

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-6976

MULCAHY, George Joseph, 1914-
A COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL METHODS APPROACH
AND THE LINGUISTIC METHODS APPROACH TO THE
TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND COMPOSITION
TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1973
Education, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL METHODS APPROACH
AND THE LINGUISTIC METHODS APPROACH TO
THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND
COMPOSITION TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
GEORGE JOSEPH MULCAHY
Norman, Oklahoma
1973

A COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL METHODS APPROACH
AND THE LINGUISTIC METHODS APPROACH TO
THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND
COMPOSITION TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN

APPROVED BY

Phil B. [unclear]
Stephen P. [unclear]
Jack F. [unclear]
Donald [unclear]

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A very sincere expression of appreciation is extended to the many persons who contributed to this study. I am especially indebted to Dr. Robert F. Bibens, chairman of my committee, for his guidance, inspiration, and patient understanding during the writing of this dissertation. I am indebted to Dr. Glenn R. Snider, Dr. Jack F. Parker, and Dr. Gerald D. Kidd for their untiring assistance as members of the committee throughout the doctoral program. I am grateful to Dr. Edward W. Porter for the statistical verification and to Mrs. Roy C. Allen for the typed format of this dissertation. I am most deeply appreciative toward my wife, Pat, for her perseverance, fortitude, and faith in my efforts.

G. J. M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Need for the Study	3
Statement of the Problem	12
The Hypotheses	12
Major Assumptions	13
Limitations	13
Definition of Terms	13
Organization of the Study	16
II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE . .	17
The Influence of Prescriptive Grammar and Ruled English	19
American Grammatical Prescriptivism	22
Early Twentieth-Century Traditional Grammar	24
Late Twentieth-Century Traditional Grammar	26
The Influence of Structural Linguistic Grammar	28
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	44
A Comparison of Traditional and Linguistic Grammar	44
Procedures	50
Procedural Narrative	54

Chapter	Page
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	60
Descriptive Data of Experimental and Control Groups	61
Results of Testing Hypothesis Number One .	61
Results of Testing Hypothesis Number Two .	64
Ancillary Findings	65
Comparisons of the English and Composite ACT Scores	65
Comparisons of the Ages of the Experimental and Control Groups	67
Comparisons of the Amount of Composition Experience of the Experimental and Control Groups	68
Comparisons of the Pretest, Posttest, and Change Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups on Grammar Usage and Theme Composition	69
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
Summary	72
Findings	73
Conclusions	76
Recommendations for Instructional Application	77
Recommendations for Further Research . . .	78
Concluding Remarks	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82
APPENDIX A--LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE TEST, FORM A	87
APPENDIX B--LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE TEST, FORM B	98
APPENDIX C--STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR FRESHMAN COMPOSITION	108
APPENDIX D--COMPOSITION EVALUATION	115
APPENDIX E--GRAMMAR AND THEME DATA OF THE CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS	118
APPENDIX F--RAW DATA REPORTED BY THE CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS	123

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Experimental and Control Groups	62
4.2 The Analysis of Covariance Results of Grammar-Usage Change Scores	63
4.3 The Analysis of Covariance Results of Theme-Composition Change Scores	65
4.4 The English and Composite ACT Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups	66
4.5 The Ages of the Experimental and Control Groups	67
4.6 A Comparison of the Theme-Writing Levels of the Experimental and Control Groups	69
4.7 A Comparison of the Pretest, Posttest, and Change Scores on Grammar Usage and Theme Composition	70

A COMPARISON OF THE TRADITIONAL METHODS APPROACH
AND THE LINGUISTIC METHODS APPROACH TO
THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR AND
COMPOSITION TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of English as a subject in American schools invites administrators, curriculum directors, and teachers to re-examine the learning processes and the meaning to the student of what he is doing in English studies.

Dixon observed:

The conflicting emphases of English challenge educators today to look for a new, coherent definition . . . its complexity invites the partial and the incomplete view--the dangerous simplification that has a tendency to restrict what goes on in the classroom.¹

Significant developments in the field of linguistic analysis have vitally affected the English curriculum.

Before 1940, innovations in grammar teaching were confined

¹John Dixon, Growth Through English, (Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967), p. 13.

mainly to eliminating some of the perplexing rules incorporated in a standard and uniform grammar. Since 1940, attention has been focused on the need for new concepts and new approaches in the teaching of English. This change has resulted partially from Fries' American English Grammar, which pioneered a new direction of development, and suggested that a new grammatical approach was needed. Fries not only emphasized change, but offered a "partial statement of a new system."²

In the past three decades English teachers have been confronted with an explosion of knowledge that suggests change in curriculum content and methodology. Many 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 methods approach, often characterized by absolute standards of correctness and rigid rules of conformity, has been deemed 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 posed a challenge to the static and "correct" body of knowledge in the

²Charles C. Fries, American English Grammar, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1940), p. 291.

standard English handbook, and has made the acceptance and recognition of newer trends gradual and cautious. These recent proclamations of a revolution in grammar have sought to define a sharp break between the advocates of the traditional grammar and the supporters of the new linguistics.

The problem of alleviating a continuing argument as to the relative merits of the traditional method versus the linguistic method of teaching English led to the development of the study herein reported. This study was conducted to concentrate upon a comparison of two groups of college freshmen at a large university to determine the differences in grammar and theme-composition knowledge gained through utilizing two different teaching methods: (1) the traditional methods approach and (2) the linguistic methods approach.

Background and Need for the Study

Demands for a higher standard of competence in the teaching of English and the language arts have become too insistent to be ignored. Many of these expressed needs have suggested revisions of the English curriculum, which is traditionally visualized as consisting of three main components: literature, language, and composition. Some unorganized additions of enriched language activities to the language arts program have 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. Those who are concerned 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. Representatives of business and industry complain that the inability to communicate with clarity is one of the primary reasons for failure in important positions. Recently, an official of the General Electric Company stated, "At the last meeting of our Association, representatives of all the major companies complained about the way their young men were putting down their words--and futures on paper. Can't someone tell us what to do?"³

The attempt to answer the above question completes a syndromic circle, peculiarly characterized by social attitudes toward the language. In the complex educational system, the elementary divisions vigilantly explore home environments, the junior high and middle school segments investigate inefficiency in the elementary school programs, while the high school organizations diligently apply "grammar" in a "scissors-and-paste" manner to prepare the student for the college or university. The university personnel indict

³Kellogg W. Hunt, "Why Study English," Our Living Language, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 102.

general education for the student's inability to manipulate the language effectively, while many faculties still continue the tradition in the preparation of teachers for the public schools. Thus, the syndrome continues, while the educationists and the specialists confront the issue of inadequate teacher training.

An ambivalent attitude of many of the public at large toward language usage, which has become psychologically labelled "grammar," has developed many of the misconceptions which impede progress in language instruction in the schools. The original conceptions of general education within communities with little specialization have conservatively characterized public opinion. Gleason claimed:

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.⁴

In addition, the academic tradition oriented toward college has augmented the ambivalence toward English. The ambidexterity of grammatical application, as the focus of the language arts program, has persisted in the eighteenth-century tradition. Certain of the textbooks in the nineteenth century defined grammar as " . . . the art of speaking and

⁴H. A. Gleason, Jr., Linguistics and English Grammar, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 6.

writing English correctly."⁵ The concept of grammar's being used as the tool to teach correct English persisted.

This concept of correct grammar, intensified by emotionalized social attitudes, has been reenforced by pre-scriptivism. Pertinent overtones of social connotations are singularly directed toward the language, in contrast to other academic subjects. Many Americans will candidly acknowledge their lack of knowledge in any of the physical sciences, but their 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 which regulate "correct" usage.

These habitual attitudes have influenced teachers and the language arts curriculum. They have persisted in upholding mis-directed concepts of traditional grammar and further encouraged an antithesis to the new grammar. Such an 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,

⁵Ibid., P. 7.

and something of the complexity of the "whole."
It is here that linguistics can make its major
contribution.⁶

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

An obvious point of fact to the professional educator is that the growing complexity of the American society invokes more stringent responsibilities on the entire 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 various 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.⁷

⁶Ibid., p. 4.

⁷Albert H. Marckwardt, Linguistics and the Teaching of English, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966), p. 5.

The above statement further suggests that ways must be devised to give this type of training to the speakers and writers 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 succeeding decades. Emerging national concerns attest to the reality of these demands. Urban Renewal and Model Cities programs, Poverty programs, Headstart and other culturally disadvantaged programs, along with rat control bills comprise tangible evidence of attempts to involve all segments of the society in the total educational process. Many educators believe the validity and success of these programs can best be determined by the type of communication established in their initial stages. In keeping with the philosophical view that "Rapport in communication is dependent on the attitudinal operants in a given situation,"⁸ especially in recent years, the educators and the public have become vitally concerned with such accord in communication, as it affects the local, national, and international scene. In this regard, the language arts teacher must visualize classroom participation as realistic preparation for effective communication in affairs encompassing the local, national, and international scene. In addition, the English teacher

⁸Herbert Lander, Language and Culture, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. IV.

must implement classroom procedures which conform to these visualized goals of effective communication on the world scene.

The ethnocentric view of education must be discarded for a realistic acceptance of the changes demanded by a technological, scientific, and mobile society. In this sense, educators can expect students to inherit a way of life that necessitates activity and participation far removed from the local scene. Thus, the semantic difficulties of communication become 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 it could become the purposive nature of the language arts curriculum. Postman and Weingartner said:

The process of becoming a master of any human skill, on any level of behavior, consists essentially of being able first to observe and then to act on differences that make a difference.⁹

Many present day teachers of English believe that an accurate knowledge of the facts of current usage in different

⁹Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching, (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1966), p. 35.

social classes, on different social occasions, among 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 speak and write well. Therefore, the decisions of "what," "when," "where," and "how" to teach necessitate a knowledge of the current and realistic use of language in our culture. Marckwardt observed:

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 of crisis, we shall have to gear our education to them.¹⁰

In view of the recent trend to support and stimulate the humanities, Marckwardt made a further observation of significance:

In both the native and the foreign language fields 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 developed and the mass of information which has come to light during the present century.¹¹

The charge is often made that teachers themselves are not skilled enough in the languages they are teaching. This, perhaps, is important in assessing some reasons for the poor results in the classroom; however, many educators believe this is a minor factor in that the teaching of English is often adversely affected by the teacher's attitude toward language. Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens contend:

¹⁰Albert H. Marckwardt, p. 135.

¹¹Ibid., p. 5.

The grave fault is the approach to language and the descriptions of language on which the teaching is grounded . . . it is difficult to assess the relative importance of the factor accurately . . . If it is true that there is something wrong with the account of a language being taught, then it is important to put this right even if the teacher is a highly qualified person; and it is even more important if he is imperfectly trained.¹²

Consideration is given to the solution of these problems in curriculum revision and reorganization of the English curriculum. In these reappraisal programs, many linguists agree that all systems of grammar, old or new, contribute perceptive descriptions of the way our language behaves. The re-education has given teachers new insights as well as new questions.

The professional teacher has the awareness that he is the catalyst in the learning situation, and he knows that to be taught well, English or any other subject content--traditional or modern-- must be taught with understanding and with enthusiasm. Also, he assumes that regardless of source, the principles of grammar should be objective, vital, and realistic.

Consequently, it seemed especially appropriate for purposes of this experiment to investigate a comparison of one teacher's utilization of the traditional method of

¹²M. A. K. Halliday, Angus McIntosh, and Peter Stevens, Linguistic Science and Language Teaching, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964), p. 106.

teaching grammar and theme-composition to one group of college freshmen, and his linguistic method of teaching grammar and theme-composition to a second group of college freshmen.

The emphasis in teaching grammar and composition may concentrate on process learning rather than product learning. Questions such as: How does one write? Where does one get ideas for writing? How are clarity, vividness, and precision achieved? lead to analyses of writing techniques. For all practical purposes, then, classrooms become writing laboratories where discussion is considered a prerequisite to writing, and where the instructor serves as a facilitator for reluctant writers, helping others find the right words, and expressing enthusiasm and positive support for well-formed expressions.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was a comparison of two groups of college freshmen at a large university to determine the differences in grammar and theme-composition knowledge gained through utilizing two different teaching methods: (1) the traditional methods approach and (2) the linguistic methods approach.

The Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were derived from the problem:

- Ho₁ There is no statistically significant difference between the pretest-posttest Language Knowledge Test change scores as recorded for the experimental group (students who were taught by the linguistic methods of English instruction) and the control group (students who were taught by the traditional methods of English instruction).
- Ho₂ There is no statistically significant difference between the pretest-posttest (Theme I - Theme VII) change scores recorded for the experimental group (students who were taught by the linguistic methods of English instruction) and the control group (students who were taught by the traditional methods of English instruction).

Major Assumptions

1. The standard sample of this study was a typical population of students enrolled in Freshman Grammar and Composition courses at a university in the State of Oklahoma.
2. The sample students were considered as being of adequate size in number from which to generalize.

Limitations

1. The study was limited to a sample of freshman students enrolled at the selected university.
2. The study was limited in that the tests which were selected for use to determine the students' grammar knowledge and composition abilities were those selected for use at the designated university.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions and explanations of terms were used:

Control Group. The class in which the instructor taught the traditional methods approach.

Experimental Group. The class in which the instructor taught the linguistic methods approach.

Grammar. This term described the study of the structure of the language and the way our language system works, irrespective of the levels or varieties of usage. Language which is grammatically correct is not necessarily good usage in all situations, but the educated student should know correct, cultivated grammar as our language now functions and be able to use it effectively. Language "becomes good as the student develops a feeling for the bright, sparkling word or phrase, the exact word for his needs, the sentence which says exactly what he wants to say as economically and clearly as possible."¹³

Language Knowledge Test (LKT) Change Scores. The difference in the score obtained on the Language Knowledge Test, Form A, and the Language Knowledge Test, Form B.

Linguistic Methods Approach. This approach studies the English sentence from the point of view of pattern, word order, and formal clues. It departs sharply from the earlier and still dominant practice of employing concepts and terminology of Latin grammar. Linguists consider language a form

¹³Robert C. Pooley, Teaching English Grammar, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), p. 106.

of behavior having its own unique system or structure.

Structural linguistics attempts to describe language.

Previous Experience in Theme Composition. The number of themes composed by the student before participating in this experiment and categorized on the following scale: (1) 0-5; (2) 6-10; (3) 11-15; (4) 16-20; and (5) 21 or more themes.

Standard ACT Score (English). The 75-item, 40-minute test that measures the student's understanding and use of the basic elements in correct and effective writing, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, style, and organization.

Standard ACT Scores (Total). The battery of tests which measures the student's skill in English, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Natural Science. In addition to the four subject areas measured, a Composite score is also derived and recorded.

Theme I - Theme VII (Pretest-Posttest) Grade Change Scores. The difference in the numerical value assigned to Theme I, and the numerical value assigned to Theme VII.

