic and external which can be seen by the variations in the attendance from some countries. Among the barriers to attendance for European students were currency exchange restrictions and the difficulty of obtaining visas. Students from Germany, normally the highest percentage of enrolments, were absent in the years after 1914. It is also important to remember that teachers, who formed at least half of the registrations, were unlikely to be the highest paid in their societies and the economic fortunes of
individual countries rose and fell during the decades. As the years passed, competition from other institutions offering summer language courses grew and Marburg and other inexpensive courses in Germany and France were competitors to London. Even if it is assumed that demand for English language was rising throughout the century, the Holiday Course was still successful in attracting its own share of eligible students and delivering a satisfying experience. By 1935 a total of 7,071 students had attended the course, an impressive achievement (Appendix 4 Enrolments 1904–1935).

The success of the course was predicated on its flexible design and the successful exploitation of its location. Ripman’s simple formula of lectures, reading and discussion, conversation and phonetic instruction together with a strong cultural and social content is generalizable across contemporary summer course situations but with the following provisos that would be essential to achieving the full effect. The residential requirement created a close community and given the multilingual composition of the students must have encouraged greater use of the target language; the presence of the director and other academic staff on some of the evenings should also have blurred the divisions between classes and social time; although students were not required to attend all the events, the fact that activities were planned for each day and evening of the course should have provided a stimulus and reassured students that they were getting value for money. Local people, the conversationalists, were involved in assisting the teaching. Walter Ripman’s annual reports refer to friendly fellowship among the students. For BPEUT, it seemed to be sufficient to be reassured from these reports that students were getting on well with other and enjoying the course. This was a similar aim to the 1902 University of Cambridge Extension Board plan which was to encourage good international relations among the participant (BEMS 14.2). In the event which was held to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the course in 1973, Ronald Knowles referred specifically to the happy and cooperative atmosphere among the students. The only problem that he could discern was, ‘A failure to find a way which could help students not to feel so unhappy when the course is over’ (EM 7/38)

This comment, perhaps reveals the nature of the intensity of the experience which summer course students are part of and which was referred to by Burrows (1976), an intensity which Ripman himself experienced in Marburg. Knowles also reminded his listeners of the many friendships, engagements and marriages which took place as a result of the course. The Holiday Course was fleeting as in the four-
week duration, after a settling-in period, it would soon be time to leave and thus the disappointment observed by Knowles. From this evidence, it can be surmised that the Holiday Course traded in happiness as much as it traded in language improvement. An example of this only came to light sixty-two years later when an Italian ex-student of the 1936 course was interviewed in 1997 on her return to study at the Summer School in English which was held on the same Kensington campus. Her memory of the course was also linked with the events surrounding the abdication of Edward V111 and the interest that romance had provoked in London (The Mail, 1997). Anecdotally, in a conversation with the researcher, she explained her disappointment that her own friendship and correspondence with a student from Czechoslovakia who she met on the course, was subsequently terminated by the outbreak of war. In researching the success of a course of study we may be drawn too heavily into valuing evidence that is based on motivation factors that are associated with learning and vocational interest, pass rates and value for money because these are the criteria set by the academic frameworks that we use and failing to note that for many students, it is the social and locational experience of the course in itself that is both the motivation and the successful outcome.
3 A lived experience approach to Walter Ripman’s contribution to the University of London Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers

‘The limits of my language mean the limits of my world’, Ludwig Wittgenstein 1889–1951

In this section, the life of the director of the Holiday Course, Walter Ripman, is explored with reference to his family and education, his teaching experience and the development of his philosophy of education in order to better understand how they influenced his work on the Holiday Course. Walter Ripman was a leading figure who worked to promote Reform Movement language teaching methods in modern foreign languages in schools in the UK. Although his work in English language is less well-known, he was engaged in all the areas which are characteristic of an influential language teaching professional. Firstly, he contributed to the development of theoretical ideas among scholars regarding teaching and innovation and engaged in experimental work and scholarly correspondence in journals. His innovation and scholarly engagement was evidenced by his work on the use phonetics in teaching and his collaboration with Sines Alge, Daniel Jones and many others. These resulted in collaboration between others working in the field of language teaching to develop professional forums and journals to support academic and professional development and international influence. Ripman was working in an age when top-down distribution of teaching policy, regulatory documents and standardised measures of teaching practice, were not developed. From the evidence given by Kay (1972) teachers at the beginning of the 20th century had considerable autonomy in the class and in curriculum design albeit in a formal atmosphere. In this context, pioneering and experimental work in education was possible and Ripman was active in encouraging a number of reforms in teaching practice.

Ripman was an active participator in professional forums through his writing in Modern Language Quarterly and Modern Language Teaching. His second area of influence was to use his teaching experience in the publication of instructional materials, what we would term course-book, in order to disseminate ideas which could be used by teachers of various groups of learners in various locations. His dissemination of ideas through the authoring of instructional publications is evident in his French German and English bibliography as Modern Languages Editor at Dents. The third area of his professional concern was in the preparation and
moderation of institutional or public examination assessment materials which came about through his work as a schools’ inspector. His work as inspector of schools in London secondary schools for the University of London Extension Board brought him into regular contact with teachers, pupils, examination item writers and assessment boards. Those who are active in one of the three areas given above may not be active in another. Some teachers may be active in parts of a number of areas. The majority of class teachers may not be active in any of the areas given but will source or create their own materials for instruction and assessment in the context of their own practice. Walter Ripman was active in all the areas given above. Add to this his wide teaching experience encompassing both schoolchildren and adults; beginners; intermediate and university degree level students and his significance becomes more apparent. His work was more than a foundation for the development of the Holiday Course, it was the inspiration for the course.

The importance of Walter Ripman’s life as a teacher and a mentor of teachers is privileged in this study as is the metropolitan context that he worked in. According to Goodson (2014) researching the background and unique experiences of a teacher are essential in understanding his/her dynamic of practice:

‘In understanding something so intensely personal as teaching it is critical we know about the person the teacher is’ (Goodson, 2014, p30).

A lived experience approach does not critique individual lives but concentrates on what people do and how they do it. (Boylorn, 2012) It can include an examination of some aspects of a person’s life and identity which are not directly associated with the research questions, everyday experiences and life transitions which evidence the commonality of experience and allow for comparisons in further research. In this section, there is an analysis of Ripman’s English language publications for evidence of his preoccupations and teaching method. The work of Constance Ripman, Walter Ripman’s wife, is also evaluated for what her work contributes to our understanding both of her purpose and their joint purpose in Let’s Talk English – Everyday Conversation for the Use of Foreigners published in 1938.

3.1 Before the war

Walter Ripman was born in January 1869 in a modest terraced house in the densely-populated suburb of Stoke Newington, North London. His parents, Hugo and Christiane, were from the Wurttemberg region of southern Germany and had come to Britain at some point in the 1860s. Their arrival may have been part of the
nineteenth century global migration pattern which in Germany tended to follow on economic crises and shortages as by 1911, 56,000 Germans were recorded as resident in the British Isles (Panayi, 2014). His father, Hugo, was employed in the wool trade as a clerk to a broker taking up a popular business opportunity. There were five younger children in the family: three sisters, Melita, Margarete and Louise and twin brothers Hugo and Helmut. During the 1870s the family moved to Sydenham, South London, where Walter and later his brothers, attended Dulwich College, a private boy’s school from which many alumni entered politics, the armed forces and medicine. According to Panayi, the class structure of German immigrants in Edwardian Britain replicated that of the host country and Walter and his sisters and brothers lived in comfortable middle-class circumstances attended by three maids and a nurse for the younger children (Panayi, 2014). It was a conventional London suburban life. The family were undoubtedly bilingual in English and German and possibly French. On leaving Dulwich, where he had been active in the student’s magazine, Walter achieved a First-Class BA in German from the University of London, where he studied as an External student. This was his first encounter with the University and he won a prize for Intermediate Level German. Walter’s talent earned him a scholarship worth £50 to Gonville and Caius College Cambridge in 1887, a scholarship which would take him out of suburbia and into the elite world of the Cambridge students. In 1890, with an increased scholarship of £60 he graduated in the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos examinations with a Distinction in spoken German. In 1891, with an extended scholarship of £70, he graduated with a Second-Class degree in Classics; in 1892 he achieved a Second-Class degree in Oriental Languages and his MA was awarded in 1894. He remained at Gonville and Caius as an assistant lecturer in modern languages until 1896 (McLelland, 2012). McLellan describes him as something of a collector of qualifications (McLelland, 2012) and it seems that the life of a Cambridge student agreed with him. On his return to London in 1896, his student life was certainly over and Ripman’s need was for employment and income. In order to evidence the extraordinary energy that Ripman expended in his daily life it is possible to adapt De Certeau’s vision of the essential role that people who walk through the city play in weaving places in the cityscape together, cited in Winter and Robert (2000) and to take a scholarly perambulation which will follow the trajectories that Ripman took in his routine engagements (Winter and Roberts, 2000).

Taking an academic stroll through Ripman’s teaching world it is possible to gain a better understanding of the context of his work and the physical pressure that
it exerted. Home was a spacious house in Ladbroke Grove, in North Kensington where he had established himself as a Professor of German. The household comprised a Housekeeper, Sophie Korsch, a German from Mecklenburg, her husband; their nine-year-old daughter, Frida, and a parlour maid. The suburb was a mixed environment and Ripman was neighboured by clerks, builders, tradespeople and professionals. This was the house with the high ceilings which according to her biographer, Katherine Mansfield found so overwhelming compared to her own home in New Zealand (Tomalin, 1987). From Ladbroke Grove, his movements were bounded by Baker Street to the north of the city, which was the site of Bedford College where he lectured undergraduates in German. In central London, he taught German to the advanced classes at Queens College in Harley Street just north of the busy shopping area of Oxford Street. Towards the south of the city, near the Strand and the river Thames, were the offices of J.M. Dents, the publishers, where in 1896 he was the recently appointed editor of the Modern Languages Series. All the destinations with the exception of Queens could be reached by the Circle line, one of the only underground lines which operated at the time. However, this would have made for a long (and circular) route to Dents. The distances are not inconsiderable. From his home in Ladbroke Grove to Queens College would entail a walk of one hour and twenty minutes. Rather closer to his home was Wren’s College, in Powis Square, on the other side of Ladbroke Grove, which was where Ripman taught evening classes and where he was appointed Senior Lecturer in German and later, in 1899, Senior Lecturer in French. Wren’s was a coaching establishment, which provided one-to-one tuition for hundreds of young men who applied each year to take the higher university examinations such as the Tripos and those that would allow them to compete in entry to the Indian Civil Service. Kensington at that time was a patchy development of fine houses and areas which had lost some of their gentility. The area around Powis Square was locally named as ‘Little India’ due to the high numbers of Asian students who occupied the run-down flats and rooms around the College buildings while they studied for their qualifications (Gladstone, 2016). In spite of its unprepossessing aspect, the College was popular and well known for its high pass rate in public examinations.

In the course of a day, it is quite possible that Ripman would have had to attend to all the destinations: morning classes at Queens; afternoon sessions at Bedford College, which was half an hour distant; next, a walk of 40 minutes to Dents and finally back to Powis Square for evening classes, a journey of another hour and a half. It is likely that like most Londoners, he developed a series of walk and ride
routes through the crowded thoroughfares using private horse-drawn buses, handsome cabs and short cuts through back streets. The ability to hold down four teaching positions across the capital positions suggests energy, enthusiasm and the ability to deal with diverse student groups and people, perhaps all in one day: schoolgirls at Queens; young women scholars at Bedford College; the staff of J. M. Dent; and ambitious male students at Wrens.

Although Ripman spent a short time at Bedford College, he made a good impression. Bedford College, which was part of the University of London, was established for women in 1849 and was the first institution for the higher education of women (Crook, 2001). Ripman was not at the College for very long. He was appointed as Professor of German in 1897 (McLelland, 2012, p. 126), no doubt on the strength of his academic achievements at Gonville and Caius. The College adhered to a strict daytime teaching timetable. Many years later, an ex-student of the College between 1897 and 1901, Ida Samuel, remembered Ripman well, as she was the only student in his class for the Higher Local Examinations. She explained that he seemed very relieved that she had got past the Elementary stage. However, Ida remembered that,

‘Although the system of chaperoning in omnibuses had, at that time, almost died out, my mother was very doubtful whether I should have lessons alone with Mr Rippmann’ (Crook, 2001, p. 183).

The College had taken over buildings which had been intended for family use rather than education and had all the characteristics of domesticity: the ground floor of the building was laid out with a common room and classrooms, while the upper floors were reserved for accommodation for boarding students and a library. In the early days of women’s higher education, this was regarded as a desirable style of architecture to reassure parents and wider society that the women were learning in an appropriately feminine environment not too dissimilar to their own homes (Vickery, 1999). Ida’s mother’s concerns were typical of late Victorian attitudes towards the education of young women. However, the vulnerability of the teacher in such one-to-one tuition circumstances was overlooked, a vulnerability that resonates today. In later building design, in London County Council school buildings, glass panels were inserted on classroom doors to ensure the visibility of the class and the teacher. Ripman lectured at Bedford College for two years until 1898. It may have been the low numbers of students in the higher classes which became an area of concern in the following years which encouraged him to resign or he may have been anxious to develop more class teaching skills (Howe, 2001).
Queens College had originally been set up to provide certification for governesses who, in common with the fictional governess Jane Eyre, were trapped in a cycle of poverty and low social esteem and often worked in miserable and exploitative conditions. However, by the 1900s governesses of that type had largely disappeared and the girls at Queens were drawn from middle class families who paid for their education. In spite of Queen’s pioneering origin in women’s education, few of these girls would aspire to university but were being prepared for a world in which women would be expected to take part in a range of high and demanding social activities in their role as educated wives and mothers (Kaye, 1972) (Grylls,1948). The lecturing staff were entirely male but numbers of female staff were employed as teachers and Lady Visitors who took over the care of the girls in the afternoon after classes, and in the evening. The Lady Resident, the most senior position, was a post that was traditionally held by former students of the College. Queens had a traditional, protective yet stimulating atmosphere and prided itself in developing the individual girl (Kaye, 1972). Ripman joined the College as Professor of German Language and Literature in 1896, having been selected from 39 applicants. He did not have an illustrious predecessor. There had been a number of complaints to Council against Professor Weil for failing to involve the female teachers in his classes, which he was required to do, and for which he had little defence (Kaye, 1972) According to student Gertrude Bell (1868–1926), the explorer, writer, politician, archaeologist and founder of the Baghdad Museum,

‘We are bored to death in this class, and we never learn anything…Dr Weil is so ugly and he always wears a dirty shirt. I have never seen him in a clean shirt yet.’ (Kaye, 1972, p. 119)

Ripman set about reforming the German teaching at Queens. He gained a reputation as an experimental teacher because of his emphasis on phonetics and pronunciation and avoidance of the mother-tongue in class (Kaye, 1972). He stimulated conversation in the class by the use of Hoezel’s picture chart of Seasons in Germany which he hung on the wall of his classroom which was opposite the Chemistry laboratory. Picture lessons and illustrations were an integral part of his methodology based on Reform principles. He was young, enthusiastic and ardent and contemporary photographs confirm that he had no difficulty in procuring a clean shirt.

Queens was an intelligent choice of school for Ripman: that fact that the College had no pretensions of imitating a boy’s public school meant that the Classics syllabus would not dominate or interfere with the time allocated to modern
languages. Up to 1916, examinations at Queens consisted of school Certificates and the girls did not participate in public examinations. This was consistent with the aim of following different educational principles to boy’s preparatory schools. The Principal defended the policy on the grounds that examinations would distort the syllabus and ‘neglect real scholarship’ (Kaye, 1972). As a result of this, Ripman had freedom to devise his own syllabus and apply the principles he had drawn from Reform teaching and prove that his method could be effective. However, as this gave him little responsibility for devising or organising language assessments beyond class tests, his lack of experience in that area was to be a weakness in the early days of the Holiday Course. In 1910, Katherine Mansfield responded to her Queens’ education in a series of works in one of which, A Fairy Story (Mansfield, 2013) it is widely believed that the character of the Wanderer is a caricature of Walter Ripman. The story takes place in a traditional fairy tale context. In this way, Mansfield could satirise Ripman’s affection for the tales of Grimm, Hans Christian Anderson and whimsical stories in general. The Boy and Girl in her tale are both foundlings and have been brought up in a house in the forest by a Woodcutter and his Wife. The Wanderer is a scholar, who carries around a large sack of books, visits the family from time to time and interests the Girl in literature and urges her to find herself and be independent. Mansfield records what seems to have been her entire reading list at Queens which the Girl dutifully absorbs and becomes very advanced. The Boy reads nothing until he discovers the Girl has left to become a Princess. The story ends in tragedy: The Boy dies under a pile of books which he is trying to study in order to be worthy of the Girl, and the Girl, who returns too late to save him, dies of a broken heart. The episode of the boy dying under the books may have been introduced because Mansfield had read Howards End, published in 1910, where self-educated Leon Baste dies under a bookcase. Mansfield had a witty and wicked sense of humour and may have found this funny. This story seems to confirm that, with the benefit of hindsight, Mansfield found Ripman’s literary recommendations, as caricatured by the Wanderer, rather intense but ultimately ridiculous and not practical for her new life and that she could not be described as uncritically influenced by him.

In 1905, a year before the Beauchamp sisters returned to New Zealand, Ripman married Constance Brockwill Grier, a Canadian, who had been a student at Queens but was at that time working on the school magazine. Constance was 21 years old and the daughter of a prominent family in Montreal. In 1906, their first child, Hermione, was born and the family moved a little further up Ladbroke Grove to number 45, a larger house with substantial accommodation for three more children,
Hugh, who was born in 1910, Daphne and later Pamela Penelope, born in 1917. All the feedback from past students at Queens before the war indicated that Professors Cramb and Ripman were the most inspiring members of staff at Queens from the 1890s to 1913. Cramb because of the breadth and vitality of his lectures and Ripman as he was ‘the best teacher’. (Kaye, 1972, p. 124) However, it may have unsettled Ripman to hear Cramb, the brilliant but controversial Professor of History, declaim in his lectures in 1899 that Germany was the arch enemy of England, a theme he developed in more detail in 1913 in a lecture in which he prophesied the tragic possibilities that could develop between the two countries (Kaye, 1972, p. 126). It is also quite possible, however, that given their shared experience as Queens’ teachers and Ripman’s easy-going social charm that the Professor of History and the Professor of German were on perfectly good terms. Katherine Mansfield was impressed,

‘And Cramb, wonderful Cramb. The figure of Cramb was enough, he was ‘history’ to me. Ageless and fiery, eating himself up again and again, very fierce at what he had seen, but going a bit blind because he had looked so long’ (Kaye, 1972, p. 136)

In 1900, Walter Ripman was appointed Chief Inspector of Schools for the University of London Extension Board overseen by BPEUT. The school inspectorate was part of BPEUT’s remit and the purpose was to monitor class teaching and overall school organisation and to comment on the examination results of students in London schools in order to be able to recommend whether students from the schools inspected had reached an appropriate level for admission to UoL External degree courses. This was the beginning of Walter Ripman’s long association with BPEUT which added a further destination on his city landscape and his daily itinerary: the central offices were in the Imperial Institute, Kensington which although some distance from Ladbroke Grove would at least involve a walk through pretty Kensington Gardens.

3.2 Education philosophy

In 1897 Ripman was at the centre of reflections on modern language teaching (McLelland, 2012). He co-founded the journal Modern Language Quarterly with Karl Breul (1860–1932) and was editor of Modern Language Teaching which succeeded it in 1905, and became the official journal for the Modern Language Association.
Ripman always had time for his colleagues: Otto Siepmann (1861–1947) who taught German at a public school in Bristol formally thanked Ripman for his assistance with his German primer,

‘...[he] has read through all the proofs with great care and vigilance’

In April 1904, in the midst of a busy year, Ripman took the opportunity to defend Reform methodology against its critics, Cloudesley Brereton and Otto Siepmann, in an article entitled ‘Is it a Reform?’ for Modern Language Quarterly (Ripman, 1904). Here, he pointed out that following Vietor, there were many general principles advocated by Reform that were common to all good teaching:

‘I do not like the term new method and have avoided it as far as possible. The method is not new; nor is it, in its main features, applicable only to modern languages. Certain general principles underlie all sound teaching, and the application of these to modern languages is the great merit of the reform’
(Ripmann, 1904a, p. 58)

Among these features, he suggested, were that the learner should be interested in the material and that s/he should be encouraged to use their reasoning power in the search for and creation of meaning (Ripmann, 1904a, p. 58)

Ripman criticised the personality teacher who stimulates interest by performance in the class. He cited all-class teaching as a more efficient means of knowledge transfer than a focus on individual high-achieving students and criticised a teacher-centred approach that left the learners with little room to engage in the material. On the subject of phonetic transcription, Ripman congratulated Siepmann on changing his opinion and advocating transcription., Ripman made it clear that a rigidly Direct Method approach in class which absolutely excluded the mother-tongue in providing a translation for unknown words was a mistake simply by nature of its rigidity. In practice, he remarked, the occasions when such a translation had to be supplied were few, in his experience, and there was no need to make oneself a slave of method. He urged teachers of whatever ability, to try and improve their own proficiency in the target language. He also cautioned that an emphasis on translation work in the early stages of language learning simply got in the way of encouraging learners to use the foreign language that they had acquired.

