

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS TOWARD THE  
MODERN LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO THE  
TEACHING OF ENGLISH

By

CECELIA NAILS PALMER

Bachelor of Arts  
Langston University  
Langston, Oklahoma  
1941

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1955

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
July, 1968

JAN 30 1969

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS TOWARD THE  
MODERN LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO THE  
TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth H. Blair*

Thesis Adviser

*Richard Wilburn*

*Daniel Selakovich*

*Leon T. Munso*

*D. D. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

696417

## PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of Oklahoma teachers who have been instructed in the linguistic approach to the teaching of English. Its purpose was also to suggest that the linguistic approach embodied a positive approach to the English classroom that was applicable to the total teaching situation. The attitudes toward the social connotations of the language are inherent in any classroom situation and become important in the creation of a climate for learning.

The writer is grateful to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, chairman of the advisory committee, for advice, encouragement and guidance in this research. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. D. Judson Milburn, Dr. Daniel Selakovich, and Dr. Leon L. Munson for serving on the writer's advisory committee.

Special gratitude is expressed to my mother, Mrs. Vasinora Nails Green, and daughter, Cynthia, for patience, understanding and moral support during the course of this study.

To all others who have been of assistance, directly and indirectly, I extend my sincere appreciation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	10
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	17
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	18
Definitions and Interpretations. . . . .	19
Basic Assumptions. . . . .	20
Scope and Limitations. . . . .	21
Summary and Preview. . . . .	23
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE. . . . .	28
Summary. . . . .	47
III. CONSTRUCTION OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENT AND METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN. . . . .	50
Selection of the Items . . . . .	51
Methodology and Design . . . . .	53
Statistical Procedure. . . . .	56
Summary. . . . .	56
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	58
Summary. . . . .	74
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	75
Summary of Findings. . . . .	81
Conclusions. . . . .	82
Recommendations. . . . .	85
Needed Research. . . . .	86
Further Considerations . . . . .	87
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	89
APPENDIX A . . . . .	93
APPENDIX B . . . . .	103
APPENDIX C . . . . .	109

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX D . . . . .	116
APPENDIX E . . . . .	129
APPENDIX F . . . . .	133

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Distribution of Responses to Questions 1-36 (Questionnaire Part II, Appendix A), Experimental and Control Groups . . . . .	104
II. Age Variable . . . . .	110
III. Sex Variable . . . . .	110
IV. Acquaintance with Linguistic Approach Variable . . . . .	111
V. Association with Teacher Using Linguistic Approach Variable . . . . .	111
VI. Taught Linguistic Grammar in English Classroom Variable. . . . .	112
VII. Last Enrollment in Linguistic Course Variable. . . . .	112
VIII. Teaching Level Variable. . . . .	113
IX. Size of Community Variable . . . . .	113
X. Teaching Experience Variable . . . . .	114
XI. Years of Training Variable . . . . .	114
XII. Amount of English Variable . . . . .	115
XIII. Amount of Formal Training Variable . . . . .	115
XIV. Mann-Whitney Comparison of Attitudes, Experimental and Control by Age . . . . .	117
XV. Mann-Whitney Comparison of Attitudes, Experimental and Control by Teaching Level. . . . .	119
XVI. Mann-Whitney Comparison of Attitudes, Experimental and Control by Size of Community . . . . .	121
XVII. Mann-Whitney Comparison of Attitudes, Experimental and Control by Teaching Experience . . . . .	123
XVIII. Mann-Whitney Comparison of Attitudes, Experimental and Control by Years of Training . . . . .	125

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
XIX. Mann-Whitney Comparison of Attitudes, Experimental and Control by Amount of English Taken in College. . . . .	127
XX. The Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of Differences Between Attitudes of Experimental and Control Groups for Items 1-36 . . . . .	130

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

The significant developments in the field of linguistic analysis have vitally affected the English curriculum. Before 1940, innovations in grammar teaching were mainly confined to eliminating some of the meaningless rules incorporated in a standard and uniform grammar. However, since 1940 attention has been focused on the need for new concepts and new approaches in the teaching of English. This change resulted partially from Fries' American English Grammar, which pioneered a new direction of development, and suggested that a new grammar was needed. Fries not only emphasized change, but offered a "partial statement of a new system."<sup>1</sup>

In the past two decades English teachers have been faced with an explosion of knowledge that suggests change in curriculum content and methodology. Most of these changes have developed as a result of linguistic knowledge which bases its premise on a systematic and objective study of language.

Research and results of classroom practice have shown that the traditional approach, characterized too often by absolute standards of

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles C. Fries, American English Grammar (New York, 1940), p. 291.



correctness and rigid rules of conformity, has been inadequate and ineffective. Linguistic concepts, characterized by a theory of constant change, adhere to a realistic and scientific approach to language. This theory of constant change has proved a threat to the static and "correct" body of knowledge in the standard English handbook, and has made the acceptance and recognition of newer trends slow and painful. Added to this disturbing situation is the "natural" opposition of humanists to anything called "science." This has aided the persistence of the eighteenth-century grammatical tradition. However, the behavioral patterns and structures highlighted in the new studies of grammar present a challenging body of relationships which, if detailed simply enough, would accomplish for instruction in language what SMSG (School Mathematics Study Group) has accomplished for the instruction in mathematics.

These recent proclamations of a "revolution in grammar" have sought to define a sharp break between the traditional grammar and the new linguistics. The basic problems persist, however, which seem to indicate that a change in the attitude toward English and the English classroom is necessary for effective application of the newer trends. This change in attitude is dependent upon a change in attitude toward the language. This change should in essence evidence a positive attitudinal approach toward a "changing" language and hence a dynamic classroom. The writer believes this positive approach is necessary to the successful application of the linguistic concepts. This becomes especially important, since the merits of linguistic ideas and concepts must be determined by application.

The writer's experiences in teaching students in the classroom and

teaching teachers in linguistic in-service courses support these conclusions. Teachers must acquire the new, sometimes highly technical knowledge in order to use linguistic concepts effectively. As has been stated recently, the "teacher of the language is as much a specialist in his field as the linguist is in his, and will remain so."<sup>2</sup> This new specialist teacher is as important as the theoretical linguists.

Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens have commented further:

The descriptions of English and other languages which are being produced by linguists will not be textbooks. The linguist can say what is a good description of a language, and can produce such a description. But he cannot say how the language should be taught. This is a matter for teachers and for those who train the teachers. Textbooks can be based on the description written by linguists; but the writing of a language textbook is again a specialized activity, and is not the same thing as describing a language.<sup>3</sup>

The application of new language description to the textbook is proceeding apace. Many educators, curriculum experts and directors of teacher education believe further that a new view of instruction must be developed. Thus, Dr. Owen Thomas, Indiana University, states:

We can establish a new philosophy for instruction. We can perceive a unity that underlies the various language arts. And we can give the children in our classroom a sense of this unity. . . . I suggest that in training teachers and in working with children we focus first on the nature of the language, and only then that we turn to the uses. . . . this slight shift in focus will have far reaching and exciting implications in teaching the arts of the English language.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>M. A. K. Halliday, Angus McIntosh and Peter Strevens, The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching (Bloomington, 1964), p. 166.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 166.

<sup>4</sup>Owen Thomas, "The Nature and Uses of the Language" (Unpublished address given at a conference designated as "The Language Component in the Training of Teachers of English and Reading: Views and Problems, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1966), p. 12.

To effectively implement this new philosophy the classroom climate must be organic and vital rather than static and mechanical; the latter atmosphere dominates so many classrooms. A linguistically based attitude of awe can be used as a means of acquiring language in a viable manner, which in turn logically motivates rationality, continuity and unity in the language arts.

There has been much controversy concerning linguistics and its application to English. "Most of the controversies in linguistics are internal to the discipline and deal with matters of very limited concern to teachers of English."<sup>5</sup> However these examples of differences are often used by teachers as reasons for resisting any change in the established methods of teaching English.

Despite the controversial issues, linguistically instructed grammarians, such as C. C. Fries<sup>6</sup>, Paul Roberts<sup>7</sup>, H. A. Gleason<sup>8</sup>, and W. Nelson Francis<sup>9</sup>, agree that the conventional school room grammar is defective and must be brought more nearly in line with the principles and methods of contemporary linguists.

---

<sup>5</sup> Nelson Francis, "Linguistics: Controversy and Consensus" (Unpublished address given at conference designated as "The Language Component in the Training of Teachers of English and Reading: Views and Problems," Washington, D. C., April 29, 1966), p. 13.

<sup>6</sup> Charles C. Fries, American English Grammar (New York, 1940), pp. 285-286.

<sup>7</sup> Paul Roberts, Understanding English (New York, 1958), Preface xi.

<sup>8</sup> H. A. Gleason, Jr., Linguistics and English Grammar (New York, 1965), p. 8.

<sup>9</sup> W. Nelson Francis, The Structure of American English (New York, 1958), pp. 544-573.

The National Council for the Teachers of English officially recommends a stronger preparation for English teachers and a critical evaluation of methods. Most scholars and teachers agree that the movement toward change in the English classroom is already too strong to be resisted, even if resistance were wise.

Realistically, there is an urgent need for teacher training experts and for institutions to transform viable linguistic concepts into logical theory that can rationally explain and employ valuable linguistic principles in the teaching of the language arts.

This is a time of great and varied activity in the English curriculum. Linguistics has offered many ideas and approaches to abstract theory and practical pedagogy. The amount of publication, both of books and of periodical articles, in the field of English alone has reached such proportions that it is very difficult for teachers to assimilate important facts in an intelligible manner. Unless the attitude toward the English classroom is positive, the wealth of linguistic material and insight becomes another ineffective tool or "gimmick." Therefore, English is experiencing the same kind of explosion of knowledge that has affected the other sciences in the second half of the twentieth century, and attempts are being made to make a linguistically respectable description of English available for classroom use.

In Oklahoma, tangible and concrete steps were made in this direction through the drafting of a Revised Teaching Guide for the Language Arts - Grades 1-13.<sup>10</sup> This was done through a production workshop

---

<sup>10</sup> Revised Teaching Guide for the Language Arts: Grades 1-13 (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1963). Prepared by the Oklahoma Council of Teachers of English.

(English 520) directed by Dr. D. Judson Milburn, at Oklahoma State University in June, 1963. Incorporated in this guide was the linguistic approach to the teaching of grammar through the structural method. The workshop was extended to intensive training of four teachers in the linguistic approach and the structural grammar method, during the summer of 1964. This was the beginning of an extension program in this new knowledge along with a new English technique. The linguistic philosophy was the framework for the introduction of the "structural" method of teaching grammar. It was hoped that the linguistic philosophy would encourage a positive change toward the teaching of the related language components, engendered in essence by the teachers' "change of attitude" toward the language. Concrete evidence produced by revised lesson plans and curriculum guides indicated an increased enthusiasm for teaching and extensive use of the linguistic method.

As a result of the extension program, approximately 400 teachers were formally instructed in the new approach through cooperation of the English Department and the College of Education working through Arts and Sciences Extension.

Further introduction of the new approach occurred during the summer of 1965 when institutes for advanced study in English were held at various colleges and universities in the United States under the auspices of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Oklahoma State University participated in this program and conducted NDEA English institutes in "Composition and Applied Linguistics" during the summers of

1965 and 1966. The center for Applied Linguistics<sup>11</sup> and the National Council of Teachers of English held a conference titled "The Language Component in the training of teachers of English and Reading: Views and Problems," April 28-30, 1966, for an evaluative study of the 1965 NDEA English institutes. Indications are that these conferences will continue with the hope of improving communication between the linguists and teachers of the linguistic approach to the teaching of English. This conference supports the view that the teachers' "positive" attitudes toward language and the English classroom will form the nucleus of improved English instruction.

In 1966, an extension class in the linguistic approach was taught in Japan and Okinawa by Mr. Jim Gardner, who is currently working toward the doctorate in teacher education at Oklahoma State University. Some impressions of the effectiveness of the course by American teachers enrolled in the course in Japan, and Oklahoma teachers enrolled in extension classes from Oklahoma State University are recorded in Appendix A. They imply that an understanding of linguistic philosophy is vital to the effective implementation of the linguistic method of teaching English.

Although the application of linguistics to the English curriculum was initially concentrated in the secondary school curriculum, the effects have not been limited to the secondary level. The Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Council of Teachers of English are equally concerned with the continuity of the language arts program and

---

<sup>11</sup>The Center for Applied Linguistics is located at 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. The center publishes the Linguistic Reporter, a useful and inexpensive bulletin on current activities in the field.

hence the improvement of both elementary and secondary curriculums in English.

Several textbooks incorporating linguistic principles with the junior high and the elementary English curriculums have been written. An example is Discovering Your Language<sup>12</sup> which emphasized the "nature of a changing language" and the "patterns" of sentences, illustrated by the "structural" approach. The late Dr. Paul Roberts published a series of textbooks, The Roberts English Series: A Linguistics Program, designed to teach the linguistic structural approach to grades four, five and six. Roberts quotes as the aim of the series,

. . . aims to improve children's writing by teaching in a thorough and sequential way, the main features of the writing system - in particular the sound and spelling relationship - and the nature of the syntax. Though this might seem an obvious plan for an English series to adopt, it has, for several reasons, not been undertaken before. One reason is that until recently not very much was known about either the sound system or the syntactic system of English.<sup>13</sup>

In addition, Dr. Roberts has published Patterns of English<sup>14</sup>, English Syntax<sup>15</sup>, and English Sentences<sup>16</sup> on the secondary level.

Many experimental projects have been designed for the English curriculum. Examples of these are exploratory units and projects for the elementary grades designed by the Carnegie Institute (1965),

---

<sup>12</sup>Greta Morine, Harold Morine and Neil Postman, Discovering Your Language (New York, 1963).

<sup>13</sup>Paul Roberts, The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program (New York, 1966), p. T1.

<sup>14</sup>Paul Roberts, Patterns of English (New York, 1956).

<sup>15</sup>Paul Roberts, English Syntax (New York, 1964).

<sup>16</sup>Paul Roberts, English Sentences (New York, 1962).

Florida State University (1965), Nebraska University (1965), Northwestern University (1966), University of Oregon (1966), and Purdue University (1966).<sup>17</sup> These experimental projects incorporate linguistic subject matter.

The science of linguistics has provided valuable knowledge concerning the phonological system of language, the syntax or structure that gives evidence of a system, and the social-psychological barriers evidenced as "attitudes" that affect the teaching of English in the classroom. Research suggests that a sequential language arts program beginning in the elementary grades should incorporate these new insights about language. Earlier studies of the English curriculum indicated that the sequential pattern of the language arts curriculum should be improved. In 1959, the Commission on English was enacted as an independent agency of the College Entrance Examination Board. Its task was to improve the teaching of English in America's schools and colleges. The commission also noted as concerns the lack of sequence in the language arts program in addition to the lack of adequate teacher preparation. Priority in this regard was given to lessening the teacher's confusion over content and to the organization of this content in the curriculum.

The current movement toward reform in the English curriculum includes the College English Association, Modern Language Association, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Association of

---

<sup>17</sup>English Institute Materials. (These experimental syllabuses, lesson plans, selections, exercises, and manuals have been gathered as a service of the Modern Language Association of American and the National Council of Teachers of English. They are experimental in nature, having been developed by the Curriculum Centers under the Project English program, and are not yet available for public use or publication).



Secondary School Principals. In addition, Project English, supported by the cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education, has implemented linguistic methods. The results of Project English have pertinent implications since it is able to up-date content and identify subject matter elements thought to be of lasting value. This direct influence on the total language arts program must of necessity affect the calibre of the college English program. This, in turn, will greatly affect the quality of teachers and the quality of instruction they will provide in the public schools.

#### Need for the Study

The demand for a higher standard of competence in the teaching of the language arts has become too insistent to be ignored. This has suggested a revision of the English curriculum, which is traditionally visualized as consisting of three main components: literature, composition and language. The unorganized addition of enriched language activities to the language arts program has obscured its central concerns and caused the language arts to become the least uniform and least coherent major segment in the American school curriculum.

As a result, the English curriculum has received limitless criticism from all segments of the population. We are confronted with many answers to the cliché "Why Johnny can't read and write." Mass media give publicity to complaints that students are not able to manipulate the language efficiently. Business and industry complain that the inability to communicate with clarity is one of the basic reasons for failure in important positions. A top official of the General Electric Company states, "At the last meeting of our Association, representatives

of all the major companies complained about the way their younger men were putting down their words - and futures on paper. Can't someone tell us what to do?"<sup>18</sup>

The attempt to answer this question completes the syndromic circle, peculiarly characterized by social attitudes toward the language. The elementary divisions vigilantly explore home environments, the junior high segments investigate inefficiency in the elementary school programs, while the high school organizations dilligently apply "grammar" in a "scissors-and-paste" manner to prepare the student for the college or university. The university indicts general education for the student's inability to manipulate the language effectively, while faculties continue the "tradition" in the preparation of teachers for the public schools. Thus, the syndrome continues, while the specialists and educationists confront the issue of inadequate teacher training.

The ambivalent attitude of the "public" toward usage, which is psychologically labelled "grammar," has developed many of the misconceptions which impede progress in language instruction in the schools. The origins of "general education" within communities with little "specialization" have conservatively characterized public opinion.

The picture of the school teacher as not much more knowledgeable than the parents has persisted even into an age where most teachers have extensive specialized preparation.<sup>19</sup>

In addition, the academic tradition oriented toward college has augmented this ambivalence of attitude toward English. The ambidex-

---

<sup>18</sup> Kellog W. Hunt, "Why Study English," Our Living Language, (Boston, 1961), p. 102.

<sup>19</sup> H. A. Gleason, Jr., Linguistics and English Grammar (New York, 1965), p. 6.

terity of grammar application as the focus of the language arts program, has persisted in the eighteenth-century tradition. Even the textbooks in the nineteenth-century defined grammar as ". . . the art of speaking and writing English correctly."<sup>20</sup> Meanwhile, grammar was the tool used to teach correct English.