Traditional Methods Approach. This approach prescribes a series of rules and definitions for language. The traditional grammarians make the distinction between "correct" form and errors according to the prescribed categories and framework of Greco-Roman grammar.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five (5) chapters. The Introductory Chapter presented the background and need for the study, the problem, hypotheses, assumptions, limitations, definitions of terms, and organization of the study. Chapter Two was devoted to a review of research and literature related to both the traditional and linguistic methods approaches to the teaching of English. Chapter Three presented the instruments, treatment of the data, sampling procedures, and data collecting procedures. Chapter Four concentrated upon the presentation and analysis of the data. A summary of the study, findings, conclusions, and subsequent recommendations were presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

Traditionally, (and even today in some schools) the subject content of English consisted of masterpieces of English and American literature, grammar and usage, and composition. It was not uncommon for students in secondary schools across the country to read approximately the same literature, study the same principles of grammar and usage, and write compositions on similar topics. However, these conditions have undergone some degree of change. Hook (1972) observed:

The content of the literature curriculum is no longer only or mainly the selections in an anthology; some schools do not even use an anthology. Much of the material is in paperbacks . . . Magazines and newspapers are often employed as sources for some of the reading material. There is no list of "classics" that every student is expected to read, and even though Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Great Expectations, "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner," and a few other works may appear repeatedly, there is much less commonality in curriculum guides than was once the case.¹

¹J. N. Hook, The Teaching of High School English, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972), pp. 15-16.

Much of the literature studied is less innocuous than that formerly read--less stylistic, often less moralistic, and possibly more realistic. Although censorship problems exist in many schools, frank and revealing, and essentially honest books like Salinger's Catcher in the Rye or Ellison's Invisible Man are included in many curriculums. "WASP" literature (white Anglo-Saxon Protestant) has been joined by works written by members of every ethnic group and of every cultural and religious heritage. And a book need not be fifty or a hundred years old to be included: many works of the present decade or even the present year are being taught. Instead of being limited to a highly restricted list, today's students may encounter almost anything in the entire range of literature, old or new. Literature for today's schools does not come only from England and America: Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia are often represented. Thus, provincialism has been slowly reduced.

There has been a similar broadening in the study of the English language. Through the first half of this century students were restricted in their study of subject content. Students of English studied the analysis of sentences (parsing, diagramming, underlining, the naming of parts) and participated in drill on correct usage. These prescriptive practices have comprised an integral part of America's heritage which had been influenced by Americans' English forefathers over the two preceding centuries.

The Influence of Prescriptive
Grammar and Ruled English

In the first half of the eighteenth century, the belief emerged that English was a debased language, which had to be methodically and vigorously cleansed of its improprieties. This attitude was based upon a scholarly reverence for the classical languages and a strong desire to make English conform to the standards of Classical Latin. Peters (1968) explained:

According to the scholar's linguistic scale of values, the more remote the kinship of a language to Greek and Latin, the more debased and corrupt it was. Greek, for example, was regarded as pre-eminent among known languages. Second in rank of linguistic excellence and elegance was Latin. Languages derived from Latin, such as Spanish, French, and Italian, were rated as less refined because they were considered vulgar corruptions of Latin. Other modern languages only distantly related to Latin, such as German and English, were held to be even more debased and inferior.²

Several determined efforts were made to purify and fix the English language. According to Sterling A. Leonard, "The prevailing view of language in the Eighteenth Century was that English could and must be subjected to a process of classical regularizing."³ To achieve that end, English

²Robert A. Peters, A Linguistic History of English. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 189.

³Sterling A. Leonard, The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 1929), p. 25.

Grammarians sought to refine the language through a marriage with logic and Greco-Latin grammar. In the process of their refining, the grammarians often disregarded English usage, including that of the better authors.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, various "new" English grammars were published, including Ann Fisher's A New Grammar (1750), Robert Lowth's A Short Introduction to English Grammar (1762), William Ward's An Essay on Grammar (1765), James Buchanan's A Regular English Syntax (1767), and Charles Coote's Elements of the Grammar of the English Language (1788).⁴ Such grammars, and others like them, are called prescriptive, because they contain prescriptions for the regulation of English.

The prescriptive grammarians advised the English that they should study grammar to eliminate errors and to acquire "correct" English.⁵ To the prescriptivists, the study of grammar meant the study of the rules of grammar, so-called "rules" which they themselves devised.

⁴Robert A. Peters, pp. 189-190.

⁵The belief in the salutary character of grammar was not new. For example, Charles Butler, English Grammar (Oxford, 1633), p. 1, said, "Grammar is the Art of writing and speaking wel." Jonson, Grammar (1640), Herford and Simpson, VII, 467, said, "Grammar is the art of true, and well speaking a Language; the writing is but an Accident."

A typical advocate of the study of grammar was Lowth who, in the second edition (1763) of his A Short Introduction to English Grammar, stated:

The Truth is, Grammar is very much neglected among us . . . if children were first taught the common principles of Grammar by some short and clear System of English Grammar . . . they would have some notion of what they were going about, when they should enter into the Latin Grammar . . .⁶

Praising Lowth's work, "in which are shown the grammatic [sic] Inaccuracies that have escaped the Pens of our most distinguished Writers," Ward in his An Essay on Grammar (1765), advocated "assisting children to comprehend the general Import and Advantage of Rules concerning Language."⁷

Similarly, Buchanan observed in his A Regular English Syntax (1767):

Considering the many grammatical Improperities to be found in our best Writers, such as Swift, Addison, Pope, etc., a Systematical English syntax is not beneath the Notice of the Learned themselves. Should it be urged, that in the Time of the Writers, English was but a very little subjected to Grammar, a question readily occurs: Had they not the Rules of Latin syntax to direct them?⁸

Coote, in his Elements of the Grammar of the English Language (1788), in which he criticized the "grammatical

⁶Robert A. Peters, p. 190.

⁷Ibid., p. 191.

⁸Ibid.

propriety of learned professions, persons of rank and fashion, as well as Authors," suggested:

This deficiency in grammatical precision may be obviated and supplied by a competent degree of attention, in the first place, to the fundamental principles of grammar, and, secondly to the particular rules of the language.⁹

American Grammatical Prescriptivism

Before the Revolutionary War in America, few private schools taught English grammar, and the public schools apparently not at all. In the latter, instruction was confined largely to reading and writing. Schoolbooks were scarce, and "Handwritten texts and other prepared-at-home substitutes were in widespread use."¹⁰ The students from families of means attended Latin grammar schools where they read Latin and Greek works.

The first English grammars used in Colonial America were British imports of the Greco-Roman-prescriptive type, the most popular of which was Thomas Dilworth's New Guide to the English Tongue (1740), which was reprinted by many publishers. Other British imports included James Greenwood's An Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar (1740); James Harris' Hermes, a Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Grammar

⁹Charles C. Fries, American English Grammar, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1940), p. 15.

¹⁰Charles Carpenter, History of American Schoolbooks, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963), p. 16.

(1751); and Lowth's A Short Introduction to New Grammar (1762).¹¹

In the period following the Revolutionary War, a popular American work was Noah Webster's A Grammatical Institute of the English Language, Part II: Containing, a plain and comprehensive grammar (1784). Based largely on Lowth's A Short Introduction to English Grammar, Webster's Institute also followed the pattern established by the Greco-Roman English Grammarians. Five years later, however, Webster reversed his course. In his Dissertations on the English Language (1789), he complained:

Most writers . . . lay down certain rules, arbitrary perhaps or drawn from the principles of other languages, and then condemn all English phrases which do not coincide with those rules . . . Instead of examining to find what the English language is, they endeavor to show what it ought to be according to their rules. It is for this reason that some of the criticisms of the most celebrated philologists are so far from being just, that they tend to overthrow the rules, and corrupt the true idiom of the English tongue.¹²

Considered the most popular and influential grammar for decades after the Revolutionary War was Lindley Murray's English Grammar, printed in England in 1795. In various abridgements and revisions, Murray's Grammar "in its field

¹¹Rollo L. Lyman, "English Grammar in American Schools Before 1850," U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 12, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), 1921.

¹²Ibid.

ranked in popularity with that of Webster's Spelling book."¹³ Following the familiar pattern of English grammarians, Murray, a Pennsylvanian who emigrated to England, made generous use of the works of writers who preceded him, including Lowth, Ward, and Webster. Murray's Grammar, as such, was Greco-Roman and prescriptive.

With persistent elaboration of "rules," the English grammar books of nineteenth-century America imitated the texts of the earlier period. Works such as Samuel Kirkman's English Grammar (1825), Peter Bullion's Principles of English Grammar (1844), and Gould Brown's Grammar of English Grammar (1851) continued the traditional trend. These and similar later works produced a strong dependence on authority.

Early Twentieth-Century Traditional Grammar

The development of Greco-Roman English grammar reached its apex in the early-twentieth century in the works of university scholars, mostly European. Major writers of that period include the Dutch scholars Etsko Kruisinga and Henrik Poutsma, the Dane Otto Jespersen, and the American George O. Curme. Their publications include Kruisinga's A Handbook of Present-Day English, 3 volumes (1931); Poustma's A Grammar of Late Modern English, 5 volumes (1904-29); Jespersen's A Modern English Grammar, 7 volumes

¹³Charles Carpenter, History of American Schoolbooks, p. 97.

(1909-49); and Curme's A Grammar of the English Language, 2 volumes (1931-35).¹⁴

Unlike their predecessors, whose studies were based on a limited sample of English sentences, the twentieth-century scholars compiled a large number of literary citations, from which they made many syntactic observations. They also asked many questions, probed into various areas that were uncertain or unexplored, and offered new terminology. Their works are accurate within the limitations of their grammatical framework and considered thorough in matters of detail. Despite rather wide differences in their interpretation of data, these scholars were basically conservative and fundamentally dependent on the Greco-Roman model of description. Their definitions and classifications also show a heavy dependence on either function or meaning, or both. Peters (1968) further explained:

The main criticism against them is that their works lack the foundation of an adequate theory of grammar, and that they fail to outline the principles upon which English sentences are organized. For these reasons, and because their works contain a mass of often unrelated details, their analyses are considered highly inefficient as descriptions of the grammar of English. Also, the scholars confined their analyses largely to written English and essentially neglected the analysis of the spoken forms of English.¹⁵

¹⁴Robert A. Peters, A Linguistic History of English, p. 193.

¹⁵Ibid.

Late Twentieth-Century Traditional Grammar

At present, many Greco-Roman prescriptive grammars, which are actually handbooks of English rather than grammars, continue to be published and continue to be used in the schools. With reference to their impact in many areas of education today, Peters (1968) made these observations:

Such works are little more than repetitious echoes of those of the preceding century. Historically, their nomenclature and classifications date back to Thrax and Donatus.¹⁶ Their prescriptive rules date from the eighteenth century. From that time to the present, such authoritarian rules have found favor with lower social-economic groups seeking a quick guide to linguistic propriety.¹⁷

In the present century, some linguistic analysts have reacted against certain inadequacies of traditional grammar by criticizing its tenets for the following major weaknesses:

1. It fails to describe. A primary weakness of traditional grammar is the attempt to impose the categories and framework of Greco-Roman grammar onto English. A universal grammar of English, therefore, is to be obtained from

¹⁶Dionysius Thrax, the Greek grammarian, whose Techne Grammatikē "art of grammar, art of letters" (circa. 100 B.C.) codified earlier Greek philosophical speculation about language; and Aelius Donatus, the Roman grammarian, whose Ars Grammatica "Art of Grammar, Art of the Rudiments of Learning" (circa. 350 A.D.) specified the eight parts of speech.

¹⁷Robert A. Peters, A Linguistic History of English, p. 193.

an analysis of the structure of English, not from a model based on the structure of some other language.

2. It attempts to prescribe. Traditional grammar sets up an artificial standard of usage by means of numerous, inflexible rules based on "logic" and Latin syntax. Standard English is determined from the actual practices of speakers of standard English. Standard usage cannot be prescribed by self-appointed linguistic legislators. Thus, in matters of usage, the rules of traditional grammar frequently fail to reflect reality, or actual standard usage.

3. It analyzes writing, not speech. The traditional descriptions of English grammar fail to acknowledge that language is speech and base their analyses on written or printed materials. As a result, traditional grammar does not describe the phonemic system of English nor does it provide a phonemic transcript of linguistic constructions, such as words.

4. It fails to show the actual working processes of the language. Traditional grammar does not describe the ordered procedures by which one sentence may be transferred into other sentences. As a result,

5. It is a limited or bound grammar. Traditional grammar can analyze only specific sentences; it cannot generate sentences.

The Influence of Structural Linguistic Grammar

In order to provide more efficient descriptions of the structure of English, structural grammar has been in the process of formulation for several decades. It is generally held that modern linguistics attained recognition in America with the publication in 1933 of Leonard Bloomfield's Language, a synthesis of American linguistics up to that time. In 1946, Robert C. Pooley stressed the importance of shifting the search for standards away from authorities and traditional rules to the language itself as it is spoken and written today. In his Teaching English Usage, Pooley stated:

The teaching of correctness in school and college courses must shift the emphasis from the laying down of negative rules to the development of positive insights. The correction of errors is less than half the teaching of good usage. Far more important is the awakening in pupils' minds of a recognition of the nature of communication, a recognition of how communication determines usage, and the development of a sensitivity to the gradations of intent and tone in every communication created by the selection of appropriate words, idioms, and constructions.¹⁸

A later and more complete synthesis of American linguistic methodology was set forth by Zellig S. Harris in his Methods in Structural Linguistics (1951). Some descriptions of the structure of American English based on the theory of structural grammar are given in such works as

¹⁸Robert C. Pooley, Teaching English Usage, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1946), p. 31.

An Outline of English Structure (1951) by George L. Trager and Henry L. Smith, Jr., and in various texts by Paul Roberts. In his Patterns of English (1956), Roberts said:

There is nothing in this presentation which will keep a student from understanding traditional grammar insofar as traditional grammar can be understood at all. To the extent to which traditional grammar deals with realities--and it does deal with them to a considerable extent--this book will help the student to understand traditional grammar . . . The student needn't be informed that there is anything especially revolutionary about this approach. He can be told simply that this is another way of looking at the language in an interesting way, and a way which may help him with some of the matters that have given trouble in the past.¹⁹

Additional publications of the decade came in the form of American English in Its Cultural Setting by Donald J. Lloyd and Harry R. Warfel (1956); The Structure of American English (1958) by W. Nelson Francis; Archibald A. Hill's An Introduction to Linguistic Structures: From Sound to Sentence in English (1958); James Sledds's A Short Introduction to English Grammar (1959); and Eugene A. Nida's A Synopsis of English Syntax (1960).

Several textbooks incorporating linguistic principles with the elementary, middle school, and junior high curriculums have been written. One example is Greta and Harold Morine

¹⁹Paul Roberts, Patterns of English, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1956), pp. 8-9.

and Neil Postman's Discovering Your Language (1963)²⁰ which emphasized the "nature of a changing language" and the "patterns" of sentences, illustrated by the "structural" approach. The late Paul Roberts was active in publishing English Sentences (1962)²¹ and English Syntax (1964)²² which were attuned to the secondary level; and he published a series of textbooks, The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program (1966), designed to teach the linguistic structural approach to grades four, five, and six. Roberts quoted as the aim of the series,

. . . 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.²³

In 1966, a group of forty-nine English Teachers representing various educational levels, assembled at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, to study the problems of teaching English. Twenty-eight were from the

²¹Paul Roberts, English Sentences, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962).