In vocabulary learning, he stressed the importance of training learners to infer words from context and to make use of techniques of word association. Many of these pronouncements had already appeared in 1888 in Ripman’s *Hints on Teaching*
French which ran to eleven editions and has recently been reissued. In this article Ripman denied that he was an extremist advocate of Reform teaching and he confirmed that he not a purist with an inflexible approach to using Reform methodology.

In December 1904, in a further article for Modern Language Quarterly, Common Faults in Method, with Some Suggestions, Ripman returned to the subject of language class teaching and his view on language teaching which, he said, were the result of his experience following inspections of 37 London schools, 361 classes, 206 teachers and 8,200 pupils which he had conducted with his colleague Dr Edwards on behalf of BPEUT. Here he displayed his enthusiasm and understanding of how best to teach languages within the constraints of the school setting. Ripman insisted that teachers have a plan of work which included not just a single class but the sequence of classes and the appropriate time to be allocated to each language item and activity together with relevant illustrations and comparisons of the material. He advised that there should be a little repetition of words and phrases but without monotony, and strictly no mumbling from the class in their response to questions. Significantly, he emphasised that only ‘a few minutes’ phonetic drill’ was all that was required to correct problem sounds among the students. This was not the advice of an extremist. And be careful, he added, not to leave work on the board which has been previously discussed as this may confuse the class. Ripman explained that the model for pronunciation for the foreign learner outside the countries where the language is spoken, is the teacher and that students are likely to adopt an approximation of the sounds that they hear, if they are not corrected. Teachers, he argued, needed some knowledge of phonetics in order to be efficient. Once again, this is a balanced and not a fanatical approach to the use of phonetic instruction. His comments reveal that in his ideal teaching situation, the phonetic training of teachers and students should be no more than the situation demanded (Ripman, 1904b).

A brief survey of the advice currently offered to English language teachers on the British Council’s Teach English web pages identifies very similar recommendations e.g. the value and purpose of lesson preparation, how to present a new language item, and how to conduct grammar drills and consolidate pronunciation. This confirms what Kelly (1976) stated in that there are enduring themes in language teaching and that we are not the originators of many practices. What the teacher should be aiming at, according to Ripman, was a form of learner-centred learning where the teacher, rather than doing all the mental work for the students, allows them to think and act for themselves. Ripman refers to new
thinking on second language acquisition which takes the linguistic development of a child as its model. This would begin with introductory practice of the spoken language and a common but limited vocabulary, followed by an introduction to writing. Pictures and drama, he proposes, can be used in class to good effect as can storytelling where the students retell a short story that they have heard in their own words (Ripman, 2004b). Interestingly, research conducted by Elley (1989) and developed by Nation (2000) indicates that vocabulary learning is increased if, while storytelling, the teacher draws the learner’s attention to the vocabulary while reading but taking care not to interrupt the story. Research indicates that vocabulary which is glossed in the text, which is a method used in Ripman’s publications, has also been found to increase learning. (Elley, 1989). On the subject of teaching style, while he commented that faults in character were not exclusive to teachers of languages, Ripman is unequivocal,

‘For sarcasm there is absolutely no excuse, it is sheer bullying’ (Ripmann, 1904b, p. 184)

Teachers who are languid, or fussy, or whose nerves are always on edge, or who lose their tempers, he suggests, have no business to be teaching. Teachers’ tics are summarily dealt with as well and Ripman complains about the excessive repetition of a pet phrase which is sometimes a habit with teachers. His example phrases are taken from German language teaching as in ‘nicht wahr’ and in French language ‘puis’ and perhaps this has its contemporary expression in English in ‘OK’ or ‘right’. He discourages teachers from remaining seated during a lesson and selecting students in turn, in the teacher-centred style of public schools. The question and answer class technique, he comments, should be used sparingly with appropriate texts and questions prepared that will actually elicit responses and explanations from the teacher that do not involve long digressions. Commenting on the type of texts used for reading in class, Ripman asks why unsatisfactory teaching texts are still used on the grounds of economy, long after their bad features have been recognised. He enquired why class texts were selected which were too difficult for the students and which introduced too many new words at once. Inexperienced teachers, he pointed out, have to rely on texts very heavily and need support (Ripman, 2014b). In a further observation on the use of class texts he stated that:

‘A class loses interest as well as respect for a teacher when it is necessary for [him/her] to apologise for the silliness of the sentences in the book that they are using.’ (Rippmann, 2014b, p. 183).
On the subject of inexperienced teachers, Ripman complained that too often they misjudged the level of the class and found themselves pitching the lesson at an unrealistically high level. In his opinion, a sympathetic, trained teacher with a sound but perhaps limited knowledge of the language was more effective than an untrained specialist (Ripman, 1904, p. 183).

On the subject of workload, Ripman’s description of the teaching conditions in London schools in 1904 is negative. Some of the schools were poorly built, with few staff and classes of forty or forty-five pupils. He complains that some schools regarded teachers as unskilled labour and that the work in preparing a class was not considered or even understood. Irritability and dullness on the part of a teacher, he suggests, could be symptoms of overwork.

‘…teaching generally and oral work in particular, does involve a strain on the teacher, and that anything like 30 hours’ …teaching in a week will be disastrous to the teacher if he[sic] be conscientious; or if he [sic] be prudent, to the teaching’ (Rippmann, 1904b, p. 42).

Ripman could be competitive, if he felt that he had genuinely been the first person to publish a technique or that someone else had. Innovation, as today, was a competitive advantage in a career and especially in publishing. His preface to his *A First English Book for Boys and Girls whose Mother-Tongue is not English* includes the following remark regarding Otto Jespersen (1860–1943) the Danish grammarian:

‘The teacher will recognise much that is familiar; indeed, the best introduction to the method here put into practice is Jespersen’s ‘*How to Teach a Foreign Language*’. My book had long been in print when his appeared, and it gave me no small gratification to find that I had independently reached the same conclusion as the great Danish teacher.’ (Rippmann, 1904c)

More crushing was his reaction to an article by Harold Palmer (1877–1949), which appeared in *Modern Language Teaching* in 1916. At that time, Palmer was employed by Daniel Jones in the phonetics department at UC and had recently completed his first series of lectures in 1915. The article contained three of his approaches to language teaching and learning, the third section recommending the use of substitution drills, which he had worked on with Daniel Jones’ wife, the French teacher, Cyrille Mott. In a substitution drill, the teacher models a word or sentence which the learners repeat. The teacher then changes a key word or prompt and the learners repeat the new structure. Palmer’s drills, which prescribed how
many times the sentences should be repeated were unlikely to find favour with Ripman due to the rigidity of the technique. Ripman and F.B. Kirkman, who taught modern foreign languages at Merchant Taylors boy’s secondary school before becoming an examiner for Oxford, Cambridge and London, subsequently challenged Palmer’s work with the weight of their class teaching experience. Typically outspoken, Ripman found the approach deadly dull, inappropriate for school teaching and, more seriously, pointed out that Palmer had failed to adequately acknowledge the ideas of Thomas Prendergast (1806–1886) who had produced a system of language learning which made use of conversational phrases in a similar way. It is likely that Palmer had wanted to appear innovative in his publication and that he was stung by the attack from influential teachers and writers such as Ripman and Kirkwood. However, the remarks appeared to remind him to familiarise himself with previous developments in language teaching in his work. (Smith, 1999)

Ripman could also become frustrated by the slow dissemination of ideas. In December 1904, at the same time as recommending Jespersen’s text he remarked that,

‘…he seems quite unaware of what has been done in England during the last five or six years.’ (Rippmann, 2004c, pp. 57–61)

His frustration indicated that he felt that his writing contemporaries were still under the impression that language teaching in Britain was unreformed and reliant on Classical models, the old enemies of the Reform group. Ripman’s remarks in Modern Language Quarterly make it clear that he felt that there was much to be achieved by skilful class teaching that is relevant to all disciplines as much as to language teaching. He remarked,

‘…you should learn to teach, before you set about teaching modern languages’ (Rippmann, 2004b, p. 184)

His class teaching approach, which followed Reform principles to a large extent in the primacy of the spoken language, the absence of any translation exercises, inductive grammar teaching and a preference for working at sentence level in connected texts, is a method familiar to English language teachers working today and evidence of the influence of these methods in oral work. It is evident that Ripman both trusted teachers to be sensitive to individual and class needs and manage their classes accordingly, and thoroughly distrusted some of the teachers he had encountered in his school inspections. His language is passionate: a pure
waste of time (referring to students being required to sight read); One cannot urge too strongly (referring to the importance of whole class work); and It must be insisted upon, again and again (referring to the need to have a well-qualified teacher at beginner level). There is a drive and assurance about his style and although he expresses his views with feeling there is no indication of dogmatism and he is anxious to dispel any idea of this. It is reassuring, although a little dispiriting in some ways, to encounter Ripman’s evidence of the problems of early 20th century London school teachers: problems of inexperience, difficulties with class control, inadequate grasp of the target language, confusion over methodology, the challenge presented by unmotivated pupils, all problems which can be found in many teaching and learning situations today. However, it is inspiring, in reading his report, to see that teacher educators were working towards solutions which were not confined to their particular time and place but were subsequently adopted by future generations of teachers.

By 1910, Ripman’s *Holiday Course* experience had convinced him of the value of international education which resonated with his belief in the great human family which he mentioned in the Preface to his *First English Book* (Ripman, 2004). As a result, he set up classes for a group of international schoolgirls who he had organised to come and study at Queen’s for a year. His role was to provide introductory classes in phonetics and in this way, he did not disturb the teachers of English at the school, an example of his sensitivity to the teaching culture. The students were predominantly from Norway with others from France, Germany, Russia, Finland and Spain (Kaye, 1972). The course was successful and was repeated each year until 1913. Ripman’s work with the *Holiday Course* had broadened his overseas contacts and given him self confidence in his ability to organise the Queen’s course on his own. In 1912, he resigned from Queen’s. Although no reason is given in the literature, he may have wanted to devote his energies to his other pursuits that were growing in importance.

### 3.3 Wartime

Up until 1914, Ripman had been living the typical, super-busy, stimulating but peripatetic life of a language teacher, bringing up a young family, managing his income by taking on several teaching and editorial positions, authoring textbooks and vigorously championing what he perceived were the necessary reforms that needed to take place in public policy towards language teaching and education in school. All this was to change. The outbreak of war in 1914 shattered lives and
careers across Europe. One of the casualties was the teaching of German language which was discontinued in some schools in 1917, whereas the language of the allies, French, increased in importance as part of the cultural construction of wartime relationships (Winter and Robert, 2007). There had been warning of the changing mood in 1913 when the Modern Languages Association (MLA) reported that out of 23 modern language professors in British universities, only eight were British (McLelland, 2012). In the debate that followed in 1918 on the issue of whether only persons of British nationality should teach languages with concern over character formation, there was an uglier tone. Ripman responded by warning that this initiative would be likely to cause resentment. The resentment however, came from those with anti-German sentiment. At Bedford College, John Robertson, who had taken over as Head of German, struggled to continue and to expand the German classes, which had always been quite fragile against what was described as a

‘…pathological hatred engendered by the war’ (Howe, 2001, p. 188).

The war polarised attitudes to language and supporters of the Entente languages dealt German language and scholarship a heavy blow from which it did not recover. The shift in preference for English among international scientific researchers began at this time with efforts made to exclude German language and scientists from international academic forums (Gordin, 2015). Language teachers, in comparison to mathematics or geography teachers are also particularly vulnerable to political change: a modern example being the fortunes of the teachers of Russian in the immediate post-Soviet world where demand for the language fell sharply. Ripman was to experience the results of this prejudice as German would take second place to French on school syllabuses.

The extent of hostility towards Germans in the UK during 1914–1918 was widespread. Non-naturalised citizens of enemy countries were interned; there were demands for even naturalised citizens to be interned; parliament was regularly required to provide statistics on enemy aliens in the country (Winter and Robert, 2007). Refugees were mistaken for aliens and after the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, people and businesses with German sounding names were suspected and some attacked. The streets of Ripman’s landscape were radically transformed and darkened by restrictions on lighting, heating, and fuel (Winter and Robert, 2007).

There were some mercies. Conscription for married men was introduced in 1916 with an age limit of 40 which just excluded Walter Ripman. His father, Hugo Rippmann, was a naturalised British subject and thus the Rippmann family were not at risk of internment or deportation as the children of an alien. However,
London became an unfriendly place for teachers and pupils who could be stigmatised as enemy aliens and British born teachers who had foreign sounding names were anxious to change them to something more Anglicized (Winter and Robert, 2007). In 1916, enemy aliens resident in Britain were forbidden to change their names. In 1919, the ban was extended to all foreigners in Britain and was only removed in 1971. As British–born men, the Rippmanns were able to make the change. By this time, Ripman was well known as an author and in his professional life so the change of name, apart from simplifying the spelling, would have little professional effect and would probably cause confusion. However, it would emphasise his British birth and to a certain extent, protect him and his family from misunderstandings or accusations. 

On 29th May 1917, Walter and his twin brothers, Christian Hugo and Helmut Armstrong, who were serving officers in the Army Medical Corps and the Royal Garrison Artillery respectively, all changed their names by deed poll to Ripman. Walter described himself as a Staff Officer Schools Inspection, a more militaristic title than the one he usually used as Professor of Modern Languages (The London Gazette, 1917). One year later, Christian Hugo was killed in France. Between 1914 and 1918, a number of sources of income for the Ripman family began to disappear. The University of London reacted to the outbreak of war by closing the Holiday Course from 1915 for the duration of the war, given the impossibility of travel to and from the militarised areas. Buildings were requisitioned for war purposes or damaged by air raids and there was a shortage of materials and ink which curtailed printing. BPEUT courses shrank from 135 in 1914–15 to 80 in 1917–18 (EM1/3/4). In 1916, Wren College closed down as the owner of the College was himself, conscripted into the war. The College never re-opened. The production of texts at Dent’s slowed due to paper shortages and financial constraints caused by wartime inflation (Dent, 1938). In 1913, the Haldane Commission, under R.B. Haldane, produced a report on their investigation into the University and BPEUT. They advised that the BPEUT school inspectorate of curriculum, organisation and teaching quality should be discontinued as it was ‘the work of a highly expert kind’. Burrows reports that Ripman’s reaction to this high-handed remark is unknown (Burrows, 1976). Fortunately, however, the Commission’s recommendations were shelved for the duration of the war and Ripman and his fellow inspectors continued their work for BPEUT. In 1918, the inspectorate visited 158 schools and monitored 2,844 candidates for the School Certificate. By 1924, the figure had risen to 11, 134 candidates (Burrows, 1976). The volume of work in dealing with inspection appointments, results and other matters related to examinations was immense.
although the department had a reputation for efficiency and concern for candidates (Burrows 1976). International education is vulnerable to political and economic changes in both the host country and the countries where the students originate. Between 1904 and 1914, Germany contributed 1,659 students which made up 23% of the Holiday Course intake (Appendix 3 Holiday Course Enrolment 1904–1935) but post-war the numbers of German students did not recover until well into the 1920’s. The University culture of providing only minimal comment on external events gave the misleading impression in the BPEUT minutes for 1919, when the Holiday Courses resumed, that almost nothing had happened in the preceding five years, the only notable feature being that there were no German speaking students on the 1919 Holiday Course (EM1/4/19). In reality, the war had seriously undermined University finances and the wider economy remained stubbornly depressed (Fordham, 2007). Ripman’s post-war landscape was far narrower than before. However, he retained his position as Modern Language Editor at Dents and continued his work with BPEUT at the Imperial Institute in Kensington, from where he continued to organise the Holiday Course and work with the school inspectorate.

3.4 Writing

Ripman produced well over 55 texts in four languages during his lifetime. His output in English language is presented here with the first date of publication to indicate the major periods of his creative activity and the number of editions which were produced, where known, to indicate the popularity of the text: A First English Book for Boys and Girls whose Mother Tongue is not English (1904), 33 editions; The Sounds of Spoken English a manual of ear training for English students (1905), 43 editions; English Sounds: a book for English Boys and Girls (1911), 20 editions; A Second English Book for Boys and Girls whose Mother Tongue is not English (1913); Good Speech: An introduction to English phonetics (1922), 19 editions; A Pocket Dictionary of English Rhymes (1932), 8 editions; An English Course for Adult Foreigners (1935); In Dent’s description of Ripman’s instructional language texts, on the inside cover of the books, it is stated that:

‘…they are based on the principles advocated by the pioneers of ‘the reform movement’ in Germany (Vietor, Franke, Walter etc.) (Rippmann 1913).’

Only one of the texts, Sounds of Spoken English, was used with the Holiday Course students. However, there follows a brief analysis of the children’s text using
McLelland’s framework (McLelland, 2015) which includes the author as practitioner and theoretician, links with other authors; the contemporary historical context; the geographical and specific context where the teaching and learning may have taken place i.e. public or private circumstances; the intellectual context and the role of literature in the text. Finally, I review the book as a material object which includes the aesthetic purpose of illustrations, binding and presentation.

In the Preface to *A First English Book for Boys and Girls whose mother tongue is not English*, Ripman set out his principles that classwork involved compromise between the better pupils and the weaker; that no scheme of language teaching could be approved that ‘...did not obey the laws that govern all good teaching; and that the principle should be ‘to connect knowledge with what the learner knows’.

In the text, there is evidence of Ripman’s style of placing himself in the class with the teacher and supplying footnotes, helpful synonyms and possible lines of linguistic enquiry. The text also demonstrates that there is very little room at beginner’s level for innovation however the writer chooses to present the basic structures and vocabulary and the selection of grammar and topics is can be fund in modern texts. Ripman deals with basic grammar quite briskly: Lessons 1–26 contain short texts and grammar and vocabulary development: grammar is presented as follows: Lesson 1) to be, questions forms, who, what Lesson 2) to have + negatives Lesson 3) pronouns and question forms Lesson 4) present tense /present continuous Lesson 5) there is /there are; indicative, personal pronouns Lesson 12) comparatives Lesson 18) simple past/present perfect Lesson 19) future with shall/will Lesson 23) superlatives Lesson 26) active and passive voice, 36) used to…

Vocabulary is presented through short reading texts and at sentence level, in line with Reform principles, as follows: Lesson 3) the family; food; play; Lesson 7) numbers; Lesson 8) the house, the street; Lesson 9) family relationships; Lesson 11) seasons and time; Lesson 17) the face, the body; Lessons 26–44) holidays and travel. There is no literary content to the short reading passages which Ripman authored presumably with a view to simplicity.

Each reading paragraph is numbered and there are comments in the footnotes, such as ‘spoilt is the past participle of spoiled’ or ‘happened – the e is silent’ which are referenced to the readings and perhaps intended for the teacher to draw to the attention of the pupil or class. There are also a number of lessons which require maths and calculation to find the answers to puzzles and problems in an early version of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). Pupils are invited to draw some of the objects that that are discussed in the texts and to collect British
and American stamps and stick them in the book, in a version of Alge’s object lessons. They are also encouraged to answer questions about their class environment and their own experience and preferences and to make their own simple sentences. In line with Reform principles, Ripman’s work contained no grammar translation. As a teacher committed to the education of girls and women, the inclusive title of the First Book is in character and quite clear in its intended readership. It was suitable for use by private and school teachers and with its extensive notes had a degree of support for the teacher. The age level, as previously discussed, would depend on the reading age of the children.

Although Ripman uses phonemic symbols to represent some problem sounds in *A First English Book*, he also examples the pronunciation of words for the teacher and pupil by giving homophones e.g. book/look, in an acknowledgement that teachers who were untrained in phonetics might be using the text. There is evidence that Ripman certainly preferred teachers and adult students to familiarise themselves with the IPA phonetic system before his courses and that he made this explicit in the registration documents for the *Holiday Course*, in which they were recommended to do so.