This concept of correct grammar intensified by emotionalized social attitudes, has been re-enforced by prescriptivism. The overtones of social connotations are singularly directed toward the language, in contrast to other subjects. The average American will candidly acknowledge his lack of knowledge in science of physics, but his lack of competence in English (which is primarily grammar via usage) is accompanied by embarrassment and feelings of guilt. This self-consciousness is often expressed and shown in the presence of English teachers, and apologetically reinforced by the parent's desire to see that "his children" receive proper grammar instruction and knowledge of the "rules" that regulate "correct usage."

These traditional attitudes have influenced teachers and the language arts curriculum. They have unfortunately upheld traditional grammar and encouraged its antithesis to the new grammar. This antithesis is especially noxious, since it prevents a realistic appraisal of the new insights. These have been stated concisely:

The language instruction which is to educate must show clearly the systematic nature of grammar, the inter-relatedness of the parts, and something of the complexity of the "whole." It is here that linguistics can make its major contribution.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 7

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

The integration of all parts in the "whole" stand contrary to the compartmental divisions of content which have too often separated spelling from reading and grammar from writing. The basic nature of language instruction should allow for the acceptance of workable concepts, whether traditional or modern, in the language arts curriculum.

It hardly needs to be noted that the growing complexity of our society invokes more stringent responsibilities on our educational system, and much of this is relegated to the language arts curriculum. Of primary essence is the citizen's improved skill of communication and a recognition of the social barriers to communication. As Albert H. Marckwardt has stated,

The development of our nation and of our social order is at a point where we can no longer afford the ease and laziness of the inarticulate, the lack of a critical sense, the preservation of a wide-eyed naivete. We shall have to amend these faults or run the risk of forfeiting our democratic heritage, of falling into the toils of dictatorship or of thought control of some kind.<sup>22</sup>

This statement further suggests that ways must be devised to give this type of training to the speakers of sub-standard as well as standard English, to the so-called culturally disadvantaged and the so-called "culturally-favored," in order to produce the leadership so desperately needed in the next decades.

Emerging national concerns attest to the reality of these demands. Model Cities Programs, Poverty Programs, Headstart and Culturally disadvantaged programs, along with the rat control bills are tangible evidences of attempts to involve all segments of the society in the total educational process. The writer believes the validity and success

---

<sup>22</sup> Albert H. Marckwardt, Linguistics and the Teaching of English (New York, 1966), p. 5.

of these programs can only be determined by the type of communication established in the initial stages. Rapport in communication is dependent on the attitudinal operants in a given situation. Recently, the educators and the public have become vitally concerned with this "rapport in communication," as it affects the local, national and international scene. In this regard, the language arts teacher must visualize the classroom as realistic preparation for effective communication in affairs involving the local, national, and international scene. Furthermore, the English teacher must implement classroom procedures that conform to these visualized goals of effective communication on the local, national and international scene.

The ethnocentric view of education must be boldly discarded for a realistic acceptance of the changes demanded by a technological, scientific and mobile society. In this sense, educators can well expect students to inherit a way of life that necessitates "breakfast in London" and "dinner in Texas."

The semantic difficulties of communication become thus compounded. Connotative meanings often become more important than denotative meanings in communication. Since connotative meaning is substantiated by attitudes toward people and culture, an awareness of the attitudinal operants is mandatory to skillful manipulation of communication. This realistic view of language is a tenet of the linguistic philosophy and should, in the view of the writer, become the purposive nature of the language arts curriculum.

In other words, the process of becoming a master of any human skill, on any level of behavior, consists essenti-

ally of being able first to observe and then to act on differences that make a difference.<sup>23</sup>

Among present day teachers of English, at least those who have been trained in modern linguistic science, it is believed that accurate knowledge of the facts of current usage in different social classes, on different social occasions, among different occupational groups, in different areas of the country, and knowledge of the processes of linguistic change are essential if one is to develop in his students the ability to write and speak well. Therefore, the decisions of "what," "when," "where," and "how" to teach necessitate a knowledge of the realistic use of language in our culture.

The demands of the future upon the language competence of literally millions of our countrymen will be so stringent, so critical, so necessary to our continued functioning as a democracy . . . and as a potent force in a world in crisis we shall have to gear our education to them.<sup>24</sup>

Despite the recent trends to support and stimulate the humanities, there are still many teachers who have not been exposed to the linguistic philosophy that is basic to the effective implementation of the linguistic approach to the teaching of English.

In both the native and the foreign language field, programs for the preparation of teachers have given no more than a minimum of time and attention to the assumptions, the ideas, and the attitudes concerning language which have been developing and the mass of information which has come to light during the present century.<sup>25</sup>

It is often stated that teachers themselves are not skilled enough in the languages they are teaching. This, perhaps, is important in

---

<sup>23</sup> Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching (New York, 1967), p. 35.

<sup>24</sup> Marckwardt, p. 135.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

assessing some reasons for the poor results in the classroom. However, the writer believes this is a minor factor in that the teaching of English is often adversely affected by the teacher's attitude toward language.

The grave fault is the approach to language and the descriptions of language on which the teaching is grounded. . . . difficult to assess the relative importance of the factor accurately. . . . if it is true that there is something wrong with the account given of a language being taught, then it is important to put this right even if the teacher is a highly qualified person. . . . it is even more important if he is imperfectly trained. . . .<sup>26</sup>

Consideration is given to the solution of these problems in curriculum revision and reorganization of the English curriculum. The addition of linguistics to the language arts curriculum has not only required many teachers to enroll in linguistic courses, but has added new dimensions to the curriculum content. The re-education has given teachers new insights as well as new questions. To be taught well, any content, old or new, must be taught with understanding and with enthusiasm. In other words, content must be taught with sympathy. Thus an important mark of good teaching is attitude. Therefore, it is necessary to observe changes. The need for this study is substantiated by the premise that successful implementation of linguistic methods is dependent on an acceptance of the "linguistic enterprise," which generally implies attitudinal change. Since the teacher is the catalyst in the learning situation, any projection in evaluation of linguistic methods, as evidenced in changed behavior of students, must be based upon such a study as this. Therefore, this study is one very important

---

<sup>26</sup>Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, p. 156.

factor in the evaluation of linguistic methods in the English classroom.

#### Purpose of the Study

The urgent demands to re-evaluate the English curriculum have given this revision top priority. The reasons are many: (1) demands of a technological society, (2) need for increased communication on the international scene, (3) increasing dissatisfaction of language arts teachers with established curricula, (4) inadequate compensation and, (5) inadequate opportunities for preparation of new curriculums.

Under such circumstances, concern encourages enthusiastic and even unrealistic acceptance and expectation of any method that might offer a solution to the problems. The new grammar has been subjected to such expectation. This is, however, grossly unfair to linguistic science and linguistic scholars, since the restructuring of the language arts curriculum entails more than a new method or content. Not that it has not been tested in a viable learning situation already. The second World War required the instruction quickly in a large number of languages previously untaught. The miraculous success of this effort by modern linguists resulted in the emergence of the "army method"<sup>27</sup> of teaching, which had implication for the teaching of English as a second language. The "army method" vitally influenced both the foreign

---

<sup>27</sup>Gleason, p. 49: "A speedy and realistic method of learning a foreign language with the aid of only a native informant. The linguist is able to prepare very quickly phonemic transcriptions which can be used in preparing class materials. The method emphasized the 'spoken' rather than the 'written' language, and was used to teach service men Japanese, Arabic, and a number of other languages, for the most part learning a step ahead of the class and producing lesson materials under terrific pressures."



language and the language arts curriculum. These implications have given credence to the relationship of many linguistic concepts to the teaching of English, since many students should be taught the standard dialect as a second language.

However, in any teaching situation, it is the author's belief that a positive attitude toward the language must accompany the attempt to implement the method. The linguistic philosophy appears to lend itself to the development of this "positive" attitude toward language and hence the students in the classroom.

It is the purpose of this study to explore the attitudes of English teachers toward the language and suggest that an exposure to linguistic philosophy encourages more positive attitudes. This, in turn, effects increased motivation and stimulates the development of the "self-concept" in students. The overall result is an increase in the climate for learning. Therefore, a pre-requisite to effective presentation of any "linguistic concept" or "method" is the teacher's positive attitude toward the language and the students in the classroom. Only then can the validity of these concepts receive the candid and objective evaluation that forms the nucleus of improved English instruction.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of a group of Oklahoma teachers and NDEA institute fellows who have been instructed in the linguistic approach to the teaching of English. This study seeks to determine whether there is a significant difference between the attitudes of those teachers who have had formal instruction in the linguistic approach to the teaching of English and the attitude

of those teachers who have had no such instruction. The primary problem is to determine whether formal instruction in structural linguistics is a factor that influences these attitudes. The study will involve the testing of the following hypothesis in null form:

There is no significant difference between the attitudes toward modern English programs of teachers who have had formal instruction in linguistics and teachers who have had no such instruction.

#### Definitions and Interpretations

The following terms appear throughout the study and are defined here in the technological sense in which they are used in this study.

Attitude. An emotionalized tendency, organized through experience, to react positively or negatively toward a psychological object.<sup>28</sup> Attitudes are, irrevocably, linked to emotions and may be roughly defined as feeling for or against something.

English. In this study "English" will refer to the language arts program and its various components. No "modern" aspects will be indicated by the use of the terms.

Linguistics. In this study "Linguistics" will be defined as a scientific study of language, specifically the linguistic philosophy and grammar known as "structural." This scientific study of language will reflect, in a general way, an acceptance of the attitudes and procedures produced by the attempt to discover and acquire knowledge about language in a scientific manner.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> H. H. Remmers and N. L. Gage, Educational Measurement and Evaluation (New York, 1955), p. 362.

<sup>29</sup> Postman and Weingartner, p. 16.

Linguistic Enterprise. Positive attitudes toward language that include a hostility toward dogmatism and authoritarianism, an understanding that all answers are tentative, a willingness to accept the possibility that there may exist different and even conflicting answers to the same question, and a preference for objectivity and detachment.<sup>30</sup>

Linguistic Approach. In this study the linguistic approach will refer to the linguistic implementation of modern methods of teaching English. The connotations of the five broad linguistic concepts will be alluded to as the framework: language changes constantly, change is normal, spoken language is the language, correctness rests upon usage, and all usage is relative.

Traditional Approach. In this study the traditional approach will refer to the close association of the teaching of English with the three "R's," the conception of grammar as the tool, the acceptance of a rigid standard of correctness, and a subjective criterion of analysis.

#### Basic Assumptions

The assumptions upon which this study is based are:

1. Attitudes are measurable and vary along a linear continuum.

We know and measure a change of attitude by the same means used to assess its existence. An attitude is revealed and measured through a characteristic mode of behavior, verbal or nonverbal. A change of this attitude is assessed through significant changes in this characteristic mode of behavior. Since an attitude denotes an existing stand or partiality toward its referent, a change in attitude denotes

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

a change in the direction and/or degree of this stand or partiality.<sup>31</sup>

2. Attitudes of teachers toward the linguistic approach to the teaching of English can be measured.
3. The expressed responses of the subjects reflected their true feelings and attitudes. It is possible that the subject may be consciously or unconsciously concealing his true attitude. In measuring the attitude expressed, this fact must be considered. However, attitudes can be effectively studied through simple judgmental-perceptual reactions, and variations in these reactions give indication of attitude and attitude change. Thus, attitudes can be effectively studied through simple judgmental-perceptual reactions, and variations in these reactions give indication of attitude and attitude change. Thus, attitudes effectively regulate and motivate the individual's experience and behavior.
4. Positive or negative attitudes toward a change in established methods and procedures in teaching English are reflected in attitudes toward the modern English programs.
5. Attitude toward English is a major factor in the competence and effectiveness of the language arts teacher.

#### Scope and Limitations

This study is the investigation of the attitudes of 550 English teachers toward the modern approach to the teaching of the English language which incorporates some linguistic concepts. The study seeks

---

<sup>31</sup>Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, An Outline of Social Psychology (New York, 1956), p. 539.

to determine whether there is a significant difference between the attitudes of those teachers who have had formal instruction in a linguistic course and the attitudes of those teachers who have had no such instruction. The study included teachers of grades 1-12.

This limitation must be considered since the application of linguistic research to teaching materials has been primarily on the secondary level. In essence, the writer does not consider this a serious limitation, since the language arts program should be viewed as sequential and cumulative. Although some teachers were exposed to this horizontal and vertical view of the language arts curriculum, it is impossible to determine if all teachers were presented the materials in this scope and sequence. Most subjects in the experimental group were Oklahoma teachers. However, since fellows from two NDEA institutes were used, there were some teachers from other states. The control group was composed of only Oklahoma teachers.

There are several other factors in the study which might be viewed as limitations, since attitudes may be temporary, changeable and subject to rationalization.

Due to the fortuitous nature of the sample it is possible that some bias exists in favor of the experimental group. In view of the fact that this study is in the realm of the language arts, it is extremely unlikely that all possible variables can be controlled. Realistically, it must be assumed that there are unmeasurable variations that influence the attitudes of the subjects of the study. These factors include the differences in the quality of instruction received by the teachers in the extension courses. There were four instructors engaged in the program to improve English instruction in the state of

Oklahoma, and it is impossible to determine the degree of commitment of each instructor to the importance of attitude. It is also impossible to determine the emphasis the linguistic philosophy, as a classroom approach, was given. Differences in the educational and administrative philosophies of the schools where teachers were employed and differences in the educational philosophies of the teachers themselves are inconsistencies that cannot be subjected to this measurement. This study does not attempt to control other possible intervening variables and factors that might affect the responses to the instrument. These variations are inherent in the findings of the study and must be considered in the conclusions that are derived from the findings.

#### Summary and Preview

During the past decade the tempo of research and experimentation has increased and so has acceptance of changes in the language arts program. Concomitant with these developments has been an attitude of open-mindedness and willingness to try new content and new methods. This has encouraged curriculum adjustments. The traditional practice of attempting to impose curricular changes upon teachers through inspection and supervision caused resentment which developed negative attitudes toward innovations. This has, in a sense, influenced the negative attitudes of teachers toward the "new approach," which some have called a "revolution" in grammar. The relevance of this linguistic approach to the teaching of English can no longer be ignored and the trend toward revision of the language arts program legislates realistic evaluation of the linguistic concepts.

In order to devise the sequential, cumulative and spiral unity of

grades 1-12, the philosophy of the school and the classroom must be incorporated into the basic integrating formula. This, in turn, will characterize an approach to the classroom that can stimulate learning.

The focus of this unified curriculum should be an understanding of the "nature of a changing language." This is a prerequisite to an understanding of its uses. Since language is a social instrument, and is so used, the attitude of the teacher toward the language is evidenced in the attitude of the teacher toward the classroom and the pupils.

A candid view of language is vital to the structuring of a sound curriculum. Linguistic theory can be used to describe language objectively and scientifically, thus contributing to this realistic appraisal, which contrasts vividly with the traditional view that language is a self-contained whole, hermetically separated from extra-lingual reality.<sup>32</sup>

However, the use of linguistic theory to describe language is not an application of linguistics. Applied linguistics begins when a description is specifically made, or an existing description is used, for a purpose outside of linguistic science. The use of linguistic theory, which influences attitudes, must precede the effective application of applied linguistics, since theories are dynamic, while facts are inert. Facts, however, define principles, rules and laws that have relevance for the components of English teaching. Since language is the chief instrument whereby society achieves unity, the nature of language as discovered by linguistic theory, and the relevant scientific principles

---

<sup>32</sup>Josef Vachek, The Linguistic School of Prague (Bloomington, 1966), p. 10.

as defined by applied linguistics merit priority in planning curriculum revision.

Any curriculum must change and develop in accordance with the ideological structure of its period, and its goals should shift as the structure demands. Therefore, caution must be exercised in making claims for linguistics as an easy answer to all of the English teacher's problems.

In this regard, the linguistic philosophy followed by linguistically based materials and approaches can offer realistic aid in attaining the goals of the language arts curriculum. Linguistic's scientific and objective approach to the language recognizes the uniqueness and variety of English, while traditional grammar tends to look at English in terms of classical languages, particularly Latin, and recognizes only one "correct" or "standard" English. Linguistics recognizes that language is in a constant state of change and regards this change as normal; while traditional grammar would, if possible, stabilize the language and view change as deterioration. Consequently, some teachers fear that the new doctrine may upset old authority, while others resent the obligation to unlearn anything that they ever learned. Re-enforcing both of these is universal human inertia, fortified by the humanist's suspicion of the "scientific" when applied to the language arts.

Modern programs in the language arts have not been sufficiently developed or consistently adopted. It is difficult to determine the exact number of programs or to what extent linguistic concepts are used. However, the trend toward teacher preparation in the language arts indicates that the use of linguistic methods is increasing. The con-



ceptions and misconceptions of the public centered about grammar and the teaching profession have intensified the emotional objections to the "new approach." The writer believes that teachers dislike being portrayed as guardians of the language but fear the loss of personal status. This effects rationalization that demands concrete and impossible verification of the merits of proposed changes. Therefore, many teachers favor traditional grammar and have negative attitudes toward linguistic materials because they believe traditional methods to be a stable body of doctrine on which they can rely and set a standard. In reality, a high percentage of traditional grammar and approaches present disagreement and illogicality.

In order to proceed toward an increase in linguistic competence the writer believes that attitudes should be considered before skill development.

For this reason, it is the attitude toward language on the part of teacher and pupil alike which takes on an importance equal to or even greater than, practice in the skill of using language and technical knowledge about its structure. <sup>33</sup>

The purpose of this study is to measure and compare the attitudes of 333 teachers who have had formal instruction in linguistics with the attitudes of 217 teachers who have had no such instruction. Statistical procedures will be employed to determine whether formal instruction in structural linguistics is a factor which affects these attitudes.

In this chapter, the writer has developed the background of the problem, stated the problem, validated the need for the study, and indicated the scope of the study. Attention was given to the basic

---

<sup>33</sup> Marckwardt, p. 74.

assumptions in order to delineate the framework of the study.

Chapter II will give a review of the selected related literature. Although no studies were found concerning attitudes toward modern English programs, there have been studies involving teacher and student attitudes toward other subjects.

Chapter III will contain a description of the construction of the measuring instrument used in the study and will describe in detail the procedures used in obtaining data for the study. This chapter will also include a description of the subjects and a discussion of the statistical methods used.

Chapter IV will present an analysis of the data.