²²Paul Roberts, English Syntax, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964).

²³Paul Roberts, The Roberts English Series: A Linguistics Program, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966), p. T1.

United States, twenty from the United Kingdom, and one from Canada. The meetings of the group were held under the auspices of the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, both American organizations, and the National Association for the Teaching of English, from Great Britain.

The Anglo-American Conference of the Teaching of English--or the Dartmouth Seminar,²⁴ as it was later called--was convened because representatives of the three sponsoring organizations were aware that for a variety of reasons, English as a school subject was facing a series of critical problems both in the United States and in the United Kingdom. Many of the disagreements between English and American participants at the Dartmouth Conference reflected differences in the educational systems of the two countries, the position that English had come to occupy in those systems, and even basic differences in fundamental assumptions, approaches, and temperament. Albert H. Marckwardt, a conference participant, (1966) reported that " . . . collaborative research developed by the Dartmouth Seminar participants revealed that the whole subject of English is being redefined."²⁵ The

²⁴John Dixon, Growth Through English, (Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1966), p. VII.

²⁵Albert H. Marckwardt, Linguistics and the Teaching of English, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966), p. X.

participants, despite their geographical backgrounds and despairing of defining English in terms of subject matter, concluded that "English" is what happens in English classes. In the twentieth-century swing of the pendulum, English was once defined as subject-matter content; then, with the Progressive Education movement and the child-centered school, the focus shifted to the child; with Sputnik, the educators swung back to subject knowledge; the Dartmouth Conference moved the focus back to the child. Such shifting emphases had serious implications. The question faced by the conference was: "Teach the child, or teach the subject?" The Dartmouth Seminar research produced this position: It is important to teach both the child and the subject. The teacher teaches the child something; the teacher teaches something to the child. The conference concluded that the child and the subject should be combined in every assignment, in every hour of school, on all levels.

The collaborative research inspired by the Dartmouth Conference led to cooperative engagement in various kinds of planning, development, and teaching on the part of English educators on both sides of the Atlantic. Encouraged by the response to his initial Series, Paul Roberts published a supplemental "Complete Course" of The Roberts English Series:

A Linguistics Program (1967)²⁶ which covers structural grammar for grades seven through twelve, and is widely used in American secondary schools today.

Further impact of the Dartmouth Seminar was reflected in the fourth edition of J. N. Hook's The Teaching of High School English (1972) where Hook stated:

The emphasis in composition is shifting toward self-discovery and toward attempts at placing in order some parts of a student's world. We are moving away from rigid and often identical-for-all assignments such as "For Friday write four hundred words of analysis of this poem." Today's students have greater freedom in what they write about. Increasingly, instruction emphasizes the process of writing, and teachers realize that the process is not the same for every writer; principles of organization, which were once a major focus, tend to appear as byproducts.²⁷

From its inception in the early 1930's to the present time, the broad general findings of modern linguistics have been based on the following:

1. All languages are systems of human conventions, not systems of natural laws. The first--and essential--step in the study of any language is observing and setting down precisely what happens when native speakers speak it.

2. Each language is unique in its pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. It cannot be described in terms of logic or of some theoretical, ideal language. It cannot

²⁷J. N. Hook, The Teaching of High School English, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972), 4th ed., p. 16.

be described in terms of any other language, or even in terms of its own past.

3. All languages are dynamic rather than static, and hence a "rule" in any language can only be a statement of contemporary practice. Change is constant--and normal.

4. "Correctness" can rest only upon usage for the simple reason that there is nothing else for it to rest on. And all usage is relative.

The preceding propositions have gradually been accepted and acknowledged by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). Founded in 1911 with only a few dozen charter members, this organization has grown to over an eighth of a million members and subscribers. Major advances in English teaching since 1911 are linked inseparably with the history of NCTE.

The first issue of the English Journal appeared in January, 1912. Since that time the Council's list of periodicals has been augmented by Elementary English, for elementary teachers, College English and College Composition and Communication for college teachers, Abstracts of English Studies for anyone interested in concise summaries of scholarly work, Research in the Teaching of English, which reports research relevant to the classroom, and English Education, first published in 1969 as an aid to the preparation of teachers. The English Journal is the most widely read professional publication for high school English teachers, many of whom regard it as indispensable if they are to keep up with current trends.

In addition to professional journals, the Council affords surveys and research by numerous committees and commissions, and distributes various books, pamphlets, literary maps, recordings, film-strips, and other teaching aids. Perhaps more importantly, the National Council of Teachers of English has assumed considerable professional leadership, working both by itself and in cooperation with other national organizations and the federal government for higher standards in teacher education and for improvement of the curriculum.

Many experimental projects were designed for the English curriculum and 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" which affect the teaching of English in the classroom. Research has suggested 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 movement toward reform in the English curriculum included the College English Association, the Modern Language Association, the already-mentioned National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. In addition, Project English, supported by the cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education, has implemented linguistic methods and encouraged individual studies and experimental projects undertaken by English teachers.

Jackie Mallis (1959) experimented with the linguistic methods approach of teaching English grammar in her high school classroom, and she claimed that her reasons for the experiment were: "(1) to help the slow students and those with little grammar background over the psychological hurdle, (2) to review fundamentals for the forgetters in the group, and (3) to challenge the superior students with a new way of handling materials they already knew well."²⁸

The results of Mrs. Mallis' experiment with the structural method were:

The reactions of the students have been favorable. The learning of the parts of speech has been so gradual and so directly related to their own writing that they have not felt

²⁸Jackie Mallis, "An Experiment with the New Grammar," English Journal, XXXXVI (October, 1959), pp. 425-426.

overwhelmed. Moreover, their writing has become clearer and more vivid as they have begun to recognize the contribution each part of speech has to make to communication. The pattern concept has appealed to those with an interest in mathematics or science, and yet has provided for the slower students a simple framework within which to develop a complete thought.²⁹

To determine the effectiveness of teaching the English language according to the principles of linguistic science as compared with traditional grammar, Lena R. Suggs conducted a study in the English classes of the eleventh grade in Avon Park, Florida, during the school year of 1959-60. The design of the investigation was to compare the writing progress, if any, of an experimental group studying structural linguistics with a control group studying traditional grammar. Mrs. Suggs' conclusions at the end of the experiment were:

. . . that the results lend definite proof that instruction in the English language according to the principles of linguistic science is superior to traditional grammar in its practical application to writing.³⁰

In addition to the favorable statistical results, other factors influenced this teacher. While students might have felt that the assignments in structural grammar required too much work, they were never frustrated as were those in

²⁹Ibid., p. 427.

³⁰Lena R. Suggs, "Structural Grammar Versus Traditional Grammar in Influencing Writing," English Journal, L (March, 1961), p. 174.

the traditional grammar class. Mrs. Suggs was convinced that the evidence shows that she should teach her pupils grammar according to the principles of linguistic science.³¹

Francis R. Link and Edgar H. Schuster (1962) involved four senior high school classes in their investigation: one English class on each grade level studied structural linguistics and a twelfth grade control class studied traditional grammar. Perhaps one of the most significant observations which came from this study was that the teacher of the group studying traditional grammar said that his traditional classes expected him to have all the answers, and that he found the students casting him in a very "authoritarian" role. Although he did not want the group to be so dependent, he was stereotyped by the structure and approach inherent in traditional grammar.

On the other hand, the classes studying the new grammar did not expect the teacher to have all the answers, but rather approached their work analytically, often challenging the teacher and creating an atmosphere which permitted him to become an integral part of the dynamics of a group willing to think.³²

³¹Ibid., p. 178.

³²Francis R. Link and Edgar H. Schuster, "Linguistics in High School," Educational Leadership, XIX (February, 1962), p. 294.

As a result of their study, Link and Schuster concluded that the new grammar has merit, that teachers can be trained to use it, and that teachers will use it once they have been convinced of its efficacy. They did not believe that traditional grammar is "all wrong," but they did believe that its exclusive use has produced a narrow view of our language as well as some very unhealthy effects.³³

O. L. Davis, Jr., H. C. Smith, Jr., and Norman Bowers (1964) designed a study to obtain objective data about senior high students' awareness of structural relationships in the English language. The students were all taught English grammar by the traditional grammar approach. Two hundred and ten students attending Fayetteville High School, Fayetteville, North Carolina, served as the subjects. Comprising the sample were all students enrolled in three sections of tenth grade English classes, four sections of eleventh grade English classes, and three sections of twelfth grade English classes. "A Test of Recognition of Structural Relationships in English" was used as the criterion test. It was supposed to measure understanding of structural relationships in English sentences without the use of grammatical terms.

No significant differences were found between the three high school grade levels in their performances on the criterion tests, but Davis, Smith, and Bowers concluded that

³³Ibid., pp. 296-297.

these results could be explained in at least two ways:

First, it was hypothesized that boys and girls had learned as much as they possibly could about structural relationships before they reached the tenth grade. If this were the case, any high school instruction in English grammar, either traditional or structural, is pointless. But, there is no evidence of a psychological upper limit on the ability to learn structural relationships in English. A second explanation was that despite the students' potential to learn, there was no significant increase in their knowledge of structural relationships in English as a result of their study of traditional grammar.

The findings and conclusions of this study did not lend encouragement to a continuance of traditional grammar in the high school curriculum; but, of course, these findings by themselves could not be the sole justification for changing to a structural approach to teaching grammar. But together with other evidence, they did suggest that a change from traditional grammar is warranted.³⁴

Larry D. Kennedy and Alfred D. Larson initiated a study which was concerned with two assumptions widely held by teachers of English at both the elementary and secondary school

³⁴O. L. Davis, Jr., H. C. Smith, Jr., and Norman D. Bowers, "High School Students' Awareness of Structural Relationships in English," The Journal of Educational Research, LVIII, (October, 1964), pp. 69-71.

levels. They are commonly made in defense of formal English grammar: (1) that a knowledge of formal English grammar has a positive effect upon student writing ability, and (2) that a knowledge of formal English has a positive effect upon student awareness of the basic structure of the English language. The introduction of structural grammar has, however, added a new dimension to the investigation of these assumptions. They must be tested according to the content and methodology appropriate to structural grammar.

Kennedy and Larson were also aware of some objections to the replacement of traditional grammar with one of the modern grammars: (1) that the students would be unable to understand the new grammar, or (2) that the grammar would be inappropriate for the formal grammatical instruction as measured by the standardized tests in English grammar knowledge which were normally administered in the public schools. These tests were geared toward a comprehension of grammatical knowledge as represented by the particular content and methodology of traditional grammar.³⁵

The objectives of the study conducted by Larson and Kennedy were to investigate: (1) the effects of traditional and of structural grammar upon student writing ability;

³⁵Larry D. Kennedy and Alfred D. Larson, "The Influence of Structural and of Traditional Grammatical Instruction Upon Language Perception Writing Ability," Illinois School Research, V, (February, 1969), p. 31.

(2) the effects of traditional and of structural grammar upon student awareness of the structural relationships in English; (3) the effects of traditional and of structural grammar upon mastery of knowledge of formal grammar as measured by a standardized test. The investigators selected the sixth and seventh grade classes at the elementary laboratory school of Illinois State University and, on the basis of the data obtained within the limitations of the study, it appeared that: (1) to the degree that an awareness of the basic structure of the English language is a proper objective of the study of formal English grammar, classroom instruction by means of the methods and procedures of structural grammar appeared to be superior to that of traditional grammar in realization of this objective; (2) to the degree that a study of formal English grammar contributes positively to student writing ability, neither structural nor traditional grammar appears to be more significantly effective than the other; and (3) the knowledge of formal English grammar as measured by a standardized achievement test does not appear to be affected significantly by a study of either traditional or structural grammar. Inferences should not be drawn from the data that grammatical instruction according to either traditional or structural grammar should be an "either-or" situation.³⁶

³⁶Ibid., pp. 32-34.

Since the focal movement of the aforementioned Dartmouth Seminar on what happens inside the student, several subsequent experimental studies have been conducted in the same general area of English instruction. A recent study by Cecilia Palmer (1968) concentrated on the attitudes of teachers toward the linguistic methods approach to the teaching of English, and it noted among its conclusions that the teacher who is at ease in the understanding of the true structure of the language can better understand how the language which he teaches realistically operates. This knowledge accompanies concomitant learnings that lend insight into how students learn and how language skills are best taught.³⁷

A more recent study by Bob W. Ford (1972) concluded that having student-peers actively participate in grading and editing English theme compositions in a freshman English course at a large university was a more effective method of teaching English grammar-usage and theme composition than by having the course instructor to grade/edit all theme compositions.³⁸

³⁷Cecilia Palmer, "A Study of Attitudes of Teachers Toward the Modern Linguistic Approach to the Teaching of English," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Graduate College, Oklahoma State University, 1968), p. 107.

³⁸Bob Wayne Ford, "The Effects of Peer Editing/Grading on the Grammar-Usage and Theme-Composition Ability of College Freshmen," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Graduate College University of Oklahoma, 1972), p. 82.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The problem of this study was a comparison of the pretest-posttest change rates of the grammar and theme-composition scores of Freshman college students who had been taught by two different methods of teaching English: (1) the traditional methods approach and, (2) the linguistic methods approach.

A Comparison of Traditional and Linguistic Grammar

The traditional terminology of English grammar has had to be reinterpreted in modern times to apply more accurately to English. It is based on terminology that originally applied to Greek and Latin, and English does not fit readily into a Greco-Roman mold. In the same way, the terminology that has been adapted to English must be further adapted if it is to fit other, quite different languages. English "parts of speech," for example, are not the same as Navajo "parts of speech." Some languages have categories wholly lacking in English--forms for "things in sight," "things not in sight," for example. For this reason a study of

language based on structure--divorced as far as possible from the meaning of ordinary grammatical terminology--avoids some of the confusions and misconceptions that arise when terminology designed for one language is used for another.

With reference to fundamental differences between the structural and the traditional approaches to grammar, Samuel R. Levin (1958) says:

Their fundamental differences emerge from the following statement--that structuralists, unlike traditionalists, are interested in making only what has been called "vulnerable" statements about grammar. It is primarily in this respect that structural linguistics has a right to be called a science. By "vulnerable" statements is meant simply statements whose claims to be true can either be verified or disproved. In order that statements may have the property of vulnerability, their terms and predicates must be open to everyone's inspection. This is a way of saying that structural statements are made only about observable, formal features of a language. Traditional grammar does not so restrict itself.¹

Levin lists three ways in which traditional grammar departs from vulnerable statements, and he labels these departures "fallacies:"

1. The Semantic Fallacy is exhibited in statements like, "A noun is the name of a person, place, or thing." This definition is too narrow and has to be enlarged to include abstractions. This enlarging process can be further

¹Samuel R. Levin, "Comparing Traditional and Structural Grammar," Reading in Applied English Linguistics, ed. Harold Byron Allen. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958), p. 46.

forced by adding additional forms, to the point where the definition becomes so particular that it is no longer a general statement, but merely a list. It would seem that when the semantic statements have the generality that would justify making them as statements, they may be inadequate; whereas, if statements of such a type are made inadequate, they are no longer general.

