A COMPARISON OF THE ACHIEVEMENT GAINS BETWEEN A GROUP OF STUDENTS TAUGHT ENGLISH BY A TRADITIONAL METHOD AND A GROUP TAUGHT BY THE NEBRASKA ENGLISH CURRICULUM

BY

MARY ANN OTTINGER

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Education degree
in the Department of Education
Montana State University
August, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Nature of the Problem	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Overview	3
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
	The Need for Improvement in Language Instruction	4
	New Concepts in Language Instruction	7
	The Use of Literature as a Medium of Language Instruction	14
	The Nebraska Curriculum	16
	Summary	20
III.	METHODS	21
	Population	21
	Procedures	22
	Limitations	23
IV.	RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
	Results	24
	Conclusions	25
	Recommendations	26
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	27
	APPENDIX	29

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Difference of Means between the Nebraska English Curriculum and a Traditional English Curriculum on the Basis of Five Selected Areas in English. 25

II. Achievement Gain for Group I. 30

III. Achievement Gain for Group II. 32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

The teaching of English today has been under constant criticism. Teachers are accused of not giving students the essential skills necessary for their later lives. The English curriculums are considered unorganized; there is confusion and disagreement as to the placement of language skills learning.

Through many years of teaching experience, the writer finds that students often have a negative attitude toward English. They seem to acquire this attitude when they are in the elementary school. At the time children enter the elementary school, they have been enjoying and using language for their communicating purposes for several years. When they enter the structured environment of the school and begin the study of language, their dislike and indifference towards language seems to begin.

Anderson, Anderson, Ballantine, and Howes (3) in quoting from a Minneapolis Public Schools publication state:

> Children just learning to talk, and later to read, reveal a spontaneous delight in language. They enjoy the mere sound of words. They ask freely about meaning. They try honestly to express themselves. As the need for social conformity arises in their use of language, however, they grow gradually more and more inhibited. By the time they reach senior high school, many of them hate to write and are shy about speaking before a group. English has become a dreaded subject.

Perhaps this dread of English may be traced to meaningless, isolated, and uninteresting activities children are often asked to do in language lessons. These activities may be meaningless and unpurposeful because language is treated more mechanically than personally. In traditional language instruction, too often there appears to be much more preoccupation with rules and correctness and too little concern for the personal and social value of language. As Moffett (21) indicates, children are often given too many facts about our language system and not enough opportunity to use it in purposeful situations.

Since language is the vehicle for all learning and is a vital part of every activity in which man engages, there is cause for concern that so many students apparently dislike English and do not seem to be using language effectively. Teachers must be constantly aware of ways to improve their teaching methods to prepare students for our automated, complex, and innovative society which requires literate members who use language fluently and clearly.

The apparent need for improvement in and a shift in the emphases of language instructions leads to the problem of this study.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of teaching English through the Nebraska English Curriculum as compared with the effectiveness of the traditional textbook method

and to determine if there would be any significant difference in the amount of achievement growth between the students taught through the Nebraska Curriculum and those taught through the traditional method.

Overview

Chapter II reviews literature on the teaching of English. Chapter III describes the population and procedures used in the study and the limitations of the study. Results, conclusions, and recommendations are considered in the final chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Four major aspects in the teaching of English that are currently under consideration by educators are: 1. the need for improvement in language instruction; 2. new concepts in language instruction; 3. the use of literature as the medium of language instruction; and 4. the Nebraska English Curriculum.

The Need for Improvement in Language Instruction

Leading authorities in the field of language arts note that there is a need for improvement in our language instruction. Tidyman and Butterfield (23) state:

> The language teacher of today has inherited from preceding generations of teachers some patterns of instruction that are as strange and as obsolete as the Model T Ford or a high celluloid collar. Traditional practices were acceptable fifty years ago, although even then they were poorly adapted to the needs of children and society. Unfortunately some traditional patterns, not consciously learned but painfully acquired through years of tuition under the zealous efforts of misguided teachers, are still to be found in schools. Life has not stood still. Change and progress continue, whether we like what is happening. Helping to formulate a program of instruction in language, patterned to meet the needs of children and of society today, is the challenge of teachers of today and tomorrow.