In Chapter V the writer will summarize results and present conclusions and recommendations indicated by the data.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The definition of an attitude, as it shall be used in this study appears on page 19 of this study. However, the term connotes such a nebulous concept in its abstraction that it merits re-examination in this context.

The nature of attitudes in the fields of education and psychology is most complex. This complexity results from controversial aspects of definition, measurement, and change. The controversial aspects are evident in comments by several students of the subject.

Thurston defines attitudes as "the sum total of man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic."<sup>1</sup> Allport sees attitude as "a mental and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive and dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related."<sup>2</sup>

Downie understands attitudes as "the readiness to react toward or against some object of value. They may be considered as a sort of

---

<sup>1</sup>L. L. Thurston and E. J. Chave, The Measurement of Attitudes (Chicago, 1929), pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup>G. W. Allport, "Attitudes," A Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. C. A. Murchison (Worcester, 1935), p. 810.

charge or potential that an individual has. When we are stimulated by the appropriate stimulus, our responses usually follow a pre-determined pattern."<sup>3</sup> Summarily, Katz defines attitude as "the predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object of his world in a favorable or unfavorable manner."<sup>4</sup> Another definition of the concept is the following:

. . . attitude is a readiness or tendency to act or react in a certain manner. No one has ever seen an attitude. An attitude, however real it is to its possessor, is an abstraction the existence of which is inferred either from non-verbal overt behavior or verbal and symbolic behavior.<sup>5</sup>

In this regard, Thurston theorized that an opinion is a verbal expression of an attitude, but that the measurement of attitudes by an opinion is not necessarily a prediction of overt action.

. . . it is of interest to know what people say that they believe even if their conduct turns out to be inconsistent with their professed opinions. Even if they are intentionally distorting their attitudes, we are measuring at least the attitude which they are trying to make people believe that they have.<sup>6</sup>

Generally the definition of attitudes falls into two groups. One group identifies attitudes as stabilized sets or dispositions toward overt actions, while the other tends to recognize attitudes as verbal substitutes for overt action. However, it is reasonable to assume that attitudes must be judged by outward manifestations, either through

---

<sup>3</sup>N. M. Downie, Fundamentals of Measurement (New York, 1958), p. 333.

<sup>4</sup>Daniel Katz, "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (Summer, 1960), p. 168.

<sup>5</sup>Quinn McNemar, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (July, 1946), p. 289.

<sup>6</sup>Thurston and Chave, The Measurement of Attitude (Chicago, 1948), p. 9.

verbalizations or overt behavior. Teachers, through informal observations, make judgments of their pupils' attitudes. Pupil inventories, case studies, cumulative records and grouping give mute evidence to this fact. It seems that the validity for noting teacher attitudes is established by these practices.

On the basis of research concerning the effect of emotionalized attitudes on learning, the evidence supports the implications that attitudes, like intelligence, are factors in learning situations. Hence, teachers will do well in planning for accomplishment to ascertain pupil attitude and deliberately strive to make it favorable.<sup>7</sup> This is substantiated in "A Study of Attitudes Toward English" that focused on the relationship between student attitude and academic success. The implications of this study suggested that attitude appears to be a factor which should be considered along with I.Q. and marks in predicting pupils' success and that some adjustment seems to be necessary in the high school English curriculum to make English more palatable to boys.<sup>8</sup> The experience of the writer indicates that the English curriculum should be revised in order to make English more palatable to all concerned. This includes teachers, students, and the general public. Representative of research that supports this view is "A Study of Attitudes in the Elementary Grades" which indicates that the

teacher's knowledge of technique, subject matter, enthusiasm or indifference for what she teaches . . . significantly influence the pupils' liking or disliking a specific subject.

---

<sup>7</sup> Briggs and others, The Emotionalized Attitudes (New York, 1940), p. 58.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Wethington, "Attitudes and Academic Success," Kentucky University Bureau of School Service Bulletin, XXXVIII (September 1965-June 1966), p. 5.

These likes and dislikes build positive and negative attitudes.<sup>9</sup>

Hence, the teacher's personality, knowledge, and his own attitude are determining factors in whether the students develop positive attitudes toward the subject area. This significantly concerns English as the core of the language arts program and has ramifications for all subjects in the school. Since these studies concerning pupil attitude tend to theorize that the personality of the teacher is important in characterizing the attitude of the pupil toward school subjects, it seems logical to explore teacher attitude which must serve as the prerequisite for the formation.

Although there are some who maintain that formal education has little, if any, affect on attitudes, the majority of educational research indicates that education can and does affect attitudes.<sup>10</sup>

The following charge was made recently by the National Council of Teachers of English:

Two obvious statements can be made concerning the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools. A great deal of time is being spent on the matter, particularly in teaching grammar, and most of the time is wasted.<sup>11</sup>

The council's conclusion was that the teaching of English in the schools is "disgracefully bad." The ultimate blame for the failure was placed squarely on the shoulders of the teacher preparatory programs of the colleges.

---

<sup>9</sup>Sister Josephina, C.S.J., "A Study of Attitudes in the Elementary Grades," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXIII (October, 1959), pp. 58-60.

<sup>10</sup>Briggs and others, p. 60.

<sup>11</sup>G. K. Hodenfield, "Teachers Council Finds Fault with Instruction Methods," Southwest American (December 1, 1964).

This indictment was the incentive for the study by Dumas.<sup>12</sup> The primary purpose of this study was to determine the relative strength or weakness of University of Arkansas student teachers in English, with respect to the 30 items constituting the Student Teaching Record. The subjects selected for this study were 21 prospective English teachers at the University of Arkansas during the fall term of 1964. In order to determine the areas of relative strength or weakness of the subjects, means of ratings by each type of rater on each item were computed. These means were then placed in rank order from one (strength) through 30 (weakness).

The weaknesses identified by the raters were: (1) sympathy with pupil difficulties, (2) breadth of general information, (3) understanding of unit organization, (4) knowledge of modern teaching materials, (5) quality of questions, (6) recognition of pupil needs, (7) use of pupil experience, (8) fixation of important learnings, (9) personal appearance.

The raters agreed upon eight items as belonging to the "strength" category. These eight items were: (1) readiness to cooperate, (2) desire to secure pupil cooperation, (3) readiness to profit from criticism, (4) knowledge of English usage, (5) definite and workable assignments, (6) self confidence and self control, (7) readiness to carry out suggestions, (8) personal appearance.

Although the raters were able to agree generally on ratings of individuals, the extent of agreement varied considerably from rater-to-rater on each type of rating.

---

<sup>12</sup>William Wayne Dumas, "Strengths and Weaknesses of Student Teachers in English," The Journal of Experimental Education, No. 1 (Fall, 1966), pp. 19-27.

In response to the growing number of criticisms aimed at teachers of English, an evaluative follow-up study was designed to assess the competencies of these student teachers at the University of Arkansas. Dumas<sup>18</sup> attempted to provide answers to the following questions:

- (1) Which of the 30 items of the Student Teaching Record, a teaching rating instrument, are critical and which are non-critical to success in teaching English?
- (2) What combination of items are most critical to success in teaching English?
- (3) How do these critical item-combinations relate to underlying factors of the ratings as defined by varimax factor solutions? Extending the question then, what is the composition of the critical combination of factors in teaching English?<sup>19</sup>

Dumas postulates that there is considerable lack of agreement among raters as to what is critical in teaching English. In this follow-up study, the same 21 prospective English teachers were observed and rated, during a period of six weeks by each of three types of raters: (a) the University of Arkansas supervisor in English, (b) the public school cooperating teachers, and (c) an experienced high school English teacher, who served as a non-supervisory observer. In addition to ratings on the evaluative instrument, global effectiveness ratings were required of all raters. The primary instrument for the collection of data was the University of Arkansas Student Teaching Record, a rating instrument which requests numerical ratings of one-to-four on each of 30 items.

In order to determine the relationship between each of the rated

---

<sup>18</sup> Willaim Wayne Dumas, "Critical Factors in Teaching English," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXV, No. 3 (Spring, 1967).

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 80.



items of the Student Teaching Record and the global ratings by the three types of raters, correlation coefficients were computed. Eighty-five of the 90 coefficients presented demonstrated a positive relationship. Dumas concluded:

A major implication of these findings is that the considerable lack of agreement among raters as to what is critical in teaching English is more apparent than real. The persistent appearance of the Knowledge Factor in the three critical combinations and the somewhat lesser persistence of the Control Factor provide substantial support for the inclusion of these two factors in any critical combination of factors in teaching English.<sup>20</sup>

The significance of these findings to the present study is that statistical recognition is given to the extreme intricacy of the teaching complex as it relates to English. This lack of agreement on critical factors in teaching English is perhaps partly responsible for the broad and vague structuring of the language arts curriculum.

Chance<sup>21</sup> supports the idea that the more accepting, adaptable student teachers are also more democratic in their attitudes toward the establishment of interpersonal relations with children. The principal objective of the study was to investigate the interrelation of selected personality factors, selected value orientations, and academic achievement as these factors relate to student teachers' attitudes toward classroom management. In addition the relationship of these factors to actual classroom practices of student teachers was also investigated. Data were utilized from a total of 146 student teachers

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 83.

<sup>21</sup>William George Chance, "A Study of Selected Factors as They Relate to the Establishment of Interpersonal Relations by Student Teachers," (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1965).

enrolled in the College of Education, the College of Arts and Science, the College of Agriculture and the College of Home Economics. The data supported the conclusion that student teachers' attitudes toward the establishment of interpersonal relations with students can be predicted.

Objective and unbiased teaching in the classroom reflect the attitude of the teacher toward the classroom and the pupils, and relevance of positive classroom social climates to the optimal school adjustment of pupils is now taken for granted by most social psychologists of education. It is then important to note that even when the social backgrounds of teachers are similar they differ significantly in ways basic to their teaching. However, positive attitudes allow teachers to see pupil characteristics as dimensions, while the negative or less-positive attitudes tend to encourage teachers to dichotomize pupil characteristics.<sup>22</sup>

Brann<sup>23</sup> points out that improvement in teacher competence is set in the framework of reference of the teacher's self-perception. The population of this study was composed of student teachers at Oklahoma State University who were divided into two groups. The control group was comprised of twenty-five participants and the experimental group was comprised of twenty participants. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Dogmatism Scale, and post scores on the Self-Concept Scale were used to collect the data. The analysis of covariance was employed

---

<sup>22</sup>Richard Shumuck, "Some Aspects of Classroom Social Climate," Psychology in the Schools, III (1966), P. 64.

<sup>23</sup>Ralph Austin Brann, "A Study of the Effect of Teaching Self-Evaluation Procedures on the Self-Concept of Student Teachers," (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967).

with the pre- and post-test Self-Concept scores to test the hypothesis. The Mann-Whitney U test was employed in calculating the correlation between the dogmatism scores and the self-criticism scores.

The principal purpose of this study was to determine whether guidance and training in self-evaluation techniques could have useful and meaningful purposes in the teacher education programs at the Oklahoma State University. The findings indicate that the concept people have of themselves influences their behavior and therefore, a change in behavior is reflected in a change in self-concept. However, the data were insufficient to indicate that there is a correlation between the variables of dogmatism and self-criticism.

Dick<sup>24</sup> attempted a statistical study in the area of attitudes. His population consisted of 50 female elementary education majors enrolled at Oklahoma State University. The Mann Whitney U test was utilized to test for differences between open- and closed-minded subjects on pre-test and post-test scores taken from tests on achievement in science and confidence in ability to teach elementary science. The Fisher exact probability test was used to test for differences in attitudes toward the teaching of elementary school science held by those who are open-minded and those who are closed-minded. Finally, the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used to test if those who are open-minded and those who are closed-minded had a significant change between their pre-test and post-test scores on the confidence in teaching science test.

---

<sup>24</sup>Roy Dennis Dick, "A Study of Open-Minded and Closed-Minded Pre-Service Elementary Education Majors Being Trained in Contemporary Science Methods," (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967).

This study indicated that attitudes held toward the teaching of elementary school science for the open-minded group were significantly more favorable than the attitudes of the closed-minded group. If attitudes of teachers are important, the open-minded group might be expected to do a better job of teaching science by the approaches now being advocated in many of the national curriculum revisions.<sup>25</sup>

Benson<sup>26</sup> attempted to determine the relative effectiveness of two methods of teaching elementary school science at the fifth grade level. The population consisted of students from two different school populations; one experimental and one control group taught by the same teacher from each school. The data analyzed in the study tended to indicate that in each school, the pupil-investigation approach compared favorably with the traditional approach to teaching fifth grade science. In one school there was a positive change in the attitudes of pupils toward science. Although the confidence scores were significantly higher at the .05 level of confidence at one school, they were below the required level of significance at the other school.

Leake<sup>27</sup> investigated the attitudes of a group of Oklahoma elementary teachers toward science. The study attempted to determine whether the natural science course for elementary teachers provided by extension from Oklahoma State University is a factor which influences these

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>26</sup> Keith Sheran Benson, "A Comparison of Two Methods of Teaching Fifth Grade Science" (unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968).

<sup>27</sup> John Benjamin Leake, "A Study of Attitudes of Elementary Teachers Toward Science" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966).

attitudes. The subjects were 285 elementary teachers, grades 1-8, employed in school systems within a 120 mile radius of Oklahoma State University. Leake concluded:

There was no significant difference found between the attitudes of in-service participating teachers and non-participating teachers in the same school district or in adjacent school districts with similar environments. The attitudes of elementary school teachers toward science did not show significant difference after participation in the in-service course.<sup>28</sup>

Leake states that this does not mean that the courses are failing to accomplish anything. "We have just been attempting to measure one parameter of an activity with hopefully many parameters."<sup>29</sup>

Rice<sup>30</sup> investigated the attitudes of 400 Oklahoma elementary teachers toward mathematics and modern mathematics programs. The study sought to determine whether there is a significant difference between the attitudes of those teachers who have had formal instruction in modern mathematics materials and the attitudes of those teachers who have had no such instruction. The subjects were divided into four groups using as a criteria the amount of formal instruction in modern materials, amount of teaching in a modern program, and enrollment in 1963-64 extension classes. The instrument used in the study was an attitude scale devised by the author. The conclusions indicate that teachers who had received training in modern mathematics materials had more favorable attitudes toward mathematics and the modern programs.

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 53.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 53.

<sup>30</sup> Jimmy Marshall Rice, "A Study of Attitudes of Elementary Teachers toward Modern Mathematics Programs" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966).

"It therefore appeared that efforts of educational institutions and agencies such as the National Science Foundation to acquaint teachers with modern materials through institutes and in-service instructions were worthwhile."<sup>31</sup>

It is this writer's belief that linguists have added some new dimensions to the teaching of reading. The teacher of reading who has some knowledge of the findings of linguistics about speech, writing, and their inter-relationship will be more intelligent and effective than the teacher who knows nothing about these findings. "The linguists would add that efficient and accurate instruction in both must be based upon a sound understanding of English phonemics, morphemics, and graphics. Only with such understanding can the reading teacher be sure he is teaching realities."<sup>32</sup>

Smith<sup>33</sup> in comparing retarded readers in special reading classes with retarded readers in regular classes concluded that there was no difference in reading gain, vocabulary, level of comprehension and overall reading skills when special instruction was provided in small classes as compared to those in the regular program. Of relevance to this study is Smith's recommendation that more research is needed to determine the effects of special reading classes on attitudes in the different subject areas.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 93.

<sup>32</sup>W. Nelson Francis, The Structure of American English (New York, 1958), p. 555.

<sup>33</sup>Loren Walter Smith, "A Study of Retarded Readers in Special Reading Classes Compared with Retarded Readers in Regular Classes" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967).

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

The social orientation of language involves the development of attitudes toward people and culture, while learning the foreign language. Those who favor foreign language instruction in elementary schools often maintain that one of the major purposes for adopting such a program is to provide for better understanding between the various nations of the world and ours. Thus the growing complexities of international understanding have many implications for the teaching of native and foreign languages.

In 1959, the Foreign Language Instruction Project of the University of Illinois, supported by Title VII of the NDEA and the Graduate Research Board of the University of Illinois, began investigating numerous problems related to foreign language programs in elementary schools. The study reported by Riestra and Johnson<sup>35</sup> is concerned with changes in pupils' attitudes. The problem was to determine the extent to which a group of elementary school pupils who had studied a foreign language differed in their attitudes toward the peoples represented by that language, from another group of pupils who had not studied the foreign language. The pilot study was conducted to establish the basis for a more comprehensive investigation on the effect of foreign language on children's attitudes. Of interest to this study is that the pilot study indicated that as the pupils studied the language they acquired more positive attitudes toward the people represented by it. The main study involved 126 fifth grade classrooms. The experimental group was composed of 63 pupils from five different classrooms who had been

---

<sup>35</sup>Miguel A. Riestra and Charles E. Johnson, "Changes in Attitudes of Elementary-School Pupils Toward Foreign-Speaking Peoples Resulting from the Study of a Foreign Language," Journal of Experimental Education, I (Fall, 1964), pp. 65-72.

engaged in learning Spanish for two years under an instructional program sponsored by the Foreign Language Instruction Project.

The control group was composed of 63 pupils from five different fifth grade classrooms where Spanish was not taught. The two groups were administered a questionnaire to determine the pupils' attitudes toward the peoples of other countries.

The findings of the study support the hypothesis that teaching a foreign language to elementary school children in its cultural setting is a potent force in creating more positive attitudes toward the peoples represented by that language. ". . . it gives support to the hypothesis that new educational media such as television, through especially designed programs, may be more effective than personal contact with classroom teachers in establishing particular attitudes."<sup>36</sup>

The recent emphasis on teaching the so-called culturally-disadvantaged has invoked an interest in the application of linguistic philosophy in this area. T. Bentley Edwards noted that "certain teachers are subjectively considered by principals, supervisors, and colleagues to hold attitudes and possess skills that make them successful with disadvantaged children and youth."<sup>37</sup> During the course of a recent research and training project in which the departments of criminology and education at the Berkeley campus of the University of California cooperated, an inventory of attitudes was prepared to assess dimensions of teacher affect that might prove relevant to success in

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>37</sup> T. Bentley Edwards, "Teacher Attitudes and Cultural Differentiation," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXV (Winter, 1966), p. 80.



the education of underprivileged children and youth. The inventory was used with a selected group of teachers to predict success with underprivileged children. Edwards concluded:

1. A valid, reliable instrument is available to test teacher attitudes relevant to the teaching of underprivileged children.
2. To be useful to the teacher, information from the behavioral sciences must be translated, by themselves, or by others, into anecdotes describing concrete classroom behavior. Teachers can then use the fresh information to sharpen their perceptions, and, if need be, add to their repertoire of techniques, so that their habitual classroom behavior is enlightened.<sup>38</sup>

The increasing importance of international understanding in the area of foreign affairs has many implications for the teaching of the language arts. Of prime importance is the effective implementation of foreign exchange and foreign study programs. Elley<sup>39</sup> concluded that classroom teachers can make a significant contribution to the improvement of attitudes basic to international understanding.