2. The Logical Fallacy: Under this are included all statements about grammar as are made on the supposition that laws of logic govern the universe--with the corollary that language perfectly mirrors that universe. This fallacy looks for order in language corresponding to the putative order in the universe. If it is established that English has three primary grammatical tenses, on the basis of the way the time continuum is cut up, a logical fallacy is committed.

3. The Normative Fallacy: Grammarians proceeding under this fallacy believe that it is possible and necessary to set up prescriptive norms for usage. If asked where the norms come from, they appeal to some earlier authority. The fallacy of the prescriptivists consists in deriving their norms from sources which often display little or no recognition of the actual state of the language for which they are making the prescriptions. This fallacy may be extended to add the one represented by discussing English grammar on the

basis of preconceptions derived from the grammatical structure of another language (as Latin).²

Levin lists some procedures of linguistic grammar which are considered superior to the procedures of traditional grammar. The first that he concentrates upon is the noun as a part of speech. In linguistics these words are identified according to their usage; in traditional grammar they are identified by definition. With reference to certain problems which the traditionalists have in this area, Levin has this to say:

These problems do not affect the linguistic method of identifying the noun. In linguistics we find that this group of words may occur with the plural suffix and with the possessive suffix; we also find that they co-occur in a restricted way with articles and with possessive pronouns, and so on. We observe further that only these certain words, from among the total English number, enjoy these privileges of grammatical domain. We decide that we have a class of English words. They can be called nouns, but what they are called is unimportant; the important thing is how they have been defined. They have been defined in a way that anyone knowing the definition can determine whether any given word is a noun or not.³

Another illustration of the different procedures and results of traditional and linguistic grammar may be seen in comparing their respective definitions of the interrogative sentence. The traditional definition is clearly inadequate,

²Ibid., p. 47.

³Ibid., p. 48.

because it pre-supposes the knowledge of what a question is. The linguists try to find out what are the structural features which correlate with a particular type of response. This response is usually the giving of information by reply.

Further examples could be added, but they all would have one thing in common, if they are based on structural facts: Their statements of definition or explanations will be expressed in terms that anyone can test for himself, and Levin contends that it is this fact which essentially constitutes certain superiority of structural over traditional grammar.⁴

The modern linguist, who has come to conclusions by observations of the way language acts, holds certain tenets true:

1. Language is the actual linguistic behavior of the native speaker.
2. Speech itself is the basic language of which the written word is only a symbolic system.
3. Every language has a grammar particularly its own.
4. Every language is divided into various dialects neither good nor bad but used for a variety of purposes and at many different levels.
5. Language itself is not static but alive and ever-changing.

⁴Ibid., pp. 52-53.

6. Language is such an important part of life that everyone should know how it works as a part of a liberal education.⁵

This view holds that the best way to teach English is to "describe" how it actually behaves and that structure (the patterns and forms of language) is the basis for meaning. With the fading of the inflectional endings of Old English, word order has become most important; even quite complex sentences are but reiterations of basic patterns which the user of English must follow. A knowledge of language structure gained from linguistics gives a sense of order to the whole of usage and dialect, a sense of the structure as a framework within which personal use of English must contain itself.

Walsh (1966) contends that "structural linguistics also offer valuable insights into our language to those who are thoroughly trained in traditional grammar."⁶ The student comes to school already possessing a broad and comprehensive knowledge of his native tongue. The teacher should attempt to establish within him a confidence in what he already knows and should show him how to use this knowledge as a firm

⁵Revised Teaching Guide for the Language Arts, Oklahoma Council of Teachers of English. (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1963), p. 131.

⁶J. Martyn Walsh and Anna Kathleen Walsh, Plain English Handbook: A Complete Guide to Good English, Fifth Edition. (Cincinnati, Ohio: McCormick-Mathers Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), p. 157.

foundation on which to build a finer, more delicate, and more precise sense of style.

The linguist's inductive approach to language study enables the student himself to make discoveries, while intensive drill continuously reenforced through writing experiences strengthens his learning. Always the important theme is "How does the language really work?"

Procedures

The investigator used two sections of Freshman students enrolled in the introductory English grammar-usage and theme-composition course offered by Central State University at Edmond, Oklahoma, to enrolling freshmen to determine the differences between the pretest-posttest grammar and theme-composition scores of one group of students who had been taught by the traditional approach to teaching English and the pretest-posttest grammar and theme-composition scores of another group of students who had been taught by the linguistic approach to teaching college level English.

The investigator taught both sections of freshman English students for the duration of the Fall Semester, 1972-73 academic year. During that time, one class was taught in the traditional way used to teach English grammar and composition to college freshmen. This group, the "control" group was given a Language Knowledge Test (Form A) at the beginning of the semester. An alternate Language

Knowledge Test (Form B) was given at the end of the semester, and the resulting scores were used as the posttest measure of grammar-usage ability. The second group, the "experimental" group, was tested at the beginning and the end of the semester with the same two instruments, Language Knowledge Tests (Forms A and B), but the experimental subjects were taught by the structural linguistic method of teaching grammar-usage and theme-composition to college freshmen.

The students in both the control and the experimental groups were asked to compose seven (7) themes during the course of the semester. These themes, written over selected subjects and subject areas, not only served as writing practice for the participants, but Themes I and VII served as the pretest-posttest indicators of the students' theme-composition abilities. The experimental group had their themes edited by their peers, under the supervision of the course instructor. The control group had their themes edited and graded by the instructor. Written compositions for both the control and experimental groups were assigned numerical values based on the Evaluation Checklist Used to Evaluate Theme Compositions (Appendix D).

The actual unit of analysis in the experiment was the grammar-usage change scores and the theme-composition change scores computed for both the experimental and control subject groups. These change scores were used as raw data

in testing the two hypotheses stated at the beginning of the experiment.

The investigator controlled several extraneous independent variables which had either been shown by previous investigations, or were strongly suspected, to affect the grammar-usage change scores and the theme-composition change scores of college freshmen who were enrolled in introductory English Grammar and Composition courses. The particular independent variables which the investigator controlled are as follows: (1) ACT scores, including the Composite; (2) age; (3) size of the high school from which the students graduated; (4) the amount of previous experience in theme composition, (a rating of 1-5 on a continuum); (5) pretest, posttest, and difference scores from the English Language Knowledge Tests, (Form A and Form B); and (6) pretest, posttest, and difference scores from the numerical scores assigned to Theme I and Theme VII. The investigator also sought to control the factor of class meeting time on the premise that the more capable students might prefer one class meeting time over another. However, a previous study by Ford (1972)⁷ which used similar groups, classes, etc., failed to show any significant differences among the academic achievement scores of students

⁷Bob Wayne Ford, "The Effects of Peer Editing/Grading on the Grammar-Usage and Theme-Composition Ability of College Freshmen," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Graduate College, University of Oklahoma, 1972), pp. 73-77.

from different class meeting times. For this reason the variable of class meeting time was considered to be irrelevant to this study.

An Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to make the necessary contrasts to test the hypotheses and to control the six entraneous variables at the same time. Additional descriptive statistical analyses were used to further compare the various characteristics of the participants chosen for the final comparison. These were in the form of several ancillary (secondary) findings made in the final calculations involving the data collected from the biographical and achievement variables being controlled for both groups.

Thirty-six college-level freshman students enrolled in the control group and forty college-level freshman students enrolled in the experimental group; and, in each group, since no attritional interference was involved for the duration of the semester, thirty-six and forty constituted the actual sample of the population who participated in each of the necessary examinations and supplied all the necessary biographical information. This selection of participants for both groups at the end of the semester eliminated any investigator effects which could have occurred as a result of choosing subjects at the beginning of the semester.

A paradigm of the model which was employed in the conduct of the investigation is shown in Figure 1.

Control Population
N=36

$\frac{O}{g-u}$ ---X --- $\frac{O}{g-u}$
 T

$\frac{O}{t-c}$ ---X --- $\frac{O}{t-c}$
 T

Experimental Population
N=40

$\frac{O}{g-u}$ ---X --- $\frac{O}{g-u}$
 M

$\frac{O}{t-c}$ ---X --- $\frac{O}{t-c}$
 M

Explanation of Symbols:

$\frac{O}{g-u}$ = Observation of Grammar-Usage: Grammar-Usage
 Test Given

$\frac{O}{t-c}$ = Observation of Theme-Composition: Theme-
 Composition Test Given

X
T = Experimental Treatment; Traditional Teaching
 Methods Used

X
M = Experimental Treatment; Linguistic Teaching
 Methods Used

Fig. 1.--Research Paradigm Used in the Study

Procedural Narrative

The procedures followed in the actual conduct of the study may best be presented in narrative form. The study began with the assignment of freshman students to two different sections of college-level English grammar and

composition courses. As the scheduled classes began, the investigator made the necessary preparations for completing the research prospectus. This included the choice of the research design, choice of statistical tests, selection and development of data collection instruments, and the determination of method to be used in the resulting presentation and analysis of data.

The Language Knowledge Test (Form A, shown in Appendix A) was administered to all control and experimental subjects during the first week of classes. The instructor briefed the students in the control group with a review of the eight groups of word classifications known as Parts of Speech. The instructor also presented prescriptive sentence structure analysis and paragraph development for unity, coherence, and *précis* according to the traditionally prescribed rules. The students were then asked to devise a written trial paragraph according to the prescriptive rules.

At the same time the students in the experimental group were being trained to edit/grade their compositions by using the instruments shown in Appendix C, "Statement of Standards for Freshman Composition," and Appendix D, "Composition Evaluation." The experimental subjects were allowed to ask questions about the instruments and then they were asked to devise a written trial paragraph "on their own" (without benefit of the instructor's review of parts of

speech, sentence structure analysis, or paragraph development according to prescriptive rules).

The written paragraphs of the control group were marked by the instructor and returned to the students for study and correction, then they rewrote their paragraphs according to the prescriptive rules applied to sentence structure and paragraph development presented by the instructor. Grammatical errors that were made served as grammar lessons for succeeding class meetings, particularly in response to each of the seven (7) themes which were written in the continuing weeks of the semester.

The students in the experimental group were divided into groups of five students each. Papers were freely exchanged among groups in order that no student would have his own. Following the suggestions of the students as to errors in each other's paragraph development, the experimental subjects rewrote their paragraphs. This procedure served as grammar lessons for succeeding class meetings, especially in response to each of the seven (7) themes which were written in the following weeks of the semester.

During the second week of classes the students of both groups were asked to read William Faulkner's short story, "Spotted Horses,"⁸ which extolled the nature of good

⁸William Faulkner, "Spotted Horses," in Monroe C. Beardsley, Robert W. Daniel, and Glenn H. Leggett, eds., Theme and Form. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), pp. 431-442.

and evil. In the control group class meeting that followed, the story was discussed with the prompting of the instructor and in conjunction with the questions prepared by the textbook editors. Then the students were asked to write Theme I, by applying the premise of the story to individual, personal experiences. In the experimental group, the students were divided into discussion groups of five in each group, and the instructor moved freely among the groups as a monitor. Then the students were asked to write Theme I based on their personal experiences to the premise of the story.

The Control students' themes were edited by the instructor and he made what he considered to be constructive comments and suggestions for rewriting each theme. This same procedure was followed for the remainder of the course, during which time the control subjects wrote and rewrote seven (7) themes.

The experimental students began their editing/grading duties with Theme I and continued to correct each other's compositions through Theme VII. Each of the experimental subjects was responsible for marking the errors, completing a copy of the composition evaluation form, and adding critical comments which he believed to be constructive and helpful to the author of the theme. The instructor continued to move from group to group, monitoring the activities when he was not involved in explaining instruments or materials, or advising about procedures. Each writer further edited his

work and rewrote the theme. Both the original and rewritten copies of each theme were submitted to the instructor who discussed the results in class.

Theme VII was the final test of the students' grammar and writing abilities for the experimental and the control groups. This final theme, written in class, was an attempt by the students to analyze D. H. Lawrence's story, "The Blind Man,"⁹ and to compose a theme relating to a concept of personal achievement and realization. After Theme VII had been written, scored, and returned, the Language Knowledge Test (Form B, shown in Appendix B) was administered to all participants. The pretest-posttest scores on the Language Knowledge Tests (LKT) were used to determine the amount of grammar-usage gain experienced by the two groups. The differences in the scores assigned to Themes I and VII depicted the amount of gain experienced by the two groups in their ability to compose themes on given subjects.

Forty students in the experimental group and thirty-six students in the control group furnished the data used in testing the two hypotheses in the study. Both populations met the necessary requirements for inclusion in the study.

⁹D. H. Lawrence, "The Blind Man," in Monroe C. Beardsley, Robert W. Daniel, and Glenn H. Leggett, eds., Theme and Form. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), pp. 547-558.

These requirements consisted of biographical and achievement variables such as ACT scores, including the Composite, age, size of high school, previous theme-composition experience, pretest-posttest, and difference scores from the English Language Knowledge Tests, and pretest-posttest, and difference scores from the numerical scores assigned to Theme I and VII. The change scores of the control subjects were compared with the change scores of the experimental subjects in testing the stated hypotheses.

The data collected from the participants were processed through the Data Processing Center at Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma. The researcher used an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and a Student's t-test to test the hypotheses and conduct ancillary findings. The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was effective in testing the null hypotheses and controlling the effects of the extraneous variables at the same time. The results of the data analysis were attested to and verified at the Educational Services Center, Shawnee, Oklahoma. These results were synthesized, tabled, and entered into the final dissertation format. The presentation and analysis of data are shown in Chapter IV of this study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of two different methods of teaching English grammar and composition to college freshmen. The two approaches used were: (1) the traditional methods approach and (2) the linguistic methods approach.

Seventy-six students who were enrolled in freshman level English courses at a large midwestern university acted as the subjects in a study which compared the pretest-posttest English grammar and theme-composition scores of students who had been taught by two different methods: (1) the traditional (the control group) and (2) the linguistic (the experimental group). The pretest-posttest difference scores of both groups in theme-composition and grammar-usage were used to test two hypotheses which had been stated earlier.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to compare the two groups' scores and to control several biographical variables as well. The results of the statistical analysis performed in the hypothesis testing are presented in this chapter of the study, along with several ancillary

findings which serve as further explanations for the overall experiment.

Descriptive Data of Experimental and Control Groups

The Experimental and Control Groups were compared along several biographical and achievement variables. These variables were as follows: (1) ACT scores, including the Composite; (2) age; (3) size of the high school from which the student graduated; (4) the amount of previous experience in theme composition, (a rating of 1-5 on a continuum); (5) pretest, posttest, and difference scores from the English Language Knowledge Test, (Form A and Form B); and (6) pretest, posttest, and difference scores from the numerical scores assigned to Theme I and Theme VII. The means and standard deviations (SD) of the data reported for the two groups are presented in Table 4.1.