The intended readership of *First English Book* is likely to have been teachers and children overseas. Dent’s marketed their products in Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, France, South Africa, and the United States and had established subsidiaries in some of these countries. Victorian children’s literature was intended both to instruct and to delight (Grenby, 2014) and Ripman followed this tradition in his stories in which children learn from their own mistakes and reflect on morals and self-improvement. The appeal is to middle class values of hard work and thrift. These stories are interspersed with entertaining accounts of humorous and historical events, both British and worldwide, well known fables and tales and courageous exploits. It is clear that Ripman’s target teacher of a *First English Book for Boys and Girls whose mother tongue is not English*, while possibly only lightly trained, still retained control over how he or she was going to organise the class in order to address the material in each lesson. Using the readings, the teacher could work with the language holistically exploring vocabulary, grammar, culture, art or computation through a single text, digressing and following up cues which could be found in the footnotes or the exercises.

In an evaluation of what we can learn from the structure of Ripman’s early 20th century text, it is instructive to consider the present. A brief survey of many of the modern English language texts produced by the major educational publishers aimed at CEFR A1/A2 (beginner’s or elementary level) reveals that they are heavily
signposted for teachers and students and a few generalisations can be made over their content. By signposting, I would include the labelling of sections such as *Unit 1: the present simple*, and *Language focus*. The activities which follow reading texts are also labelled with the appropriate skill: reading, writing, listening or speaking to indicate the inclusion of these skills, where the teacher may find them and further information on how they should be exploited. Teacher’s books, where they accompany the student book, or a workbook tell the teacher in some detail how to organise the class, how to run an activity, the length of time to be spent on each activity, and the answers to questions. There are transcripts of the recordings. I would propose that what we have now in our modern English language teaching texts, is a high degree of personal detachment on the part of teachers from a system that has been designed for speed of language acquisition and pre-determined outcomes and which is so heavily guided and supported in terms of class management and auxiliary resources as to be almost able to teach itself with a minimum of decision making required from the teacher who can proceed in auto-pilot mode. This would suggest that, as Ripman complained in 1904, the least experienced teachers are likely to be teaching at the elementary levels. This is certainly a change brought on by historical circumstances i.e. by the development and spread of commercial language teaching resources and by the adaptation of language teaching methodology to a need for speed of language acquisition. Here, the historical evidence from the past may prompt contemporary teachers to question the current practices at elementary level.

In *A Second English Book for Boys and Girls whose mother tongue is not English* (1913) Ripman intended to build on the work completed for the *First Book* and stated as much in his Preface. This is an important remark as it confirms that the publisher’s intention was that teachers would use the English books as a series as their students advanced and not as stand-alone volumes. This suggests that there was a systematic approach to vocabulary development and graded reading in Ripman’s work in order to make the text more appropriate for the older learner who would probably be in their early teens. All the new vocabulary, new that is in that it was not introduced in the *First English Book*, is highlighted, explained and explored. In this text, the stories are taken from real-life adventure and historical events from around the world; Ripman was not an Anglo-centric writer. The vocabulary is grouped according to language domain and the exercises which followed the reading are classified for easy reference as A questions on content, B questions of vocabulary, C questions on each grammar and D opportunities for free composition. In his Preface, Ripman explained that his intention was to provide a
simple but sound basis for grammar and vocabulary which would not be off-putting to the learner.

‘I want them to look upon the study of English as something delightful’ (Rippmann, 1913, p. vi).

As well as providing reading texts for vocabulary development, Ripman believed in the value of reading for pleasure and in both of his children’s texts he included passages for easy reading which, because they contained well known words, would make it easier for the child to appreciate the story without having to puzzle over meaning, in an early precursor of a graded reader. What is interesting in the reading for pleasure section is that no exercises or activities accompany the readings making it an authentic first language activity as no children would expect their story book reading to be followed by homework and exercises. This is a real insight into the mind of a child.

In 1935, Ripman published *An English Course for Adult Foreigners*. In the Preface to this book, Ripman explains that he had been asked to produce a book for adults which was less childish in tone and more appropriate for adult learners than those in his 1904 *First English Book for Boys and Girls whose Mother-tongue is not English*. The target learners in this case would seem to be false beginners or lower intermediate students as Part One follows the typical elementary themes of family, house, home, daily routine and food to introduce basic grammar and vocabulary. This is followed by texts which describe young adults smoking cigarettes and cigars, attending British and American cinema and going to the village inn in a number of suitably adult pursuits. There is a text on sailing to France by ferry and the final text takes the students to London and its important landmarks. Part One deals briskly with the basics of English grammar and vocabulary: Lesson One presents the verbs ‘to be’ and ‘to have’, possessive adjectives, a number of basic prepositions and interrogative pronouns. There are examples of how the Latin case system can be discerned in English with nominative, accusative and genitive structures. Relative pronouns appear in Lesson Eight, together with comparative and superlative adjectives. Lesson nine introduces adverbs, the infinitive, the active and passive voice and the present perfect tense. In Lesson Ten students are introduced to the idea of weak and strong verbs i.e. those verbs that form the past tense by a suffix – *ed* and those that change the vowel e.g. *sit – sat*. Lesson Eleven presents the present and past continuous; Lesson twelve includes a note on opposites in meaning. Each new item of vocabulary is highlighted in bold, as in his previous publications, and each Lesson includes up to twelve footnotes which
direct students and teachers to explanations of the structures and meaning of the vocabulary which are to be found in the reading texts. The Lessons are followed by Exercises which are composed of six to eight questions based on the content of the reading.

In Parts Two, Three and Four, there are fewer closed questions on the lines of ‘Who came to the King?’ and ‘What did he buy?’ and more commentaries which expand on the vocabulary and invite the student to consider alternative answers e.g. ‘…suppose they come back?’ or ‘what if.’ structures. Ripman uses circularity, with which he presents exercises on the same topic but with increasing difficulty. The vocabulary includes single words, grammatical terms, and colloquial phrases such as ‘I have a fair number [of books] myself’, ‘I did so’, and ‘you yourself’ (Ripman, 1935, pp. 10, 11, 16) which depart from strictly beginner level vocabulary and phrasing by introducing reflexive pronouns. As the students gain more vocabulary and confidence, there are opportunities to ‘tell the story in your own words’ inviting free expression. As in the children’s textbooks, it is left up to the judgement of the teacher how much of the work is conducted orally, alone or in groups in the class. The readings, while they are admirably multi-cultural are based on folk tales and historical anecdotes which are predictable rather than stimulating reading. The literary value of the texts may have been low as most were derived from well-known tales, fables and stories although the English texts reveal a wry humour, but the creativity and linguistic skill required to exploit them is high. Ripman himself complained in his Preface that he had not found the work easy (Ripman, 1935). The reason for the lack of literary texts may be found in publishing policy. Due to costs, and particularly in the economic downturn of the 1930s, Dent’s was only able to publish literature for which the copyright had expired. This would have restricted Ripman’s choice to the English classics published 100 years earlier at around 1835. He may have had reservations about using these texts based on anachronistic language, style and their poor potential for exploitation for elementary 20th century language instruction.

What is notable is the intense and structured method of vocabulary acquisition. In *A First English Book* the total vocabulary count for the text is 1,491 items. In *An English Course for Adult Foreigners* there are 1,551 items of vocabulary explained, phonetically transcribed and cross referenced to the text in the Word List. In a study of contemporary graded readers from three major publishers, Oxford Bookworms, Cambridge Readers and McMillan Guided Readers, Claridge (2012) identifies some significant differences between the number of vocabulary items required for the CEFR A2 and B1 levels which are part of Council of Europe levels. MacMillan
Guided Readers cites between 300–600 words at A1 level and between 1100 – 1400 words at A2/B1. Cambridge Readers include 250–400 words at A1 Level and 800 at A2. Oxford Graded readers also contain 250–400 words at A1, and 700 words at A2/B1 level, substantially fewer than the other readers (Claridge, 2012). In comparison, Ripman’s texts are vocabulary rich for his stated learner level and appear to form more of a bridge between the elementary and intermediate language stage. After the learner has revised basic grammar, Ripman encourages him or her to work on building as much vocabulary as possible and introduces more complex structures such as active and passive voice, perhaps in recognition that adult learners may well have some basic competence before starting the text, and are often anxious to gain a command of the language as soon as possible. Ripman’s emphasis on the value of reading and vocabulary development at the elementary stage is an interesting comparison to Claridge’s findings that fewer graded reading texts are currently produced at the elementary level, the majority publications being at intermediate and above. In addition, her study found that the needs of elementary learners are not regularly researched (Claridge, 2012). Ripman’s teaching philosophy referred to earlier in this section, was adamant that the elementary stage should not be rushed.

However, there are weaknesses in An English Course for Adult Foreigners. The vocabulary is not grouped into language domains, as in the Second English Book for Boys and Girls whose mother-tongue is not English. In her analysis, Rosenberg comments that there is no attempt to introduce contractions in the dialogues which would indicate an awareness of the need to introduce colloquial English and some of the questions are stilted. (Rosenberg, 2007). What is also lacking is the social realism and attachment which was created in the children’s texts in the form of narratives concerning the Robinson family. There is no family in the adult course and therefore the narratives are less engaging or useful for anyone with practical intentions in learning the language as, after Part One, typical domestic scenes and activities are replaced by folk tales.

The framework for my analysis requires that Ripman’s work is compared with another writer and a useful comparison can be made with C.E. Eckersley. In 1935, Eckersley produced A Modern English Course book for Foreign Students. From its title, this text appears to have a similar target readership as Ripman’s An English Course for Adult Foreigners and both texts were published in the same year. As Rosenberg observed, Eckersley used his experience as a teacher of English in the Regent Street Polytechnic as inspiration for his texts for foreign students. The book begins with a table in which there is phonetic transcription of voiced and unvoiced
consonants, vowels and diphthongs. These are followed by several words which exemplify the sounds. Short exercises are included which ask students to transcribe words into phonetic script. The text contains twenty-six lessons which would cover the academic year. The lessons take the form of a presentation of a grammar point, followed by a reading in which the point is exemplified, followed by exercises. In some exercises which focus on vocabulary, students are given a word and invited to make a sentence which includes this word, or they are asked to provide antonyms, link adjectives to nouns or to fill gaps with appropriate adverbs. The lessons are followed by four parts. Part One: The Elements of the Language: Everyday England, includes a basic beginner’s vocabulary with numbers, nationalities, the verbs ‘to be’ and ‘to have’. Part Two; Conversations contains dialogues which take place between friends who are shopping, looking for accommodation, buying a car, buying clothes, visiting the doctor and attending a football match. Part Three contains readings which have been taken from newspaper articles and extracts from essays some of which date back to the previous decade. Part Three: Snapshots of England by Writers of Today contains seven extracts each of which is followed by exercises. Part Four: Chiefly for Amusement contains jokes, crosswords, puzzles, a nursery rhyme and riddles. There is an Examination Paper at the end of the text in which exercises on some of the grammar points are included together with vocabulary tests on words selected at random. From the Preface, it is clear that Eckersley was intending his book to appeal to markets which were quite distinct, 

'The student who knows no English at all can make a beginning with this book but those students who have already a slight knowledge of English can telescope the first ten lessons into two or three and will then find, I think, material that is new to them' (Eckersley, 1935, Preface)

This claim as to the suitability of the text to the target learners is not credible. Complete beginners who attempted the first three pages would soon be mired in what Ripman referred to as dreary dictionary work and would not be able to proceed. This appeal to multiple levels of ability may reflect a typical publisher’s insistence on aiming at sales to several language learner markets by claiming that the work is appropriate. The Preface goes on to explain that the emphasis of the book is conversational English and for that reason the teaching is in the form of question and answer, a technique that Ripman suggested should be used with care. Eckersley sets out to showcase London in his readings but, he tells his readers, it is a city without the elite and clichéd inclusion of Westminster Abbey and the Tower of London. His would be a real, everyday city indicative of the daily working lives
of its inhabitants. However, the readings do not cross many social class boundaries. Instead, his readers go to an Oxford College, a Law Court and Wimbledon, buy cars and fancy clothing and learn why British boys go to Eton. There is some work which is relevant to business English students, a glossary of business terms and some basic letter writing tasks, which may have been part of Eckersley’s Polytechnic syllabus. The text is closely aligned to the format of English lessons which might be used with schoolchildren where writing tasks consist of a one word prompt, for example ‘shopping’ or a saying, for example ‘Crime does not Pay’. Such prompts not only appeal to and are weighted in favour of, the more imaginative student, whether a first or other language speaker, but they may not be recognisable as free writing prompts at all by students from other cultures where an entirely unguided response may not be common. Quite what the students are intended to write in response may have been puzzling. The vocabulary development through the text is random. Sometimes the learners are asked the meaning of words which are not in the reading texts and the vocabulary is not grouped according to function. The strongest appeal of *A Modern English Course book for Foreign Students* is in the careful and detailed presentation of grammar which is more comprehensive than Ripman’s and is illustrated with clear example sentences. Useful colloquialisms are also included, as are contractions and question tags to encourage informal expression.

There are short reading passages throughout the text which are followed by two or three factual questions to elicit understanding of the global meaning. Some key words are selected from the texts for the students to provide definitions but many other words and phrases are left unexplored and there is an emphasis on working on single words rather than presenting vocabulary at sentence level. The text appears to be a compromise between a structured language approach used for schoolchildren which is enhanced by a full grammatical preparation for those for whom English is not the first language, and an approach for foreign learners who would need to be introduced to aspects of British culture with explanations. The advantage that Ripman had over Eckersley is that in preparing his teaching texts, he never had any other audience for his instruction in mind than the foreign learner at a clearly defined level and that he approached vocabulary acquisition in a systematic way. Both writers had difficulty in achieving an adult tone in their work rather than an upper secondary school atmosphere although Eckersley at least had the advantage that his publisher’s copyright agreements allowed him to use texts from newspapers and modern novels. From an aesthetic perspective, Eckersleys
text, with its simple Times style typeface and buff linen binding is unmistakeable as a college text.

In his Preface, Ripman explains that the phonetic transcription was there to provide an example of the English that a well-brought-up boy or girl would use. The problem of just whose pronunciation English language teachers should be encouraging learners to adopt was a controversial matter that is unresolved today. Both Ripman and Daniel Jones favoured a southern English pronunciation. Ripman freely admitted that there was a social class prejudice attached to accents in English which he pointed out in *Good Speech: an introduction to English phonetics*. In his definition of standard speech, he suggested that while there was no inherent beauty in standardised pronunciation, it was necessary to find a median acceptable to all. He pointed out that educated speakers of English were likely to recoil from a pronunciation in which ‘lady’ rhymed with ‘tidy’, the pronunciation of a lower social class. Similarly, a pedantic speaker who enunciated the ‘t’ in ‘often’ was considered anti-social and gave the impression of superiority. The speaker who made hardly any effort to enunciate at all and for whom ‘genoa’ approximated for ‘did you know her?’ was, in his opinion, equally offensive and anti-social. Genuine local variations, Ripman proposed, were not wrong given that the speaker could adapt his speech and writing at will to the ‘golden mean’ that everyone could understand (Ripman, 1922). There is a certain humour discernible in these remarks that indicates that Ripman was probably not on the extreme end of arguments relating to standardisation of pronunciation.

One of the criticisms of the Reform method was that in order to make speaking the centre of language development, a knowledge of phonetics was required and that student and teachers would have to spend time on learning this. McLelland notes that, although Ripman’s German publications provided phonetic transcriptions of some passages at the back of the book it is questionable how useful these transcripts would have been to the ‘average pupil in the hands of the average teacher’ (McLelland, 2012). Putting aside the issue of whether there could ever be an average pupil or an average teacher, the question is pertinent. It is possible that the absence of phonetic tables in some of Ripman’s books may have been an issue of commercial policy. If the tables were produced separately by the publisher, and they were, in the form of wall charts for each of the languages English, French and German then Dents would have expected their customers to buy those products rather than integrating two products into one by reproducing the charts in the books and thus losing sales. A small book-size chart would not be helpful to the class teacher who needed a script large enough to be visible on the blackboard and this
adds weight to the argument that initially most of Ripman’s publications were aimed at teachers and not as self-access books for students. In the 1920s, in the English text *Sounds of Spoken English* 1924, a complete phonetic table and Daniel Jones triangulation of vowel sounds appears in the front of the book. Teachers are invited to purchase the wall charts and small *key sound* cards are offered for sale for the pupils in packs of fifteen. This is a reminder that language teaching is a commercial activity as well as an academic pursuit. The modern expression of this commercial consideration in English language is that student’s books, teacher’s books and answer books, DVDs, CDs and workbooks are all sold separately by the publishing houses. Dents was also distinctive in the philosophy that texts should be produced in a series, and that they should be affordable so that buyers of modest means could add to their collection as their income allowed (Dent, 1928).

It was Constance Ripman who developed the idea of a self-access text for adult students and produced a text composed entirely of dialogues and conversations between members of a family in her *Let’s Talk English*, published by Dents in 1938. The book is an almost undisguised and for this reason touching account of the Ripman family life. The text, which was phonetically transcribed by Walter Ripman, on each facing page is discussed more fully below. At that time, in the late 1930s, it may have been that the Ripman’s made a decision to follow separate paths in the content of their books in order to capture different readers, and that knowing that they were developing situational dialogues in Constance’s work, Ripman decided to omit these and focus instead on phonetics, grammar and vocabulary development in his work. *Sounds of Spoken English* was the text that Walter Ripman used throughout his directorship of the *Holiday Course* to teach his classes on phonetics which were conducted every other day throughout the course. The text is over one hundred and fifty pages long and closely written and thus, presumably, he would have used selections that were particularly useful for the student cohort he was faced with. The contents of the text develop the subject of pronunciation from a description of the speech organs; individual sounds; sounds in connected speech; varieties of English; the speech of children; and the teaching of reading. There are a number of practice passages, taken from adult and children’s literature, which students can use to read aloud and which are illustrative of certain sounds which can be analysed and discussed. These latter were probably exploited in the *Holiday Course* reading classes. Two areas of significance are evident in this text: The first is the active and lengthy discussion of the nature of standard or good pronunciation and all the complications which arise in making judgements on regional varieties, local varieties, and the the implications of social class and education indicating that
the topic was fluid and popular. While unenthusiastic about varieties in spoken English from a teaching perspective, Ripman was inclined to see local variations in speech as dialects, and at the same time as critiquing the variations, to argue that dialects should be prevented from decay. The discussion and the evident contradictions in it, makes it more likely that he supported Received Pronunciation to help clarify confusion in a classroom situation rather than to be imposed as a dominant ideology and that what occurred outside the class was not to be controlled. Here, he may have been taking a German language position and licensing dialect for the home but not the school. The second insight concerns Ripman’s capacity for networking and the collaborative nature of his work. The Preface to Sounds of Spoken English acknowledges the assistance he has received from teachers in schools, Miss Annakin from the Teacher Training College, Miss Partington at Queens College, and professors in the field including his colleague and Extension lecturer, G.E. Fuhrken from Gottenberg. He also consulted linguistic specialists such as D.L. Savory from Belfast and C.H. Grandgent from Harvard. Ripman is both inclusive in his authorial process and generous in his thanks.

In considering Ripman’s texts which have been identified above as material objects, it appears that changes in technology and taste were to play as much of a part in the lifespan of the texts as the popularity of the content. Historically, and in keeping with the wishes of the founder, Dent’s house style required that all books were pocket sized, so that their readers could carry them in a jacket pocket and comfortably open them on the tram or bus or wherever they were (Rose and Anderson, 2000). The bindings should be of the best possible material to indicate the value of what was within. Jacob Dent’s vision of providing good reading material for the average person of modest income meant that the books themselves must be attractive and mark a departure from the early Victorian style texts which were habitually printed in muddy type faces on inferior paper and poorly bound. Dents products were lavishly illustrated using some of the most famous artists of the time who used a variety of techniques including fine line drawing, etching, and cross hatching (Dents, 1938). Ripman’s First English Book for Boys and Girls whose Mother Tongue is not English is a good example of a quality binding. The book is covered with an embossed peacock-blue cover and illustrated on almost every page in the art nouveau style which Ripman so admired himself. The images were produced by the well-known artist, J. Symington, who completed a number of commissions for Dents, illustrating birds, animals, well known fable characters, children, cats and flowers which were interspersed in the text with exercises, readings and longer stories. As a material object and as a possession for a teacher
or pupil the book is highly desirable, as a result. This handbook as a portable object, could be carried home for recreation reading or would not be out of place ornamenting a bookshelf. It is an elite object, limited in its circulation to a few (Thomas, 1996). In contrast, *An English Course for Adult Foreigners* has all the appearance of a college-text. Dent’s were no longer printing in–house by 1935 and the text was produced at the Temple Press in Letchworth just outside London as the business began to introduce new technology. It is part of Dents’ standard Modern Language Series format, handbook sized, with a plain green linen cover and black title. However, the illustrations by Lance Cattermole are lively line drawings which have a simpler style than the ornamentation of the *First English Book* and in the hands of a younger reader might lend themselves to colouring. However, Ripman makes no concessions to social class considerations and is determinedly middle-class in his presentation of family life: The first illustration on page 8 is that of the family housemaid knocking at the bedroom door. This would have been a more difficult image to generalise in post-war households. Interestingly, from a cultural perspective, an illustration of a maid is also part of Eckersley’s text but on this occasion, she is no longer in service but is working as a waitress in a restaurant. From the end of World War Two, both books would be overtaken by developments in educational publishing which took advantage of the innovations in printing technology which allowed colour and photographic images to be reproduced in the text and in inexpensive gloss covers. Increased paper supply, quality and size also allowed larger sized attractive looking books in larger fonts to be produced. To teachers and pupils, the Dents editions must have looked what they were – a fine Victorian design which had found itself in reduced circumstances owing to the privation of quality materials and new technology. Dents were not able to take advantage of new formats to edit and reissue the Modern Language Series and from the 1950s, educational publishing in languages was driven forward by the expansion of the Longman’s and Heinemann publishing houses.