Mauree Applegate (4) notes that we must overhaul our school curriculums because the world stage is rotating so fast. "The language arts program especially needs overhauling...; it's as

patchy as a hobo costume at a masquerade. There's a little bit of everything in it, put together in a haphazard manner unworthy of the careful planning needed by a space age."

Dr. William A. Jenkins (15), Professor of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee makes the following comment:

> Our current assessment of the state of English is that we still have a diversity in approach. How one teaches composition, for example, is almost as varied as there are individuals teaching. Perhaps more concern should be directed to attitudes about the teaching of English. To us the only acceptable approach commensurate with today's world is that English be considered a process of discovery and inquiry into the use and status of one's native tongue.

Dr. Jenkins also believes that the textbooks which we use in teaching English are not as good as they might be. They do not reflect real life. They represent compromises which the publishers have to make in deciding whether to advance new ideas which may be unpopular, or to present familiar and accepted materials in order to sell their books.

The development of new textbooks in English has been impeded by the very nature of language teaching itself. English is complicated by the presence of a great many specific skills which educators and curriculum leaders find difficult to place within the curriculum. (Greene and Petty, 10)

A part of the language program which has caused much debate because of the diverse ideas of curriculum leaders, is grammar. Greene and Petty (10) maintain:

> The place of grammar in the elementary language program has been the subject of lively debate almost constantly in the past fifty years. In spite of the quantity of research questioning the value of formal grammar, the case for and against grammar is still strongly argued.
>
> Teachers of formal grammar have long defended the thesis that the study of formal grammar provides the only effective basis for the mastery of expressional skills; that only through the study of formal grammar, involving the mastery of language forms, the learning of rules, the parsing and diagramming of sentences can the student learn to express himself acceptably. Proponents of this theory believe that a detailed understanding of the individual parts of the sentence leads to correct usages and to good oral and written expression.

Research has found that the formal, analytical study of grammar does not meet the needs of children and does not transfer to improved English expression. According to Lamb (16), "Research supports the conclusion that very little teaching of grammar as it has been done in the past has helped children to speak or write better."

Though the results of research have demonstrated that formal and indirect methods do not assure good language expression, Greene and Petty (10) do not deny that grammar does have value as a structural framework of language. An understanding of this framework and its value is a problem that the classroom teachers and curriculum leaders need to face. They must determine the ways in which grammar may be employed effectively to improve the language usage habits of school pupils.

Because of the uncertainty in the teaching of grammar and because

of other conflicting ideologies of educators and curriculum leaders, many teachers are dissatisfied with the programs of instruction; they are unsure of themselves in the teaching of language and are not pleased with the attitudes of the pupils or with the results obtained. Mauree Applegate (4) notes that many teachers "...are distinctly uneasy in English...and are seldom quite sure what they should teach in their language arts classes, let alone how they should teach it."

Such uncertainty and dissatisfaction with some of our present English programs are resulting in the poor preparation of many students for later academic work. Teachers of college English are concerned about the number of unprepared freshmen they encounter. Vivian Buchan (5), an instructor at the University of Iowa, claims that the problem begins in the elementary grades where students are given inadequate instruction in the language arts.

Statements such as Mrs. Buchan's concerning the inadequacy of English instruction, the presence of diverse ideas as to what constitutes a good English program, and the apparent dissatisfaction with some of our present English programs indicate the need for continued research and a constant revision of the English programs in order to meet the needs of children and society today.