. . . usual methods of teaching in the New Zealand social studies curriculum have no measurable effect on tolerance or international understanding, a professed aim of the course. This points to the hypothesis that schools make little contribution to international understanding unless teachers deliberately plan to foster it.<sup>40</sup>

Of peculiar interest is the study of the attitudes of professional people toward the language. Subjects for this study included college presidents, business executives, lawyers, judges and magazine and

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., pp. 85-86.

<sup>39</sup> Warwick B. Elley, "Attitude Change and Education for International Understanding," Sociology of Education, XXXVII (Summer, 1964), pp. 318-325.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 325.

newspaper editors. The study reflected attitudes of national concern for the improvement of the English curriculum; grammar was cited as the main area for this emphasis.

Many of the comments about the deficiencies in English instruction center around the presumed lack of knowledge of grammar. Occasionally hope is expressed for greater knowledge of linguistics or for the "linguistic" approach.<sup>41</sup>

This observation gives indication of the public's attitude toward English, in that it envisions English instruction as grammar via usage. However, many students can often answer every question on a grammar test and consistently write incoherent sentences and badly organized paragraphs. The established need for remedial composition courses at most Universities supports this fact. It is ironic that the attitude of the public contrasts vividly with practice in all forms of mass media.

The problem as seen by Wade H. Nichols of Redbook, seems to be largely a matter of finding teachers who themselves respect our language and literature and who can convey enthusiasm about them to their students.<sup>42</sup>

The writer believes that this statement delineates a basic problem in English teaching. The area of linguistic study indicates a study of the nature of the language in its philosophy. Positive implementation of this concept should evoke positive attitudes toward language, English, and the English classroom. It is gradually being realized that the teacher who is at ease in the understanding of the true structure of the language can understand better how the language which he teaches realistically operates. This knowledge must accompany concomitant

---

<sup>41</sup> Joseph Mersand, Attitudes Toward English Teaching (New York, 1961), p. 347.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 117.

learnings that lend insight into how children learn and how language skills are best taught. It is even difficult for the ". . . adequately prepared teachers of English to develop the attitudes and skills and to impart content and skills"<sup>43</sup> unless they are relatively free of linguistic prejudice.

The greatest improvement in the teaching of the language arts appears to be coming from recent re-evaluations, revisions, rewriting and revising of syllabi and other curriculum materials. Almost as significant as curriculum revision and development is the activity in linguistic conferences, workshops, and in-service programs across the country.<sup>44</sup> Perhaps these activities can bridge the wide gap between research and the English classroom. This has been a constant concern to the National Council of Teachers of English, school administrators, and the teachers themselves. This concern has reached national proportions in this decade, and the language arts curriculum is in a state of flux. In an attempt to alleviate a problem made evident in 1965 by the tremendous expansion of national efforts toward improving instruction in English, the Center for Applied Linguistics created an Education and Research Program for the purpose of publishing an Inventory of Projects and Activities in Reading and English.<sup>45</sup> Action programs seeking to exploit advances in linguistic science and related fields were included in the publication. This publication seems to be the most concise in its attempt to inform teachers of modern trends,

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 348.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>45</sup> Inventory of Projects and Activities in Reading and English, Center for Applied Linguistics (Washington, 1966).

projects and activities designed to evaluate or to improve the teaching of English. An additional publication, Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research by Harold Shane and June Grant Mulry serves the same purpose for the language arts.<sup>46</sup> Both publications indicate a limited amount of research concerning the English linguistic programs. A search of relevant literature revealed no studies directly concerned with teacher attitudes toward traditional or modern programs in the teaching of English. However, there were studies concerning several components of English that involved the linguistic approach. These have implication and relevance for this study.

Significantly relevant is an evaluative follow-up study of the NDEA institute in Applied Linguistics at Chicago Teacher's College. Although it was not extensive or exhaustive, it delineated the following implications pertinent to this study.

Those who were most successful used linguistic concepts implicitly rather than explicitly in the classroom, and more emphasis might be placed on the relationship between language and other human activities, such as language and culture, language and history, language and psychology, and language and society.<sup>47</sup>

The vehement criticism that followed the publication of Webster's Third New International Dictionary,<sup>48</sup> which followed linguistic

---

<sup>46</sup> Harold G. Shane and June Grant Mulry, Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA (Washington, 1964).

<sup>47</sup> Joseph C. Beaver, "Evaluative Follow-up Study NDEA Institute in Applied Linguistics" (Unpublished report given at the conference "The Language Component in the Training of Teachers of English and Reading: Views and Problems," Washington, D. C., April 28-30, 1966), p. 47 of the program.

<sup>48</sup> Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Springfield, 1961).

concepts in its word selection, is indicative of the importance of the attitude toward change in the English language. This dictionary is probably the most significant documentary of American attitudes toward language in this century, and has implications extending far beyond lexicography. "In short Webster's Third was viewed as a kind of linguistic Kinsey report condemned because the authors felt obligated to describe human behavior rather than dictate its course."<sup>49</sup>

Especially pertinent to this study is Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching,<sup>50</sup> which offers a conception of linguistics that may lead to a revolution in the methods of teaching and learning in our schools. Positive attitudes toward language and the classroom are assessed as important in translating linguistic inquiry into classroom activities through English education.

It has been observed by the writer as well as more well-known educators, that students preparing to teach and experienced teachers are more concerned with "what correct usage is and how you beat it into the kid's heads."<sup>51</sup> Although the teachers have been exposed to many English courses, they know little of the nature and structure of the English language, the nature of language habits, the relation of speech to writing, and the differences in usage which arise from dialect and from differing occupational and educational demands. Of equal importance is the neglect of skills in combining and integrating grammar, composition, and literature. This neglect, along with the monolithic

---

<sup>49</sup> Postman and Weingartner, p. 155.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. x.

<sup>51</sup> Leonard F. Dean and Kenneth G. Wilson, Essays on Language and Usage (New York, 1963), p. 308.

concentration on usage, as the prime objective of English instruction, identifies a negative attitude toward language and the English classroom.

Further review of the literature includes a study of teachers' attitudes toward their own academic and professional competencies. McMillan<sup>52</sup> concluded that confidence is related to competence and that professional and academic confidence are related to teacher preparation and active participation in professional organizations and meetings. The interest in new trends, work-shops and NDEA institutes in English are indicative of these findings. Linguistics as one of the new trends evokes much of this interest.

#### Summary

Investigation and research have shown that teacher attitudes toward pupils and their behavior are related to teacher-pupil rapport in the classroom. Since educators agree that a teacher's effectiveness is related to his attitude toward the program in which he is teaching, it is of importance that studies be made to determine whether in-service experiences and NDEA institutes foster better attitudes toward English on the part of those teachers who participate in them. Linguistic philosophy has indicated that some of the problems in language arts teaching may be due to negative attitudes toward the language.

In the review of the literature it has been demonstrated that emotionalized attitudes, like intelligence, are factors in learning

---

<sup>52</sup>Rachel Augusta McMillan, "Attitudes of Teachers of English in Certain Oklahoma Junior High Schools Toward Their Own Academic and Professional Competencies" (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966).

situations. The complexity of attitude measurement has made difficult the attempts to identify and measure attitude development and change in relation to teacher effectiveness. Therefore, relating attitudes to teacher effectiveness has become more complex since attitudes are not always congruent with behavior and actions can be distortions of attitudes. The attempts to relate the principles of democracy to congruent behavior can be considered in this context.

The criticism directed at measuring verbal attitudes bases its premise on the insufficient accuracy of behavior prediction. It is the belief of the writer that a similar analogy may refer to many hypothetical constructs that are accepted as valid factors in establishing educational guidelines and predicting academic success. The measurement of I.Q. is a case in point, since I.Q. measurements are used as indicators of predicted academic behavior. However, the margin of error evident in the validity and reliability of I.Q. tests is reason to believe that the predictability factor needs further research. Recent studies indicate that this research should include the attitude factor as important in the assessment of the value of I.Q. predictability.

Therefore, we may rationally concede that attitudes are not amenable to measurement in any conclusive sense, since complexities cannot be wholly described by any single numerical index. Neither men or tables can be wholly represented by any numerical index.

The context may well imply without explicit declaration what aspect of the man we are measuring; his cephalic index, his height, or weight, or what not. Just in the same sense we shall say here that we are measuring attitudes. We shall state or imply by the context the aspect of people's attitudes that we are measuring. . . . It is

just as legitimate to say that we are measuring attitudes as it is to say that we are measuring tables or men.<sup>53</sup>

Research supports the supposition that improvement in teacher competence is set in the framework of reference of the teacher's self-perception; hence the prestige factor highly influences the positive and negative aspects of the teacher's attitude toward the school and the curriculum.

The review of the literature suggests that open-minded teachers are more favorable toward modern programs. It further suggests that there is some valid evidence that the efforts of in-service courses and NDEA institutes to acquaint teachers with modern materials are worthwhile. Current trends toward curriculum revision in the language arts in many instances tend to reflect the activity of linguistic conferences, in-service programs and NDEA institutes across the country.

---

<sup>53</sup>L. L. Thurston, The Measurement of Values (Chicago, 1939), p. 216.



## CHAPTER III

### CONSTRUCTION OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENT AND METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

The purpose of this chapter is to present a description of the measuring instrument and the methods and procedures used in this study. Since the writer could find no available scale suitable for measuring the attitudes of teachers toward modern English programs, it was necessary to construct a scale that would produce data suitable for the study of these attitudes. The attitude scale was chosen as the measuring instrument because of its adaptability to measurement that would yield data compatible with the purposes and objectives of this study.

There have been many instruments devised to measure attitudes. One of the earliest instruments was the Bogardus Social Distance scale. Thurston followed with the technique of equal-appearing intervals, which allowed the measurement of a variety of issues. However, the Thurston procedure gives absolute meaning to scale units and, therefore, to an individual score achieved on the attitude instrument. Since the population of this study is not amenable to the assigning of absolute measurement, this technique was found inappropriate. The Likert technique, developed by Rensis Likert in 1932, allows the individual score to be interpreted by reference to a set of norms for a given population. The study of group attitudes, rather than individual attitudes, lends itself to more reasonable interpretation through the

use of the Likert method since its technique is based upon direct responses of agreement or disagreement with attitude statements. Each item in the test is a rating device designed to reveal both the direction of the individual's stand on the issue and the intensity with which he holds it. The number beside each alternative is the score value for that choice. On this scale the higher value indicates a pro-stand and the low value indicates an anti-stand. The Likert method requires the development of a method of scoring. For favorable statements, the "strongly-agree" response is given the highest weight on a rated continuum to the "strongly-disagree" response. The scoring system is reversed for unfavorable statements. These score values were assigned by the writer.

In addition, the Likert method of scoring allows the construction of tests which are applicable to a wide variety of issues without some of the more difficult assumptions and procedures of the Thurston technique. World War II and public opinion polls on surveys are cases in point.<sup>1</sup> In the majority of cases, studies have shown that results obtained with the Likert type scale, as far as reliability and validity are concerned, are quite comparable to those obtained by Thurston.<sup>2</sup>

#### Selection of Items

The items were selected on the basis of their relevancy to a feeling for or against the scientific approach to an analysis of language and the use of linguistically oriented materials in the classroom.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sherif and Sherif, p. 510.

<sup>2</sup> H. H. Remmers, N. L. Gage, and J. Francis Rummel, A Practical Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation (New York, 1960), p. 296.

This was defined earlier in the study as "Linguistic Enterprise." An effort was made to formulate statements in agreement with the philosophy that "how" to learn is as important as "what" to learn. This idea characterizes the position taken by modern philosophers from John Dewey to Jerome Bruner. The writer believes this is the basic issue involved in acceptance or non-acceptance of the linguistic approach to the teaching of English.<sup>3</sup>

Some of the items were formulated by the writer and had been used successfully in extension classes and NDEA institutes in Structural Linguistic courses. Additional items were selected from linguistic texts and readings. These sources are included in the selected bibliography.

The initial list was composed of 90 unfavorable and favorable statements. Thurston<sup>4</sup> suggests that 80 to 100 statements should be used. These statements were distributed randomly throughout the list. The preliminary form was evaluated and rated by a panel of experts selected by the writer. The panel was composed of Dr. D. Judson Milburn, Professor of English and Director of NDEA institutes at Oklahoma State University, 1965 and 1966, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, head of the Education Department at Oklahoma State University and Dr. John C. Egermeir, Associate Professor of Education and Associate Director of the Research Foundation, Oklahoma State University.

This rating eliminated 30 of the initial statements. The items were then organized into a form and administered to a pilot group

---

<sup>3</sup>Postman and Weingartner, p. 30.

<sup>4</sup>Thurston, The Measurement of Values (Chicago, 1959), p. 226.

composed of students enrolled in a graduate course "Linguistics in the Classroom," taught by the writer. The group included elementary and secondary teachers with varied backgrounds in respect to the formal training in English and the linguistic approach. This group appeared to be generally similar to the population from which the samples for the study were to be drawn.

The scale was divided into two parts. Part I was designed to supply background information concerning the variables of age, teaching level, teaching experience, and the training and sex of the respondents. Part II was designed to identify dispositions for or against the linguistic approach to the teaching of English and the use of linguistic materials. The final scale consisted of twelve items in Part I and thirty-six items in Part II.

#### Methodology and Design

The purpose of this study is to describe the attitudes of teachers who have been formally instructed in the modern approach to the teaching of English. The study will compare and describe by statistical measure the attitudes of two groups of teachers. One group (control) is composed of teachers who have received no formal training in the modern approach to the teaching of English. The modern approach involves the use of the linguistic concepts. The other group (experimental) is composed of teachers who have received formal instruction in the modern approach, or linguistic method. The amount of training varied within and between the groups. The purpose of this section is to describe the subjects in the design, discuss the methods of data collection and the statistical designs employed in this study.

The previously described instrument was used to secure data for the study. The department of Arts and Sciences Extension furnished the names and addresses of all teachers who had been enrolled in linguistically oriented classes. The participants in NDEA summer institutes at Oklahoma State University, during the summers of 1965 and 1966 were added to this list to comprise the experimental population. The experimental sample was randomly selected from this population. The contact with respondents was made through mailing lists from Arts and Sciences Extension, and NDEA summer institutes through the courtesy of Mr. Claude Jones, and Dr. D. Judson Milburn, director of NDEA summer institutes.

The control group was comprised of teachers in the state of Oklahoma who taught English, but had not been enrolled in English linguistic classes and were not teaching linguistic materials. This population was secured by contacting schools in Oklahoma. The control sample was selected from this population.

The control and experimental samples could not be selected from the same schools, since many schools offered the linguistic course to all teachers in the language arts departments. In addition, many schools paid the tuition for the teachers, thus making participation mandatory. Many NDEA courses were offered in the United States during the summers of 1965 and 1966, and many Oklahoma teachers had opportunity to attend these. This reduced sharply the availability and eligibility of a potential control group.

The experimental sample was drawn from a wider area. A few out-of-state respondents were included because of the NDEA institutes. A complete listing of the cities and states from which the experimental and control samples were drawn appears in Appendix A.

Contact with the respondents of the study was established by the writer in many ways. The initial experimental group was contacted through the mail, through supervisors, and through friends who administered the instrument. It was difficult to strictly dichotomize the control group before administering the instrument; therefore, the writer divided the returns and used only the respondents who had not received linguistic training in the control group. This was the factor used to separate the groups and perhaps accounted for some of the differences in populations.

Several precautions were taken to secure honest responses. It was emphasized that the respondent should not sign his name. It was believed that more objectivity could be secured by anonymous answering of questions by the respondents.

A total of 618 returns of the instrument was received by the writer; however only 533 of these were used for the study. The remaining 75 were not used for various reasons. For example, there were 42 blanks that were so incomplete that they could not be used. Some of these were perhaps not completed due to oversight on the part of the respondents; however, others seemed to be incomplete because of deliberate oversight and mutilation. Thirty-three of the returns were received too late for inclusion in the study.

Each of the 533 blanks was scored according to the answers on the return. The score assigned to each answer was based on the number of the choice that reflected the opinion of the respondent. The scores ranged from 1 to 5 on each question and were indicative of the five represented choices. This range represented the strongly agree to strongly disagree continuum.

## Statistical Procedure

A Chi-square test was performed on the background data (Part I of the instrument) to determine the similarity of the two populations. An over-all Mann-Whitney U test was then performed on the attitude scale (Part II of the instrument). An item analysis revealed the differences of opinion on each question between the experimental and control groups.

In addition, Mann-Whitney U tests were performed on six variables in order to further validate the conclusions of the over-all Mann-Whitney U test. The following variables were selected for the six Mann-Whitney U tests: They were (1) age, (2) teaching level, (3) size of community, (4) teaching experience, (5) years of training or college degree, and (6) amount of English taken in college. The results of these tests will be statistically treated in the following chapter.

## Summary

The instrument used in this investigation had two parts. Part I consisted of 12 questions designed for the purpose of obtaining general information. Chi-square was used to test the answers to these questions in order to determine if the populations were similar.

Part II contained the attitude scale which has been discussed. For the final scale, 36 items were selected by the procedure previously described. Approximately half of the statements were favorable while the other half were unfavorable. Items were distributed throughout the list in a random manner. A copy of the final form appears in Appendix A.

An over-all Mann-Whitney U test was performed to test significant differences between groups. In addition, Mann-Whitney U tests were

performed on six variables to validate the conclusions from the overall Mann-Whitney U test.



## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present a statistical analysis of the data of the study. Data from the one experimental group and one control group were gathered by the investigation in the form of answers to a questionnaire (Appendix A). The raw data in the form of distribution of responses to questions 1-36, experimental and control groups, appears in Appendix B, Table II.

A Chi-square test was employed to determine the similarity of the population characteristics for the two groups. Part I (Background data) of the instrument was tested. In every category except sex, the control population differed from the experimental population at the .025 probability level. (Tables II-XIII, Appendix C)

As a result of this finding Mann-Whitney U tests were used to compare the attitudes of the experimental versus control groups separately for each of the six categories of background data, for which the samples differed. Each question was treated separately. The results are presented in Tables XIV-XIX (Appendix D).

For the age variable (Question I of the instrument, background data), analysis of the data reveals the following information. Of the 180 possible comparisons, (36 questions multiplied by 5 possible choices), 17 were not significant, 16 were significant at the 10 per cent level, 12 at the 5 per cent level, and the remaining 135 at the

2.5 per cent level. Therefore it can be concluded that the experimental group revealed a more positive attitude than the control group regardless of age. (Table XIV)

For the teaching level variable (question 7 of the instrument), analysis of the data reveals that of the 144 possible comparisons, (36 questions multiplied by 4 possible choices), 20 were not significant, 9 were significant at the 10 per cent level, 9 at the 5 per cent level, and the remaining 106 at the 2.5 per cent level. Therefore, it can be concluded that the experimental group revealed a more positive attitude than the control group regardless of the teaching level. (Table XV)

For the size of community variable (Question 8 of the instrument) analysis of the data reveals that of the 180 possible comparisons, (36 questions multiplied by 5 possible choices), 19 were not significant, 14 were significant at the 10 per cent level, 10 at the 5 per cent level, and the remaining 137 at the 2.5 per cent level. Therefore, it can be concluded that the experimental group revealed a more positive attitude than the control group, regardless of the size of community in which the school was located. (Table XVI)

For the teaching experience variable (Question 9 of the instrument), analysis of the data reveals that of the 180 possible comparisons, (36 questions multiplied by 5 possible choices), 13 were not significant, 7 were significant at the 10 per cent level, 10 at the 5 per cent level and the remaining 150 at the 2.5 per cent level. Therefore it can be concluded that the experimental group had a more positive attitude than the control group, regardless of the teaching experience. (Table XVII)

For the years of training variable (Question 10 of the instrument), analysis of the data reveals that of the 108 possible comparisons, (36 questions multiplied by 3 possible choices), 4 were not significant, 4 were significant at the 10 per cent level, 4 at the 5 per cent level, and the remaining 96 at the 2.5 per cent level. Therefore, it can be concluded that the experimental group had a more positive attitude than the control group regardless of the years of training or college degree. (Table XVIII)

For the amount of English variable (Question 11 of the instrument), analysis of the data reveals that of the 108 possible comparisons, (36 questions multiplied by 3 possible choices), 3 were not significant, 2 were significant at the 10 per cent level, 4 at the 5 per cent level, and the remaining 99 at the 2.5 per cent level. Therefore, it can be concluded that the experimental group had a more positive attitude than the control group regardless of the amount of English taken in college. (Table XIX)

In addition, the six variables tested in the study revealed that there is a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the attitudes toward modern programs of teachers who have had formal instruction in linguistic courses and teachers who have had no such training. Since there were highly significant differences found in the comparisons of the variables, discussion will be limited to those few categories in which the tests were non-significant.

I. The age variable comparison reveals that 81.7 per cent of the responses to the questionnaire questions were highly significant at the .05 level. (Table XIV)

(1) Responses to question 1 of the instrument in the age

category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the 41-50 age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the need for evaluation of the language arts program in their schools.

- (2) Responses to question 3 of the instrument in the age category revealed three non-significant differences between the groups. These were found in the 30 or under, 31-40, and 41-50 age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the value of grammar as a discipline in its own right.
- (3) Responses to question 4 of the instrument in the age category revealed one no significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the authoritarian use of the dictionary in the classroom.
- (4) Responses to question 6 of the instrument in the age category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the preservation of rigid standards in English usage.
- (5) Responses to question 8 of the instrument revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers

in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of levels of usage as it applied to the teaching of English.

- (6) Responses to question 10 of the instrument revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the 30 or under age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes involving parental approval of the teaching of linguistic materials to students.
- (7) Responses to question 11 of the instrument revealed two no-significant differences between the groups. These were found in the 30 or under age groups and the 51-60 age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the anxiety caused by modern English programs.
- (8) Responses to question 20 of the instrument in the age category revealed one no-significant difference between the 51-60 age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the inductive method of teaching English.
- (9) Responses to question 24 of the instrument in the age category revealed one no-significant difference between the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the more effective use of language as a result of teaching English by the linguistic method.
- (10) Responses to question 27 of the instrument in the age

category revealed one no-significant difference between the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the reading of periodicals on English teaching.

- (11) Responses to question 29 of the instrument in the age category revealed two no-significant differences between the groups. These were found in the 30 or under age groups and the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these age groups did not differ in attitudes toward the use of the language as a social instrument.
- (12) Responses to question 35 of the instrument in the age category revealed one no-significant difference between the 60+ age groups. Control and experimental teachers in these groups did not differ in attitudes toward the use of the standard dialect by educated people.

II. The teaching level variable comparison revealed that 78.6 per cent of the responses to the questionnaire questions were highly significant at the .05 level. (Table XV)

- (1) Responses to question 1 of the instrument revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 7-8. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the need for evaluation of the language arts program in their schools.
- (2) Responses to question 3 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of the 1-3 and 4-6

grade levels. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the value of grammar as a discipline in its own right.

- (3) Responses to question 4 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3 and 4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the authoritarian use of the dictionary in the classroom.
- (4) Question 6 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3 and 4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the preservation of a pure English.
- (5) Responses to question 8 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3 and 7-8. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of levels of usage as it applied to the teaching of English.
- (6) Responses to question 11 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3 and 4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the anxiety aroused by modern English programs.

- (7) Responses to question 13 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitude toward an English teaching preference.
- (8) Responses to question 20 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3 and 4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the inductive method of teaching.
- (9) Responses to question 29 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the use of language as a social instrument.
- (10) Responses to question 30 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the concept that each person uses a dialect.
- (11) Responses to question 31 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3 and



4-6. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of constant change in language.

(12) Responses to question 33 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of levels of usage.

(13) Responses to question 36 of the instrument in the teaching level category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers of grade levels 1-3. Control and experimental teachers of these grade levels did not differ in attitudes toward the relationship of word derivation and clear communication.

III. The size of community variable comparison revealed that 83.4 per cent of the responses to the questionnaire questions were highly significant at the .05 level. (Table XVI)

(1) Responses to question 1 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the size of communities less than 300. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the need for evaluation of the language arts program in their schools.

(2) Responses to question 3 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed two no-significant differences

between the attitudes of teachers in communities 5,000 to 15,000 and communities over 15,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the value of grammar as a discipline in its own right.

- (3) Responses to question 5 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities 300 to 1,000. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of style as linguistic choice.
- (4) Responses to question 7 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300 in size. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the correlation of linguistic teaching and the knowledge of the "nature of the language."
- (5) Responses to question 8 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300 and 300 to 1,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward levels of usage in English.
- (6) Responses to question 9 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than

300. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the effectiveness of the linguistic method over the traditional method of teaching English.

- (7) Responses to question 10 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers in communities 300 to 1,000 and 5,000 to 15,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes involving parental approval of the teaching of linguistic materials to students.
- (8) Responses to question 11 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities 5,000 to 15,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the anxiety aroused by modern English programs.
- (9) Responses to question 12 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the emphasis placed on modern English programs in their schools.
- (10) Responses to question 13 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities 5,000 to 15,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in

these communities did not differ in attitudes toward an English teaching preference.

- (11) Responses to question 20 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300 and 300 to 1,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the inductive method of teaching.
- (12) Responses to question 21 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in the realization of the need for a modern English program designed for teachers.
- (13) Responses to question 31 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of constant change in language.
- (14) Responses to question 32 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities less than 300 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the concept that modern English programs challenge theories established by tradition.

(15) Responses to question 36 of the instrument in the size of community variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in communities over 15,000 in sizes. Control and experimental teachers in these communities did not differ in attitudes toward the relationship of word derivation and clear communication.

IV. The teaching experience variable revealed that 90 percent of the responses to questionnaire questions were highly significant at the .05 level. (Table XVII)

- (1) Responses to question 3 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 16-25 years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the value of grammar as a discipline in its own right.
- (2) Responses to question 4 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 25+ years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the authoritarian use of the dictionary in the classroom.
- (3) Responses to question 8 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 25+ years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the con-

cept of levels of usage as it applies to the teaching of English.

- (4) Responses to question 10 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 1-3 years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward parental approval of the teaching of linguistic materials to students.
- (5) Responses to question 11 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 25+ years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward anxiety aroused by modern English programs.
- (6) Responses to question 20 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers with 1-3 and 4-8 years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the inductive method of teaching.
- (7) Responses to question 27 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 4-8 years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the reading of periodicals on English teaching.

- (8) Responses to question 29 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers with 1-3 years of experience and teachers with 4-8 years of experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the use of language as a social instrument.
- (9) Responses to question 31 of the instrument in the teaching experience category revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 4-8 years experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the concept of constant change in language.
- (10) Responses to question 36 of the instrument in the teaching experience variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with 4-8 years of experience. Control and experimental teachers with these years of experience did not differ in attitudes toward the relationship of word derivation and clear communication.

V. The years of training variable revealed that 92.6 per cent of the responses to the questionnaire questions were highly significant at the .05 level. (Table XVIII). There were no respondents in the 2 years or less or 3 years categories in either the control or experimental groups.

- (1) Responses to question 1 of the instrument in the years of training variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers at the more than 5 years

level of training. Control and experimental teachers in these categories did not differ in attitudes toward the need for evaluation of the language arts program in their schools.

- (2) Responses to question 3 of the instrument in the years of training variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers at the B.A. or B.S. level and the more than 5 years level of training. Control and experimental teachers in these categories did not differ in attitudes toward the value of grammar as a discipline in its own right.
- (3) Responses to question 8 of the instrument in the years of training variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers in the more than 5 years category. Control and experimental teachers in these categories did not differ in attitudes toward levels of usage in English.

VI. The amount of English variable revealed that 95.4 per cent of the responses to the questionnaire questions were highly significant at the .05 level. (Table XIX)

- (1) Responses to question 3 of the instrument in the amount of English variable revealed two no-significant differences between the attitudes of teachers with majors in English or those with less than a minor in English. Control and experimental teachers in these groups did not differ in attitudes toward the value of grammar as a discipline in its own right.



(2) Responses to question 20 of the instrument in the amount of English variable revealed one no-significant difference between the attitudes of teachers with less than a minor in English. Control and experimental teachers in these categories did not differ in attitudes toward the inductive method of teaching.

Since the evidence of the preceding series of tests indicated significant differences between the experimental and control populations regardless of the category of background data, Mann-Whitney U tests were run for each question for the total control population versus the experimental population. The significance level was computed for each test (Table XX, Appendix E). In all but question 3 the populations differed at the .00003 probability level. For question 3 the probability level was .01499. The statistical calculations for these findings are contained in Appendix E, Table XX.

#### Summary

This chapter has presented the results of a statistical analysis of the data of the study. The Chi-square test was used to test the similarity of the experimental and control populations. Statistical evidence revealed differences in every category of the background data (Part I of the instrument) except sex.

The Mann-Whitney U tests were run for six categories of background data. In addition, an over-all Mann-Whitney U test was employed to test significant differences between the total experimental and control populations.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The past decade has introduced a minor revolution in the teaching of English. This change has been due to the development of scientific linguistics, which had little effect on the English curriculum in this country before 1940. Until then, the overwhelming majority of English teachers in schools were practitioners of an eighteenth-century tradition, with its classical bias. However, in 1940 linguistic knowledge was used to focus attention on the need for a new grammar. The appearance of linguistic textbooks in 1950 encouraged the application of linguistic methods in the English classroom. The popularity of this application has caused the emergence of a "new English" along with the "new math," the "new science," and the "new social studies."

The "new English" often mistakenly translated as the "new grammar" has been set sharply in opposition to the traditional grammar. This antithesis, unfortunate as it may be, has evoked both negative and positive reactions and attitudes from English teachers toward the change from the traditional modes of teaching English.

The English teachers' resistance to change indicates a desire to maintain the status quo in the teaching of English. This is often caused by an emotional commitment to the ways in which language is used. This commitment often prevents the objectivity and detachment necessary for a candid appraisal of newer teaching methods. Pedagog-

ically, the teacher has the task of developing in the students a sensitivity toward language and hence culture. However, the teacher cannot escape the necessity of first developing this sensitivity within himself.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of English teachers toward the new method of teaching English as suggested by the linguistic approach. In addition, the study attempted to determine whether formal instruction in linguistic courses was a factor which favorably influenced these attitudes. This was accomplished by comparing the attitudes of 333 teachers who had taken formal courses in linguistic classes through in-service programs and NDEA institutes with the attitudes of 217 teachers having no such instruction. The groups were designated as experimental and control. The experimental group was composed of teachers who had received linguistic training, while the control group was composed of teachers who had not received linguistic instruction. The amount of training varied between the groups. A questionnaire, designed by the writer, was the instrument used to secure the data for the study.

The control sample was randomly selected from a group of teachers in the State of Oklahoma who taught English but had not been enrolled in linguistic classes and were not using linguistic materials. The experimental sample was randomly selected from a group of Oklahoma teachers along with a few teachers from other states who had been enrolled in NDEA institutes. It was found, through use of the chi-square statistical measure, that the groups differed in every category of background data, except age.

An over-all Mann-Whitney U test revealed significant differences

in responses to the 36 items on the questionnaire. (Appendix A) In addition, Mann-Whitney U tests were performed on six (6) variables of background data (Part I of the instrument) in order to further validate the conclusions of the over-all Mann-Whitney U test. The following variables were selected for the six Mann-Whitney U tests. They were: (1) age, (2) training level, (3) size of community, (4) teaching experience, (5) years of training or college degree, and (6) amount of English taken in college.

The six variables tested gave further support to the over-all Mann-Whitney U test for significant differences. Although there were some non-significant differences found in these categories, they did not affect the over-all Mann-Whitney U test results.

The 17 non-significant differences in the age category suggest that the younger teachers (30 or under) and the older teachers (60+) are more traditional in attitude than the other age groups, although the 60+ group shows some tendency to a greater difference. These two categories seem less affected by newer trends and more concerned with maintaining the status quo. This might indicate that, generally, the younger teachers are receiving this emphasis or focus in teacher training courses and are more anxious about job status. This also could imply, perhaps, that the older teachers are more concerned with maintaining an established status and are more reluctant to accept change in teaching methods. In this regard, the teacher's concern for prestige and competence may be a factor in the development of a resistance to change in English teaching. Evidence suggests that teacher training institutions should employ the linguistic philosophy and newer methods in the English preparatory programs.

The 20 non-significant differences in the teaching level category were found in the responses of teachers of grades 1-3, 4-6 and 7-8. None were found in the responses of teachers of grades 9-12. The questions that revealed significant differences suggest that elementary and junior high teachers feel that there is a pure English that we must preserve; that grammar is a discipline in its own right; and that the dictionary is an authority in the classroom. These teachers tend to disagree with the inductive approach and do not accept the concept of change in language. This is significant in that it implies that the elementary and junior high school program should be more highly correlated with the programs of the secondary grades. This suggests that vigorous effort should be made to correlate the language arts curriculum in grades 1-13. In addition, instruction in linguistic philosophy should begin in the elementary grades in order to produce more effective results at the secondary level.

The 19 non-significant differences discovered in the size of community variable reveal that 13 of these occur in the smaller communities with populations less than 300 and 300 to 1,000. This might indicate that these communities are more traditional and conservative in attitude toward change in the teaching of English, or that the more conservative teachers gravitate to these communities. The 5,000 to 15,000 community indicates more non-significant differences (this category revealed four) than the over 15,000 which revealed only two non-significant differences.

The 13 non-significant differences in the teaching experience category further support the conclusion that the younger teachers with less experience and the older teachers with the most experience are

more traditional in teaching approaches. However, older teachers are more authoritarian in teaching approaches. Teachers with 1-3 years and 4-8 years experience indicate disagreement with the inductive method of teaching. This implies that these younger teachers are more familiar with the deductive or prescriptive approach. This same group of teachers evidences disagreement as to the use of language as a social instrument. The teachers with 4-8 years experience do not accept the concept of change in language. On the other hand, the older teachers do not accept the concept of levels of usage, do not question the authority of the dictionary, and usually feel that modern English programs arouse anxiety in both teachers and students.

The years of training variable contained no data for the 2 years or less or the 3 years categories. This indicates that the teachers used in this research possessed B.A. or B.S. degrees and above. The 4 non-significant differences found in this category revealed that 3 were found in the more than 5 years category and one in the 5 year or masters degree category. The B.A. or B.S. category revealed no significant differences. These findings suggest that these teachers with more training do not tend to believe that the language arts program in their schools needs evaluation. They tend not to accept the levels of usage concept but tend to accept the importance of grammar as a focal point of English instruction. This might imply that these teachers, because of training, are responsible for the formation and implementation of the language arts program in their schools. This would perhaps cause them to be less critical of these programs. Although these non-significant differences do not affect the validity of the overall significance of the research, they do indicate the characteristics of

teachers who seem less affected by the newer trends.

The 3 non-significant differences in the amount of English category, reveal that teachers with majors in English (1 significant difference) and teachers with less than a minor in English (2 significant differences) tend to agree that grammar is valuable as a discipline in its own right. The teachers with minors in English do not reveal this non-significance. However, teachers with less than a minor in English do not accept the inductive approach to the teaching of English. These findings suggest that the teaching of grammar remains the focus in the teaching of English. This seems to be more important to teachers with majors in English and teachers with less than a minor in English. The teachers with minors in English reflect more positive attitudes in this regard. However, these implications must be evaluated within the framework of the few significances found in this category.