Results of Testing Hypothesis Number One

The first hypothesis concerned the effects of the two different teaching techniques upon the grammar scores of the students. The specific null proposition tested in the first hypothesis was as follows:

- Ho₁ There is no statistically significant difference between the pretest-posttest Language Knowledge Test change scores as recorded for the experimental group (students who were taught by the linguistic methods of English instruction) and the control group (students who were taught by the traditional methods of English instruction).

TABLE 4.1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUPS

Variables	Experimental Group (N=40)	Control Group (N=36)
English ACT	$\bar{X} = 13.72$ SD = 4.63	$\bar{X} = 17.67$ SD = 3.79
Math ACT	$\bar{X} = 21.48$ SD = 6.78	$\bar{X} = 20.61$ SD = 6.16
Social Studies ACT	$\bar{X} = 21.10$ SD = 4.87	$\bar{X} = 22.03$ SD = 4.99
Natural Science ACT	$\bar{X} = 21.73$ SD = 4.72	$\bar{X} = 21.67$ SD = 3.85
Composite ACT	$\bar{X} = 19.43$ SD = 3.03	$\bar{X} = 20.25$ SD = 2.83
Age	$\bar{X} = 21.15$ SD = 3.95	$\bar{X} = 21.81$ SD = 6.61
Theme Writing Experience	$\bar{X} = 2.79$ SD = 0.40	$\bar{X} = 3.25$ SD = 0.73
Pretest (Grammar)	$\bar{X} = 59.78$ SD = 11.60	$\bar{X} = 71.42$ SD = 11.04
Posttest (Grammar)	$\bar{X} = 79.38$ SD = 10.97	$\bar{X} = 82.31$ SD = 10.96
Change (Grammar)	$\bar{X} = 20.10$ SD = 9.67	$\bar{X} = 12.11$ SD = 7.66
Pretest (Theme)	$\bar{X} = 1.57$ SD = 0.77	$\bar{X} = 2.72$ SD = 0.59
Posttest (Theme)	$\bar{X} = 3.62$ SD = 0.44	$\bar{X} = 3.76$ SD = 0.37
Change (Theme)	$\bar{X} = 2.11$ SD = 0.57	$\bar{X} = 1.05$ SD = 0.50

The first hypothesis was tested by using an analysis of covariance on the pretest-posttest change scores reported by the two different groups. The data recorded for the biographical variables were controlled statistically by the ANCOVA techniques. The results of the statistical calculations are presented in Table 4.2. A complete listing of the raw data from the pretesting, posttesting, and computed difference scores, and the computed descriptive statistics are presented in the Appendices of this report.

TABLE 4.2
THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE RESULTS OF
GRAMMAR-USAGE CHANGE SCORES*

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Adjusted Mean Scores	F-Value	Sign. Level
Between Groups	1,438	1	1,438	14.17	< .001
Within Groups	7,511	74	101.5		

Total	8,949	75			

*Previous experience, English ACT, Composite ACT, and age were treated as covariables.

The results presented in Table 4.2 show a significant F-value ($F = 14.17$; $df = 1/74$; $p < .001$).

Results of Testing Hypothesis Number Two

The second hypothesis concerned the effects of the two different teaching techniques upon the theme-composition scores of the students. The specific null proposition tested in the second hypothesis was as follows:

- Ho₂ There is no statistically significant difference between the pretest-posttest (Theme I - Theme VII) change scores recorded for the experimental group (students who were taught by the linguistic methods of English instruction) and the control group (students who were taught by the traditional methods of English instruction).

The second hypothesis was tested by using the same technique as that used in testing the first hypothesis, the analysis of covariance. This statistical procedure allowed for the adjustment of the pretest-posttest theme-composition change scores to reflect any difference which could have been caused by the participants' individual measures of English ACT, Composite ACT, age and previous theme-writing experience. The final results of the statistical calculations are presented in Table 4.3. A complete listing of the raw data collected from the pretesting session (Theme I), the post-testing session (Theme VII), the computed difference scores, and the derived descriptive statistics are presented in the Appendices.

The results presented in Table 4.3 show a significant F-value for the differences between the experimental and control groups' theme-composition scores ($F = 59.71$; $df = 1/74$; $p < .001$).

TABLE 4.3

THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE RESULTS OF
THEME-COMPOSITION CHANGE SCORES*

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Adjusted Mean Scores	F-Value	Sign. Level
Between Groups	19.32	1	19.32	59.71	< .001
Within Groups	23.95	74	0.324		

Total	43.26	75			

*Previous Experience, English ACT scores, Composite ACT scores, and age were treated as covariables.

Ancillary Findings

Several ancillary (secondary) findings made in the final calculations add some interpretation to the findings shown in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. These secondary findings involve the data collected from the achievement and biographical variables being controlled for both groups. A comparison of the data collected for the experimental and control groups is presented in the following sections.

Comparisons of the English
and Composite ACT Scores

The English ACT and the Composite ACT scores were the two most important achievement measures being controlled

in the study. The differences noted among the various ACT scores were controlled with the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) procedures described in the hypothesis testing section. The actual comparisons of the two groups along these two measures are presented in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4

THE ENGLISH AND COMPOSITE ACT SCORES OF THE
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Measures	Experimental		Control		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
English ACT	13.72	4.63	17.67	3.79	4.085**
Composite ACT	19.43	3.03	20.25	2.83	1.220

**Significant beyond the .01 level.

The data presented in Table 4.4 indicate that the students in the control group had significantly higher English ACT scores than the students in the experimental group ($t = 4.085$; $df = 74$; $p < .01$), but the Composite ACT scores of the two groups were not significantly different ($t = 1.220$; $df = 74$; $p > .05$). The analysis of covariance calculations equated these two groups on each measure, however. In both cases the experimental group had the lower ACT scores.

Comparisons of the Ages of the Experimental
and Control Groups

A second comparison of the two groups was made by computing the t-value of their mean age differences. This was done in order to determine possible effects of the participants' ages upon their performances in the experiment. Ferguson (1971) contends it is generally conceded that older students make the best grades and perform the best work in colleges and universities.¹ The results of the statistical calculations are presented in Table 4.5, with the means and standard deviations (SD) of the two groups.

TABLE 4.5

THE AGES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUPS

Measures	Experimental		Control		t-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Age	21.15	3.95	21.81	6.61	0.521*

*Not Significant beyond the .05 level.

¹George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 388.

The results presented in Table 4.5 show that while the control group showed a slightly higher mean age ($\bar{X} = 21.81$) than the experimental group ($\bar{X} = 21.15$), the results of the t-test between the two means are not significant ($t = 0.521$; $df = 74$; $p > .05$).

Comparisons of the Amount of Composition
Experience of the Experimental
and Control Groups

An attempt was made to determine the amount of theme-writing experience each of the participants had had before enrolling in Freshman Grammar and Composition, since previous practice could be a definite factor in their performance during the experiment. Each participant was asked to indicate his amount of theme-writing experience by checking one of the following categories: (1) 0-5 themes; (2) 6-10 themes; (3) 11-15 themes; (4) 16-20 themes; and (5) 21 or more themes. The numerical values assigned to each of these categories were compared for the two groups of participants. The results of the t-test between the mean values of the two groups are presented in Table 4.6, along with the means and standard deviations (SD) of the individual ratings.

The data presented in Table 4.6 show that the average experience category for the control group, (3.25; 11-15 themes written during their time in high school) was slightly higher than the average amount of experience

TABLE 4.6

A COMPARISON OF THE THEME-WRITING
LEVELS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL
AND CONTROL GROUPS

(N=76)

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value
Experimental	2.79	0.40	0.460*
Control	3.25	0.73	

*Not Significant at or beyond the .05 level.

reported by the experimental group, (2.79; 6-10 themes written during their time in high school); but the differences in the mean values for the two groups were not significant ($t = 0.460$; $df = 74$; $p > .05$).

Comparisons of the Pretest, Posttest, and
Change Scores of the Experimental
and Control Groups on Grammar
Usage and Theme Composition

One final ancillary comparison was made between the data reported by the two groups. In particular, the investigator compared the pretest, posttest, and change scores on grammar-usage and theme-composition. This was an attempt to determine whether the linguistic or traditional approaches to teaching college-level freshman English had significantly different effects on the grammar-usage and theme-composition scores of the two groups. The means, standard deviations

(SD), and the t-values computed for the various measures of the two groups are presented in Table 4.7. A perusal of this table will show the effects of the two different approaches on the two areas being measured.

TABLE 4.7

A COMPARISON OF THE PRETEST, POSTTEST, AND CHANGE
SCORES ON GRAMMAR USAGE AND THEME COMPOSITION

Group		Grammar-Usage Scores			Theme-Composition Scores		
		Pretest	Posttest	Change	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Experi- mental Group (N=40)	$\bar{X}$	59.78	79.38	19.60	1.56	3.62	2.06
	SD	11.60	10.97	10.67	0.77	0.44	0.62
Control Group (N=36)	$\bar{X}$	71.42	82.31	10.89	2.72	3.76	1.05
	SD	11.04	10.96	9.36	0.59	0.38	0.50

t-Values	-4.48**	-1.16	3.79*	9.33**	-1.49	7.85**
----------	---------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------

*Significant beyond the .01 level.

**Significant beyond the .001 level.

The data presented in Table 4.7 indicate that in both areas, the experimental group started with the lowest pretest scores and ended the investigation with the lowest posttest scores. At the same time, the experimental subjects being taught by the linguistic methods approach made

significant gains in their grammar-usage and theme-composition scores, while the control subjects being taught by the traditional methods approach did not.

This chapter presented tabulated results of data obtained from investigational procedures described in Chapter III. Further analysis of the data was also presented. The final chapter of this study contains a summary of the entire investigation, the conclusions which could be drawn from the results and findings, and the implications and recommendations for instructional application and further research efforts along these same lines. The concluding statement at the end of Chapter V is followed by the references to other materials made in the context of the study and the appendix materials mentioned in the text of the study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare two different methods of teaching college-level English grammar and composition, the linguistic method and the traditional method, to freshman students at a large midwestern university. Two hypotheses were developed and tested concerning the effects of the two different methods of instruction.

The investigator used two sections of freshman English students enrolled in the introductory English Grammar and Composition course offered by the state university where the study was conducted. Both the experimental (N=40) and the control (N=36) groups were given a Language Knowledge Test, Form A at the beginning of the first semester of the 1972-73 academic year, and an alternate Language Knowledge Test, Form B was administered at the end of the same semester to determine the pretest-posttest measures of their grammar-usage ability.

During the course of the semester, the students of both groups were asked to compose seven (7) themes covering selected subjects and subject areas. A standardized method of grading compositions was used to assign numerical values to each theme, and the first (Theme I) and last (Theme VII) themes were considered to be pretest-posttest measures.

Several biographical measures were taken in addition to the two measures already mentioned. These were as follows: Standard ACT scores, English ACT scores, Composite ACT scores, age, size of the high school from which the students graduated, and the amount of theme-writing experience the students had gained in high school (a rating of 1-5 on a continuum).

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test the two hypotheses and to control the effects of the discrepancies reported among the various biographical measures at the same time.

Findings

The results of testing the two hypotheses showed that the experimental group, those students who had been taught by the linguistic methods approach, had made significantly greater gains in both areas being tested than the control group, those students who had been taught by the traditional methods approach. Further comparisons of the two groups' biographical data showed that the additional variables of ACT scores, English ACT scores, age, and

previous theme-writing experience had very little effect on the final results of the experiment. At least two previously-mentioned studies had shown that these variables were related to certain aspects of English grammar and/or composition, but their effects upon the grammar-usage and theme-composition scores of the two groups in this investigation were insignificant.

The null proposition tested in Hypothesis Number One was as follows:

- Ho₁ There is no statistically significant difference between the pretest-posttest Language Knowledge Test change scores as recorded for the experimental group (students who were taught by the linguistic methods of English instruction) and the control group (students who were taught by the traditional methods of English instruction).

The results of testing the first hypothesis were significant, ($F = 14.17$; $df = 1/74$; $p < .001$). These results allowed the investigator to reject the first null hypothesis and conclude that the linguistic method of teaching college-level freshman English courses had a significantly greater effect on the participants' pretest-posttest grammar-usage change scores than the effects caused by the traditional method of teaching college-level freshman English courses. These results were true even when the effects of such variables as the participants' English ACT scores, Composite ACT scores, ages, and previous experiences in theme writing were taken into consideration. These findings indicate that the linguistic methods approach to teaching college-level

freshman English courses is significantly more facilitatory to grammar usage than the traditional methods approach to teaching these same courses.

The null proposition tested in Hypothesis Number Two was as follows:

- Ho₂ There is no statistically significant difference between the pretest-posttest (Theme I - Theme VII) change scores recorded for the experimental group (students who were taught by the linguistic methods of English instruction) and the control group (students who were taught by the traditional methods of English instruction).

The results of testing the second hypothesis were significant, ($F = 59.71$; $df = 1/74$; $p < .001$). These results allowed the investigator to reject the second null hypothesis and conclude that the linguistic method of teaching college-level freshman English courses had a significantly greater effect on the participants' pretest-posttest theme-composition change scores than the effects caused by the traditional method of teaching college-level freshman English courses. These results were still true even when the effects of such variables as the participants' English ACT scores, Composite ACT scores, ages, and previous levels of theme-writing experiences were taken into account. These findings would further indicate that the linguistic methods approach of teaching college-level freshman English courses is superior to the traditional methods approach to teaching these same courses, if the criterion for determining superiority is the pretest-posttest theme-composition change scores of the

student participants. In effect, these findings reflect the results calculated with the analysis of covariance used in testing the two hypotheses. However, the t-values (shown in Table 4.7) do not take into account any differences which may have been caused by the additional biographical and achievement variables, while the ANCOVA results do take these variables into account.

The results presented in the ancillary findings allowed the investigator to consider them as additional explanations to the results of testing hypotheses one and two, and not an alternative explanation to the hypotheses results. In essence, the ancillary findings have shown that nearly all the differences noted in the two groups' theme-composition and grammar-usage scores were caused by the two different methods of teaching the college-level freshman English courses and not the additional variables.

Conclusions

Within the limitations of the population studied and according to the results of the subsequent tests and measurements, the investigator was able to reject the null propositions of the two hypotheses and draw the following conclusions:

1. The linguistic methods approach of teaching the courses was more effective than the traditional methods approach.

2. The linguistic methods approach should be utilized in beginning college English courses to accomplish the objectives of language-usage knowledge and theme-writing skills.
3. The participational involvement of the students in several ways with course content, in the linguistic methods approach, apparently contributed to greater efficiency in learning than that which was experienced in the more limited procedures of the traditional methods approach.

The ancillary findings supported the preceding conclusions and showed that the differences caused by the additional variables of English ACT scores, Composite ACT scores, age, and previous theme-writing experiences had very little effect on the final results of the investigation. Previous studies have shown that these variables are related to certain aspects of English courses, but their effects upon grammar-usage and theme-composition knowledge and ability of the two groups in this study were nominal.