### 3.5 Ripman on Ripman: *Let’s Talk English – Everyday Conversation for the Use of Foreigners*

In this section, the work of Constance Ripman is examined to illustrate how her interest and that of Walter Ripman began to turn towards an audio–lingual approach in using dialogues and gramophone recordings which could provide models of spoken English for foreign students. Walter had already experimented in making recordings of his work *Good Speech* for University College and for the Language
Education Institute in 1929 (Ripman, 1929). A recording of Let’s Talk English was not made until 1946 with the assistance of Caryl Jenner (1917–1973), their daughter Pamela, founder of the Unicorn Theatre.

Constance Ripman was an established writer of illustrated children’s books for the very young during the 1930s: Ginger and Snout; David Dragonfly and Jock and Judy in Secrets Land were popular texts and were published by Franklin Ward and Wheeler Ltd. During the 1930s, the Ripman family began to play a greater role in the Holiday Courses and in 1935, the prospectus indicates that Constance was working as Walter’s private secretary. Two of his daughters, Daphne and Pamela worked with Reading class groups and Daphne acted as private secretary for one session (EM/1/1935). Constance had no previous experience as a language teacher but working closely with her husband she must have had the opportunity to familiarise herself with the teaching and to make contact with the international students and assess their language needs. In Walter Ripman’s Preface to Let’s Talk English, it is explained that the text is an account of the lives of the Brockwill family (Constance’s maiden name); Mr Brockwill, a schools’ inspector and director of a Holiday Course, Mrs Brockwill the mother of the house, and their children, a boy and three girls (the Ripman’s had a boy and three girls) over the course of one day. Clearly, there are strong autobiographical links in the scenario. The idea of describing events in a family over the course of one day in novel form was successfully achieved by Virginia Woolf in 1925 with Mrs Dalloway and Constance demonstrates her own imagination and style in adapting the format to language learning. The thematic topics are divided into Chapters and in the Preface, Ripman advises the foreign readers that the text provides examples of good colloquial English which are intended to counteract the tendency of English language learners to be bookish in expression and pedantic in their pronunciation. He points out that the phonetic transcription which faces every page of text and which has been divided into sentence sense groups, should be read fluently with no pauses between the words. Problems with weak forms, often a feature of foreign pronunciation are covered in Conversation V11. In later editions, the full phonetic alphabet is provided at the start, together with Daniel Jones triangulation of vowel sounds. The emphasis on sentence level work, a Reform principle, suggests that Ripman hoped to deal with some of the problems that he had discerned over the years from listening to students’ reading chiefly that there were difficulties not only in individual sounds but with connected speech.

In Chapter V11 Mrs Brockwill (Mrs. B) is speaking to a Swiss teacher of English, Mr Gosler who is on study leave from his school and would like advice
on his pronunciation. He has called at the house in search of Mr Brockwill. As her husband is out, Mrs B advises him. The teacher has difficulties with word order ‘I think it is a good thing, perhaps?’ He explains that he pauses too often before words, he has no friends in London and as a result has no chance to practice his English. Mrs B advises him to rent a wireless and listen to some of the talks and discussions as she has found these useful in language learning. She also advises him to get some private lessons in conversation and phonetics from a contact before he joins her husband’s course in Kensington. Mr Gosler is enthusiastic about the Kensington course and Mrs B describes the delight of the excursions that are available and that teaching staff often invite students to their homes to sample the English way of life. Mr Gosler is anxious to take the Certificate of Proficiency in English and Mrs B stresses the need for a good knowledge of phonetics. She goes on, diplomatically, to correct Mr Gosler’s stress in the word examination from examination to examination. She sympathises with the hard life of a teacher and advises him to take the number 52 bus back to his boarding house. The 52 passed in front of the real Ripman residence, if any further evidence of autobiography were needed.

It is impossible to be sure how much of this Chapter was written by Walter or by Constance but the content resonates with Walter at his experimental and commercial best as the text begins by presenting an example of language error analysis at the same time as advertising the real-life programme of study on the Holiday Course. The text also confirms his belief, probably held since his days at Wren’s College, of the value of private study in preparation for public examinations.

The other ten Chapters follow the family from breakfast, to lunch and dinner and to the close of the day. In the meantime, Mrs B goes on an extended shopping trip to a department store to buy food and haberdashery, meets a girlfriend for lunch and goes to a fitting session with her dressmaker. Mr and Mrs B end the day speculating on the positive and negative points regarding modern developments in technology, for example, radio and space travel, and the new forms of transport that they have witnessed. At mealtimes, the young adult children joke and chatter about their friends, plans, lives and interests in cinema and travel in a natural and colloquial way e.g ‘we were in fits of laughter’. As the text is themed around daily life, the vocabulary is grouped roughly in language domains but the method here is immersion teaching and there is no effort made to limit the levels of difficulty or the range of lexis. For this reason, given Walter Ripman’s systematic control of vocabulary which is evidenced in his previous texts, it appears that the conversations are a result of Constance’s input and her (their) desire for authenticity. From a social and cultural analysis, the family depicted is middle class. They eat
well; they shop at department stores; take taxis for convenience and they have a housemaid and cook. On the other hand, they are a progressive household in which all the children work or study, including the girls, and are careful in budgeting and keeping track of expenses. In her assessment of the text, Rosenberg does not object to the lexis but discerns that the passages are of increasing complexity which she views as a positive factor (Rosenberg, 2007). This impression might have been caused by the way the family move through the familiar language domains of mealtimes to more specialised lexical areas of shopping and travel. The immersion technique also means that grammatical structures are introduced as required and it is only in the final Chapter in the conversation between Mr and Mrs B that the deliberate introduction of future forms is evident.

If Let’s Talk English is an undisguised visit to the real Ripman home, then there are some insights into Walter Ripman’s lifestyle and character contained in it: Mrs B comments that Mr B has been a hard worker since boyhood; he has a cough, brought on by his heavy smoking, which she is trying to cure; he has a preference for the home-made scones at the Baker Street station café and he is a prolific letter writer who receives a great deal of correspondence. In her conversation with Mr Gosler, she assures him that when he meets her husband at the Holiday Course,

‘You will see a lot of him then. He will teach you and talk with you and help you where he can’ (Ripman, 1935, p. 120).

Whether this comment was written by Constance or Walter, it is a statement of his personal commitment to the purpose of the Holiday Course in improving the proficiency of teachers of English. Let’s Talk English is a fascinating transition text from Ripman’s previous instructional style which focused on the systematic presentation of grammar and thematic vocabulary, to a more active and participatory text which required students to speak the target language in pairs or small groups whether or not they entirely understood all the words and phrases. The students are also introduced to the need to link the words at sentence level to convey meaning and to pay attention to weak forms in order to produce a more colloquial register. The development of audio–lingual material to accompany Let’s Talk English is an indicator that Ripman’s methodology was not stuck in the early 20th century but that he was willing to research the benefit of the recorded voice. In 1932, Ripman attended the first meeting of a commission of enquiry into the use of the gramophone in education. The meeting was chaired by Arthur Clow-Ford, the UoL External Registrar and attended by language professors, including Daniel Jones, representatives from the BBC, the education press and schoolteachers from
elementary and secondary schools together with the education managers of the recording companies HMV and Linguaphone who undertook to advise on the technical aspects of record production (Sight and Sound, 1932). Previous to this, in 1929, Ripman had recorded sessions from his work *Good Speech* with Columbia. The use of recordings was a natural development for phoneticists and for multi-media language teaching publications.

One criticism of the actual recordings of *Let’s Talk English* is that they are delivered at speed and that speed normally creates difficulty for language learners at many levels. Another observation is that the tone and accent of the speakers is entirely in keeping with that of middle-class, 1930s southern English speakers, authentic at the time, but indicative of the constant changes which take place in the pronunciation of the living language which creates the need to update listening materials from time to time.

This case-study set out to provide the historical context and personal circumstances which impacted on the lives of those involved in the Holiday Course and to trace their relationships with each other. This information can deepen our understanding of their role in events and qualify their actions. This section assessed what Walter Ripman brought to the *Holiday Course* in his role as director which came from his lived experience. There is no job description for this position against which to match his capabilities and so the role must be interpreted. From the evidence in Appendix 1 Holiday Course Start-Up Costs, which is a list of the equipment that was needed to accommodate the first course in 1904, a high degree of financial and organisational ability was required together with familiarity with classroom practice. To these tasks, Ripman could bring his financial acumen which he gained as an editor in a commercial environment together with solid classroom experience gained while working as an inspector of schools. The responsibility for hiring Holiday Course staff was entirely his responsibility but qualified in that the Extension Board regulations dictated that lecturers must be approved UoL employees. A job description would also require that the candidate had experience of managing staff and an interest in students. In addition to colleagues, Ripman had wide contacts among London teachers and many names to call on to staff the positions of reading class teachers and conversationalists, even members of his family, as he did in the 1930s. The director’s role would also require stamina and energy as s/he would be expected to attend the *Holiday Course* intensively over the four weeks for which it ran. Significantly, and unlike the practice in many contemporary short-courses at universities where the staffing and arrangements are made within weeks of the start of the course, preparations for the *Holiday Course*
took place around the year. The examination papers and dates for the UoLCPE examination in English were finalised with the External Registrar in April, room bookings were made in early summer and the production of a final report on the course for the Board occupied the Autumn. Planning for the next course would begin during the winter period. Ripman’s energy levels across the academic year, as evidenced by his ability to travel distances around the city to his various engagements, were very high.

The man that emerges from the account of his work at Queens College is a gifted and inspirational teacher. However, Ripman was also member of a generation born in the nineteenth century who were just too old to enlist but whose careers were, nevertheless, severely disrupted by the First World War. By 1920, his primary language specialisation, German, had fallen out of favour in teaching and research circles and the ‘spirit of friendly fellowship’ at Marburg in Germany which had been the inspiration for his view of international understanding had been swept away by nationalism. Between the wars, relationships with continental Europe changed. As far as it is possible to establish his motivation in his work, Ripman’s reaction to these changing circumstances went further than his projects for spelling reform (McLelland, 2012) as he continued his work in international education and the Holiday Course and in publishing, with the new interest of audio-lingual approaches to teaching and learning. In this positive response, he can be compared with other teachers, for example, Arthur Clow Ford, Ripman’s colleague at the BPEUT and an ex-inmate of Ruhleben Prisoner of War Camp in the First World War who was inspired to re-join university life on his release in 1918. He became BPEUT External Registrar and for a short time, the director of the Holiday Course in the immediate years after the Second World War. In the same way, Frank Bell, ex-Prisoner of War from 1942–45 was inspired by what he had observed in his captivity of the value of,

‘... the friendly cooperation that is found in learning and studying as in no other sphere of life: enmity and jealousy cannot flourish when the welfare of common humanity is in view’ (Bell, 1991, p.163).

Bell went on to found the Bell chain of language schools and Bell Educational Trust dedicated to promoting intercultural understanding through language education. This thesis proposes that Ripman was not using the Holiday Course simply as a vehicle to promote his preference for the use of phonetics in language teaching but that he was motivated by the UoL Extension mission to provide opportunities for
English language teachers to improve their competence and to promote intercultural understanding among the staff and participants of the course.
4 A comparison between the BPEUT Holiday Course for Foreign Teachers and the Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners at University College 1923 and 1924

One of the difficulties in analysing and interpreting the Holiday Course is the lack of detailed research and information on similar courses that were being held in London and in other parts of the UK at universities during the period of this study which would provide effective points of comparison. An exception to this is the Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners which was held at University College in Central London from 1907. This course is particularly relevant as the course leader, Daniel Jones, was a friend of Walter Ripman and both had a shared interest in phonetics and the Simplified Spelling Society. Jones was also a member of the Advisory Panel for the Holiday Courses from 1907. Drawing on the archives for both courses, this section will present the different approaches which were taken by the two course leaders to the teaching and learning of English language and teacher training as they are evidenced by the course programmes and suggest reasons as to why this was so. Data has been selected from the period of the mid–1920s to the mid–1930s at a time of post-war recovery when both courses had stable intakes.

4.1 Walter Ripman and Daniel Jones: shared interests

Daniel Jones had a great admiration for Walter Ripman and particularly for his energy. According to his biographers, Jones had strong hypochondriac tendencies all his life and was often affected by the stress of his work (Collins and Mees, 1999). Ripman, on the other hand, was a tower of strength. In 1947, Jones wrote an obituary for Ripman for the journal Le Maitre Phonetique in which he stated that,

‘Ripman had a colossal store of energy. For many years he never worked less than fourteen hours a day, and he took only brief holidays’ (Le Maitre Phonetique, 1947, p. 2–3 cited in McLelland,2012).

Jones admiration was founded on the period during which he and Ripman collaborated closely together on one of the most important initiatives of Daniel Jones life, his English Pronouncing Dictionary, which was first issued in 1913 and
published by Dents in 1917. According to Collins and Mees, he was in no doubt as to whom he owed his gratitude which he stated in the introduction to the text,

‘My chief debt is to Mr Walter Ripman…whose help dates from the time when my work was in contemplation…he revised the whole of the manuscript with great care, and supplied me with much information that I lacked and with innumerable suggestions for improvement’ (Jones, 1917, pp. ix–x cited in Collins and Mees 1998, p. 165).

Jones admitted that the revision of the proofs of the dictionary was laborious and that Ripman, with his own meticulous attention to detail, had even gone so far as to look for words which had been left out. They shared a love of words, of languages and of the importance of phonetics. Both Ripman and Jones favoured a practical and experimental approach to their work. However, while Ripman actively sought collaboration, encouraged feedback on his publications and engaged theorists and teachers whenever he could, Jones was notable for working within his own close circle of university colleagues. He was disinterested in linguistics and linguistic theory, failed to read the works of others as he was mistrustful of their data and theories, and relied on data that he had collected himself, or that his assistants had collected as the only reference point for his ideas. He disliked hashing and rehashing, as he put it of the work of others in academic writing (Collins and Mees, 1999). Ripman enjoyed Jones’ confidence not only as the author of Sounds of English, a serious attempt to explore and systematise phonetic analysis but also as a fellow member of the Simplified Spelling Society which Jones joined in 1910 and in which he remained a member for the rest of his life. His main concern about the movement was that the changes proposed to English spelling should not be inconsistent with the pronunciation of educated English speakers (Collins and Mees, 1999). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine the work of the Society in detail but its purpose led to enthusiasm for simplifying the spelling of the English language in the first half of the 20th century an enthusiasm which became dissipated by the 1940s by etymological arguments over the culture and history of the vocabulary, schools’ policy, and developments in business shorthand systems (Collins and Mees, 1999). Ripman’s life-long enthusiasm for spelling reform which advocated an experimental introduction of the reforms in schools, may have been inspired at Marburg when he was present during discussions of the Duden reforms to the spelling of German which were proposed at that time (Nail, 2000) and by the phonetic advantage of the German language for teachers of German.
Although Daniel Jones had studied in Marburg, it was not on the University Summer course and thus he never experienced the collaborative study and socialising that was part of that course. Instead, on the recommendation of Paul Passy, who he met in Paris in 1904, he went to study with a phonetics teacher, Walter Tilly, who took private students and introduced them to his rigorous system of phonetic drilling. Initially put off by the method, Jones later commented that he grew to admire Tilly’s professionalism and the discipline of the method and determined that rather than follow his parent’s plans for him to study law, this would be the topic to which he would devote his energies (UCL/SC/1). Unlike the gregarious Ripman, whose classroom presence had earned him devoted students, Jones was a nervous lecturer and admitted in 1926 to always writing out his entire presentation, including asides and jokes before he lectured (Collins and Mees, 1999). However, Jones was particularly good at lecturing to a non-specialist audience. J. Carnochan, a student of Jones commented that he [Jones] could make his subject interesting in public lectures to people who had come in out of the rain in Gower Street and who had no knowledge of the subject at all (Collins and Mees, 1999). The differences in the personalities of the two men, to some extent, explains the differences between the two summer courses.

4.2 The purpose and structure of the UC Vacation Courses

The vacation courses at UC were extensions of the work which was being conducted to a greater or lesser extent in the Department of Phonetics. One of the principle reasons for teaching during the summer was the opportunity which it gave to the full-time staff to earn some more money. Jones was highly critical of the salaries which were paid at the time at University College describing them as preposterously small and lower than those of provincial universities. As a professor, although he was earning £400 a year, he was acutely aware that other members of his staff were not so well rewarded (Collins and Mees, 1999). It was the custom for some time at UC for professors to fund their assistant’s salaries and expenses out of their own pay. Jones was meticulous in his accounting and kept a petty cash book for a number of years in which he recorded postage and minor expenses, although whether he was funding these himself or presenting them for reimbursement is not known (UCL/SC/1). Another advantage of the vacation course was that admission of relatively large groups of students or teachers for the classes provided Jones and his team with more data and experimental information which could be used in their research on phonetics. During the 1920s, at least three vacation courses were
offered, which all took place during the first two weeks of August: *The Summer Vacation Course in French Phonetics; A Summer Vacation Course in English Phonetics* and *A Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners*. French was the more popular language in the summer courses. An intensive course in German phonetics was also offered in 1933. The courses differed from the Holiday Courses in that there was no social programme for the students nor were there guest lecturers or weekend activities. From the information given on the application form, the university would attempt to find private board and lodgings for students on request (UCL/SC/1). All the vacation courses at UC were conducted on the Bloomsbury Campus in central London which was, and is, dominated by the Octagon building with its Corinthian columns, wide entrance hall, and cathedral-like dome. Classes were held in the Phonetics Lab, the Physics Theatre and the Anatomic Theatre as well as smaller classrooms and these locations must have lent the classes an appropriately scientific atmosphere (UCL/SC/1). On the final day of the vacation courses, the traditional course photograph was taken with all the students arranged on the entrance steps of the Octagon and with some perched precariously round the edges. Daniel Jones and his entire teaching staff, who do not wear academic dress, are seated in the front row gazing insouciantly into the camera. From the image of the 1923 session, just over two hundred students of mixed ethnicity attended the courses and appeared cheerful and animated in spite of the intense studies in which they had been engaged.

In a report prepared for the British Council, Jones listed the average attendance per year on the *Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners* during the early 1930s as 69 students which compares with the *Holiday Course* intake of at least 250 students. The spread of nationalities in comparison to the *Holiday Course* was also narrower with twenty-one nationalities represented, the majority from Europe. The sections of the report which enquired after reasons why students had been rejected were left blank and clearly all who had applied were accepted. The fact that Jones was reporting to the British Council also suggests that the Council was recruiting students for his courses (UCL/SC/1). This is in contrast to the marketing and admission arrangements of BPEUT which will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

The timetables for each of the language courses followed much the same pattern and were significantly different from that of the *Holiday Course* in the stress that was placed on all aspects of phonetic instruction and practice. The first summer vacation courses were organised for French language in 1916 in which students attended for three hours, every morning, from Monday to Friday. The classes began
with lectures on French phonetics followed by ear-training, which instructed students on how to recognise individual sounds and sounds in contrast. This was followed by practical sessions on pronunciation and intonation and a little written work in the form of a report on the morning’s work. The work was intense and students were given only a five-minute break between the final sessions of the morning. The prospectus for the 1925 French course states that teachers of French nationality could observe the phonetics courses in order to learn from the methods employed (UCL/SC/1). This was a further and most significant difference in Jones’ approach: the students who attended the French Phonetics classes were to be the subjects of study themselves by other teachers. It appears that for Jones, French nationality would correspond to French first language proficiency. In the afternoons, on four occasions, in an updated example of Viëtor’s recording cabinet, students could observe Stephen Jones (no relation), the Superintendent of the Phonetics Laboratory, who gave a practical demonstration of the equipment which could be used in phonetic research. Students were recommended to purchase their set books from the university book supplier which included: Paul Passy’s phonetic reader and Klinghardt and De Fourmestraux’s French Intonation. In the 1925 French Phonetics course the lectures were conducted by Daniel Jones and Lilias Armstrong (1882–1937), who had joined the department in 1918 after turning down the offer of a secure position as a head teacher (Collins and Mees, 1999). Both she and Jones lectured in English rather than French in sensitivity to Jones insistence that only native-speakers must be provided as models of pronunciation. The practical work in French was led by Helene Coustenoible and Sophie Lund who were both members of staff in Jones’ Department of Phonetics (UCL/SC/1). His biographers report that Jones was strongly influenced by the female members of his staff and the department was significant in the UoL context for the equal numbers of male and female lecturers employed (Collins and Mees, 1999).