Much research has been reported in the area of teacher attitudes, although very little has been concentrated in the field of English. However, the present study tends to support the findings of the National Council of the Teachers of English (Chapter II) that English teachers spend more time in teaching grammar and much of this is due to the training received in teacher training institutions. In addition, the study supports the conclusion of Mersand (Chapter II) that grammar was the subject thought to be more needed in the improvement of the English curriculum. Dick (Chapter II) reported more favorable attitudes toward science by the open-minded group while Rice (Chapter II) reported more favorable attitudes for teachers who had received training in Modern Mathematics materials. The present study does tend to support these findings.

Leake (Chapter II) reported that attitudes of elementary school teachers toward science did not show significant differences after participation in the in-service course. The present study does not tend to support this finding.

Brann (Chapter II) pointed out that teacher competence is set in the framework of reference of the teacher's self-perception while McMillan (Chapter II) concluded that teacher confidence is related to active participation in professional organizations and meetings. The present study tends to support these findings. The study further supports the fact that there is a lack of linguistic materials and instruction at the elementary level.

The study also indicates that NDEA institutes and federally initiated and supported training centers for English teachers are of merit and worth to the total English program.

#### Summary of Findings

The study reveals that there is a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the attitudes toward modern programs of teachers who have had formal instruction in linguistic courses and teachers who have had no such training. This finding is further supported by the significant differences found in testing experimental versus controls when six of the variables differing between groups were held constant. The six variables tested were: (1) age, (2) teaching level, (3) size of community, (4) teaching experience, (5) years of training, and (6) amount of English taken in college.

The younger and older teachers seem to be more traditional in attitudes. This might be interpreted as a reflection of the emphasis



in teacher training institutions on traditional and prescriptive methods of teaching English. Younger teachers who lack experience in the classroom tend to rely heavily on these methods. In addition, younger teachers seem concerned with establishing status, competency and adequacy. Older teachers are concerned with maintaining acquired status and feel threatened by newer methods that introduce change.

Therefore, the non-significant differences were concentrated in the following areas: (1) younger (30 or under) and older (60+) age categories, (2) the elementary level of teaching, (3) smaller communities, (4) majors and those with less than a minor in English, and (5) those with more years of training. The non-significant differences found in the variables of age, teaching experience, teaching level, size of community, amount of English taken in college, and years of training did not affect the overall significant differences found in these categories.

### Conclusions

The research data and the total statistical analysis resulting from the present study would seem to allow the following conclusions:

1. There is a significant difference between the attitudes toward modern linguistic programs of teachers who have had formal instruction in modern materials and teachers who have had no such training. Those with the training have more favorable attitudes. It therefore appears that the linguistic courses offered through Arts and Sciences Extension at the Oklahoma State University are worthwhile. The findings indicate that the efforts of NDEA summer and year long institutes to acquaint teachers with modern English materials at

Okahoma State University have been significantly successful.

2. Among all teachers of the study, attitudes toward modern English programs are independent of sex.

3. Among teachers who have unfavorable attitudes toward modern English programs there tends to be agreement that grammar is the focus of the language arts program.

4. Among teachers who have unfavorable attitudes toward modern English programs, there tends to be disagreement as to the importance of levels of usage in teaching English.

5. Among teachers who have unfavorable attitudes toward modern English programs, there tends to be agreement that modern English programs arouse anxiety in both teachers and students, while teachers with favorable attitudes tend to minimize the anxiety caused by modern English programs.

6. Among teachers who have unfavorable attitudes toward modern English programs there tends to be disagreement with the merits of the inductive approach, while teachers with favorable attitudes accept the merits of the inductive approach.

7. Among teachers with unfavorable attitudes toward modern English programs, there tends to be disagreement with the relationship of the derivation of words and clear communication, while teachers with favorable attitudes tend to agree that there is an important relationship.

8. The results of the study indicate a positive change in the attitudes of teachers who have received instruction in linguistic courses. This might imply that the linguistic training is a factor that influences this change. However, these results must be evaluated

in regard to the differences found in the samples. Therefore, these findings must be considered within this limitation.

9. Attitudes toward modern English programs are not independent of the amount of English training. There were more English majors in the experimental group than were in the control group. The experimental group showed more favorable attitudes toward modern programs.

10. Teachers who have over-all favorable attitudes toward modern English programs are more knowledgeable about the linguistic approach and are more closely associated with teachers using this approach, than those with less favorable attitudes.

11. Teachers who have taught in modern programs possess more favorable attitudes toward the linguistic approach.

12. Teachers who have enrolled for instruction in linguistic courses showed more favorable attitudes toward modern programs.

13. Teachers who have more favorable attitudes toward modern programs are primarily teaching on the senior high level.

14. Teachers who possessed the more favorable attitudes toward modern programs are teaching in communities with populations of over 15,000.

15. Teachers who evidence more favorable attitudes toward linguistic programs have more teaching experience than those with unfavorable attitudes.

16. The experimental group, which evidences more favorable attitudes toward modern linguistic programs, possessed more teachers with more than 5 years of college training. However, the amount of formal training in the use of linguistic materials was used as a control to differentiate between the groups. Therefore, this finding must be

considered within this limitation.

### Recommendations

The writer makes the following recommendations as a result of the study.

1. Efforts should be made to provide more formal training in linguistics for elementary teachers and more linguistic materials should be designed for the elementary grades.
2. Efforts should be made to encourage teachers to obtain additional instruction in the use of linguistic methods.
3. The teacher training institutions should make greater effort to acquaint English majors with linguistic methods and contemporary materials.
4. More emphasis should be placed on the linguistic philosophy as an introduction to linguistic methodology.
5. Since the linguistic attitude reflects an understanding and an acceptance of differing dialects, prospective teachers should be assigned to schools in areas that differ from their cultural backgrounds, if possible. This would, perhaps, allow a more objective acceptance of different dialects and language habits in the classroom. This would, in turn, aid communication in the classroom.
6. The linguistic philosophy should be incorporated as the basis of an objective and scientific concept of language and society. It should become an integral aspect of the positive approach to any classroom. This could encourage the inductive and descriptive teaching of other subject areas in the elementary

grades that are taught by the language arts teacher.

7. Since many communication problems in the classroom result from semantic differences in dialects, teachers who have been successful in teaching the culturally different, the culturally disadvantaged and the less-accelerated classes should be employed at national centers to instruct other teachers in successful techniques and approaches. These courses should be provided through NDEA institutes and should become a requirement of teacher education certification. In-service courses and summer institutes could use these opportunities for instruction. In this regard, national centers for this type of instruction should be set up.
8. English and education departments should work cooperatively to provide prospective English teachers with the benefits from both disciplines.

#### Needed Research

The writer makes the following suggestions for further studies.

1. Studies should be made to determine whether student achievement in the language arts is affected by the attitude of the teacher.
2. Further studies should be conducted to determine the relationship between the teacher's positive attitudes and the student's achievement in modern English programs.
3. Studies should be conducted to contrast the achievements of students taught by the linguistic method with the achievements of students taught by the traditional method.

### Further Considerations

There are many obvious reasons for the anxiety neurosis that has developed toward language and the teaching of English. In order to rationalize the absurdity of this neurosis, a rigid body of usage rules has been developed. These are in essence complete denials of the language as it is really spoken and written. This unrealistic view of language characterizes the subjective teaching of English in the classroom. By contrast, the linguistic approach advocates a realistic and objective study of language in the classroom. In addition, the linguistic philosophy offers the strategy for translating linguistic materials into programs and attitudes that can make the study of English a more relevant and realistic activity as contrasted with the often irrelevant and unrealistic activity displayed in many English classrooms.

In order to achieve the above goals, attempts must be made to replace negative attitudes with positive attitudes toward the language and culture. This is important since language involves our attitudes toward people and culture. In a sense, this aspect of teacher attitude has been grossly over-looked, in attempts to improve the teaching of English.

Therefore the goals of language instruction must parallel our most meaningful educational objectives. In English, most of our efforts have been in the area of content to be taught. A realistic reorganization of the language arts curriculum would emphasize the methods of teaching English. This has been achieved in the fields of mathematics and science, since the changes in these fields have involved methods as well as content. Since this has been feasible in mathematics and science, it seems logical that the English curriculum reflect a trans-

lation of abstract and subjective goals into tangible expected behaviors. The linguistic philosophy can aid in effecting this translation.

It can hardly be argued that the methods that stress learning "the facts" and set up the teacher of the textbook as the indisputable authority on the "truth" of facts, do not prepare students for meaningful participation in a highly technological, scientific and humanistic society.

The writer does not believe that the subject matter of linguistics offers immunization from the prescriptive and authoritarian teaching that dominates so many classrooms. In fact, many teachers tend to teach the new method in the same manner that characterized traditional methods. This is perhaps the most important argument for emphasis on a change of attitude, since effective use of linguistic materials is dependent on an objective and unbiased classroom presentation.

Therefore, the writer believes that the new method can become another "gimmick" unless it is accompanied by this positive attitude toward language and culture. Linguistics has much to offer the components of the language arts, if it is accompanied by the linguistic philosophy. To fail to employ both the findings and the philosophy of this area would be a dis-service to the discoveries of linguistic analysis.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Harold B. Applied English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964.
- Brown, Dona Worrall, Wallace G. Brown, and Dudley Bailey. Form in Modern English. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Conlin, David A. Grammar for Written English. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- Dean, Leonard F. and Kenneth G. Wilson. Essays on Language and Usage. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Deterline, William A. An Introduction to Programed Instruction. Englewoods Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- Dinneen, Francis P. An Introduction to General Linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Fowler, Mary Elizabeth. Teaching Language, Composition and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Francis, W. Nelson. The Structure of American English. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.
- Fries, Charles G. American English Grammar. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1940.
- Galfa, Armand J. and Earl Miller. Interpreting Education Research. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1965.
- Garrett, Henry E. and R. S. Woodworth. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Co., 1958.
- Gleason, H. A. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, Rev. Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Gleason, H. A. Linguistics and English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Good, Carter V. and Douglas E. Scates. Method of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.
- Guth, Hans Paul. English Today and Tomorrow: A Guide for Teachers of English. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1964.



- Halliday, M. A. K., Angus McIntosh and Peter Strevens. Linguistic Science and Language Teaching. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Himmelstrand, Ulf. Social Pressures, Attitudes and Democratic Processes. Sweden: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1960.
- Hughes, John P. The Science of Language: An Introduction to Linguistics. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Hunt, Kellogg W. and Paul Stoakes. Our Living Language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Kentucky English Bulletin, vols. 15-16, Fall, 1965, Spring 1966.
- Kohl, Herbert R. Teaching the "Unteachable" The Story of an Experiment in Children's Writing. New York: Book Review, 1967.
- Lander, Herbert. Language and Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. Introduction to the English Language. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. Linguistics and the Teaching of English. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
- Mohrmann, Christine, Norman F. Mohrmann and Alf Sommerfelt. Trends in Modern Linguistics. Belgium: Spectrum Publishers, 1962.
- Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- National Council of Teachers of English, ed. The Professional Sampler. Illinois: 1965.
- National Council of Teachers of English, ed. Elementary English. XXXII (December, 1965).
- National Education Association. Schools for the Sixties. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.
- New York College Entrance Board, ed. Freedom and Discipline in English: Report of the Commission on English. New York: 1965.
- Ornstein, Jacob and William W. Gage. The ABC's of Language and Linguistics. Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1964.
- Pooley, Robert C., ed. Perspectives on English Essays. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.
- Postman, Neil, Harold Morine, and Greta Morine. Discovering Your Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

- Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1966.
- Roberts, Paul. English Sentences. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962.
- Roberts, Paul. English Syntax: A Book of Programmed Lessons. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
- Roberts, Paul. Patterns of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956.
- Roberts, Paul. The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program. Book 3. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- Roberts, Paul. The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program. Book 4. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- Roberts, Paul. The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program. Book 5. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- Roberts, Paul. The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program. Book 6. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- Roberts, Paul. Understanding English. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.
- Robertson, Stuart. The Development of Modern English. 2nd ed. Rev. by Frederic G. Cassidy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Shane, Harold G., and June Grant Mulry. Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1963.
- Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Shipley, Joseph T. Dictionary of Word Origins. New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1964.
- Sledd, James. A Short Introduction to English Grammar. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1959.
- Smith, B. Othanel, William O. Stanley and J. Harlan Shores. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1957.
- Trauger, Wilmer K. Language Arts in Elementary Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Vachek, Josef. The Linguistic School of Prague. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
- Van Dalen, Deobold. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Weiss, Jerry M. An English Teacher's Reader. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1962.

Wert, James E., Charles O. Neidt, and J. Stanley Ahmann. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Wolfe, Don M. Language Arts and Life Patterns: Grades 2 Through 8. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1961.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL LETTER TO RESPONDENTS RANDOMLY  
SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

May 11, 1967

Dear Fellow Teacher:

You have been selected to participate in an evaluation of the linguistic approach to the teaching of English. Your performance as a student indicates that your opinions are germane to this study.

I know how busy you must be at this time; however, I feel that you as one of the select few will agree that it is imperative that we include your perceptive observations.

Please complete the short questionnaire, and return it immediately in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. It is extremely important that I receive this information before your school closes for the summer.

Thanks in advance for your time and effort. Accept our gratitude for allowing Arts and Sciences Extension to share these linguistic insights with you. I am sure that your classroom was dynamically vital as a result of your skillful application of many linguistic principles.

Happy vacation!

Sincerely,

Mrs. Cecelia N. Palmer

CNP:cp

Enclosures

## QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are designed to obtain general information. Please answer each question.

1. Age    
     30 or under   
     31 - 40   
     41 - 50   
     51 - 60   
     over 60
2. Sex   
     Male   
     Female
3. Are you acquainted with the linguistic approach to the teaching of English?   
     Yes   
     No
4. Are you closely associated with a teacher who is using this approach?   
     Yes   
     No
5. Have you taught one of the linguistic grammars in the English classroom?   
     Yes   
     No
6. Give your last enrollment as student in a linguistic course. Include in-service extension courses, NDEA summer sessions and resident college courses in deciding your enrollment.   
     Within the past year   
     Within the past three years   
     Never enrolled   
     Within the past four years
7. Teaching Level   
     1 - 3 Grades   
     4 - 6 Grades   
     7 - 8 Grades   
     9 - 12 Grades

## 8. Size of community in which your school is located

- Less than 300
- 300 to 1,000
- 1,000 to 5,000
- 5,000 to 15,000
- Over 15,000

## 9. Teaching experience

- 1 to 3 years
- 4 to 8 years
- 9 to 15 years
- 16 to 25 years
- More than 25 years

## 10. Years of training or college degree

- 2 years or less of college training
- 3 years of college training
- B.A. or B.S.
- 5 years or master's degree
- More than 5 years

## 11. Amount of English taken in college

- Major
- Minor
- Less than a minor

## 12. The amount of formal training which you have received in the use of linguistic materials (not necessarily for credit).

- None
- 1 - 3 hours or equivalent
- 4 - 6 hours or equivalent
- 7 - 9 hours or equivalent
- Over 9 hours

## PART II

The following pages contain a number of statements about which there is no general agreement. People differ widely in the way they feel about each item. There are no right answers. Read each item carefully and indicate the choice which best expresses your feeling about the statement. Wherever possible, let your own personal experiences determine your answer. For the purpose of this instrument, we shall describe modern English programs as those English programs which use materials linguistically oriented. These may include instructions in structural, generative, or transformational approaches to the teaching of grammar.

The five following categories will be used to indicate your feelings about each statement.

- ( ) Strongly agree
- ( ) Agree
- ( ) Undecided
- ( ) Disagree
- ( ) Strongly disagree

Please check one category for each item.

SA   A   U   D   SD

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| — | — | — | — | — | 1. We need an evaluation of the language arts program in our school.  |
| — | — | — | — | — | 2. I use the inductive method in the English classroom.   |
| — | — | — | — | — | 3. Grammar is valuable as a discipline in its own right.  |
| — | — | — | — | — | 4. The dictionary is an authority in the English classroom.   |
| — | — | — | — | — | 5. Style is linguistic choice.  |
| — | — | — | — | — | 6. There is a pure English that we must preserve.   |
| — | — | — | — | — | 7. Students who are taught linguistically have a better knowledge of the "nature of language" and how it works. |
| — | — | — | — | — | 8. All usage is relative and correctness rests upon usage.  |
| — | — | — | — | — | 9. The linguistic method of teaching English is more effective than the traditional method.                     |



- | SA | A | U | D | SD |   |
|----|---|---|---|----|---|
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 10. I think parents would prefer that their children <u>not</u> be given instruction in modern English programs.                                  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 11. Modern English programs arouse anxiety in both teachers and students.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 12. Those school systems which do not put emphasis on Modern English programs are not being fair to their students.                               |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 13. I do not mind teaching English but I prefer to teach other subjects.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 14. The movement toward Modern English Programs has developed too rapidly.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 15. I think that traditional definitions of parts of speech clarify and enforce English concepts.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 16. Modern English programs encourage inappropriate and irrelevant materials in the English classroom.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 17. Traditional English programs are better suited to the philosophy and objectives of today's society than modern programs.                      |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 18. I think most students, who have not been exposed to the linguistic approach, would be enthusiastic about a modern English program.            |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 19. I think the emphasis on modern English may result in such concern for English as subject matter that the child as learner will be overlooked. |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 20. A child will learn better if he is provided with a learning situation in which he discovers the meanings and concepts of English for himself. |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 21. I see little need for my school to offer a modern English program for teachers.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 22. Efforts to teach English linguistically cause too many transitional problems.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 23. All English teachers should have formal training in the use of modern English program materials.  |

- | SA | A | U | D | SD |   |
|----|---|---|---|----|---|
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 24. English taught linguistically enables the students to use language more effectively.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 25. Modern English programs place too much stress on terminology.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 26. I get frustrated when I study linguistic materials.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 27. I can teach English well without reading periodicals on English teaching.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 28. The addition of linguistic concepts in the curriculum has given teachers the feeling that they are teaching English more effectively. |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 29. Language is a social instrument.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 30. Every person uses a dialect.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 31. Language is constantly changing.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 32. Modern English programs challenge theories established by tradition.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 33. High school students vary their language to suit the situation in which they find themselves.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 34. There is a difference in meaning between grammar and usage.   |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 35. Educated people use only standard English.  |
| —  | — | — | — | —  | 36. Knowing the derivation of words adds little to one's ability to communicate clearly and effectively.                                  |

## FOLLOW-UP LETTER



September 3, 1967

Dear Fellow-Teacher,

I have not received the English questionnaire on linguistics that I sent you in May. Perhaps you were extremely busy and inadvertently overlooked it in the rush that preceded the closing of school. I can easily understand that!