Recommendations for Instructional Application

The ultimate question which has to be asked of any research effort is, "What are the practical applications of the findings?" The findings of the present study can have very practical applications for those who teach in colleges and universities in consideration of the following:

1. Instructors in beginning college English courses should lend encouragement to a variety of classroom and out-of-class activities which may provide means for student-student interaction, student-teacher interaction, and other means of flexible variability.
2. Planned programs for the in-service training of beginning college English instructors should be instituted to acquaint them with certain techniques of the linguistic methods approach to teaching English Grammar and Composition.

Recommendations for Further Research

Through the conduct of the present study, considerably more questions arose than were answered by the results obtained. Most of these questions, if developed properly, could result in worthwhile research efforts concentrated in three general categories: (1) studies which would be conducted in a similar manner but would make use of different populations of students, (2) studies which would be conducted in a similar manner but would use different measuring devices for the grammar-usage and theme-composition scores, and (3) studies which would be conducted in a similar manner but would make use of different variables and/or conditions. Specific recommendations for further research in this area are as follows:

1. The use of high school students as the sampling population, with other conditions similar to the provisions of this study.
2. The use of graduate students as the sampling population, with other conditions similar to the provisions of this study.
3. The use of high school students as the sampling population, but having them taught the linguistic methods approach and the traditional methods approach by different instructors, with other conditions similar to the provisions of this study.
4. The use of three groups of subjects: high school students with one instructor, college freshmen with one instructor, and graduate students with one instructor.
5. The use of different instruments for determining the grammar-usage ability of the participants. Some examples are (a) the English section of the School and College Ability Test (SCAT), (b) the Standardized English Examination, and (c) the Wide Range Ability Test (WRAT).
6. The use of extreme caution should be exercised to safeguard the integrity of the student theme and grammar-assignment editors. Information transmitted to control group members could confound the entire investigation.

7. While it is a near impossibility, an attempt should be made to equate the control and experimental groups as much as possible at the beginning of the study. If this is not possible, an analysis of covariance statistical test should be used to equate both groups in as many ways as possible.

One strong possibility for further research efforts would include the use of different instructors for each of the classes instead of one instructor for both groups. While it is usually a much better situation to have only one instructor for all groups, there is still a certain amount of contamination which occurs from one treatment group to the other. At the same time, the contamination can be assumed to be equally harmful and facilitatory to both groups. In other words, both groups are probably being contaminated, but they also are being contaminated to the same directional degree since the same instructor is teaching both.

On the other hand, the use of more than one instructor introduces a more critical contamination because of the differences in the individual ability of the instructors. While both of these methods are used widely in research projects, it is generally conceded by most researchers that the use of one investigator is much less contaminating to the experimental study than the use of multiple investigators. These two issues should seriously be considered before further studies of this nature are undertaken.

Concluding Remarks

This study was never intended to be a remedy for the entire scope of instructional problems which confront today's college and university English professors. It was intended, however, to shed some enlightenment on the way the students learn English grammar and composition and to suggest certain possible alternatives for teaching grammar-usage and theme-writing at the college level. If the results of this study serve as a catalyst for further research efforts, it will have achieved its purpose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allen, Harold Byron, ed. Readings in Applied English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958.
- Beardsley, Monroe C., Robert W. Daniel, and Glenn H. Leggett, eds. Theme and Form. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Carpenter, Charles. History of American Schoolbooks. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963.
- Dinneen, Francis P. An Introduction to General Linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.
- Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1971.
- Fowler, Mary Elizabeth. Teaching Language, Composition, and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965.
- Francis, W. Nelson. The English Language: Background for Writing. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1965.
- _____. The Structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press, 1958.
- Fraser, Hugh and W. R. O'Donnell, eds. Applied Linguistics and the Teaching of English. New York: The Humanities Press, 1969.

- Fries, Charles C. American English Grammar. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1940.
- Garrett, Henry E. and R. S. Woodworth. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, 1958.
- Gleason, H. A. Jr. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, Rev. Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- _____. Linguistics and English Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
- Guth, Hans Paul. English Today and Tomorrow: A Guide for Teachers of English. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Stevens. Linguistic Science and Language Teaching. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Hook, J. N. The Teaching of High School English. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972.
- 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 Company, 1961.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Lander, Herbert. Language and Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Leonard, Sterling A. The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800. Madison: University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 1929.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. Introduction to the English Language. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- _____. Linguistics and the Teaching of English. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.
- Morine, Greta, Harold Morine, and Neil Postman. Discovering Your Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1963.

- Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of English. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Ornstein, Jacob and William W. Gage. The ABC's of Language and Linguistics. Philadelphia: The Chilton Company, 1964.
- Peters, Robert A. A Linguistic History of English. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Pilgrim, Geneva H. Learning and Teaching Practices in English. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.
- Pooley, Robert C., ed. Perspectives on English Essays. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960.
- _____. Teaching English Grammar. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1946.
- _____. Teaching English Usage. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1946.
- Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1966.
- Roberts, Paul. English Sentences. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1962.
- _____. English Syntax. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964.
- _____. Patterns of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1956.
- _____. The Roberts English Series: A Linguistic Program. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1967.
- _____. Understanding English. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1958.
- Robertson, Stuart. The Development of Modern English. 2nd ed. Revised by Frederic G. Cassidy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1954.
- Shane, Harold G. and June Grant Mulry. Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1963.

- Sledd, James. A Short Introduction to English Grammar.
Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959.
- Van Dalen, Deobold. Understanding Educational Research.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- Walsh, J. Martyn and Anna Kathleen Walsh. Plain English Handbook: A Complete Guide to Good English.
Cincinnati: McCormick-Mathers Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Wert, James E., Charles O. Neidt, and J. Stanley Ahmann. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Wolfe, Don M. Language Arts and Life Patterns. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1961.

Journals

- Davis, O. L., Harold C. Smith, and Norman D. Bowers. "High School Students' Awareness of Structural Relationships in English." The Journal of Educational Research, LVIII (October, 1964), 69-71.
- Kennedy, Larry D. and Alfred D. Larson. "The Influence of Structural and of Traditional Grammatical Instruction Upon Language Perception and Writing Ability." Illinois School Research, V (February, 1969), 31-39.
- Link, Francis R. and Edward H. Schuster. "Linguistics in High School." Educational Leadership, XII (February, 1962), 294-299.
- Mallis, Jackie. "An Experiment with the New Grammar." English Journal, XLVI (October, 1957), 425-427.
- Suggs, Lena R. "Structural Grammar Versus Traditional Grammar in Influencing Writing." English Journal, L (March, 1961), 174-178.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. "If Grammar, Which Grammar, and How?" College English, XXIX (January, 1968), 303-309.
- Witty Paul. "Some Characteristics of the Effective Teacher." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVI (April, 1950), 193-208.

Wycoff, George S. "Suggestions for the Reading of Themes."
College English, XI (January, 1960), 210-214.

Reports

Lyman, Rollo L. "English Grammar in American Schools Before
 1850." U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 12.
 Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931.

Revised Teaching Guide for the Language Arts. Oklahoma
 Council of Teachers of English. Oklahoma City:
 Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1963, 131.

Walcott, Fred G. "Experiments in Composition." Reprint from
the University of Michigan School of Education Bulletin,
 1968.

Unpublished Materials

Ford, Bob Wayne. "The Effects of Peer Editing/Grading on the
 Grammar-Usage and Theme-Composition Ability of College
 Freshmen." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Graduate
 College, The University of Oklahoma, 1972.

Palmer, Cecilia. "A Study of Attitudes of Teachers Toward
 the Modern Linguistic Approach to the Teaching of
 English." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Graduate
 College, Oklahoma State University, 1968.

Shades, C. T. "A Study of Practices Considered Effective by
 Teachers of Language Arts Methods Courses in the 16
 Oklahoma Colleges Accredited for the Teacher Education
 Program." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Graduate
 College, Oklahoma State University, 1965.

APPENDIX A
LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE TEST, FORM A

Form A

Date _____ Name _____

Directions: Read each sentence and decide whether there is an error in usage in any of the underlined parts of the sentence. If so, note the number printed under the wrong word or phrase, and put this number in the parentheses at the right. If there is no usage error in the sentence, put a zero (0) in the parentheses.

No sentence has more than one error, and some sentences do not have any errors. The sentences are to be judged on the basis of suitable usage for general written English.

Samples:

1. He says₁ that he ain't₂ coming home₃ with us₄ today. 1(2)

In this sentence, ain't is wrong. The number printed below this word, 2, is therefore written in the parentheses.

2. She isn't₁ ready to go₂ home₃. 2(0)

In this sentence, there is no error in any of the underlined words. A zero is therefore written in the parentheses.

1. Tom spent₁ that summer at the beach, where him₂ and one of his classmates were₃ employed as₄ life guards. 1()

2. They're₁ grateful to him because₂ he gave₃ them help when they was₄ in need of it. 2()

3. She thinks George, not you, is₁ the one who sent_{2 3} her them₄ flowers. 3()

4. A committee of the dramatic club is₁ said to have chose₂ a very interesting play for₃ presentation in₄ May. 4()

5. Let₁ them stay a little longer₂ if they want₃ to;
let's₄ us go home. 5()
6. Twenty years₁ ago he seen₂ the danger of₃ this course
of action and warned against₄ it. 6()
7. I was not completely₁ convinced by his₂ insisting
that it was them₃ who were to blame₄. 7()
8. He attributes his success to₁ his custom of delegating₂
as₃ much authority as possible to people in who₄
he has confidence. 8()
9. We stopped at the next roadside stand we came₁ to
and John he₂ went₃ inside₄ to get some sandwiches. 9()
10. He could have₁ taken₂ part in the final match if he
hadn't of₃ been defeated₄ in the preliminary
contest. 10()
11. Something is₁ got to be done immediately, for the
situation is becoming worse, and there₂ may not be
another opportunity to₃ correct these₄ conditions. 11()

12. A few days before₁ the time that us₂ employees had
chosen₃ for our annual picnic, a committee was₄
 appointed to make the necessary arrangements. 12()
13. Mr. Green, like₁ many others, has₂ approached us
 on the question, but Alice and me₃ really don't₄
 have anything to do with it. 13()
14. When we were₁ about three mile₂ from the farm, a
 tire blew₃ out, and we had to stop to put₄ on the
 spare tire. 14()
15. Before beginning₁ to mix a cake, you should
 assemble all₂ the ingredients that₃ is₄ called for
 in the receipt. 15()
16. The engine of the wrecked plane had tore₁ loose₂
 from the fuselage and sunk₃ in twenty feet₄ of
 water. 16()
17. Men at all times₁ have felt₂ the need to₃ fashion
 for themselves₄ some kind of creed to live by. 17()
18. The Amateur Athletic Union allows₁ the payment of
 the contestants' hotel and traveling₂ expenses, but doesn't
 permit no₃ reimbursement for time lost from₄ work. 18()

19. They have decided to hire women for₁ the inspection
of small parts, a job at which they have proved₂ more
efficient₃ than the men who₄ they replace. 19()
20. My brother is two years₁ older than I₂, but I never
have to₃ wear his outgrown clothes because I am
taller than him₄. 21()
21. He asked whether the situation would of₁ improved
or seemed different₂ if they had been₃ better₄
informed. 21()
22. According₁ to the seed catalogue, this here₂ variety
of beans is₃ very well₄ suited to the small vegetable
garden. 22()
23. The pleasure he took₁ in the work and the helpful
experience were₂ his main incentives, but of course
the fifty dollars were₃ no₄ small prize. 23()
24. The ill-fated₁ plane snapped off tree tops for
nearly₂ half a mile before₃ it burst₄ into flames. 25()

25. If they would have₁ known that the departure of all residents except₂ wives and children of officers was₃ entirely voluntary, they would have₄ stayed. 25()
26. Most of this magazine is₁ devoted to₂ fiction, but there is_{3 4} usually two or three timely articles in each issue. 26()
27. Every man, whether₁ citizen or alien, must₂ register their₃ name and other information at₄ the local board. 27()
28. It was impossible to tell whom₁ it was that had sent₂ the package, as there₃ was no₄ return address on it. 28()
29. Since the meeting began₁ so late₂, there₃ was not time to allow each of the members to express their₄ own opinion. 29()
30. It seems to we₁ radio listeners that too many of the best programs are₂ presented at the same time, and that there₃ are many evenings when very little of interest is on the air. 30()

31. Barrett always use₁ to leave his office at about six o'clock, but when₂ I got there₃ that day his secretary told me he had gone₄ home a little after four. 31()
32. The amount of our liabilities has₁ increased considerable₂ in the last few months, according to₃ the treasurer, and there₄ is some question whether we can continue. 32()
33. Perhaps the greatest merit of this novel lays₁ in the development of the two main characters and the portrayal of their₂ effect₃ on each other₄. 33()
34. He had to postpone making₁ the purchase on account₂ of he didn't₃ have sufficient₄ cash at the time. 34()
35. At this₁ school for₂ mountain boys and girls, the students₃ pay for tuition or₄ maintenance. 35()
36. I remember thinking at the time that₁ Dr. Robinson was coming₂ to see my sister rather than me_{3 4}. 36()
37. Twenty years₂ ago there was₃ more than fifty schooners sailing out of Boston with cargo for southern ports. 37()

38. Mother had dinner waiting for my brothers and I
1
 when we got home, although it was quite late when
2 3 4
 we arrived. 38()
39. Today's announcement that mine fields have been
1
laid around the off-shore islands was received with
2 3 4
 astonishment. 39()
40. They had drunk the last drop of water, and some who
1
had had no sleep for thirty-six hours couldn't hardly
2 3
 keep their eyes open. 40()
4
41. In the last five years, the number of cattle owned
1 2
by the Indians on this reservation have increased
3 4
 from 2,000 to more than 12,000. 41()
42. In this group there are many British and Norwegian
1
 refugees, which have just begun to get accustomed
2 3
 to their new surroundings. 42()
4
43. This affects you principally--at least more than it
1 2 3
 does Philip and I. 43()
4

44. You hadn't ought₁ to believe everything you see in₂
print, as many rumors and unconfirmed₃ reports
are being₄ published every day. 44()
45. My father thinks that₁ it would be₂ best for my sister
and I₃ to stay₄ home this summer. 45()
46. Last year, when₁ we lived in the country, I use₂ to
take₃ my dog for a run in the woods every₄ day. 46()
47. The old fellow was proud of the fact that he had
not run₁ for a train or swum₂ a river or took₃ a hike
or done₄ a bit of work in twenty years. 47()
48. He told us that he expected₁ to be able to report
some progress in a week or two, but said that we
hadn't ought₂ to be too₃ disappointed if a longer period
was₄ required. 48()
49. The supply of golf balls laid₁ in by the various
dealers for the spring and winter trade are₂ almost₃
exhausted₄. 49()

50. The manager insists that either he₁ or one of his
clerks have₂ to be on hand throughout the day in case of₃
an urgent order. 50()
51. We hoped to keep₁ this matter secret₂ while₃ the
acceptance of the new members were₄ being
considered. 51()
52. From the mountains comes₁ news of more avalanches,
which have₂ interrupted traffic and taken₄ several
lives. 52()
53. Spring in Washington is a great time for tourists,
especially₁ school children, who₂ swarm into the
all ready₃ crowded hotels of the capital₄. 53()
54. Since everyone knows₁ that my hobby is collecting₂
postcards, each time any one of my friends or
relatives go₃ on a trip, I am sure₄ to receive at
least one new postcard for my collection. 54()
55. I think that a person will probably₁ remember a book
they₂ have read₃ much longer₄ than a movie on the
same subject. 55()

56. The possibility of joint development of the resources₁ of the Amazon and its₂ tributaries by the United States and Brazil was₃ the principle₄ topic of discussion. 56()
57. The organ grinder's monkey graciously₁ excepted₂ the coins we₃ children offered, and politely₄ tipped his hat. 57()
58. This writer is₁ one of the few authors of fiction who are_{2 3} distinguished for₄ artistic integrity in the short story. 58()
59. Mr. Kraft, whom₁ we later learned had been a farmer himself for many years₂, said that the production of truck crops in the past few months has₃ been much better than₄ last year. 59()
60. The experimental study and the occasional practical use of this vitamin during the past decade has given_{1 2} some promising results, but definite comment is withheld until₃ additional data are₄ available. 60()

APPENDIX B
LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE TEST, FORM B

Form B

Date _____ Name _____

Directions: Read each sentence and decide whether there is an error in usage in any of the underlined parts of the sentence. If so, note the number printed under the wrong word or phrase, and put this number in the parentheses at the right. If there is no usage error in the sentence, put a zero (0) in the parentheses.