The Phonetics for English Teachers course which was offered in 1923 followed the same pattern as the French phonetics courses, however, the students had only two hours instruction per week. Students were recommended to read Lilias Armstrong’s own text An English Phonetic Reader during the course. It is important to note that unlike the French course, this course was designed exclusively for first language English teachers and not for foreign teachers in accordance with Jones principles of instruction and concern over pronunciation. The majority of teachers who joined this course came from the London Day Training College for teachers and in an end of course report for the 1925 course Jones explained how the thirty students who had attended the course had responded to the tuition:
‘There was not a single one who failed to gain benefit from the course. They all expressed a keen interest and a desire to discuss the possibility of using phonetics in correcting slovenly or dialectical English pronunciation among students in Training Colleges and eventually in schools. A considerable number showed aptitude for phonetics and many of them wrote interesting and original essays on various subjects connected with phonetics’ (UCL/SC/1).

Here Jones’ pre-occupation with local, regional and national varieties of pronunciation in English is evident. Like Ripman, Jones was uncomfortable with north of England regional accents and there are strong elements of social class evident in his early pronouncements on the matter where he equated acceptable pronunciation with middle class education and upbringing. The Introduction section of his *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, which was part of the Dent’s series, presents the best model for pronunciation of English as Public Schools Pronunciation (PSP) that is the pronunciation of,

‘…families of Southern English persons whose men folk have been educated at the great public boarding schools.’ (Collins and Mees, 1999, pp. 166–167).

Collins and Mees point out that although in his development of received pronunciation, which he initiated, Jones moderated his position over the years, to include the speech of educated people and dropped the Public-School requirement, throughout his life, he held the same view that the best model for foreign speakers was that of the south of England. It was Jones who used the term received pronunciation (RP) in his dictionary for this his preferred pronunciation. Even in his recommendation that teachers should develop tolerance towards differences in pronunciation found among their colleagues and within their own departments, such as American English, this was still tolerance according to his accepted norm (UCL/SC/1).

The Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners was the course which most closely resembled the content of the Holiday Courses. This course was built on the lectures which had first been used in the department by Harold Palmer during the Summer term at UC in 1917. In a bid at firstness, Jones biographers claim that this was the first course which could be called an English as a Foreign Language Course but, as in Rosenberg’s work and ESOL, referred to in section 1.2, retrospective English language labels are unhelpful and the claim to being any kind of first course in teaching English to foreign speakers as late as the 20th century is probably too late (Collins and Mees, 1999). In 1923, the two-week spoken English
The course comprised three hour’s morning tuition per day made up of: eight lectures on phonetics, conducted by Daniel Jones and his colleague A. Lloyd-James (1884–1943). It is likely that Jones dealt with vowels, his special interest, and Lloyd-James with consonants; There were four lectures on the grammar of colloquial English with Hyacinth Holdsworth; daily ear-training exercises with Lilias Armstrong; daily practical classes on intonation and pronunciation with Ida Ward, who later went on to become the Chair of Phonetics at SOAS and an expert on African languages. Students on the English course enjoyed ten minute’s rest between their classes. The content of Holdsworth’s classes is not known but these sessions on colloquial speech are indicative of Jones’ principle of presenting this to learners as in his *Colloquial French* and *Colloquial Sinhalese* readers. Ripman, on the other hand was uneasy with using contractions and informal speech in his dialogues as pointed out by Rosenberg (Rosenberg, 2007) and there was no special provision for a specifically colloquial class on the *Holiday Course*. It is interesting that one student reported after the course that many of his classmates had arrived with no knowledge of phonetics and needed to learn the basics (Collins and Mees, 1999) which was exactly what was discouraged on the *Holiday Course*. What is also of interest here, is the structure of the application form for the course which is designed to elicit more than the students’ interest in the course and level of language proficiency and appears to be aimed at compiling a phonetic profile based on information which concerns family and regional origin. The questions read:

‘Q1 What is your object in studying phonetics?

Q2 Is your pronunciation of English generally considered: good, moderate of indifferent?

Q5 In what country and in what part of it did you live as a child?

Q6 To what extent do you consider that your pronunciation has been influenced by that of the locality in which you spent the greater part of your life? Give details.’

Q7 How far are you desirous of acquiring a really good pronunciation of English: extremely, very, moderately, not particularly, not at all?’ (UCL/SC/1).

Rather more difficult to answer were questions 2 and 7, which required a degree of reflection and self-assessment. Apart from the difficulty of arriving at a judgement using this terminology, there is a logical redundancy in that it is hard to believe that
a student who was not at all interested in developing a good pronunciation in English would apply to a course where that skill was a key part of the tuition.

Class sizes were limited to groups of eight students and students were divided on the basis of their first language, as they were for the Holiday Course. In 1925, sixteen teachers were employed to take the pronunciation groups. Possibly as a result of this, the UC course was significantly more expensive than the Holiday Course. Those students taking the Spoken English course were charged £4.00 for thirty hour’s tuition in comparison to the BPEUT charge of £5.00 for at least sixty hour’s tuition plus guided visits, extra lectures, Saturday classes, evening entertainment and use of the University library.

4.3 Key similarities and differences

In the summer of 1925, the students were gathering for the Holiday Course in leafy Kensington, five kilometres from the arid pavements of Bloomsbury where the UC course was based. There were two hundred and fifty registrations and four hundred applicants had been rejected. Students had been advised in the prospectus that there might be an ‘exceptional number of foreigners’ attracted to London by the Great Empire Exhibition at Wembley in north London (EM3/2/2/1925). They were also advised that the Exhibition would be only twenty minutes away by public transport should they wish to take advantage of it themselves. As usual, the course began after the conversazione with lectures and conversation classes. Seven lectures were delivered by Walter Ripman that summer based on his text Sounds of Spoken English. Students were divided into four groups and studied from 9.20am to 11.00am according to their knowledge of and proficiency in phonetics and phonetic transcription. Following this, they attended reading and conversation classes which were led by twelve women and two men and which included a husband and wife team. In the latter part of the morning, the students attended a lecture from Professor L.U. Wilkinson on contemporary English Writers and in these he included John Galsworthy, Somerset Maugham, Arnold Bennet, Joseph Conrad, John Masefield and Walter de la Mare. On alternate weeks, Gilbert Slater presented his three lectures on the ‘Government of Britain’ which discussed ‘The Fate of Liberalism’, ‘Communists and other Extremists’, ‘The Two-Party System and the Civil Service’ and the Electorate and the Distribution of Political Power’. By contemporary beliefs of the criteria for the selection of listening material for language learners, the titles of these lectures appear to be advanced in their vocabulary. However, both Wilkinson and Slater were BPEUT approved lecturers.
who conducted lecture and tutorial classes across London during the academic year and they were familiar with a general audience which had no previous knowledge of the subject or the terminology, although their home audiences would have had a greater cultural knowledge than the foreign students. Wilkinson, in particular, had a wide repertoire in history, literature and political science. In 1926, he continued his outline of contemporary writers and in 1928 he lectured on British dramatists. There were also native English speakers attending the *Holiday Course* who were not there to observe other students but to take advantage of whatever interested them in the course programme. The afternoons were devoted to excursions. Contemporary accounts of the weather indicate that July and August of 1925 were cloudy and unsettled with strong bursts of sunshine followed by thunderstorms (Meteorological Office). Nevertheless, the groups visited Cambridge, Harrow School, Windsor and Eton as well as the traditional London landmarks which featured on previous courses. Another BPEUT lecturer, Mr Allen S Walker delivered five lectures on the History of London to provide the students with some background to the buildings which they would visit. Mr Firth gave a lantern lecture about the River Thames and in the evenings, Mr Allen Walker gave five lectures which introduced English Architecture. There was tennis at the weekends, dancing in the evenings, opportunities to talk to the director, and student and staff parties (EM3/2/2).

The fundamental differences between the courses are as follows: The UC course was an extension of the content of the UC lecturers’ classes which they conducted during the academic year. The 1920s were a particularly busy period of research in the department and both Lilias Armstrong and Ida Ward were publishing some of the own research material that they subsequently used as set texts with the students (Collins and Mees, 1999). The vacation course provided an opportunity for experimental work in phonetics with a larger than usual cohort. In this way, the vacation course furthered the interests of the Phonetics Department. The course also provided an extra income for the full-time staff and for other teachers. The course was short, intense and open to all students not only teachers.

In contrast, the Holiday Course was a product of Extension movement and primarily targeted at teachers. The spoken English classes contained short periods of phonetic instruction followed by practical reading and pronunciation work but these were balanced by lectures in literature and history, talks from visiting speaker and performances. The context and location of the course in London was very important to the course identity. The students were invited to explore the city in
which the language was spoken and to take advantage of opportunities to engage with the education sector by visiting schools and colleges.

However, it would not be true to say that because the UC vacation course had no social programme that this aspect of the students’ experience was deliberately ignored. What is more likely is that the staff of the Phonetics Department did not see that the social and cultural side of the students’ activities was within their remit and expertise. This raises two questions: were the English language students on both courses basically the same kind of student? Why was there no co-operation between Daniel Jones and Walter Ripman in organising cross-course activities? The answers to both questions can only be speculative given the absence of information in the records but there were strong contrasts between the courses in terms of content and length which would determine the registrations. It is also likely that the UC students had a very specific interest in experimental phonetics and were attracted by a course which was based in a university department. The title of the BPEUT course as a *Holiday Course*, however misleading that was, may have deterred them. In the same way, English language teachers with a predominant interest in improving their proficiency and learning more of British educational practice and culture, would not have been attracted by a phonetics course which developed only one aspect of their language proficiency. In answer to the second question regarding the cooperation between the course leaders it is important to understand Daniel Jones single minded approach to his own research. Although he was a member of the Advisory Committee for the *Holiday Course* and was very well aware of their content and although he and Ripman were on good professional and friendly terms he either did not have enough time or felt that it would be an interference to engage with the content or operation of the course. Jones was not primarily concerned with establishing good community or international relations on his courses, although that may have been a secondary consideration, but on furthering the knowledge of his subject. His report on the 1925 *Summer Vacation Course in English Phonetics* stressed the individual benefit to students that he perceived had been created but there was no reference to group benefits (UCL/SC/1). This was entirely in keeping with the contemporary attitude that university study was an individual pursuit. In terms of power relationships, Ripman may also have had a cultural deference towards Jones the University professor, department leader and author of a seminal work on phonetics.

It can be argued that the UC Spoken English vacation course and the BPEUT *Holiday Course* are indicative of the purpose and drive of their directors: Daniel Jones was dedicated to research into phonetics and convinced of the value of
experimental phonetics. The intensity of the UC course left no time for the students to socialise during the morning and Jones himself was intense and driven in his work, at one point suffering a breakdown through overwork (Collins and Mees, 1999). This same intensity could find no room for cultural or social content on the courses. Jones was an experimental phoneticist and had no reservations in absorbing the vacation students into his work. In spite of his fluency in French language he was extremely self-critical and his nomination of a native French speaker as the best pronunciation model for the students is indicative of an attitude that was both humble and perfectionist. His nomination of southern English speakers as pronunciation models, while it might be seen as snobbish, was a preference that he was entitled to. During the 1920s, he worked with people from all over the world in an effort to record and transcribe their languages. He passionately believed in phonetics as a force for good in the world: For many years between the wars, Jones campaigned for an Institute of Phonetics to be established at UC and cited many economic and political benefits that would ensue. In a memo written to support the study of Burmese he claimed,

‘The better we can do this, the more prosperous the trade. At present, we do not speak Burmese very well because it is taught by hopelessly old-fashioned methods. What is wanted, above all, is that the language of Burma is taught on phonetic lines.... Think of the time and money that could be saved if we could actually speak Asiatic languages really well, and furthermore, if we could understand without difficulty everything that was said to us by the people. We should be able to dispense with that supreme hindrance to trade, the interpreter’ (UCL/SC/1).

In contrast, Walter Ripman, as Jones himself pointed out, rarely took holidays and was more generous with his time. The Holiday Courses were not an extra activity, they were not designed to earn extra money for staff but were part of the Extension programme. There is evidence that Ripman enjoyed the interaction with students and from his positive experience at Marburg, followed by the bleakness of the period of the First World War, that there was a philosophical drive to his work in establishing intercultural communication between teachers and students of languages. 1925 was a successful year for student applications to the Holiday Course and Ripman commented at the time that he could have filled the whole College accommodation (EM/1/4/1927). Jones biographers also report that,
‘Large numbers of registrations for the summer schools were proof of the success of the methods of pronunciation training he was advocating’ (Collins and Mees, 1999, p. 287)

This deduction has to be qualified. The UC Spoken English course was comparatively small but that is a less important factor than the idea that large numbers of registrations indicate that what was taught on the course had been put into practice and as a result was successfully educating speakers in a number of countries or contexts, and that this success had generated more interest in the method and the classes at UC from prospective students. It is not possible to make such a correlation. Whilst it could be true that ex-students encouraged others to attend the course because they enjoyed it, the claim that a method had been successfully applied, particularly if the student were a language teacher, would require much more objective evidence. There are no records of alumni of the UL course. The comment is further evidence of the need, which is sometimes apparent in the history of linguistics and language teaching, to claim the more significant influence of ‘our man’ whether it is Jones, Palmer, Eckersley or even Ripman, claims which are difficult to verify, given the fact that theories and methodologies do not filter down directly into classrooms in all the different locations and circumstances in which teachers work.

4.4 The University of London Certificate of Proficiency in English: the problem of content and preparation

In this section, a selection of examination papers from the University of London Certificate of Proficiency in English are examined with a view to analysing how appropriate the examination was as a test for the Holiday Course students. As explained in section 1.2, the three, main university examining boards established in the late 19th century were Oxford, Cambridge and London. Before examining the London papers, it is important to set the context by taking a brief look at the University of Cambridge examinations and how they developed. In 1913, the first Cambridge CPE was started which according to Hawkey and Milanovic, was probably a break away from the London examination and was heavily academic. The paper included a section on phonetics and Daniel Jones was the examiner for this part of the paper (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013). The examination was originally intended to provide a teaching certificate for teachers of English language and was clearly aimed at foreign teachers.
‘…who desire a satisfactory proof of their knowledge of the language with a view to teaching it in foreign schools. The Certificate is not, however, limited to foreign students’ (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013, p. 15)

The content of the paper included translation, items on grammar and lexis, an essay title from a choice of topics, a literature paper and a phonetics paper which required the candidates to make phonetic transcriptions of prose passages, describe the articulation of various sounds, explain phonetic terms, and suggest ways of teaching some of the sounds. There was also an oral paper which included half an hour of dictation; a passage to read aloud and a conversation with the examiner. The examination took twelve hours to complete and cost £3. Cambridge examinations were held in June and applications were received in April. For this reason, the Cambridge CPE was never in competition with the London examination which took place in late July. What the Cambridge paper reveals is the strong influence of Daniel Jones and in 1923, both his English Pronouncing Dictionary and Outline of English Phonetics were on the examination reading list. Harold Palmer was also influential in the composition of the oral examination and the assessment of pronunciation through his work The Oral Method of Teaching Languages published in 1921 (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013). Three candidates took the test and all failed, principally in the phonetics paper for which they were ill-prepared (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013). For the next ten year’s applications were very low and by 1931 the total number of candidates was only 15 (Roach, 1945, p. 30) However, with the appointment of a new Secretary, Jack Roach, to the Cambridge Syndicate, a decision was taken to drop the phonetics paper in 1932 and to broaden the marketing of the CPE from an exclusively vocational teacher base to include all foreign students. Numbers began to steadily climb reaching 202 candidates in 1935 (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013). The Cambridge experience reflected the growth of interest in an English language certification which could be used by students in other personal and professional contexts who were in additional circumstances to teaching. The removal of the Phonetics paper qualifies the statement by Sweet on the value of phonetics as,

‘… an indispensable foundation of the study of our own and foreign languages’

(Howatt, 2000, p. 354)

What Cambridge were proposing in the move to encourage a wider spread of English language interests was that while the study of phonetics was appropriate for language teaching, it was not an essential part of language learning. The Board
was able to justify the removal of the phonetics paper on the grounds that phonetics was not part of the Local Examinations school syllabus and therefore, given there was no preparation for it, there would be no link between the school examinations and the Proficiency Certificate and that this would be an anomaly. Secondly, the phonetics paper could only be sat at the centre in London and students had the inconvenience of having to go there. Knowledge of phonetics, it was argued, could be tested in the Oral paper. In short, they saw the phonetics paper as a barrier to students’ success and the popularity of the examination, a perception which it was argued was proved by the increase in registrations once the phonetics paper was removed (Hawkey and Milanovic, 2013). This raises the question as to whether phonetics per se was redundant for language learners, or whether it was the particular design of the phonetics paper that was presenting an insuperable hurdle. From 1932–1939, candidates for the Cambridge CPE rose sharply from 33 to 752 and examination centres were licensed across Europe. The paper was adapted to include only translation, literature and essay questions (Roach, 1945).

In London, the same low number of admissions and passes was apparent but the promotion of the examination was complicated by the division of the CPE papers into two schemes: Scheme A was intended for foreign candidates and Scheme B for native-speaking candidates. The Oral paper for Scheme A could only be administered in London as there were no examiners overseas. The stated purpose of the examination was explained in an introduction to the paper in that it would enable teachers to,

‘demonstrate a practical working knowledge of English language both written and spoken and of such acquaintance with phonetics as may be of special value for teaching English in foreign countries.’ (EM3/5/2)

This statement is interesting as it indicates that although the UoLCPE was aimed at teachers who wanted to teach overseas, there was no specific university preparation course in London other than the phonetic instruction offered at UC during the course of an academic year. The UoLCPE was also open for foreign candidates but in the same way there was no preparation course except for phonetics at UC and the Holiday Course which was never promoted as an exclusive examination preparatory course. Furthermore, foreign candidates needed to travel to London to take their oral test. This suggests that there was a considerable gap between the UoLCPE paper and the availability of relevant preparatory teaching. This gap between examining and teaching had been the negative characteristic of the pre-1900 University of London before it was reformed to include a teaching
remit, and in the situation surrounding the UoLCPE, it was still apparent in the nature of the paper.

Considerable insights and improvements have occurred in the process of assessment and testing and the preparation of international examinations and it is not the intention in this section to critique the UoL papers from the current research perspective but to establish whether, taking into account the period and context in which it was offered, there was anything about the paper that made it inherently unfair. There are a number of issues surrounding preparation which suggest that this might be so. A decision as to whether to apply for the examination had to be made by Holiday Course students by the second week of their course. The set texts for Scheme A were Jones’ *Outline of Phonetics for Foreign Students*, Palmer’s *English Intonation with Systematic Exercises*, Ripman’s *Sounds of Spoken English* and Coleman’s *Intonation and Emphasis* all of which would have to be ordered from London and studied in advance of the course. Although Ripman used *Sounds of Spoken English* in class, students would only have had a few introductory lessons before they sat the examination.