However, I am sure you will want to be included in this study. In order for me to do this, I must have your expert opinion. Please return the questionnaire as soon as you finish reading this letter. If you have misplaced it, please let me know and I will forward a duplicate by return mail.

Your candid comments are vital to my dissertation. I really need your help,--and you can understand that!

Thanking you in advance for your kind cooperation, I remain

Your friend and Co-worker,

(Mrs.) Cecelia N. Palmer

GNP/cnp

## GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

## ARKANSAS

Gurdon  
 Little Rock  
 Magnolia  
 Malvern  
 Springdale

## CALIFORNIA

Newhall  
 Ojai

## FLORIDA

Bora Raton  
 Boynton Beach  
 Coral Gables

## KANSAS

Elkhart  
 Great Bend  
 Kingman

## LOUISIANA

Marrero

## MISSISSIPPI

Canton  
 Jackson  
 Moss Point  
 Picayune

## MISSOURI

Columbia

## NEBRASKA

McCook  
 Omaha

## NEW MEXICO

Socorro

## OKLAHOMA

Afton  
 Altus  
 Alva  
 Ardmore  
 Atwood  
 Bethany  
 Bowlegs  
 Chelsea  
 Chickasha  
 Chilocco  
 Claremore  
 Coyle  
 Crescent  
 Cushing  
 Dewey  
 Dover  
 Edmond  
 Elk City  
 El Reno  
 Enid  
 Eufala  
 Fay  
 Frederick  
 Gage  
 Gotebo  
 Grandfield  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Healdton  
 Hennessey  
 Kingfisher  
 Langston  
 Lenapah  
 Morris  
 Norman  
 Oilton  
 Oklahoma City  
 Okmulgee  
 Owasso  
 Pauls Valley  
 Pawhuska  
 Ponca City  
 Poteau  
 Prague  
 Pryor  
 Sallisaw

Sapulpa  
 Shattuck  
 Spavinaw  
 Stillwater  
 Stroud  
 Sulphur  
 Tonkawa  
 Tulsa  
 Wagoner  
 Watonga  
 Weleetka  
 Yukon

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Spartanburg

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Rapid City

## TEXAS

Dalhart  
 Del Rio  
 Floydada  
 Houston  
 Jacksboro  
 Paris  
 Rowena  
 Shamrock  
 Tyler

## WEST VIRGINIA

Buckhannon

## GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONTROL GROUP

Cleveland, Oklahoma and vicinity

Jay, Oklahoma

Sapulpa, Oklahoma

Oklahoma City and Moore, Oklahoma

Stillwater, Oklahoma

Tulsa, Oklahoma

APPENDIX B

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 1-36 (QUESTIONNAIRE  
PART II, APPENDIX A), EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Symbols for categories: (1) strongly agree - SA, (2) agree - A, (3) undecided - U, (4) disagree - D, (5) strongly disagree - SD.

Question	Groups	1	2	3	4	5
		SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Experimental	161	110	25	34	3
	Control	57	92	38	20	10
2	Experimental	89	190	40	11	3
	Control	11	87	56	60	3
3	Experimental	57	120	38	68	50
	Control	38	96	31	34	18
4	Experimental	43	129	22	95	44
	Control	38	129	21	27	2
5	Experimental	80	175	51	23	4
	Control	15	95	60	18	29
6	Experimental	25	66	33	107	102
	Control	28	64	34	71	20
7	Experimental	123	135	56	16	3
	Control	23	55	101	19	19
8	Experimental	90	146	44	46	7
	Control	20	120	30	26	21

TABLE I (Continued)

Question	Groups	1	2	3	4	5
		SA	A	U	D	SD
9	Experimental	78	118	116	20	1
	Control	6	41	124	25	21
10	Experimental	1	24	93	144	71
	Control	11	22	78	87	19
11	Experimental	19	71	65	140	38
	Control	17	48	88	56	8
12	Experimental	60	128	64	70	11
	Control	6	52	96	46	17
13	Experimental	7	42	16	107	161
	Control	31	40	11	72	63
14	Experimental	1	22	57	184	69
	Control	24	23	93	69	8
15	Experimental	8	62	53	125	85
	Control	30	73	46	53	15
16	Experimental	1	21	38	169	104
	Control	25	19	79	83	11
17	Experimental	1	12	51	175	94
	Control	25	21	85	71	15



TABLE I (Continued)

Question	Groups	1	2	3	4	5
		SA	A	U	D	SD
18	Experimental	74	171	66	22	0
	Control	10	87	86	17	17
19	Experimental	4	31	46	176	76
	Control	23	27	84	74	9
20	Experimental	121	162	25	21	4
	Control	43	119	20	15	20
21	Experimental	3	12	24	164	130
	Control	21	18	46	98	34
22	Experimental	5	15	62	178	73
	Control	26	22	103	62	4
23	Experimental	137	164	17	11	4
	Control	43	119	25	8	22
24	Experimental	85	135	93	16	4
	Control	5	69	103	19	21
25	Experimental	7	45	67	159	55
	Control	26	34	114	42	1
26	Experimental	3	29	28	189	84
	Control	35	35	83	60	4

TABLE I (Continued)

Question	Groups	1	2	3	4	5
		SA	A	U	D	SD
27	Experimental	3	15	26	168	121
	Control	26	13	23	123	32
28	Experimental	70	152	92	18	1
	Control	3	58	119	10	27
29	Experimental	152	172	3	4	2
	Control	68	122	5	18	4
30	Experimental	133	180	13	6	1
	Control	33	141	14	7	22
31	Experimental	193	133	1	3	3
	Control	83	103	4	7	20
32	Experimental	91	170	38	31	3
	Control	25	109	40	12	31
33	Experimental	123	179	19	11	1
	Control	37	136	16	5	23
34	Experimental	120	165	21	24	3
	Control	26	122	13	28	28
35	Experimental	8	18	12	201	94
	Control	24	13	13	140	27

TABLE I (Continued)

Question	Groups	1	2	3	4	5
		SA	A	U	D	SD
36	Experimental	6	34	23	166	104
	Control	24	21	24	107	41

APPENDIX C

## CHI-SQUARE FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL

## 12 BACKGROUND VARIABLES

TABLE II

## AGE VARIABLE

	30 or Under	31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60	Total
Experimental	73	69	92	85	14	333
Control	80	44	42	43	8	217
	153	113	134	128	22	550

Chi-Square 16.1798

TABLE III

## SEX VARIABLE

	Male	Female	Total
Experimental	48	285	333
Control	21	196	217
	69	481	550

Chi-Square 2.6871

TABLE IV  
ACQUAINTANCE WITH LINGUISTIC  
APPROACH VARIABLE

	Yes	No	Total
Experimental	319	14	333
Control	88	129	217
	407	143	550

Chi-Square 208.3951

TABLE V  
ASSOCIATION WITH TEACHER USING  
LINGUISTIC APPROACH VARIABLE

	Yes	No	Total
Experimental	103	230	333
Control	12	205	217
	115	435	550

Chi-Square 51.2602

TABLE VI  
 TAUGHT LINGUISTIC GRAMMAR IN ENGLISH  
 CLASSROOM VARIABLE

	Yes	No	Total
Experimental	122	211	333
Control	1	216	217
	123	427	550

Chi-Square 99.0308

TABLE VII  
 LAST ENROLLMENT IN LINGUISTIC  
 COURSE VARIABLE

	Within Past Year	Past Three Years	Never Enrolled	Past Four Years	Total
Experimental	149	147	0	37	333
Control	0	1	216	0	217
	149	148	216	37	550

Chi-Square 545.8421

TABLE VIII  
TEACHING LEVEL VARIABLE

	1-3	4-6	7-8	9-12	Total
Experimental	30	44	73	185	332
Control	43	52	44	78	217
	73	96	117	263	549

Chi-Square 30.9718

TABLE IX  
SIZE OF COMMUNITY VARIABLE

	Less Than 300	300- 1,000	1,000- 5,000	5,000- 15,000	15,000+	Total
Experimental	13	22	65	71	162	333
Control	6	13	51	42	105	217
	19	35	116	113	267	550

Chi-Square 1.8089



TABLE X  
TEACHING EXPERIENCE VARIABLE

	1-3 Years	4-8 Years	9-15 Years	16-25 Years	25 Years+	Total
Experimental	59	86	66	61	61	333
Control	77	47	30	33	30	217
	136	133	96	94	91	550

Chi-Square 22.7666

TABLE XI  
YEARS OF TRAINING VARIABLE

	2 Yrs. or Less	3 Years	B.A. or B.S.	5 Yrs. or M.A.	5 Yr.+	Total
Experimental	2	3	157	85	86	333
Control	0	0	145	46	26	217
	2	3	302	131	112	550

Chi-Square 25.9178

TABLE XII  
AMOUNT OF ENGLISH VARIABLE

	Major	Minor	Less Than Minor	Total
Experimental	187	87	59	333
Control	91	61	65	217
	278	148	124	550

Chi-Square 14.1740

TABLE XIII  
AMOUNT OF FORMAL TRAINING VARIABLE

	None	1-3 Hours	4-6 Hours	7-9 Hours	9 Hours+	Total
Experimental	0	162	91	62	18	333
Control	217	0	0	0	0	217
	217	162	91	62	18	550

Chi-Square 550.0000

APPENDIX D

TABLE XIV

MANN-WHITNEY COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES  
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL BY AGE

	Ages 30 or Under		Ages 31-40		Ages 41-50		Ages 51-60		Ages 60+	
	Sign.		Sign.		Sign.		Sign.		Sign.	
1.	2.004	**	2.986	**	0.729	NS	4.213	**	1.785	*
2.	5.401	**	3.812	**	3.330	**	6.705	**	2.463	**
3.	-0.107	NS	-1.084	NS	-1.041	NS	-2.487	**	-1.441	+
4.	-4.021	**	-4.089	**	-2.692	**	-2.864	**	-0.446	NS
5.	3.022	**	4.050	**	3.617	**	3.995	**	1.284	+
6.	-3.094	**	-5.271	**	-1.325	+	-3.251	**	-0.937	NS
7.	4.393	**	5.675	**	2.927	**	5.673	**	1.517	+
8.	1.523	+	3.818	**	2.168	**	1.428	+	-0.037	NS
9.	4.062	**	5.556	**	3.646	**	4.862	**	1.728	*
10.	-0.493	NS	-2.153	**	-3.814	**	-2.626	**	-1.621	+
11.	-1.264	NS	-2.971	**	-3.470	**	-0.776	NS	-2.342	**
12.	1.594	+	3.769	**	2.224	**	2.810	**	2.494	**
13.	-2.485	**	-3.991	**	-2.134	**	-3.760	**	-1.884	*
14.	-4.466	**	-5.852	**	-3.049	**	-5.770	**	-2.094	**
15.	-2.580	**	-4.980	**	-4.216	**	-4.114	**	-1.819	*
16.	-4.047	**	-5.215	**	-4.775	**	-5.750	**	-2.534	**
17.	-4.674	**	-5.902	**	-4.074	**	-5.520	**	-2.312	**
18.	2.752	**	4.401	**	2.970	**	5.013	**	1.535	+
19.	-3.548	**	-5.889	**	-3.457	**	-5.084	**	-2.400	**
20.	3.218	**	1.857	*	1.831	*	1.242	NS	2.347	**
21.	-3.130	**	-4.668	**	-3.064	**	-4.964	**	-2.684	**
22.	-5.314	**	-5.485	**	-5.142	**	-4.844	**	-1.657	*
23.	1.951	*	2.599	**	2.900	**	4.757	**	1.841	*
24.	3.471	**	4.363	**	3.326	**	6.155	**	0.403	NS
25.	-5.540	**	-3.966	**	-3.940	**	-5.078	**	-2.376	**
26.	-5.421	**	-6.196	**	-5.532	**	-6.062	**	-3.207	**
27.	-1.713	+	-2.937	**	-3.673	**	-3.799	**	-1.270	NS
28.	3.782	**	4.030	**	3.762	**	6.100	**	1.510	+

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	30 or Under Sign.		Ages 31-40 Sign.		Ages 41-50 Sign.		Ages 51-60 Sign.		Ages 60+ Sign.	
29.	0.430	NS	2.844	**	1.652	*	4.259	**	1.164	NS
30.	2.808	**	4.858	**	3.588	**	3.623	**	2.414	**
31.	3.343	**	2.005	**	1.601	+	3.476	**	2.414	**
32.	2.143	**	1.996	**	1.921	*	4.666	**	1.320	+
33.	2.503	**	3.381	**	3.232	**	2.319	**	2.147	**
34.	2.626	**	3.988	**	3.503	**	4.909	**	2.340	**
35.	-3.705	**	-1.564	+	-3.639	**	-2.420	**	-0.332	NS
36.	-1.083	NS	-1.606	+	-1.779	*	-3.524	**	-1.545	+

	No. Significant	Percentage of Responses Significant at these Levels
N.S. = Non Significant	17	9.4
1.282 + = Significant at .10	16	8.9
1.645 * = Significant at .05	12	6.7
1.96 ** = Significant at .025	<u>135</u>	75.0
Total	180	

TABLE XV

MANN-WHITNEY COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES EXPERIMENTAL  
AND CONTROL BY TEACHING LEVEL

	Grades 1-3	Sign.	Grades 4-6	Sign.	Grades 7-8	Sign.	Grades 9-12	Sign.
1.	1.430	+	2.423	**	1.279	NS	4.406	**
2.	4.188	**	3.840	**	4.372	**	7.601	**
3.	0.094	NS	0.856	NS	-1.589	+	-2.520	**
4.	-1.193	NS	-0.531	NS	-3.775	**	-4.691	**
5.	2.996	**	2.053	**	3.394	**	5.203	**
6.	-0.087	NS	0.261	NS	-2.137	**	-6.631	**
7.	3.688	**	5.145	**	2.751	**	6.878	**
8.	-0.248	NS	1.813	*	0.517	NS	4.837	**
9.	4.124	**	5.847	**	2.560	**	6.022	**
10.	-1.536	+	-1.285	+	-1.306	+	-4.282	**
11.	0.105	NS	-0.406	NS	-2.651	**	-4.119	**
12.	3.199	**	3.183	**	2.786	**	3.235	**
13.	3.057	**	1.242	NS	-2.899	**	-8.779	**
14.	-1.847	*	-3.363	**	-4.793	**	-7.846	**
15.	-2.177	**	-3.109	**	-4.344	**	-5.279	**
16.	-2.432	**	-2.050	**	-4.957	**	-8.628	**
17.	-2.825	**	-2.344	**	-5.584	**	-7.533	**
18.	2.673	**	4.802	**	2.828	**	5.087	**
19.	-1.569	+	-3.016	**	-4.443	**	-7.219	**
20.	0.957	NS	0.838	NS	3.341	**	3.457	**
21.	-2.713	**	-1.940	*	-3.953	**	-6.338	**
22.	-3.626	**	-6.205	**	-3.814	**	-7.401	**
23.	2.037	**	2.579	**	3.030	**	4.527	**
24.	4.629	**	3.940	**	3.442	**	5.333	**
25.	-2.008	**	-5.736	**	-4.802	**	-6.108	**
26.	-4.302	**	-4.408	**	-5.883	**	-8.910	**
27.	-2.547	**	-1.774	*	-1.761	*	-5.406	**
28.	4.335	**	4.830	**	4.018	**	5.960	**

TABLE XV (Continued)

	Grades 1-3	Sign.	Grades 4-6	Sign.	Grades 7-8	Sign.	Grades 9-12	Sign.
29.	1.451	+	-0.067	NS	2.426	**	4.713	**
30.	0.984	NS	1.565	+	3.947	**	6.354	**
31.	0.979	NS	-1.140	NS	2.419	**	6.207	**
32.	1.438	+	2.822	**	4.385	**	2.833	**
33.	0.638	NS	1.903	*	2.828	**	4.627	**
34.	1.662	*	2.776	**	3.548	**	5.610	**
35.	-2.775	**	-2.525	**	-2.652	**	-3.345	**
36.	-1.048	NS	-1.815	*	-1.713	*	-3.875	**

No.                      Percentage of Responses  
Significant      Significant at these Levels

NS = Non-Significant	20	16.4
1.282 + = Significant at .10	9	5.0
1.645 * = Significant at .05	9	5.0
1.96 ** = Significant at .025	<u>106</u>	73.6
Total	144	

TABLE XVI

MANN-WHITNEY COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES EXPERIMENTAL  
AND CONTROL BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