No sentence has more than one error, and some sentences do not have any errors. The sentences are to be judged on the basis of suitable usage for general written English.

Samples:

1. He says that he ain't coming home with us today. 1(2)
 1 2 3 4

In this sentence, ain't is wrong. The number printed below this word, 2, is therefore written in the parentheses.

2. She isn't ready to go home. 2(0)
 1 2 3 4

In this sentence, there is no error in any of the underlined words. A zero is therefore written in the parentheses.

1. The law don't go into effect until the first
 1 2 3 4
 of the year. 1()

2. Thomas seated himself at the desk, carefully selected
 1 2
 a sheet of paper, and begun to write. 2()
 3 4

3. As a rule, we civilians know very little about
 1 2 3
 life in the army. 3()

4. The results of the conference will not be announced
 1 2 3
 without a complete agreement is reached. 4()
 4

5. The trustees appointed₁ to the presidency a man for
who₂ everyone₃ feels₄ great respect. 5()
6. The first question that₁ must be answered is₂ this:
 For whom₃ was₄ the reward intended? 6()
7. In them₁ days, when it took₂ three months to cross
 the ocean, news from Europe was₃ ancient history by
 the time it₄ arrived. 7()
8. A group of Indians came up and began inspecting₁ our
 camp; when₂ we tried to stop them, they became₃
angry₄. 8()
9. Ruth had been watching₁ the clock for₂ some time; the
 moment it struck₃ the hour, Thom and her₄ raced for
 the door. 9()
10. He knew₁ very few of his neighbors₂, for he had only
recently₃ came₄ to the town. 10()
11. The intense₁ heat hampered the firemen₂, four of who₃
were₄ burned or overcome by smoke. 11()

12. She asked me₁ to speak a little louder₂, explaining
that she did not₃ hear very good₄. 12()
13. Although₁ it was₂ late in April, there₃ was₄ still
patches of snow in the shaded spots. 13()
14. They are sure that₁ he neither said or₂ implied
anything unfavorable₃ to their₄ case. 14()
15. If the berries had been₁ a little riper₂, they
could of been used₃ for₄ preserves. 15()
16. All₁ the travelers which₂ made the journey to the
Orient₃ brought back tales₄ of fabulous wealth. 16()
17. They frankly₁ expressed there₂ disapproval of the senator,
who₂ they told us had refused to accept₄ the
compromise. 17()
18. Every₁ evening, they used₂ to set₃ on the porch
until₄ dark. 18()
19. The junior class has₁ invited we₂ seniors to a
picnic, to be₃ held the week before₄ commencement. 19()
20. He was in₁ despair₂; to who₃ could₄ he turn? 20()

21. A large section of the fashion show was₁ devoted to "after-dark" gowns, a surprising number of which₂ was₃ long-sleeved₄. 21()
22. When he questioned the maid, she only shook₁ her head, for₂ her mistress had told her₃ she was not to say nothing₄ about the recent happenings. 22()
23. She was glad₁ to rest for₂ a while before dinner, laying₃ on the sofa with a cushion under₄ her head. 23()
24. He was still₁ angry₂, and refused₃ to speak to Helen or I₄. 24()
25. The police department announced that₁ weather conditions were₂ so₃ bad that motorists hadn't₄ ought₄ to use the Washington Street bridge. 25()
26. The boys worked hard₁, and the gymnasium was already₂ for the dance an₃ hour before the time set₄. 26()
27. John had persisted in₁ trying to carry out his project, in spite of our lack of interest; but he was as₂ surprised as us₃ when₄ it proved successful. 27()

28. There₁ was₂ in this country many aliens who were
unable to return to their₃ homes on account of₄
the war. 28()
29. As the struggle went₁ on, they became₂ completely₃
discouraged and offered scarcely₄ no resistance. 29()
30. The company has₁ been steadily₂ expanding, and
their₃ are₄ now over 500 employees. 30()
31. They use₁ to spend all their₂ holidays₃ at the beach₄. 31()
32. The editor took₁ the pages I handed him₂, glanced at
what I had wrote₃, and told me the article would be₄
printed in the next day's paper. 32()
33. The opponents₁ of the bill₂ did not believe that
either the safety or₃ the neutrality of the
country were₄ threatened. 33()
34. At the baby contest, every mother was₁ perfectly sure₂
that they₃ had the most beautiful baby₄. 34()
35. It is said that₁ the Secret Service knows whom₂ the
leaders of the gang are₃ and is preparing to₄ trap
them. 35()

36. The advice₁ which they gave₂ the young woman saved her₃ and her husband a good deal₄ of money. 36()
37. As₁ time passes, the prisoners write₂ to their₃ friends and relatives less and less frequent₄. 37()
38. He agreed₁ that, in principal₂, honesty is₃ the best₄ policy. 38()
39. This new volume is₁ illustrated with seventeen reproductions of Audubon paintings; the most interesting part of the book, however₂, are₃ the writings rather₄ than the paintings. 39()
40. It was₁ one of those editorials that do₂ more to arouse₃ prejudice than₄ to enlighten. 40()
41. Accuracy₁ of movement, like₂ accuracy of words, are₃ essential to the success₄ of magical rites. 41()
42. I am both₁ pleased and flattered by₂ you₃ coming here to see me₄ and my family. 42()
43. She thoughtfully₁ invited several other friends who₂ she was sure₃ her guest would like₄ to meet. 43()

44. He looked at me reproachfully₁ when I refused to₂
 accompany him, though it was Tom, not I₃, who₄ had
 promised to go with him. 44()
45. The only occupant of the room was in a chair near
 the fireplace; he sat₁ there₂, so still₃ that he
might of been₄ sitting for his portrait. 45()
46. Each of the various regions₁ has₂ its₃ characteristic
 flora and₄ fauna. 46()
47. She curtsied to him, like₁ she wished to convey that
 she felt₂ how₃ much older and wiser he was than she₄. 47()
48. The chairman reports that₁ the work of the specialists
 who were₂ employed₃ to make a survey of conditions are₄
 nearing completion. 48()
49. If they would have₁ built their₂ house on higher
 ground, they would have₃ suffered less₄ at the time
 of the flood. 49()
50. He doubted whether they would care₁ to go with him,
 but he resolved to offer them the invitation and leave₂

them decide for themselves₃ whether they cared to

accept₄ it.

50()

51. Each one of these₁ plants need₂ a different₃ kind of₄
soil.

51()

52. The little girl stared₁ at my sister and I₂ as if₃
she had never seen twins before.

52()

53. The unusually₁ warm weather did not seem₂ to effect₃
his determination to finish₄ the job.

53()

54. The terms of the agreement, which₁ is subject to₂
confirmation by₃ the union and the company, was₄
not disclosed.

54()

55. The application of the principles₁ discovered during
those₂ years have₃ been of great value₄.

55()

56. The storm had cut₁ off the electricity; but in spite
of that, everyone tried₂ to carry on their₃ work
as usual₄.

56()

57. Beatrice, who₁ Dante met when₂ he was₃ a child,
remained his guiding star throughout₄ his life.

57()

58. We shall be able to spend only₁ a few hours₂ in

Washington on this trip, but we are planning to
visit the White House and the Capital₃, and possibly₄

the Lincoln Memorial.

58()

59. I was certain₁ they intended you and I₂ to bring₃ the

rest of the₄ books.

59()

60. A competent₁ machinist would not be₂ satisfied with

these kind₃ of₄ tools.

60()

APPENDIX C

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR FRESHMAN COMPOSITION

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS FOR
FRESHMAN COMPOSITION

Introduction

This booklet sets forth general standards for the courses in freshman composition at Central State University. Its purpose is to provide guidelines insuring some degree of congruity among the many sections of English 1113 and 1213 without violating the assumption that teaching is an individual art. Therefore, the freshman committee has carefully avoided dogmatic, detailed prescriptions; what is presented here, we feel, is a basis for faculty agreement and practice.

The nature of the instruction of freshman English composition should be such as to enforce and/or inculcate the idea that English and the study of English is a liberal art, not merely a skill. Even from a practical viewpoint, the objective of freshman English should be not only to improve the students' present abilities to write clearly and effectively but also to insure or encourage that they will continue to improve and to expand. This probably can be achieved only if students are made aware of the intrinsic worth of knowledge and understanding of the structure and the modes of the development of the English language, its various uses, its richness and cultural value, and its sources of power, beauty, vitality, and effectiveness.

Purpose and Essentials

The primary purpose of freshman English is to produce writers of competent expository prose: additional areas of study (reading of literature, class discussion, library projects, and grammatical analysis) should be viewed primarily as means of improving student writing and secondarily as worthy ends in themselves. Grammar instruction, for instance, should stress those principles most closely allied to correct sentence structure and punctuation of good English prose.

The committee feels that though legitimate differences in emphasis among English teachers exist, the following are essentials which every freshman composition course should thoroughly cover in order to guarantee that each student has been exposed to a common body of skills so that he can compete successfully in other English courses and on the English Proficiency Exam, and, more important, so that he can communicate in clear, effective prose at all times. Thus the student composition should demonstrate

- (1) a clear purpose (thesis) and a properly limited subject;
- (2) an introduction, a body, and a conclusion;
- (3) unity for both the composition as a whole and for individual paragraphs;
- (4) adequate development for the essay's thesis and for topic sentences of individual paragraphs;

- (5) coherent and orderly progression of ideas within and between paragraphs;
- (6) forceful and succinct sentences showing some sophistication in structure and variety;
- (7) an awareness of the English word--the use of specific, concrete, vivid words instead of the general, the vague, the abstract; the hackneyed;
- (8) an awareness of the possibilities of figurative language;
- (9) an originality and creativity--expressed through a personal style and tone--which support the author's purpose;
- (10) and the elimination of those errors generally deemed the "gross illiteracies" of composition:
 - (a) unjustifiable fragment,
 - (b) unjustifiable comma splice,
 - (c) fused sentence,
 - (d) errors in agreement,
 - (e) dangling modifier,
 - (f) shifts in tense and person,
 - (g) excessive misspelling,
 - (h) substandard or erroneous verb forms.

Evaluating Themes

The composition teacher tries to cultivate in the student a baffling complex of intellectual skills; likewise,

properly grading themes requires a complex and perhaps baffling skill. It is impossible (and perhaps not even desirable) for all English teachers to agree on the grades of individual papers, but in order that we may aim at some objectivity in the highly subjective art of paper evaluation, the following definitions of A, B, C, D, and F papers are offered.

The writer of an F paper treats his subject in only a superficial manner and with a disregard for correct usage. He either fails to narrow his subject to manageable proportions, fails to keep his paper unified and coherent, or fails to develop his points adequately. He mistreats his paragraphs, either by lumping several topics into one cumbersome paragraph or by consistently writing short, choppy paragraphs of only a sentence or two. He writes only simple sentences or loses himself (and the reader) in awkwardly complex structures. He fails to subordinate properly. He uses words imprecisely. He misspells frequently. He omits punctuation where it is needed or else puts it in where it should not be. He cripples his paper with gross illiteracies. In brief, he is either unable or unwilling to communicate clearly and effectively in writing.

The writer of a D paper differs from his F brother more in degree than in kind: he probably commits most of the same faults, but less frequently and less obviously. He does make an attempt to transcend superficiality. He does show a rudimentary understanding of unity, coherence, and

subordination. However, he often fails to organize his papers logically or to develop them satisfactorily. He makes an effort to write good paragraphs, but only partially succeeds. He commits fewer errors in usage--especially the gross illiteracies. All in all, he writes poor but passable papers, perhaps more from carelessness than from ignorance.

The writer of a C paper produces an adequate but mediocre essay. He states his subject clearly, but somewhat tritely and generally. He organizes his paper logically, but too mechanically. He writes paragraphs which show unity and coherence, but he frequently fails to develop his topic sentence concretely and specifically. He uses transitions, but too crudely. He writes clear sentences, but makes them dull. He often stumbles in his word choice, perhaps because his vocabulary is limited. He prefers clichés. He spells fairly well, though he sometimes errs. Though he occasionally loses his way in complex sentences, he punctuates fairly well. He avoids all of the gross illiteracies. In general, he is technically correct, but tedious to read.

The writer of a B paper handles his subject interestingly. He catches his reader's attention in the introduction, justifies it in the body of the paper, and does more than merely repeat his thesis in the conclusion. He organizes his paper coherently and logically. He creates unified and well-developed paragraphs. He writes clear sentences, with a variety of structures. He uses vigorous, vivid language,

precisely. He is nearly flawless in mechanics. However, though he does tackle a worthwhile subject, he often fails to do it justice, because he either oversimplifies it or lacks the knowledge to do it well. In essence, he is a competent and interesting writer, but he lacks depth and polish.

The writer of an A paper knows what he is doing and does it beautifully. He organizes his ideas logically and provides smooth but not blatant transitions: he seems to flow rather than march to his conclusion. He writes clear and varied sentences which reveal an individual but not eccentric style. He commands a vocabulary sufficiently wide to say everything he wishes, and uses it precisely and vigorously. He writes with virtually no errors of mechanics or usage. In brief, through his desire and ability to achieve clear and precise communication, he reveals a disciplined and mature mind.

Amount of Written Work

A student essay should contain approximately 300 words as a minimum with an effective introduction, a substantially developed body, and a satisfactory conclusion. Practice in writing individual paragraphs is desirable; for this purpose, three separate paragraphs of approximately 100 words each are the equivalent of one theme. A semester's work, however, should not consist of writing only separate paragraphs.