The paper which was set for 1925, was very similar to that of the original Cambridge CPE and consisted of a grammar paper, an essay section, a phonetics paper and an oral examination. The overall length was slightly shorter at ten hours but still a gruelling experience for the students and a considerable number of hours to lose from the Holiday Course for which they would receive no refund. The relationship between the writer of an examination paper and the candidates who sits it is an appropriate example of a power relationship and in the case of the UoLCPE there was no indication of encouraging language but rather instructions regarding the necessity for clear handwriting. The authority of the writer of the paper became evident as a word length was set for the first Essay of 300 words but the writer fell silent on the number of words which should be written for the Composition in Colloquial English. When students were asked to rewrite sentences or passages of prose in the Grammar paper, they were warned that slang would not be acceptable. Thus, it was supposed that while they would have a knowledge of slang and colloquial English, they would be challenged by having to use a more formal register. In fact, for foreign students the reverse was likely to be the case, given that they may have spent little time in communities where English, especially colloquial English was spoken. This pre-supposition suggests that the paper, or the creative drive behind its authorship, originated in school testing and was evidence of the influence of examinations which had been prepared for school assessments
where among the schoolboys and girls the normal informal/formal register was weighted on the side of informal.

The essay title of 300 words asked students to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of boarding schools for boys and girls (EM3/5/2). Essay titles, as discussed in section 3.4 could have been a particular problem for foreign students as the traditional method popular in school assessments of supplying one word prompts, for example, ‘Byron’ or ‘English Cathedrals’, and which were intended to provide room for a free interpretation of the topic, were likely to have been quite baffling for them students not only in cultural terms but in their function as clear rubrics. Students would be left wondering what the examiners expected in terms of structure, criticality and the voice of the writer. The dilemma, which was also one which faced the Cambridge board, was whether the construct of the essay writing section was a test of students’ knowledge of culture, specifically British culture or a test of writing proficiency. Cambridge had decided that it was the latter, London still kept to titles which were culturally loaded, for example, ‘Pageantry’ and ‘Literature as a Reflection of Contemporary Life’.

Daniel Jones was the author of the phonetics papers and the afternoon Elementary Phonetics paper was similar to that of the Cambridge papers of that time in that phonetic transcriptions of prose passages were required but with the addition of instructions that candidates should also add the appropriate stress and intonation marks on sentences. This was followed by instructions to explain the position of the speech organs in articulating various sounds and then a passage of dictation. The content of the passages was taken from plays and literature, for example extracts from Noel Coward’s plays and although the content was irrelevant for the transcription into phonetic symbols the level of difficulty of the passages was high and there seems to have been no consideration by the author that students were writing about what they did not understand. The pointless nature of this activity finds no parallel in the real world where a shorthand transcriber would at least have a comprehension of meaning. There is a question mark over the level of difficulty of this paper which was described as indicating a ‘practical working knowledge of phonetics’ and an ‘acquaintance with phonetics’ (EM3/5/2) and it appears that a far longer preparation than two weeks would be required to complete the paper successfully. The validity, or ‘soundness’ of the whole paper is questionable as to whether the paper measures what it sets out to measure (Miller, 2012), which was given as a practical knowledge of the English language presumably for discourse, travel and understanding of English texts.
The content of the UoLCPE may have been one of the reasons that Ripman was keen for students to have a working knowledge of the IPA system before they joined the course and that this was not necessarily a requirement that would facilitate his own classes but would give students an advantage in examination preparation. The problem that faced Walter Ripman was what he was going to do in order to make the UoLCPE accessible and attractive for Holiday Course students. What he did not do was panic and fall into the trap of distorting the content of the Holiday Course into a preparation for the UoLCPE in an attempt to align teaching to the examination. In this he was guided by his experience that there was no pressure from the University Examining Board to hold him accountable for the pass levels and, in any case, it was impossible to know the origin of candidates whether from the Holiday Course or independent students from the published statistics. In fact, BPEUT did not have high or unreasonable expectations with regard to pass rates and the records indicate an awareness of the circumstances that surrounded part time students and prevented their qualification.

There seems to have been very little washback from the UoLCPE into the Holiday Course except in the content of Ripman’s phonetic course. One strategy that he might have taken was to synchronise the topics of the lectures or the destinations of the visits towards those relevant to the examination paper, which he had undoubtedly seen in advance, but this did not take place. Ripman’s reaction to the gap in examination preparatory work demonstrates his pragmatism and his attitude to self-improvement. If the imaginary Brockwill family in Let’s Talk English are to be credited with reality, then Ripman had already decided that prospective Holiday Course students who were lacking phonetic expertise should take private lessons and this was what was recommended in the text to Mr Gosler the teacher from Switzerland. In the same text, it was probably a little precious to insist on a period of study of phonetics of several months given that Daniel Jones was accepting complete beginners onto his vacation courses (Collins and Mees, 1999) but Jones was not sending these students for examination, and comprehension of the meaning of texts in his method was not so much of an issue. In the fictional scenario, Gosler was strongly motivated and wanted to sit for the UoLCPE as it would help his career prospects. Mrs B reassures him that preparation in phonetics will be what is required. In reality, from the early 1930s, Ripman began to offer private tuition sessions to students as part of the Holiday Course in a strategy to help the candidates succeed. This strategy was based on Ripman’s personal route to success which had required a similar intensity of study. In addition, his teaching experience at Wren’s the coaching college was convincing evidence
that success could be achieved in examinations, if the student were motivated, worked hard and used practice papers and tests, as was the case for those sitting the civil service examinations and the Tripos. What is intriguing is why Ripman never queried the content of the UoLCPE. As an inspector of schools, he had never hesitated in providing candid feedback from the annual examinations and critiqued the examiners’ choice of tasks and the pupils’ performance alike but it would appear that his deference to Jones and his own commitment to the importance of phonetic knowledge for teachers, prevented him from discussing the content of the papers and the situation of the *Holiday Course* students. It was not until 1945 when the examination was reviewed as part of a wider course review, that any challenge was mounted to the form and content of the UoLCPE.

### 4.5 Financial issues: Helen Reynard: hosting the course

In this section, Helen Reynard (1875–1947), the Warden of King’s College of Household and Social Science between 1925 and 1945 is introduced, together with an evaluation of her contribution to the *Holiday Course* and an analysis of her relationship with Walter Ripman. It is argued that without a good working relationship between the two areas: academic and accommodation, the *Holiday Course* would have been less of a success. In 1925, the *Holiday Course* was moved from the Imperial Institute in Kensington to the campus of KCHSS a little distance away. The campus was built on a large site just off Kensington High Street A summer course could become a very unwelcome visitor indeed in the university calendar. The academic year in London universities was short but intense and conducted over three terms. Teaching began in late October and examinations were conducted in the early summer. During the long vacation, the university buildings emptied of students, many facilities such as dining rooms and sports halls were locked and students vacated their residences. During this time, staff could also vacate the buildings. Lecturers could take holiday leave or turn their attention away from teaching to travel and research. Administrators could relax or take leave for a brief period, once the yearly examination results had been processed and before the activity generated by new admissions began, and they were faced with the work necessary in planning for a new academic year. It was a time of quiet, of empty corridors, locked classrooms and silent halls. The arrival of a lively group of international holiday makers in the middle of the University vacation and the need to create a pleasant and small-scale university experience for them during this period, was a challenge to all concerned with the *Holiday Course*.  

138
However, in the new accommodation at KCHSS, not only could the students enjoy the value of a programme of daytime and evening activities but they could also benefit from the solidarity created by the domestic arrangements which meant that learning, cultural exchanges and socialising could all take place within the enclosed environment of the College. The administrative functions of student registration and student accommodation operated separately: Walter Ripman and the Course Secretary took care of course admissions and the accommodation bookings; payments and administration were made through the Bursar and her colleagues at KCHSS. It was all the more fortunate that the second important friend of the Holiday Course, Helen Reynard, the Warden of KCHSS, agreed to host the students. As the Warden, she was resident on site and in an important position to oversee the Holiday Course.

The relationship between Helen Reynard and Walter Ripman was primarily based on the £150 which she charged as rent for 10 classrooms, a director’s office, a secretary’s office, a common room and a library (QAP/GPF5/4). ‘Stools and sinks’ was Ronald Knowles wry comment on some of the classroom accommodation at KCHSS which was clearly designed for practical science classes (EM7/38/1). The rental from the Holiday Courses was the one item on Reynard’s Balance Sheet for external income. It was, in fact, the only external income that the KCHSS earned but Reynard carefully maintained it for 14 years, warning Walter Ripman on one occasion in 1928 to register as soon as possible to avoid losing the booking (QAP/GPF5/4). Helen Reynard and Walter Ripman had much in common: Reynard was a German speaker. Her family had come to Britain from Vienna when she was a child in the 1880s. Her father, like Ripman’s, was in the wool trade but her family was based in Yorkshire and owned the Bradford Wool Extracting Company Ltd, a mill just outside Bradford in Yorkshire. German immigrants had been colonising the city since the 1840s and Bradford was cosmopolitan with wool samples circulating in the city from all over the world (Hanson, 2006). Helen was a bright young scholar and was educated at Bradford Grammar School, a secondary school for girls, before, as Ripman did, she benefited from her success in public examinations. She won a place at Girton College, Cambridge the pioneering establishment for the higher education of women founded by Emily Davis (1830–1921) where she studied from 1893–1897 subsequently graduating in moral sciences, the same subject area followed by Sophie Bryant. In 1904, she was chosen from forty applicants to become Junior Bursar at the College. Emily Davis rejected any discussions of a separate syllabus for women undergraduates or separate examinations, as from her philosophy they would be indicative of a less than equal
status. However, she was careful to monitor the behaviour of the female students and to provide suitable domestic accommodation in the same way that Bedford College had, in order to pursue high academic aims for the College while not becoming caught up in the criticism and unpopularity that surrounded the suffrage movement and a more overt competition with male colleges (Vickery, 1999). Helen, however, was a supporter of the suffrage movement. In 1900, she wrote an essay in which she attacked what for her generation had become the eye-rolling tedium with which all the disproved objections to women’s suffrage were constantly restated and reviewed turning the whole issue into a sad cliché. She prophesised:

‘…the agitation will be successful in the end because a new generation will arise with minds unspoilt by false ideals to whom the injustice of the existing system will appear intolerable’ (Varty, 2000, p. 156).

It was during the First World War, that Helen and her family changed their family name from Rienherz to Reynard, probably in response to the same punitive atmosphere which surrounded German speaking families and which had influenced the Rippmann men’s decision in London. At the same time, she returned to Bradford to help her family run the mill and became Joint Director, an experience which her biographer noted was unusual for a woman (Pedersen, 2004). In his semi-autobiographical novel, *Bright Day* (1968), J. B. Priestley describes the tough character and abrasive behaviour of the wool-men of Bruddersford (Bradford) and their shrewd business dealings. The book also confirms the strong connections between the wool producers in the North of England, the agents in London, who would have included Walter Ripman’s father, and the main customers for the product in Germany. The account suggests that Helen must have had authority and business acumen to survive in such a challenging environment.

Although Helen Reynard was twenty-five years younger than Sophie Bryant, the position of women as staff members in universities for her generation did not reflect the elevation and gender barrier-crossing illustrated by Bryant’s career. It was while she was studying in Cambridge that she caught the attention of J. M. Keynes, the economist, who had been a regular teacher at Girton where Helen studied. Keynes later wrote that he would recommend her for a post as a lecturer in Economic and Business Affairs at King’s College based on the work that she had done for the *Economic Journal* (Komine, 2012). She did not achieve that position. In spite of the University’s openness to female undergraduates, all the senior posts at KCL and at KCHSS were held by men (Blakestead, 1995). However, Reynard’s achievement at King’s was subsequently applauded in her home town of Bradford
and a newspaper item on Bradford Grammar School written in 1962, Reynard’s old school, took care to point out its claim to the achievements of the number of alumni who had distinguished themselves in the arts, politics, public life and academia, among whom was Helen Reynard formerly Reinherz.

Reynard’s actual position at King’s was not the second-class experience of a Warden in a women’s college which is described by Dyhouse and in which she was expected to undertake a purely domestic role with the students and concern herself with their morals and behaviour (Dyhouse, 1995). A photograph, taken during her tenure as Warden shows a serene and gentle looking young woman (Blakestead, 1994). Her biographer refers to her as calm, efficient and fair-minded, a gifted administrator and states that her principal goal while she was at the college was to develop new careers for women (Pedersen, 2004). This is evidenced by her publications. Reynard wrote a number of texts to try and raise the standards of the students of Household Science including *Institutional Management and Accounts* (1934). In this work, she explained the active initiatives that a financial administrator could take to ensure the smooth running of a residential institution by economising on costs and budgeting for future liabilities including the unexpected. What is significant about the application of her expertise, is that far from using the *Holiday Course* as an elastic and ready source of income for the College, she consistently and successfully kept charges down and therefore contributed to the sustainability of the course. In fact, costs for the tuition fees rose more quickly than those for accommodation. Between 1925 and 1936 accommodation fees were stable at £2-2s and the price of lunch and tea for students remained the same. In 1925 tuition fees were £5-00, rising to £5-10s in 1939. Even allowing for a worldwide economic downturn during the 1930s, Reynard’s cost control was remarkable (EM7/38/1).

The evidence in the archive reveals the relations between Reynard and Ripmant to have been cordial but businesslike. Their communication between 1925 and the early 1930s includes polite exchanges on the arrangements that she had made to allow the students access to the tennis courts, queries over Ripman’s entitlement to free lunches (this was agreed), lost property (an evening dress and a diamond ring) and one incidence of unpaid fees. She was regularly invited to lectures and to the *Holiday Course* party, which she usually declined as she delegated the day to day management of the international students to her Bursar, a popular member of staff. In July and August, Reynard normally took advantage of the increase in staff on site to arrange her own holidays. By 1936, however, Reynard and Ripman’s correspondence includes appropriately coded university-style understatements of
the possibility of impending war. Writing to inform Ripman of the Vice Chancellor’s intention to deliver the opening speech at the Holiday Course in 1936, she refers to *troublous days* and wishes the course well. In turn, he agrees that they are experiencing *dark days* although neither of them gave any indication at that time that their work was threatened (QAP GP5/4).

Reynard had a great deal on her mind in the 1930s. Blakestead notes Reynard’s practical disposition in problem solving but also points out the problems that she experienced during her tenure in trying to push up standards; students who were accepted on to the courses generally had a low attainment in science subjects which in turn depressed examination results (Blakestead, 1995). It is beyond the scope of this thesis to investigate how much actual support for evacuation the Warden of KCHSS received from King’s College itself, which was based on the Strand in central London, but as the prospects for war in Europe began to increase, her responsibility for investigating and providing air raid training for staff, finding a suitable destination to evacuate the students and encouraging enrolments began to occupy more of her attention and sapped her energy. It fell to her to communicate with the local air defence authorities in Kensington and, with her loyal Bursar, to take long train journeys to the north and west of England to investigate suitable university premises outside the London area, where students and staff could continue their work. In 1940, it was finally decided to evacuate the College to Nottingham and the *Holiday Course* was cancelled for the duration of the war.
5 The post-war changes in the University which impacted on the Holiday Course from 1945 to 1952

In this section, some of the effects of World War 2 on the UoL and their impact on the Holiday Course are evaluated. In doing so, it becomes evident that Walter Ripman’s design for the course structure was robust and flexible enough to incorporate the changes in focus and activities that the new generation of students and the new course directors required. The appointment of a new Principal of KCDSS, Miss M.J.Sargeaunt, at the Kensington campus which hosted the course, was also a test of how reliant the Holiday Course was on a good relationship with the staff on the College site and with satisfactory residential arrangements for the students. External relations, between the University and the world, were in the process of being redrawn, as they had been after the First World War, in the light of the developing independence of former British colonies and the realignment of political power blocks. In 1949, the London Declaration created a new Commonwealth of Nations establishing a cooperative association which would be of benefit in advancing common causes among its members. These political developments, far from narrowing the mentality of the University, created increased demands for the provision of higher education for the politicians, technicians and professionals who would be needed in the new economies. The British Council, which was established in 1934, began to take a more active role in developing previous national and international educational networks and contacts. In 1946, A. S. Hornby (1898–1978) was appointed linguistic advisor to the Council, one of whose concerns was raising standards in English teaching in the countries where the language was taught in school and thus highlighting the need for teacher training. A new journal *English Language Teaching* was sponsored by the Council to support teachers with articles and views on contemporary method.

A major change to the UoL student base was the return of thousands of demobilised men and women whose education had, in many cases, been disrupted and who required re-skilling for employment. The University Extension classes, which had been working with very low numbers, received a strong stimulus for part-time study of all kinds. The External arm of the University was also stimulated by the demand from national and international students for External degrees which would enhance their knowledge and career prospects. The major stumbling block to satisfying all these demands was financial. The British economy was staggering
from economic weaknesses which had begun after the First World War and were accelerated by the second. These included the costs of physical destruction and loss, the diversion of manpower to the war effort, the loss of overseas markets, and a poor balance of payments position. New costs had arisen in the form of the Anglo-American loan and maintaining armed forces and civil services abroad (Timlin, 1946). The UoLs post war vision was one that would be severely restrained by the availability of finance.

5.1 The Holiday Course post-war 1946–1952

The University buildings around the metropolis had suffered severe damage as a result of bombing, and this included the King’s College Kensington campus, which meant that the course planned for 1946 had to be abandoned while repairs were taking place. The Holiday Course itself was being prepared for a new marketing initiative and a decision was taken to rename it. The 1936–1939 title of the Holiday Course in English for Overseas Students was changed to the Holiday Course in English for Foreign Students in 1947. This change was required because of the perceived ambiguity about the term overseas. Although technically everywhere outside the British Isles was overseas, this was not an effective linguistic description of the target clientele as it could be thought to include those residents of Canada and Australia who were English mother-tongue speakers (EM7/38). The previous term of foreign to describe the student profile, while it had been problematic for the students and teachers from the USA who had another interpretation of the term, was felt to be more helpful in making a linguistic division. Learning English as a foreign language was to be the terminology that was taken up by publishers to describe, as Walter Ripman put it in his First English book, those whose first language was not English. Following Walter Ripman’s retirement, the immediate need for the relaunch of the Holiday Course was for the University Extra–Mural Department as the Extension Board was to ultimately be re–named to create a new Advisory Committee to determine the direction of the course and a new director to take it forward. The financial stringency which was imposed on UoL budgets post-war provoked some interesting economies. The new director would be paid £250 in future, an increase of £100 from Ripman’s period; course lecturers received a pay cut of 50%; class teachers would receive an increase of 25% and the conversationalists or conversation teachers were to be offered only their expenses for attending sessions (QAP GPF5/4). Another proposed economy was to appoint class teachers only once the student numbers were known thereby avoiding
the possibility of having to pay a teacher for a non-existent class. The reduction of the conversationists to voluntary status, while it may have been financially justified immediately post-war, was an unsustainable policy, and one that contradicted the linguistic purpose of the course in giving the students the opportunity to hear and speak colloquial English in an unstructured conversation with a native-speaker, which was not provided elsewhere in the course content.

In 1947, representatives from some of the Schools of the University met to discuss the proposed August course. Present was Arthur Clow-Ford, the External Registrar and temporary Holiday Course director. He was joined by Marjorie Daunt from Birkbeck College, B. Ifor Evans from Queen Mary College who was active with the British Council, Miss Jebb from Bedford College, P. Gurney from the Institute of Education, J. R. Firth from SOAS, Daniel Jones from UCL and Ronald Knowles, the Assistant Registrar and Course Secretary. The relationship between Professor Firth and Professor Jones must have been rather strained as Firth had left Jones’ Phonetics department in 1945 and taken a number of the staff with him to found a new department at SOAS which worked in opposition to Jones’ methods (Collins and Mees, 1999). The Committee began by reappraising the purpose of the Holiday Course and this debate was focused on questions regarding the nature of the language input. Was it to be primarily based on phonetic instruction as Daniel Jones favoured? Should the students be divided on entry as to those who wanted to specialise on phonetics and those who wanted a more general course? What was the place of literature and culture in the course? During Clow-Ford’s directorship over the next two years, there were a number of experimental attempts at reform in which the students were realigned into different groups and levels according to their interests and perceived capabilities. All those who were interested in phonetics joined Group 1 and all those who had not elected for phonetics joined Group 2. This may have reflected the preference of Daniel Jones who took over the teaching of the phonetics class for a group which would be dedicated to phonetics and nothing else, as was the arrangement on his own Vacation Course in Spoken English at UC. The other course activities and the timetable remained unchanged and students were able to attend conversation classes and a series of lectures which were concerned not only with Britain and the British way of life but with developments in the Commonwealth and the world. Visits and excursions remained an important part of the programme and there was a greatly extended list of interesting venues. There was significant interest in those places which were foremost in the development of media, a subject of great interest in language teaching with the opportunities it offered for the use of audio–visual and audio–
lingual teaching and learning material as well as the opportunities it offered for mass communication and intercultural communication. Students were able to visit the major recording studios, the Ealing film studios and attend lectures on English teaching at the BBC. They visited the English by Radio offices and attended a live transmission of a programme (EM3/2/1947). Some old friends of the course from Walter Ripman’s days were also helpful and both Bedford College and the North London Collegiate School, Sophie Bryant’s school, welcomed Holiday Course visitors. Dame Ninette de Valois came to speak on her chosen topic English Ballet Today; Community singing was led on two evenings and the traditional students’ concert and end of course dance were held as they had been before the war.