	Less Than 300	Sign.	300- 1,000	Sign.	1,000- 5,000	Sign.	5,000- 15,000	Sign.	Over 15,000	Sign.
1.	-0.147	NS	2.094	**	3.869	**	2.478	**	2.451	**
2.	2.159	**	1.412	+	6.057	**	4.822	**	6.576	**
3.	-2.025	**	-1.364	+	-2.699	**	0.995	NS	-0.781	NS
4.	-1.892	*	-1.793	*	-3.060	**	-2.466	**	-3.867	**
5.	1.288	+	-0.619	NS	3.410	**	4.307	**	5.335	**
6.	-1.717	*	-2.275	**	-3.179	**	-2.622	**	-3.192	**
7.	0.996	NS	2.259	**	6.578	**	4.044	**	5.945	**
8.	0.204	NS	0.942	NS	2.236	**	1.505	+	2.901	**
9.	0.194	NS	2.234	**	6.947	**	3.059	**	5.892	**
10.	-1.452	+	-1.273	NS	-3.122	**	-1.039	NS	-3.158	**
11.	-1.431	+	-2.018	**	-1.391	+	-0.488	NS	-3.681	**
12.	-0.185	NS	2.809	**	4.602	**	2.354	**	3.003	**
13.	-2.324	**	-2.822	**	-3.011	**	-1.129	NS	-3.905	**
14.	-1.800	*	-3.113	**	-5.760	**	-3.861	**	-6.106	**
15.	-1.562	+	-2.368	**	-5.651	**	-2.755	**	-4.869	**
16.	-2.493	**	-1.795	*	-6.048	**	-4.438	**	-6.408	**
17.	-2.176	**	-3.146	**	-6.724	**	-3.314	**	-6.370	**
18.	1.565	+	2.143	**	4.127	**	3.814	**	4.668	**
19.	-2.353	**	-2.139	**	-4.601	**	-3.679	**	-6.001	**
20.	0.095	NS	0.258	NS	4.606	**	1.330	+	2.635	**
21.	-0.991	NS	-2.219	**	-6.147	**	-2.740	**	-4.620	**
22.	-1.861	*	-2.930	**	-5.739	**	-4.420	**	-7.285	**
23.	2.599	**	3.135	**	3.608	**	1.764	*	3.760	**
24.	3.141	**	1.693	*	5.885	**	2.640	**	5.291	**
25.	-2.270	**	-4.042	**	-3.711	**	-5.507	**	-5.343	**
26.	-2.335	**	-4.418	**	-6.696	**	-5.575	**	-7.302	**
27.	-1.407	+	-2.868	**	-3.320	**	-3.359	**	-3.601	**
28.	2.413	**	2.481	**	6.096	**	2.871	**	6.261	**



TABLE XVI (Continued)

	Less Than 300	Sign.	300- 1,000	Sign.	1,000- 5,000	Sign.	5,000- 15,000	Sign.	Over 15,000	Sign.
29.	1.981	**	2.323	**	3.059	**	1.311	+	2.055	**
30.	2.393	**	2.323	**	2.387	**	3.126	**	5.076	**
31.	0.705	NS	2.073	**	3.773	**	1.526	+	3.312	**
32.	1.173	NS	1.966	**	2.966	**	2.259	**	3.515	**
33.	1.692	*	2.554	**	2.911	**	1.565	+	3.922	**
34.	1.670	*	3.322	**	3.881	**	3.140	**	4.177	**
35.	-2.078	**	-2.847	**	-2.018	**	-2.109	**	-2.983	**
36.	-2.124	**	-3.407	**	-2.057	**	-2.492	**	-1.026	NS

	No. Significant	Percentage of Responses Significant at these Levels
NS = Non-Significant	19	8.8
1.282 + = Significant at .10	14	7.8
1.645 * = Significant at .05	10	7.3
1.96 ** = Significant at .025	<u>137</u>	76.1
Total	180	

TABLE XVII

MANN-WHITNEY COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES EXPERIMENTAL  
AND CONTROL BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE

	1-3 yrs.	Sign.	4-8 yrs.	Sign.	9-15 yrs.	Sign.	16-25 yrs.	Sign.	25+ yrs.	Sign.
1.	1.751	*	2.462	**	2.540	**	2.777	**	2.236	**
2.	5.734	**	3.497	**	4.202	**	3.441	**	5.286	**
3.	0.183	NS	-1.309	+	-1.681	*	-0.644	NS	-2.739	**
4.	-3.654	**	-2.824	**	-3.171	**	-2.732	**	-1.933	NS
5.	2.895	**	3.862	**	4.570	**	2.055	**	3.175	**
6.	-3.344	**	-2.897	**	-4.049	**	-1.833	*	-2.852	**
7.	3.812	**	5.388	**	4.892	**	3.504	**	4.238	**
8.	3.048	**	2.198	**	1.891	*	1.563	+	0.600	NS
9.	4.149	**	5.047	**	4.354	**	3.480	**	3.798	**
10.	-0.259	NS	-2.220	**	-2.953	**	-2.858	**	-2.940	**
11.	-1.930	**	-2.264	**	-2.868	**	-1.525	+	-1.381	NS
12.	2.311	**	2.849	**	2.491	**	3.322	**	2.465	**
13.	-3.382	**	-2.498	**	-3.401	**	-3.354	**	-3.487	**
14.	-4.270	**	-4.972	**	-4.578	**	-3.583	**	-4.585	**
15.	-2.825	**	-4.374	**	-3.989	**	-2.949	**	-3.982	**
16.	-4.034	**	-5.002	**	-5.430	**	-3.181	**	-5.527	**
17.	-4.507	**	-5.461	**	-5.540	**	-3.431	**	-4.900	**
18.	1.522	+	4.703	**	3.293	**	2.631	**	4.748	**
19.	-3.137	**	-4.990	**	-6.061	**	-3.214	**	-3.498	**
20.	0.997	NS	1.279	NS	3.105	**	2.208	**	3.789	**
21.	-3.435	**	-3.722	**	-3.505	**	-3.565	**	-4.763	**
22.	-4.659	**	-5.529	**	-4.806	**	-4.753	**	-4.161	**
23.	2.380	**	2.605	**	2.283	**	2.790	**	4.173	**
24.	2.800	**	3.866	**	3.752	**	4.022	**	5.254	**
25.	-3.833	**	-5.107	**	-4.568	**	-2.269	**	-5.139	**
26.	-5.040	**	-6.053	**	-5.800	**	-4.329	**	-5.568	**
27.	-2.760	**	-1.945	NS	-3.878	**	-1.432	+	-3.843	**
28.	2.821	**	4.444	**	4.690	**	3.973	**	5.117	**

TABLE XVII (Continued)

	1-3		4-8		9-15		16-25		25+ yrs.	
	yrs.	Sign.	yrs.	Sign.	yrs.	Sign.	yrs.	Sign.	yrs.	Sign.
29.	0.958	NS	0.681	NS	3.686	**	1.774	*	3.972	**
30.	1.956	*	3.980	**	4.406	**	2.617	**	3.843	**
31.	2.820	**	1.028	NS	1.411	+	3.742	**	2.978	**
32.	1.812	*	1.752	*	2.314	**	3.238	**	3.128	**
33.	2.545	**	1.875	*	2.936	**	2.338	**	2.793	**
34.	2.825	**	2.963	**	3.711	**	3.783	**	3.518	**
35.	-2.156	**	-2.288	**	-2.157	**	-2.574	**	-2.599	**
36.	-1.782	*	0.524	NS	-1.644	+	-2.483	**	-3.618	**

	No. Significant	Percentage of Responses Significant at these Levels
NS = Non-Significant	13	5.3
1.282 + = Significant at .10	7	4.7
1.645 * = Significant at .05	10	6.7
1.96 ** = Significant at .025	<u>150</u>	83.3
Total	180	

TABLE XVIII

MANN-WHITNEY COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES EXPERIMENTAL  
AND CONTROL BY YEARS OF TRAINING

	B.A. or B.S.	Sign.	5 yrs. or Master's	Sign.	More than 5 yrs.	Sign.
1.	4.293	**	2.669	**	0.337	NS
2.	7.966	**	4.463	**	3.396	**
3.	-1.201	NS	-2.631	**	-0.304	NS
4.	-5.705	**	-3.104	**	-1.522	+
5.	5.087	**	4.789	**	2.830	**
6.	-3.957	**	-3.673	**	-2.060	**
7.	7.358	**	5.510	**	1.939	*
8.	2.048	**	3.588	**	1.082	NS
9.	7.266	**	4.674	**	2.932	**
10.	-2.321	**	-4.006	**	-2.091	**
11.	-3.001	**	-2.417	**	-2.315	**
12.	4.258	**	3.053	**	1.648	*
13.	-4.450	**	-1.950	*	-3.700	**
14.	-7.413	**	-4.994	**	-2.903	**
15.	-5.219	**	-5.681	**	-3.057	**
16.	-7.868	**	-5.439	**	-3.328	**
17.	-7.235	**	-5.679	**	-4.065	**
18.	5.706	**	4.701	**	1.613	+
19.	-7.127	**	-4.127	**	-2.689	**
20.	3.207	**	3.084	**	1.278	+
21.	-5.084	**	-5.808	**	-2.567	**
22.	-8.212	**	-6.309	**	-2.795	**
23.	4.036	**	3.990	**	2.475	**
24.	5.726	**	5.184	**	3.497	**
25.	-7.299	**	-4.008	**	-3.909	**
26.	-9.607	**	-5.825	**	-3.703	**
27.	-4.673	**	-2.798	**	-2.509	**
28.	6.834	**	5.568	**	2.586	**

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

	B.A. or B.S.	Sign.	5 yrs. or Master's	Sign.	More than 5 yrs.	Sign.
29.	1.992	**	3.054	**	2.759	**
30.	4.834	**	4.054	**	3.266	**
31.	3.415	**	3.496	**	1.955	*
32.	3.798	**	2.963	**	2.495	**
33.	3.636	**	3.282	**	3.233	**
34.	5.192	**	4.345	**	2.907	**
35.	-3.522	**	-2.893	**	-2.460	**
36.	-3.501	**	-2.429	**	-1.414	+

	No. Significant	Percentage of Responses Significant at these Levels
NS = Non-Significant	4	3.7
1.282 + = Significant at .10	4	3.7
1.645 * = Significant at .05	4	3.7
1.96 ** = Significant at .025	<u>96</u>	88.9
Total	108	

TABLE XIX  
MANN-WHITNEY COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES EXPERIMENTAL  
AND CONTROL BY AMOUNT OF ENGLISH TAKEN  
IN COLLEGE

	Major	Sign.	Minor	Sign.	Less Than a Minor	Sign.
1.	2.802	**	3.804	**	2.638	**
2.	6.547	**	5.727	**	5.181	**
3.	-0.603	NS	-2.960	**	0.728	NS
4.	-3.484	**	-3.450	**	-3.383	**
5.	4.851	**	4.660	**	2.347	**
6.	-2.821	**	-4.488	**	-1.998	**
7.	6.829	**	5.373	**	4.656	**
8.	2.489	**	1.892	*	2.417	**
9.	6.046	**	5.767	**	5.159	**
10.	-2.838	**	-3.079	**	-2.185	**
11.	-2.772	**	-2.028	**	-1.867	*
12.	3.507	**	4.109	**	3.252	**
13.	-2.325	**	-3.640	**	-1.645	*
14.	-6.145	**	-5.516	**	-4.696	**
15.	-5.450	**	-4.883	**	-3.360	**
16.	-6.775	**	-5.520	**	-4.615	**
17.	-6.799	**	-5.318	**	-4.971	**
18.	4.533	**	5.293	**	4.390	**
19.	-5.897	**	-4.505	**	-4.851	**
20.	2.718	**	3.847	**	1.202	NS
21.	-5.146	**	-4.616	**	-4.065	**
22.	-7.418	**	-6.015	**	-5.411	**
23.	3.018	**	4.504	**	3.402	**
24.	5.469	**	5.499	**	4.809	**
25.	-6.190	**	-5.228	**	-5.170	**
26.	-8.039	**	-7.025	**	-5.661	**
27.	-3.363	**	-3.887	**	-3.907	**
28.	6.444	**	5.332	**	5.048	**

TABLE XIX (Continued)

	Major	Sign.	Minor	Sign.	Less Than a Minor	Sign.
29.	1.476	+	3.459	**	2.635	**
30.	4.379	**	4.893	**	2.637	**
31.	2.152	**	3.690	**	2.918	**
32.	2.986	**	3.895	**	2.873	**
33.	3.103	**	3.581	**	2.760	**
34.	3.611	**	5.928	**	2.428	**
35.	-2.807	**	-3.857	**	-2.080	**
36.	-1.555	+	-3.804	**	-1.798	*

	No. Significant	Percentage of Responses Significant at these Levels
NS = Non-Significant	3	2.8
1.282 + = Significant at .10	2	1.8
1.645 * = Significant at .05	4	3.7
1.96 ** = Significant at .025	<u>99</u>	91.7
Total	108	

APPENDIX E



TABLE XX

THE MANN-WHITNEY U TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN  
ATTITUDES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL  
GROUPS FOR ITEMS 1-36

Null Hypotheses: There will be no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence between the attitudes of teachers who have had formal instruction in Linguistics and teachers who have had no such instruction toward items 1-36. (Part II)

	Groups	N	Z Value	Computed Significance
1.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.06212	0.00003
2.	Control Experimental	217 333	-10.41192	0.00003
3.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 2.12995	0.01659
4.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 6.11614	0.00003
5.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 7.38230	0.00003
6.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.85704	0.00003
7.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 9.78543	0.00003
8.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 4.10960	0.00003
9.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 9.46327	0.00003
10.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 4.69934	0.00003
11.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 4.26522	0.00003
12.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.91595	0.00003

TABLE XX (Continued)

	Groups	N	Z Value	Computed Significance
13.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.71003	0.00003
14.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 9.83561	0.00003
15.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 8.23430	0.00003
16.	Control Experimental	217 333	-10.25934	0.00003
17.	Control Experimental	217 333	-10.28778	0.00003
18.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 7.73742	0.00003
19.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 9.04507	0.00003
20.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 4.68423	0.00003
21.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 8.11051	0.00003
22.	Control Experimental	217 333	-10.93119	0.00003
23.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 6.32442	0.00003
24.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 8.74537	0.00003
25.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 9.57335	0.00003
26.	Control Experimental	217 333	-12.32401	0.00003
27.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 6.49718	0.00003

TABLE XX (Continued)

	Groups	N	Z Value	Computed Significance
28.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 9.65188	0.00003
29.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 4.44839	0.00003
30.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 7.23962	0.00003
31.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.44630	0.00003
32.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.60061	0.00003
33.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.76018	0.00003
34.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 7.29389	0.00003
35.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 5.25037	0.00003
36.	Control Experimental	217 333	- 4.26621	0.00003

**APPENDIX F**

Attitudinal comments from Linguistic extension courses taught by Mr. Jim Gardner in Japan and Okinawa, 1966-67.

"Boys often feel that English is a girl's subject but the variety of responses and individual solutions that would come in a linguistic approach to both grammar and literature should be able to capture the interest of more boys."

Robert Richardson

"Modern linguistics has strong appeal because it is realistic."

Judith Jones

"Attitude will play a major part in the success of modern linguistics."

Sr. Jeanne d'arc

"I have grasped that an English teacher's attitude makes or mars his student's interest for life. . . . language is social and relative. For a long time, I must confess, I ignored this fact, and I am sure I must have caused some students to have feelings of discomfort, if not of disdain or disgust."

Sr. Odile

"Who knows? - perhaps the world will lose a lot of great potential scientists if everyone discovers the magic of language."

M. M. Maryana

"Perhaps one of the most undesirable attitudes for an English teacher to hold is a rigid attitude toward language. Obviously the teacher fails to realize that language changes, that he is trying to get the world to stand still."

Robert Soyrota

"I am convinced that the linguistic method of teaching English is a great improvement over traditional methods. Linguistics emphasizes a total approach to the language arts. The history of language, grammar, writing, spelling and literature are now unified and this is as they really are."

Betty Foshee

"Recognizing the linguistic principle that children come to school knowing more about language than we given them credit for knowing, will enable authors to design formal grammar instruction that is meaningful for lower levels."

David L. Schmeltzer

"Modern English has made the job of being an English teacher just a little more pleasnat. It makes sense."

Fred Dyer

"I had excellent English teachers in high school and college, but I remember virtually nothing about the terms and rules I once learned. This is the first time I have really understood much about (or cared much about) the overall structure of the language."

Ann Berg

"What a precious lession to me as a teacher! Like a refresher course. May I apply this principle to mathematics and other areas of teaching - of reaching the child's level of appeal, reasoning power, and learning? (and not a mass of facts)."

Pearl Chang

"It was proven in my class that modern linguistics is usable. I say this because of the enthusiastic faces of my slow learners as they succeeded where they had failed before."

Carol Sparks

"Without question then, it is only a matter of time and education until traditional grammar comes to its demise and with no better epitaph than the Latin, 'Requiescat in pace'."

Ranalletta

Attitudinal comments from Linguistic extension courses taught by the writer in Oklahoma through Arts and Sciences Extension, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

"I have thoroughly enjoyed the course. It has been my closest relationship with what is going on in the language arts field. I am intrigued with the hope that something can yet be learned and accomplished in the methods of teaching our language. The teacher has been excellent; something fresh and new and sparkling in the often too drab, monotonous halls of our university."

Clyde Brown

"The linguistic approach to grammar was the most helpful to me, because I have always feared trying to teach grammar in the secondary schools and to a degree this approach has simplified the confusion this section of English has created."

Connie Jones

"The linguistic course has certainly caused me to take a more liberal look at the 'speaking English' of my students. Dialect has come to have a different meaning to me."

Ruby Schreiner

"Perhaps I was less aware what this class would offer than the others, but I am so glad that I was a part of it. I have received so many applicable facts in a field that is so prone to be treated as it was a century ago. I do feel more elementary teachers should have this course. Price of extension courses and already filled schedules kept many from enrolling I am sure.

Eleanor Acklin

"The attitude of the teacher toward the language is most important to teaching English successfully. The teacher's biased attitude can and does often influence attitudes toward the children and the classroom - if the attitude is negative the teacher rejects the children she must try to teach. This has often happened in the case of dialects and poor language habits that are used to label children.

D. Rabon

VITA

Cecelia Nails Palmer

Candidate for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

**Dissertation:** A STUDY OF ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS TOWARD THE MODERN LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

**Major Field:** Secondary Education

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born at Tulsa, Oklahoma, the daughter of James and Vasinora Nails.

**Education:** Received the Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in English from Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma; received the Master of Science degree in Education with a major in Secondary Education from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in 1955; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in July, 1968.

**Professional Experience:** Taught elementary and junior high grades in Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1950-61; taught in teacher training college in Kingston, Jamaica, West Indies on a Fulbright teaching grant, 1961-63; taught high school English in Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1963-64; received a teaching assistantship at Oklahoma State University to teach "Linguistics" to teachers in the public schools in Oklahoma, 1966-67; employed as instructor in the English department at Oklahoma State University, 1967-68; taught in three NDEA summer institutes at Oklahoma State University during the summers of 1965-68.

**Professional Organizations:** National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association, Sigma Tau Delta English fraternity, Alpha Kappa Alpha social sorority.