APPENDIX D

COMPOSITION EVALUATION

Name: _____

COMPOSITION EVALUATION

Student I.D. Number _____ Theme Number _____ Period _____

					Score Possible
I. COMPOSITION					
A. Content					30
1. Sticking to the subject					5
2. Selection of material					10
3. Adequate illustrations and details to justify statements					15
B. Organization					35
1. Introductory paragraph					
a. Topic sentence					2
b. Inclusion of basis for discussion					9
2. Subsequent paragraphs					
a. Topic sentence (premise)					4
b. Development (proof)					12
c. Application to subject (projection)					8
C. Presentation					15
1. Style					
a. Well-chosen words					3
b. Graphic phrases					3

	<u>Score Possible</u>
c. Economy of words	3
2. Proper use of words	3
3. Variety in sentence structure	3
II. TECHNIQUE	
A. Appearance	20
1. Neatness	2
2. Legibility	4
B. Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, and sentence structure)	14
TOTAL	100

APPENDIX E

GRAMMAR AND THEME DATA OF THE CONTROL
AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

GRAMMAR AND THEME DATA OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Subject's Number	Pretest Grammar	Posttest Grammar	Grammar Difference	Pretest Theme	Posttest Theme	Theme Difference
1.	71	81	10	2.33	4.00	1.67
2.	51	63	12	1.00	3.00	2.00
3.	70	75	5	1.00	3.33	2.33
4.	80	93	13	2.33	4.00	1.67
5.	70	83	13	1.00	4.00	3.00
6.	41	70	29	1.00	2.66	1.66
7.	71	78	7	1.33	3.33	2.00
8.	61	51	-10	1.00	3.00	2.00
9.	67	86	19	2.33	4.00	1.67
10.	70	78	8	1.66	4.00	2.34
11.	65	85	20	2.33	4.00	1.67
12.	61	70	9	1.33	3.33	2.00
13.	67	81	14	2.00	4.00	2.00
14.	43	56	13	0.00	3.00	3.00
15.	56	85	29	2.33	3.33	1.00
16.	58	80	22	2.00	4.00	2.00
17.	41	65	24	0.00	2.66	2.66
18.	46	81	35	1.00	4.00	3.00
19.	40	80	40	2.66	4.00	1.34
20.	51	73	22	1.66	3.33	1.67
21.	58	90	32	2.66	4.00	1.34
22.	63	87	24	2.00	3.33	1.33
23.	45	63	18	2.00	3.66	1.66
24.	58	83	25	0.00	3.33	3.33
25.	41	73	32	0.00	3.00	3.00
26.	53	85	32	1.00	3.00	2.00

-----continued on the following page-----

-----GRAMMAR AND THEME DATA OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP Continued-----

Subject's Number	Pretest Grammar	Posttest Grammar	Grammar Difference	Pretest Theme	Posttest Theme	Theme Difference
27.	63	95	32	2.66	3.66	1.00
28.	67	73	6	1.00	4.00	3.00
29.	87	100	13	1.00	4.00	3.00
30.	50	70	20	2.00	4.00	2.00
31.	77	95	18	2.00	4.00	2.00
32.	65	87	22	1.66	4.00	2.34
33.	61	90	29	2.00	4.00	2.00
34.	68	80	12	1.66	3.66	2.00
35.	51	83	32	2.33	4.00	1.67
36.	50	85	35	2.33	3.66	1.33
37.	75	95	20	2.33	4.00	1.67
38.	53	75	22	1.00	4.00	3.00
39.	63	65	2	1.00	3.66	2.66
40.	63	87	24	1.66	3.00	1.34
Mean	59.78	79.38	19.60	1.56	3.62	2.06
SD	11.60	10.97	9.67	0.77	0.44	0.57

GRAMMAR AND THEME DATA OF CONTROL GROUP

Subject's Number	Pretest Grammar	Posttest Grammar	Grammar Difference	Pretest Theme	Posttest Theme	Theme Difference
1.	85	97	12	3.66	4.00	0.34
2.	71	90	19	1.66	3.00	1.34
3.	78	85	7	2.00	3.00	1.00
4.	90	98	8	3.33	4.00	0.67
5.	73	88	15	2.66	4.00	1.34
6.	61	77	16	2.66	3.33	0.67
7.	57	91	34	3.00	4.00	1.00
8.	58	78	20	2.66	4.00	1.34
9.	77	93	16	3.66	4.00	0.34
10.	53	77	24	2.66	3.33	0.67
11.	81	83	2	3.33	4.00	0.67
12.	63	81	18	2.00	3.33	1.33
13.	70	78	8	2.00	3.00	1.00
14.	53	75	22	2.66	3.66	1.00
15.	70	87	17	3.33	4.00	0.67
16.	71	81	10	3.00	4.00	1.00
17.	58	80	22	2.00	3.00	1.33
18.	73	83	10	2.66	3.00	0.34
19.	87	97	10	3.33	4.00	0.67
20.	71	88	17	2.66	3.33	0.67
21.	63	75	12	2.33	4.00	1.67
22.	80	95	15	4.00	4.00	0.00
23.	81	80	- 1	1.33	4.00	2.67
24.	50	47	- 3	2.00	3.66	1.66
25.	65	71	6	2.33	4.00	1.67
26.	85	90	5	3.33	4.00	0.67

-----continued on following page-----

-----GRAMMAR AND THEME DATA OF CONTROL GROUP Continued-----

Student's Number	Pretest Grammar	Posttest Grammar	Grammar Difference	Pretest Theme	Posttest Theme	Theme Difference
27.	83	90	7	3.33	4.00	0.67
28.	75	57	-18	3.00	4.00	1.00
29.	81	81	0	3.00	4.00	1.00
30.	77	90	13	2.66	4.00	1.34
31.	60	77	17	2.66	4.00	1.34
32.	70	78	8	2.33	3.66	1.33
33.	81	88	7	3.00	4.00	1.00
34.	70	85	15	2.66	4.00	1.34
35.	60	61	1	2.33	4.00	1.67
36.	90	91	1	2.66	4.00	1.34
Mean	71.42	82.31	10.89	2.72	3.76	1.05
SD	11.04	10.96	9.36	0.59	0.37	0.50

APPENDIX F

RAW DATA REPORTED BY THE CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

RAW DATA REPORTED BY THE CONTROL GROUP

	Sex	ACT Scores					Age	HS Size	Exp.	Grammar-Usage			Theme-Composition		
1.	1	22	26	18	22	22	21	5,000	4	85	97	12	3.66	4.00	.34
2.	1	16	21	30	23	20	19	800	2	71	90	19	1.66	3.00	1.34
3.	1	19	23	25	26	23	19	2,400	3	78	85	7	2.00	3.00	1.00
4.	2	23	17	26	19	21	56	200	4	90	98	8	3.33	4.00	.67
5.	2	16	26	24	20	21	21	300	4	73	88	15	2.66	4.00	1.34
6.	1	12	22	16	19	17	20	2,500	2	61	77	16	2.66	3.33	.67
7.	2	15	19	27	18	20	22	1,500	4	57	91	34	3.00	4.00	1.00
8.	2	18	17	19	24	19	19	2,300	4	58	78	20	2.66	4.00	1.34
9.	2	23	14	25	26	22	19	400	4	77	93	16	3.66	4.00	.34
10.	2	16	13	19	21	17	19	400	3	53	77	24	2.66	3.33	.67
11.	1	23	31	24	28	26	19	2,000	4	81	83	2	3.33	4.00	.67
12.	1	17	30	19	14	20	19	500	2	63	81	18	2.00	3.33	1.33
13.	1	12	22	16	18	17	23	1,400	2	70	78	8	2.00	3.00	1.00
14.	2	19	19	29	19	21	19	700	3	53	75	22	2.66	3.66	1.00
15.	2	16	14	26	26	20	19	1,500	4	70	87	17	3.33	4.00	.67
16.	2	20	15	30	28	23	20	200	4	71	81	10	3.00	3.33	1.33
17.	1	18	23	22	22	21	19	1,500	3	58	80	22	2.00	3.33	1.33
18.	1	14	24	15	17	17	21	1,400	3	73	83	10	2.66	3.00	.34
19.	2	25	14	26	22	22	19	1,600	4	87	97	10	3.33	4.00	.67
20.	1	14	23	18	19	18	25	1,500	3	65	71	6	2.33	4.00	1.67
21.	2	19	20	25	27	22	19	2,000	3	85	90	5	3.33	4.00	.67
22.	2	21	09	19	20	17	35	500	3	83	90	7	3.33	4.00	.67
23.	1	20	30	20	20	23	24	2,000	4	75	57	18	3.00	4.00	1.00
24.	1	17	27	29	23	24	19	1,000	3	81	81	00	3.00	4.00	1.00
25.	2	19	11	29	23	20	20	2,500	3	77	90	13	2.66	4.00	1.34

124

-----continued on the following page-----

-----RAW DATA REPORTED BY THE CONTROL GROUP-----

	Sex	ACT Scores					Age	HS Size	Exp.	Grammar-Usage			Theme-Composition		
26.	1	15	17	17	20	17	19	2,800	3	60	77	17	2.66	4.00	1.34
27.	1	16	26	20	19	20	24	1,300	3	70	78	8	2.33	3.66	1.33
28.	1	18	28	24	20	22	20	2,500	3	81	88	7	3.00	4.00	1.00
29.	2	20	14	18	23	18	18	1,300	3	70	85	15	2.66	4.00	1.34
30.	1	09	18	20	14	15	24	1,200	3	60	61	1	2.33	4.00	1.67
31.	2	21	11	18	20	17	20	500	4	90	91	1	2.66	4.00	1.34
32.	1	19	24	18	26	22	19	2,300	3	71	88	17	2.66	3.33	.67
33.	2	17	31	29	30	27	20	400	3	63	75	12	2.33	4.00	1.67
34.	2	19	17	29	20	21	23	1,800	5	80	95	15	4.00	4.00	0.00
35.	2	20	18	26	26	22	20	600	2	81	80	1	1.33	4.00	2.67
36.	1	08	28	09	18	15	23	2,000	3	50	47	3	2.00	3.66	1.66

125

Mean 17.67 22.03 20.25 3.25 82.31 2.71 1.05

SD 3.79 4.99 2.83 0.73 10.96 0.59 0.50

Mean 20.61 21.67 21.81 71.42 12.11 3.76

SD 6.16 3.85 6.61 11.04 7.66 0.37

RAW DATA REPORTED BY THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

	Sex	ACT Scores					Age	HS Size	Exp.	Grammar-Usage			Theme-Composition		
1.	2	16	13	15	14	15	19	1,400	3	63	87	24	1.66	3.00	1.34
2.	1	18	20	24	22	21	20	3,000	2	63	87	24	2.00	3.33	1.33
3.	1	11	29	19	24	21	19	400	3	45	63	18	2.00	3.66	1.66
4.	1	18	16	22	22	19	19	4,000	3	58	83	25	0.00	3.33	3.33
5.	1	14	19	17	16	16	19	500	2	41	73	32	0.00	3.00	3.00
6.	1	12	28	16	25	20	20	1,400	3	53	85	32	1.00	3.00	2.00
7.	1	23	24	30	28	27	19	2,000	3	63	95	32	2.66	3.66	1.00
8.	1	12	22	29	19	20	23	900	2	67	73	6	1.00	4.00	3.00
9.	2	19	10	19	26	18	19	2,300	3	87	100	13	1.00	4.00	3.00
10.	1	15	27	16	23	20	19	300	3	50	70	20	2.00	4.00	2.00
11.	1	20	28	19	16	20	19	1,000	3	77	95	19	2.00	4.00	2.00
12.	1	16	20	24	20	20	23	2,000	3	65	87	22	1.66	4.00	2.34
13.	1	13	28	20	24	21	26	1,000	3	61	90	29	2.00	4.00	2.00
14.	1	14	19	19	17	17	22	1,300	3	68	80	12	1.66	3.66	2.00
15.	2	10	17	29	19	18	19	350	3	51	83	32	2.33	4.00	1.67
16.	2	16	08	26	18	17	19	1,200	3	50	85	35	2.33	3.66	1.33
17.	1	18	17	27	19	20	41	3,000	3	75	95	20	2.33	4.00	1.67
18.	1	10	20	18	18	16	21	1,800	3	53	75	22	1.00	4.00	3.00
19.	1	21	20	12	14	19	19	2,000	3	53	65	2	1.00	3.66	2.66
20.	1	20	25	26	28	25	22	2,800	3	71	81	10	2.33	4.00	1.67
21.	1	07	19	16	21	16	24	300	2	51	63	12	1.00	3.00	2.00
22.	1	13	19	29	23	21	23	3,200	3	70	75	5	1.00	3.33	2.33
23.	2	19	12	23	20	18	19	600	2	80	93	13	2.33	4.00	1.67
24.	1	14	32	14	22	20	19	1,200	3	70	83	13	1.00	4.00	3.00
25.	1	06	26	18	24	18	18	300	2	41	70	29	1.00	2.66	1.66
26.	1	10	30	18	34	23	21	500	2	71	78	7	1.33	3.33	2.00
27.	1	08	18	28	13	17	20	700	2	61	51	10	1.00	3.00	2.00

-----continued on the following page-----

-----RAW DATA REPORTED BY THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP Continued-----

	Sex	ACT Scores					Age	HS Size	Exp.	Grammar-Usage			Theme-Composition		
28.	1	09	29	19	27	21	18	500	3	67	86	19	2.33	4.00	1.67
29.	1	14	24	18	22	19	25	400	3	70	78	8	1.66	4.00	2.34
30.	1	17	31	21	27	24	25	2,000	3	65	85	20	2.33	4.00	1.67
31.	1	11	19	20	25	18	20	3,800	3	61	70	9	1.33	3.33	2.00
32.	2	17	12	18	17	16	22	3,000	3	67	81	14	2.00	4.00	2.00
33.	2	09	07	17	20	14	19	1,400	2	43	56	13	0.00	3.00	3.00
34.	1	10	23	19	20	18	19	1,400	3	56	85	29	2.33	3.33	1.00
35.	1	17	27	26	31	25	20	1,500	3	58	80	22	2.00	4.00	2.00
36.	1	05	19	29	21	18	19	2,200	2	41	65	24	0.00	2.66	2.66
37.	1	13	33	19	28	23	26	2,200	3	46	81	35	1.00	4.00	3.00
38.	1	07	17	27	19	17	21	2,000	3	40	80	40	2.66	4.00	1.34
39.	1	10	20	17	18	16	19	2,200	3	51	73	22	1.66	3.33	1.67
40.	1	22	32	22	25	25	20	400	3	58	90	32	2.66	4.00	1.34

Mean	13.72	21.10	19.43						2.79	79.38	1.56				2.06
SD	4.63	4.87	3.03						0.40	10.97	0.77				0.57

Mean	21.48	21.73	21.15						59.78	20.10			3.62		
SD	6.78	4.72	3.95						11.60	9.67			0.44		