It was not until the appointment of Professor Bruce Pattison, in 1950, that a distinct policy for the language input of the course was decided. Pattison was an interesting choice as director as he already had experience of resolving one of the problem areas in the UoLCPE. In 1948, he was appointed Chair of teacher training at the Institute of Education, which was a member of the UoL and occupied buildings in the Bloomsbury university area. In 1940, it had been decided to discontinue the Scheme B of the UoLCPE. This Scheme had been designed for English native speakers who were intending to teach English abroad and who needed a certificate as a result. The paper was almost identical to Scheme A except for the Elementary Phonetics paper which required students to answer questions on phonetics in hypothetical teaching situations which also included aspects of speech therapy (EM3/5/1925). In 1946 the scheme was restored but not in its original form and was placed under the direction of Pattison’s department at the Institute where he established a preparation course for teachers of English language as well as other research areas in applied linguistics. In 1949, both Jones and Clow-Ford left the Advisory Panel and Pattison began a review of the Holiday Course himself.

One of the developments he was critical of was the insistence that students make a choice of groups to join on their entry to the course as Jones and Clow-Ford had arranged. Pattison explained in his report to the Extra-Mural department that dividing the students in this arbitrary way deprived them of a full experience of the classes on offer. He commented that students who were not interested in phonetics, would not automatically be interested in social history, the other alternative. He recommended that a way be found to return to the pre-war arrangement of allowing students to take part in both spoken English and British History and Culture sessions. In a detailed review of the 1950 and 1951 courses, he also argued for a fuller treatment of the lecture topics in a move to exploit the opportunities that students had for listening and integrate this with their spoken English work.
(GP5/5/4). He suggested that although the evening lectures were of high quality, they could be replaced by recitals and demonstrations due to the fatigue that might affect the students at that time of day. It is also possible that the staff could not aspire to Water Ripman’s energy levels. Pattison instituted a number of reforms. He separated the students by language level for their classes rather than by the linguistic classification of their first language; he introduced new conversation and structure drills created by J. D. O’Connor, a member of teaching staff and lecturer at UCL newly de-mobilised; and he trained the conversation teachers in the implementation of the drills. Pattison also made time for two classes of students to be prepared for the UoLCPE with the result that from the annual total registration of 29 students, the percentage pass rate rose from 30% in 1947 to 48% in 1951 (QAP GP55/4). His verdict on the purpose and design of the *Holiday Course*, which, by the time that he took it over was forty-three years old, was positive and optimistic.

‘From what students have said and written, the Course seems to have been appreciated by them, and there can be no doubt that it is fulfilling a need among foreign students and providing for them what no other University could provide so fully. It [the course] has fallen into a pattern in the years it has been running that is sound in essentials. With a few improvements in detail, in the light of further experience, it should continue to benefit students of English from many countries’ (QAP GPF5/4)

Pattison later tried to explain how he intended that the *Holiday Course* should fit in to the University’s wider remit of the recruitment of international students and international education. The *Holiday Course*, he explained could be highly influential in transmitting pedagogical knowledge abroad.

‘The Course is attended by teachers, mainly university educated, with a considerable period of their professional life before them so that they are likely to be influential in the education system of their own countries. They desire teaching of the highest standard. The possible effect of what they have learned on the course on the teaching of English in many countries, particularly European countries is considerable’ (QAP GPF5/4)

The war had informed Pattison’s vision of what the UoL should be aiming for in its outward looking role and the influence that it could have on education worldwide but more importantly, as he signalled, in the post-war reconfiguration of Europe. In spite of the strong return of students to almost pre-war levels, there was no doubt
that recruitment would be challenging in future. The normal method of recruitment through embassies, educational contacts and the Honorary Correspondents had been broken. In fact, there was no list of Honorary Correspondents on the prospectus for 1947 as there was no guarantee that any of the alumni were living, living at the same addresses or even that the addresses had survived the war. In 1946, the issue of recruitment to the Holiday Course had been discussed with the British Council who were anxious to play a major part in this as they did in other universities. Earlier to that discussion, Arthur Clow-Ford and Ronald Knowles had met a representative from the British Council and in the course of the discussion it was suggested that all the available places could be taken up on the Holiday Course, if the course announcement were restricted to certain countries. If not, the representative suggested, there would be no point in advertising far afield in, for example, Latin America, as those students would be unlikely to attend due to travel restrictions and the course, the representative predicted, would be swamped by better–off students from European countries such as Sweden and Switzerland. This, he predicted, would disadvantage students in poorer countries who had fewer opportunities for visits to England. The Council were in the process of developing some training courses for their own staff and were planning various intervention strategies to aid their agenda in higher education, part of which was the establishment of the Universities Advisory Committee to set up links between visiting scholars and universities (BW 89). However, the Holiday Course proposal in which places were reserved for British Council sponsored students was based on quotas based on estimates of the populations of various countries (EM1/4/46/U.3437). The disagreement between the Council and the Advisory Panel centred on the issue of the historical independence of the Holiday Course in that it had traditionally been open to all eligible students from all countries on a first–come, first–served basis. The matter was discussed among the Advisory Panel and in October 1946, Clow-Ford reported that there was no question that there would be an allocation of places to one nationality and that students would be accepted in order of application as before This was following a vote, during the course of which it emerged that Marjorie Daunt and Professor Firth mounted serious objections to any compromise on the independence of the Course (EM7/39/2). In this way, they preserved the educational purpose of the course from a political agenda.

The 1947 course recruited 201 students, down on pre-war numbers, including a resident from Uruguay in a contraindication to the British Council’s prediction, and twenty-four nationalities were represented in all (EM/3/2/1). The Council
secured twenty reserved places on the *Holiday Course* for teachers from France, Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Romania, Spain, Egypt, Turkey, Luxemburg, Cyprus, Malta and Palestine who would be in receipt of their bursaries. Teachers and students were evenly represented and for the first time, the number of women substantially exceeded men, a trend that was set to continue throughout the 1940s and 1950s. The independence of the *Holiday Course* had been preserved and some of the benefits of the new demands for English language had been achieved as well.

The UoLCPE was also reviewed at a meeting in May 1946. British Council representatives, A. E. Morgan, A. S. Hornby and B. Grovenhall had enquired whether the *Holiday Course* could be used as an effective preparation for foreign students who wanted to take the examination in London. The proposition foundered on the length of preparation that would be required, which exceeded the length of the *Holiday Course* and the fact that the course had never been designed or marketed as such a preparation. Although the idea was dropped, the contacts with the Council indicated a surge of interest in English language abroad, some of which may have been due to plans to include English as an official language in newly emerging states or as a result of wartime training, communications and experience and a very buoyant market for university education.

One of the key testimonies as to the operation of the *Holiday Course* and the personnel involved comes from the witness historian, Ronald Knowles, the Secretary to the *Holiday Course* from 1928–1973 and Assistant Director from 1965. In the text of his speech, which he gave at the 1973 anniversary of the course, Knowles gave an engaging presentation in which he looked back at his period as Secretary in an anecdotal account. His rather shameless name-dropping indicates that he put a high value on the well-known and esteemed lecturers and academics who had been involved in the delivery of the course or associated with it. As well as the qualifications of university personnel, Knowles drew attention to the location of the course and the city of London with all its cultural and historic resources which he believed were integral to the students’ experience of the course programme. As well as privileging the names of well-known personalities from the arts and literature, he made a point of listing important university post holders. The account can be relied on for its accuracy but also for the insight it gives as to how he understood the purpose of the course and what it was that endeared it to him.

He was also the compiler and protector of the archive materials, a position of responsibility but also of editorial power in what was preserved of the narrative.
Following the suspension of the course in 1939, Knowles had spent the war years working closely with Arthur Clow-Ford on the arrangements to supply University examination papers to POW camps across Germany, to arrange for their marking and grading and to issue the results to the candidates. It was a huge undertaking conducted in cooperation with the University of Oxford which Knowles approached with energy and administrative skill. Knowles delivered a wide-ranging speech in which he summarised the contribution of the Course directors, all of whom he had worked with. He began by commending Walter Ripman for establishing the Course and maintaining its popularity and effectiveness and that:

‘…under his guidance, the scope of the course was restricted to work on spoken English and the importance of phonetics was emphasised throughout all his teaching’ (EM/7/38)

Although the use of the word restricted here implies some reservation over the value of phonetics, Knowles confirmed that during Ripman’s directorship

‘…there was no unpleasantness or strife even in times of international tension.’ (EM7/38).

On Arthur Clow-Ford’s period as director, he remarked that his lectures on British life and institutions were

‘…outside the purely linguistic’ (EM7/38/)

and that he had established visits to institutions of historic, architectural or social significance. According to Knowles, Bruce Pattison was responsible for dividing the morning lectures with an emphasis on literary content which made them successful and much appreciated by the students.

The changes that each director brought to the Holiday Course were instrumental in building on Ripman’s legacy rather than overturning it. The Holiday Course had been oversubscribed throughout most of its history and the mixed formula of linguistic content and skilful social timetabling was hard to improve on. In spite of the debate over the separation of phonetic class groups and social history groups, phonetic instruction remained a part of the Holiday Course and a part of the UoLCPE which in 1951 was recognised as one of the entry qualifications for degree study. The pass rate, however, did not match that of Cambridge. Some of the changes that were introduced to the Holiday Course were forced by financial constraint, for instance, the course fees doubled from the pre-war £5 to £10 in 1951; similarly, the accommodation costs rose from £2 pre-war to £4-00 in 1951. The
necessity for students to pay the cost of their visits and excursions, which had not been the case pre-war was another indication of the University’s financial predicament. In 1951, this meant that the take up of excursions was rather less than usual but as Pattison commented in his report, that may also have been an indication of the tight budgets that many of the students were working with (GPF5/4). The cut in pay which was applied to the conversationalists was a retrograde step and although their motivation may not have been entirely financial, the loss of status would have made them vulnerable to further downgrading. In reviewing the course, neither Clow-Ford nor Pattison set out to apply their own linguistic dogma, Clow-Ford because he did not necessarily have any, and Pattison because he did not aim to make changes which were not evidence based and supported by the review that he conducted when he became director. Those parts of the course which could be seen to be effective and popular were supported and updated. For example, the lecture sessions were staffed by a new group of lecturers whose subject matter was of contemporary interest. There was no consideration of moving the *Holiday Course* to a different destination or of separating the *Course* from its residential base. All the rituals and mores and traditions of the pre-war Course were re-established, in the traditional way of UoL administrative culture, as if six years of war had never taken place the only apparent difference that there were no German speaking students.

5.2 New relationships

From 1950, when Professor Bruce Pattison took over as director, there was more evidence of the need for supportive relationships to ensuring the smooth running of the Holiday Course and the maintenance of an atmosphere of friendly cooperation among the staff and students. In 1945, Miss M.J. Sargeaunt M.A. B. Litt, was appointed as Principal of Queen Elizabeth College (QEC), the new name for the Kensington KCHSS site. It is a significant sign that some progress was being made in referring to female staff in the same terms as the males in that she was appointed with the status of Principal and was not described as the Warden, the title which Helen Reynard had inherited and which was associated with the domestic and pastoral duties of that role in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Miss Sargeaunt made an immediate impression with her enthusiasm. Between 1947 and 1949, Sargeaunt smoothed the collaboration between QEC staff and Arthur Clow-Ford. She also stayed on the University site for the period of the *Holiday Course* in August rather than take her vacation; she persuaded Clow-Ford to continue renting
the tennis courts for the summer as part of his budget, in spite of his objections, so that the students could have some popular sporting activity. Sargeaunt attended all the opening and closing ceremonies and collaborated in ensuring that appropriate University staff welcomed the students on the first day of the course. Clow-Ford recognised in turn in 1949, that Sargeaunt’s interest went beyond the professional and financial obligations of the host and that she was genuinely interested in the course.

‘I would like, however, to specially mention the continued happy relations between the University authorities and the College. The Principal of the College, Miss Sargeaunt, took a lively personal interest in the Course and the members of her staff took all possible trouble to make the students interested and happy.’ (GP4/5/1949)

On May 10th 1952, Ronald Knowles wrote a letter of personal thanks to Miss Sargeaunt which revealed the difference that the positive participation of the host institution in accepting the course, not as an unofficial extra, but as a collaborative relationship between colleagues who had a shared purpose, had made to his work as Course Secretary

‘May I as ever, express my own personal thanks for the active interest you take in the course and for the many ways in which you contribute to its successful running. Without you, we should always be conscious of our extra-mural position, with you, we feel grateful if unworthy members of a collegiate foundation’ (GPF5/4).

Knowles comment reveals that although the Holiday Course had been a regular summer event pre-War, he had not felt that the course entirely fitted in to the wider work of the University. It was a feeling, which was, perhaps, a result of the atmosphere of locked rooms, and empty offices and corridors that are typical of the holiday period in universities. Miss Sargeaunt had changed this. It is useful, at this point, in examining the relationships between the University staff in different parts of the institution and the relationship of the host staff towards the residential students to cast one eye on present relationships. Although, the UoL prided itself in being the most international university as a result of its outward looking ethos, accessibility and position in London, a historically international city, it was the case that in the pre-war and early post-war days international students may have been something of a novelty. It is not within the scope of this dissertation to provide an analysis of post-war immigration or attitudes to race and ‘other’ in general terms as
this may not be what is most relevant to the situation of the Holiday Course visitors. What is significant in analysing the social activities which were arranged for the Holiday Course students is the seniority of the University staff who attended the social functions which took place and the status of the people outside the University who greeted them on arrival at their destinations.

In July 1951, the News Chronicle, a popular daily newspaper, ran an article on four female Holiday Course students: an office worker from Switzerland, a nursery teacher from Calcutta, India, a shorthand writer from Rome and a secretary with an American newspaper from Paris, entitled Here from There. This article is one of the only documents in which the voices and views of Holiday Course students are recorded. The students commented on what they found difficult about the English language and their aims and aspirations. The article explained that there were two hundred foreigners, including teachers, attending the Holiday Course, and that the students had had tea with the Lord Mayor of London. The director of the course Professor Pattison was introduced who remarked,

‘It is easy to learn a little English but very difficult to learn English properly owing to the variety of meanings one word can have’ (Soward, 1951).

The careful placement of course information suggests that Pattison was cooperating with an advertorial article. Walter Ripman also used to do this and on one occasion, on a visit to Australia, achieved an advertorial in an Australian newspaper (Ripman, 1921). What is significant for contemporary readers is first, that this national newspaper published the story at all and second, the information that the Holiday Course students had tea with the Lord Mayor of London. There are other references in the excursions timetables of the courses between 1920 and 1939, of the students being greeted by the directors of museums, representatives of large organisations, the Bishops and clergy of cathedrals and local authority representatives. In contemporary life, the arrival of foreign students would not be greeted as news, local dignitaries would not come to greet them and the Lord Mayor’s invitations are a thing of the past. It is probable that the arrival of the Holiday Course students on the Kensington campus was also a very interesting event for the residential staff, given the relatively monocultural profile of the full-time students during the term that they were accustomed to and that this was inspiring. In our contemporary times, university staff are accustomed to international visitors and columns of backpacking youngsters are a familiar sight in towns and cities. Perhaps in our striving for intercultural educational understanding, we have lost something of the
interest, excitement, delight and curiosity that appears to have characterised some 
attitudes to foreign students in the first part of the 20th century.
6 Discussion and conclusion

In the Introduction to this thesis in a statement of the value of the study of the history of language teaching, three areas were identified: the inspiration of the individual teacher, the recovery of knowledge and the application of knowledge in our contemporary circumstances. To take the first area of inspiration, it is the case that although the importance of learning English language in much of the world is unquestioned, the contemporary focus is on the particular method and skills which will lead to this accomplishment in the shortest possible time. Teachers are instrumental. Yet the reputation of Walter Ripman, during his career as a teacher of English, German, and French inspired his pupils because, in the words of his Queens’ pupils, ‘he was the best teacher’. How to be the best, in the relative circumstances of a teacher’s work, without becoming the teacher whose concern is to impose his or her personality on the class or who is obsessed with accolades and professional status is an inspiration worth reflecting on. Ripman’s suggestion was that teachers took part in professional development,

‘…embrace every opportunity for qualifying themselves [the teachers] for good work’. (Rippmann, 1904b)

Chang (2016) identified the recovery of knowledge as a benefit of the historical approach, which, he said, in the context of science, was sometimes a difficult proposition as it was quite true that some historical scientific knowledge had been very soundly disproved and deserved to be forgotten. However, as discussed in the Research Situation 2.1, the historical situation in English language teaching in terms of its geographical spread, the reasons for its popularity, the methodology that has been used and the transmission of ideas is far more complex than the assertions which have been made in the literature and there is still a need for further research. Classroom practice and how to negotiate it is a fundamental part of teacher education. The issues which Walter Ripman raised in his address to teachers, Common Faults in Method With Some Suggestions (Rippmann, 1904b) were extracted from a report which he wrote for the London County Council after an inspection of thirty-eight London schools in 1904. The advice includes classroom practice and organisation and the personal control and behaviour of the teacher. Ripman’s suggestions can still be applied to many contemporary school situations and the dilemmas of many contemporary teachers. Ripman has advice for the teacher who is confident in their subject and those who are not. Most of the everyday school challenges are reviewed and solved: when to correct a pupil, how
to correct; how to inspire a pupil and when such attempts at inspiration are probably not going to be effective. Humility as a personal attribute of the teacher is advised rather than a tendency to show off knowledge. Lesson planning is explained and the necessity to guard against overwork and stress. The use of stories and pictures, plays and poems is explained with tips on question and answer techniques. Even for experienced teachers, the wisdom, practicality and succinct nature of this article written from the perspective of a school teacher one hundred and thirteen years ago, is remarkable. The position of the teacher at that time is explained by Ripman’s observation on the relationship between teacher, students and teaching materials.

‘In the older books the language alone was considered, not the learner, and the book became all important; now the centre of interest is transferred to the teacher, who acts as chief mediator between the foreign language and the learner.’(Ripmann, 1904b)

This is a position that is not teacher-centred, with an emphasis on a hierarchical structure but neither is it learner-centred, the position which in the minds of Western educators, as evidenced by contemporary teaching materials, stands for everything positive in teaching and learning. In Ripman’s approach, the mediator or teacher, would be able to teach directly but also to share the responsibility for language discovery with the students.

The third area, that of the application of knowledge can be exemplified by returning to the formula for the *Holiday Course* and observing some reasonable parallels with our contemporary circumstances The first general observation is that although the *Holiday Course* was a university, based in a university, it was part of the University Extension activity in providing for the public and it had been envisaged in the early days of planning when it was thought that French and German courses would be run, that it would serve modern languages teachers in London as well as foreign students. The course was not a transient visitor with a shallow attachment to the institution. The formula was based on the pre-requisite that there would be a university administration overseeing the delivery and controlling the finances as part of their work on all the other short summer courses which the university offered. This would ensure continuity and the presence of university ethos. In contemporary terms, financial support is always a problem in universities and here the *Holiday Course* seems to have suffered the same constraints which was not entirely predicated on low wages. In 1919, Daniel Jones was paid £700 a year as a professor at UC whereas Walter Ripman was paid £150 for four weeks as director of the *Holiday Course* (Collins and Mees, 1999) (GPF5/4). The
involvement of members of the public who did not have professional teacher status but who were trained to lead conversation classes is an intriguing aspect of the course. Leaving aside the issue of financial reward, this group supplied a valuable colloquial language input. In contemporary terms, this arrangement could be valuable in extending wider community participation in universities without compromising the professional teacher. The language input of the Holiday Course contained phonetic instruction sessions and these were deemed to be important both for teachers of English and students. This interest in phonetics and application in actual classes rather than a cursory reference to pronunciation has yet to be revived and recycled. Most teacher training programmes today will at least require students to be able to pronounce the sounds of the phonetic alphabet and read words but often pronunciation work with students is fragmentary. In any effort to improve students’ pronunciation, active effort is required. Although it is not currently common practice to ask students to read aloud at length, which was the technique used in the Holiday Course reading and discussion classes, work on pronunciation and the exploration of intonation are not passive skills and this kind of practice can be valuable and well received. Visiting lectures are not uncommon on English language courses where the students are advanced but these occasions may not be as consistent and satisfactory as the service provided by the Extension lecturers. The challenge in designing a lecture based programme is how to embed the lecture input into the linguistic and social framework of the course. During the Holiday Course a lecture on architecture by A.S. Walker, would be followed up by a visit to city churches and extended by relevant readings. Without that coherence, the purpose of including the lecture whether for vocabulary enhancement or development of spoken English becomes diffused. As discussed earlier, the coherence of the Holiday Course might also have been even more advantageous, if it acted as a preparation for assessment by making use of formative opportunities and linking the content of lectures and visits to the syllabus for the UoLCPE. The live, spoken–voice situation of the lecture would have provided an authentic listening opportunity in terms of purpose and immediacy, which a recording does not.

In learning about the specific circumstances of this case–study, four main assertions can be made: firstly, that the positive community and comradeship experienced by students on the course and noted by staff were the result of the attitudes of the students themselves in embracing all the opportunities that were provided for them for socialisation and intercultural exchanges and by rejecting the establishment of language or gender based cliques. Secondly, that the cultural aims
of the course in introducing students to British society and important contemporary locations were an integral part of the course design from the outset and not a separate programme. Next, that the historical context of London was exploited for the students’ learning activities in comprehensive and expert ways by specialists. Finally, that the personality and energy of the director, Walter Ripman, while seminal to the establishment and development of the course was not the only factor in the success and sustainability of the course and this is proved as the *Holiday Course* (*The Holiday Course in English for Overseas Students*) did not fail following his retirement. The original 1904 model for the structure of the course remained unchanged until the adjustments made in 1952.

What is evident from an investigation of the purpose of the course is that although each of the supporters of the course, the University, the Extension Board, the director and the host institution had different ideas as to why the course was important and different reasons for encouraging the success of the course, the fact that these differences existed had no negative effect on its actual operation and there were no internal disputes. In fact, in terms of UoL mentality, there appears to have been no belief in change as an entity to be recognised, a constant and self-justifying factor in decision making. Even in the conditions of the post-Second World War, the adjustments that were made to the course were a simple realignment of emphasis towards literature in the morning, and language input classes to solve the problem of a perceived lack of choice for students who did not wish to study phonetics. This realignment was also intended to bring the content of the course closer to the subject areas which were offered at the University. In the post-War boom in student registrations, the University was not in need of an international recruitment strategy to subsidise numbers but in his 1952 report Pattison suggested that the world was in need of the knowledge and values of the University and that students from the *Holiday Course* would be important ambassadors. Ronald Knowles commented that Pattison had created a quality programme of study that was not even available to the undergraduates at that time (EM7/36) The arguments in favour of relinquishing control of recruitment to the British Council, which would determine which geographical areas were most likely to provide students or employees of the Council who would benefit from the course, were rejected in favour of a non-politically engineered, open-access policy a typical reaction, perhaps, from academics who, in university tradition, were wary of the interference of a state sponsored organisation in their affairs and a loss of control.

This thesis has argued against an approach to the history of language teaching, which is divided by periods and chronology, with a tendency to focus on those
individuals perceived to be the leaders of thought and practice. The case–study focuses on the operational aspect of the course in order to see it from the lived experience of those who worked on it. The research problem as to who supported the Holiday Course and why, has been informed by the discovery that the director Walter Ripman, the Vice-Chair of BPEUT, Sophie Bryant, the Warden and Principal of KCHSS, Helen Reynard and M. J. Sargeaunt respectively, had a surprising commonality as immigrants, or the children of immigrants, speakers of modern languages and enthusiasts for international education. However, they were not the only people who contributed to the success of the course. The *Holiday Course* created a life of its own in which the course secretary, the lecturers, readers, conversationalists, administrators, the Extension Registrar, the Bursar, the visiting ballerinas and schoolchildren, the musicians who provided recitals and played for the long, evening dances and *conversazione*, the poets, booksellers, cooks and maids who took care of the students’ catering needs, the tennis-playing students and Honorary Correspondents from twenty-one countries all played a part and they are privileged in this thesis. Ronald Knowles speech on the centenary of the *Holiday Course* in 1973 is affectionate and his reminiscences indicate his enjoyment in his involvement with the students and personalities that he encountered during his work as Course Secretary and Assistant Course director. It is a reasonable proposition that he took care to make sure the records of the *Holiday Course* were preserved not only for public record and as his duty as a University employee but because they contained very good memories of the happiness engendered on the course.

Walter Ripman was committed to the education of girls and women. What is remarkable in the investigation of this small academic unit is how many women appear and demonstrate the important roles that they had and the professionalism with which they performed them, once the strategic and operational areas of the course become more visible. Three women were identified as of particular importance to the *Holiday Course* and in addition to their contributions to its operation the study investigated their experience as women in the learned world. Sophie Bryant represented the extraordinary success of the education movement of the late 19th century, in which she was involved, to provide an education for girls that was intended to supplant the pursuit of purely frivolous or domestic pursuits in girls school curriculum and replace these with real academic opportunities (Watson, 2000). Much of her importance and her positive reception in the University was as a result of her status as a teacher and a headmistress as well as a university lecturer. Bryant had more concrete visions of the exchange scholars who
would result from the *Holiday Course* experience and a premonition that something important was developing. Helen Reynard’s achievement in business and in her academic career was unusual and meaningful. She was conscious that she was doing everything possible to use the College site to generate income and for useful academic purposes even during the holiday time. However, for the women of her generation, who secured university degrees, the long wait for the suffrage and the difficulty of competing on equal terms with male colleagues for academic positions had been personally tiresome and unjust. Miss M. J. Sargeaunt who succeeded her at Queen Mary College achieved a position with a higher status. Sargeaunt had the liberty and opportunity to use her talent for building good interpersonal relations between each of the stakeholders in the course, the Extra-Mural Department and her staff at the College, and to do the work that she clearly enjoyed. The role-call of female lecturers in this study continues with Lilias Armstrong, Ida Ward, Hyacinth Holdsworth and Helene Coustenoble, language teachers at UC. The historical status of these women in prestige or in power is of less importance than the contemporary recognition of the concrete evidence of their talent and essential value to the purpose and life of the University and their vital roles in teaching and materials design. It is not possible to retrospectively reform historical attitudes to women which have been found lacking when compared to our own beliefs but it is possible to provide evidence of the importance of the women within their own period. Constance Ripman, loyally supported her husband by assisting with administrative work on the *Holiday Course* during the late 1930s. At the same time, she produced an innovative contribution to English language teaching which made use of the most up to date technology available for audio-lingual resources in her ‘Let’s Talk English’. Constance had no experience or training in writing for foreign students herself but was clearly very familiar with her husband’s work and in her imaginary persona as Mrs B, refers to having been a language learner. How Walter and Constance divided the creative work in the book is not known but it is unlikely that he was as familiar with the haberdashery departments in London stores or so familiar with the household domestic economy as Constance and the likelihood is that the content is all hers.

One of the aims of this study was to answer the research question as to what Walter Ripman brought to the course which made it successful by providing a lived experience narrative of his life-history that takes an evaluation of his career beyond the image of a dashing, language-reforming firebrand, obsessed with the hopeless cause of spelling reform, and that presents him as a brilliant scholar, a charming and gifted teacher, a shrewd publisher, a loyal friend, an experimental practitioner,
a whimsical author, and, according to his friends and professional associates, rather a workaholic. In his persona as Mr B in Constance’s story, he was also a heavy smoker, a family man, and an enthusiast for home-made scones. His central premise, that the skills required for the teaching of languages are, in the main, no different from those required for the teaching of any other subject area and require knowledge, sensitivity and energy on the part of the teacher is an important statement. His advice to language teachers, given at a time when the class teacher was also a curriculum designer, is a reminder of how autonomy can and should be used in contrast to the contemporary experience of elementary level English language teachers which, if it is interpreted through current published materials, consists of working through the pages of the course-book. Ripman’s English language publications were, to some extent, casualties of their publisher’s economic fortunes and policy in that the style and content of the texts was not updated for the demands of a new market and thus they sank into obscurity. What the thesis asserts, is that his single-minded focus on the foreign teacher and learner ensured that his work did not suffer from the confusion as to target readership demonstrated by other authors. 

Daniel Jones support for the Holiday Course has been identified through his contribution to the Advisory Panel and his decision, in the absence of Ripman, to step in and take over phonetics teaching on course for a few years after the War. According to Daniel Jones’ biographers, his most important attribute was his ability to work practically with ideas, either his own or someone else’s, develop them and then disseminate them to a wider audience through public lectures or events. He inspired others to work on these ideas and he inspired loyalty among some of these people (Collins and Mees, 1999). The comparison of the Holiday Course with the Summer Vacation Course in Spoken English for Foreigners suggests that as an expression of his personal drive, Jones’ model for his vacation course was as important to him as Ripman’s model was to him. The student experience in each case was quite different but Jones was clearly proud of the numbers of cheerful looking students who he ranged around the steps of the Octagon at the end of the course each July. These cohorts were not intended to act only as recruiting instruments for the Vacation Course but rather emissaries in their own countries of the benefits of his training (Collins and Mees, 1999) There was, perhaps, still some part of his own Marburg experience which inspired Jones. The friendship between the two men was also sincere and Jones referred to Ripman in his obituary as
‘...a great pioneer and a good friend’ whose work ‘laid an indelible mark for good on our education system’ (Jones 1947 cited McLelland 2010, p. 2).

However, if, as seems highly likely Jones was the sole author of the papers for UoLCPE then these papers display some of his limitations in writing assessment materials. This study has identified evidence which supports the view that Jones was an able experimental class teacher and a lucid and lecturer. However, not all class teachers are equally able in designing assessment and his adherence to a design for the paper which reflected the content of his own classes but was not generalised or valid for all elementary phonetics students could have contributed to the lack of success on the UoLCPE.

This case-study of the *Holiday Course* has examined the course content in some detail in order to identify and analyse the factors that might have contributed to its success and its weakness. The course which Ripman developed for the teachers and students was less a system of language learning and more a formula for language learning. It was a formula in that the timetable could be easily generalizable to other languages, as had originally been the intention, and for other levels of language proficiency, and it was a formula because it could be adapted in emphasis to include more of one element than another and thus to strengthen or weaken the mix. This, for example, is what took place over the years in the lecture programme as it was adjusted to reflect contemporary interests in the arts and the economy by recruiting lecturers with different specialisations, without disrupting the basic timetable. This flexible design allowed Professor Pattison to introduce more literature study into the timetable in 1951 and reduce the number of phonetics classes without unbalancing the course.

A common cause for course failure is what Collins and Mees describe as a *palace revolution* when dissatisfied members of staff leave to join other institutions. This is what happened to Daniel Jones post-war when J.B. Firth left UC to open a new department at SOAS (Collins and Mees, 1999). The *Holiday Course* was particularly vulnerable to this behaviour as it relied on lecturers, teachers and conversationalists being available during a part of the summer holiday time. The evidence from the course prospectuses indicate that a loyal team of Extension lectures, readers and conversationalists appeared year after year (EM3/2/1). A further cause of course failure is an inadequate marketing and advertising campaign. Ripman’s list of Honorary Correspondents were a response to the competition for short summer language courses which existed in the UK, France and Germany. Even after the First World War, when many students’ names were removed, the list
of alumni who were willing to promote the course swiftly grew to healthy proportions. There seems no doubt, given the number of rejections for admission and the existence of a waiting list, that the demand for the course remained high throughout the pre-war and interwar years. How many of the students were rejected on the grounds of a low language proficiency is unknown but in some years rejections surpassed actual registrations. It is intriguing to consider why Ripman did not expand the *Holiday Course*. One reason might have been that to do so would mean he would inevitably lose some control over the course and perhaps he did not relish this. While the course was at an optimum size, he could engage with the students personally and they could be accommodated on the Kensington site enhancing the community atmosphere of a residential course.

The weakness of the course, although it appeared to have no influence on registrations, was the lack of success in giving students and particularly teachers, a real opportunity to gain an international certificate in English language. This became more acute when the UoLCPE became one of the recognised pre-requisites for entry to the University degree programmes. The construct of the examination mitigated against the success of the *Holiday Course* candidates, due to the difficulty of the Elementary Phonetics paper, the unpredictability of the Writing paper and the lack of time that students had for preparation. Ripman also bears some responsibility for the minority interest in the examination as he did not attempt to query the content.

For many years before the Second World War, the Extension Board was content with reports of the *Holiday Course* which described the good relations between the students from different lands and their presence in the heart of the University. In the aftermath of the war they were forced to reconsider the position of the course and this consideration occupied the attention of representatives from many of the constituent colleges. While the actual post-war changes which were applied demonstrated the intention of maintaining the course with much the same content and purpose, the doubling of course and accommodation fees was a considerable increase and must have made access very difficult for lower income students specifically those from poorer countries. The relegation of the conversationalists to unpaid volunteers who were, nevertheless, instructed to undertake teaching duties in using the new pronunciation drills, was little short of exploitation. However, Professor Pattison found a formula which he could use to reconstruct a more literary content rather than a social science emphasis, with a view to preparing foreign students for study at the University. What that demonstrated is that Ripman’s formula could be varied in any number of ways to accommodate English language
tuition for different purposes. Significantly, the growing interest in television and sound could be integrated into course activities as this media was to be a powerful innovation in language teaching in the years to come.

The third aspect of the *Holiday Course*, that of context, has been identified throughout this dissertation. Context here can be understood both as social and as locational and environmental. It was a matter of importance to place Walter Ripman’s life into his social context as a part-time language teacher at the beginning of the 20th century who was struggling to make his professional way. His education and the culture in which he was brought up were all important indicators of the choices he would later make and the things he would hold dear, such as his interest in professional journals and publishing, and his interest in young people and family life. References have also been made in this narrative to his middle-class aspirations which has functioned as a useful shorthand to include his home and working circumstances. This analysis of his personal life expands the information available to us of his role as a proponent of Reform group principles in language teaching which is limited by a focus on the methodology of his teaching practice. The social context of the *Holiday Course* students in the way that they were regarded by town and city officials in some of the many heritage, religious and parochial institutions which some groups of them visited is illustrated by the positive and personal welcomes that they received. The locational context of the *Holiday Course* was the environment of London. Every prospectus until 1939 carried William Fitzstephen’s description of the beauties of the city and the positive attributes of the citizens indicating that the *Holiday Course* was intended not only as an opportunity for teachers and students of English to practice the language in the environment in which it was spoken but that this experience could be enhanced by their gaining an historical and cultural knowledge of the city of London. The study has drawn attention to the actual boundaries of the UoL metropolis, the physical territory which the University claimed and claims as its own and within which it has positioned its architecture: libraries; colleges; halls of residence; laboratories and sports fields. In their individual environment, the students of the *Holiday Course* occupied a comfortable and attractive residence in a quiet Kensington street, secure behind tall ornamental gates. The dancers who took part in evening entertainments in the college hall could look across the lawn to the trees in nearby Holland Park in a quite different experience to the part–time, non–residential students at UC.

The physical context of Ripman’s world, which was based in the centre of the city, was presented to illustrate the speed with which he moved around in his many
teaching identities. An understanding of the physical and locational context of the
city also helps in the understanding of universities as closed cultures which are
contained in sturdy architecture and which can resist a great deal of external
pressure simply by their isolation and the impenetrability of their administrations.
This ability of the University to appear to isolate itself from threatening events in
its public discourse was noted in the study as a typical behaviour during the war
years.

The theoretical significance of the thesis is that the use of a case–study
approach to historical events and the inclusion of lived experience analysis for the
actors in the case may be useful for other researchers who wish to investigate the
distant past. In the Holiday Course, the case provides an illustration of curriculum
design for a short course which, in spite of the fact it was used in the past, may still
have elements which are relevant to contemporary curriculum and course designers.
In the framework for the analysis of language textbooks, my inclusion of a criteria
which requires an evaluation of the aesthetic qualities of the book as a material
object can provide further insights for those working in this area. My research is
also a contribution to knowledge of the history of ELT by highlighting the
complexity of the situation with regard to adult English language teaching and
learning in the UK at the beginning of the 20th century and by my empirical research
provide insights and understanding of the contribution of the University of London
to the training of English language teachers.

The limitations of the study are those created by time and my distance from the
Holiday Course. It has not been possible to become an ‘insider’ and achieve an
emic perspective because although I know where the classrooms are and who the
teachers and students are, and what the timetable would be on any given day, I
cannot enter the rooms as an observer. As a researcher, I cannot interview teachers
or students. I was not able, through lack of space, to investigate further the records
of the publishing policy of J. M. Dents and Son to expand my theory of the
influence of company policy on the layout and purpose of the texts or to analyse
Walter Ripman’s relationship with his employers. The field of research that I have
chosen is vast and many layered and there are possibly hundreds of documents in
various repositories which I have not seen and therefore I cannot say that the study
is comprehensive. There were also areas that were beyond the scope of the present
thesis.

In future research, there are a number of aspects of the history of language
teaching in the United Kingdom which would be very rewarding.
1. The development of the *Holiday Course* post–1953 to the final course in 1973 would be informative as to the profound social changes which took place in the UK and internationally during the 1960s and 70s and how these influenced the *Holiday Course* students and staff and the teaching methodology that was adopted.

2. The historical lived experience of ELT teachers.

3. The history of private language teaching institutions has been almost entirely neglected in the historiography.

4. The transmission of culture in language textbooks and in their aesthetic value to teachers and students.
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## Appendix 1 1904 Holiday Course Start-Up Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure for the 1904 Holiday Course</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>Total £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 chairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough table covers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x noticeboards covered with baize</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire of piano for 5 weeks: carriage included</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern, manifold and gas for 4 lectures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform for West Room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 folding tables</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 blackboards 3ft x 4 ft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 easels and pointers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x portable hat racks with accommodation for 120 hats</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 screens</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 blackboard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 easel and pointer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 yards of baize</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses for conversazione includes evening lecture and refreshment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire of tables and screen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling expenses of staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Balance</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtesy of Senate House Library, University of London. (EM1/3/4 1904)
Appendix 2 Holiday Course Receipts and Expenditure 1904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts for the Holiday Course 1904</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Fees</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam fees</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers Exhibition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booksellers commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post cards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Tickets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure for the Holiday Course 1904</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers’ fees</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner’s fees</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and Secretary fees</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (general)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (souvenirs)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtesy of Senate House Library, University of London. (EM1/3/4 1904)
## Appendix 3 Nationalities and Gender 1904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentine Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtesy of Senate House Library, University of London. (EM 1/3/4 1904)
# Appendix 4 Holiday Course Enrolments 1904-1935

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>1904-1914</th>
<th>Changes during the 1920s and 30s</th>
<th>Final total in 1935</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentine Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>decrease after 1914</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>decrease in the 20s</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzig</td>
<td></td>
<td>decrease in the 20s</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>decrease in the 20s&amp;30s</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>decrease in the 20s</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>decrease in the 20s</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>1904-1914</td>
<td>Changes during the 1920s and 30s</td>
<td>Final total in 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. A</td>
<td></td>
<td>increase in 20s</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total male students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total female student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139. Siitonen, Pauliina (2016) Ehdotukseen vastaaminen perheen vuorovaikutustestissä : keskustelunalyystin näkökulma vuorovaikutukseen ja sen arviointiin
140. Mustamo, Aila (2016) ” Yö, metsä, aika ennen kristinuskoon” : kotimaan ja kansakunnan reprentataat jot black metalissa ja folk metalissa Suomessa ja Norjassa
141. Kanto, Laura (2016) Two languages, two modalities : a special type of early bilingual language acquisition in hearing children of Deaf parents
143. Lindh, Johanna (2016) Poikikkiristillinen identifioituminen vapauden ja yhteisyyden vuorovaikutuksena
144. Zachau, Swantje (2016) Signs in the brain: Hearing signers’ cross-linguistic semantic integration strategies
146. Riekki, Marita (2016) Navigating change : nexus-analytic explorations in the field of foreign language education
149. Suorsa, Anna (2017) Interaction for knowledge creation : a phenomenological study in Knowledge Management
151. Tuomi, Pirjo (2017) Kaunokirjallisuus suomalaiselle yleiselle kirjastolle haasteena, rasionaatio ja mahdollisuutena : historiallis-argumentatiivinen tarkastelu suomalaisen yleiston kirjastolaitoksen suhteen kaunokirjallisuuteen ja kirjalliseen järjestelmiin
153. Niemitalo-Haapola, Elina (2017) Development- and noise-induced changes in central auditory processing at the ages of 2 and 4 years

Book orders:
Granum: Virtual book store
http://granum.uta.fi/
Etain Casey

WALTER RIPMAN AND THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON HOLIDAY COURSE IN ENGLISH FOR FOREIGN TEACHERS 1903–1952