New Concepts in Language Instruction

The primary goal in language instruction has always been, and

still is, that of developing skill and effectiveness in oral and written expression. At the present time, the formal methods of language instruction that have been used toward meeting this goal are being debated. As a result of the dissatisfaction and confusion that exist in the teaching of language, there has been an increased interest in the field of language arts, and new concepts have emerged which question the learning effectiveness of former methods. Two major concepts will be explained here to indicate the current thinking of those in the field.

The first of these concepts is in regard to the current upsurge of interest in the language arts which probably reflects a new recognition of the importance of language in modern life and in the development of children, a better understanding of the language processes, and a growing concern over the inadequacy of traditional methods. (Tidyman and Butterfield, 23)

Much important research is being done in the field of language instruction and the scope of learning activities is beginning to enlarge from the contrived exercises of formal methods, toward more practical activities.

Trauger (24) gives the following account of the present broadening of language instruction:

> Two major factors account for the widening horizons. One is educational research; the other, dissatisfaction with results of older methods. Research contributes the viewpoints that a child acquires skills, facts, and desirable language usages most efficiently when the items to be learned are associated with projects which interest him. The dis-

> satisfaction with meager accomplishments in English usage, grammar, and poetry, prompts teachers to experiment in search of more effective methods.

Although the importance of developing good language has always been prominent, the increased emphasis upon language and the research being done have resulted because of the world of almost instant communication in which we live. Language is a tool needed in every walk of life. Its three main functions are: a means of communicating thoughts, ideas, and feelings to others; a vehicle of thought and understanding; and a means of transmitting culture. (Greene and Petty, 10)

> A reasonable mastery of the language skills is of prime importance to our educational thinking and planning. It enables us to think clearly and logically, to communicate these ideas to others, and to preserve them for the use and guidance of future generations.

Such ideas about language and its importance have become basic in the determination of what should be taught in the language programs of the schools. According to Tidyman and Butterfield (23), a broad basis for language instruction is provided in the concept of language as an essential part of the growth process and as a means of securing unity of purpose and social action. "We no longer think of communication, therefore, as a narrow set of linguistic skills. It is a process which involves ways of living--ways of thinking, of looking at oneself, of adjusting to social situations, of dealing with reality."

A second new concept in language instruction is in respect to the provision of more functional and direct approaches to language learning.

Although progress has been slow, more effective methods of teaching are coming about. Indirect approaches depending upon formal grammar, sentence diagramming, and the memorization of rules are based on a theory that is becoming obsolete. According to this theory, mastery of language was a general function of the mind that was acquired through memorizing formal rules and generalizations.

Tidyman and Butterfield (23) account for these former practices:

> Prevailing practices in the past were not inconsistent with conceptions of the learning processes then current. The psychology of habit formation underlying most of the instruction in language instruction justified the analysis of learning tasks into specific elements learned singly could be combined as needed in performing certain language functions.

This earlier disciplinary concept is opposed to the modern functional point of view of education. In all areas of the curriculum, the modern view is the substitution of real, lifelike learning experiences for the previous drill in isolated elements or skills. Tidyman and Butterfield (23) note that the functional point of view is consistent with the natural learning of children--learning by doing.

Instead of the previous over-emphasis on lessons to establish correct usage, the social and realistic importance of language is being given more recognition. According to Trauger (24), "Primary emphasis is placed on real, current, language experiences such as conversation, discussion, reporting, dramatizing, letter writing, arising in dynamic classroom situations."

It is being realized that if children are to learn to use

acceptable language habitually, they must be given the opportunity for its practice in both written and oral expression in meaningful situations:

> Now we have a better understanding of the learning processes. The best learned situation is real, lifelike experience providing meaning and adequate motivation for the several kinds of language experiences, and demanding the exercise of the language abilities and skills which are essential in various situations. Learning involves a significant meaningful <u>whole</u> rather than practice on isolated, disconnected habits and skills. (Tidyman and Butterfield, 23)

In order to provide for a meaningful whole, good language programs must provide experiences that are closely related to the child's needs and which will enable him to associate language symbols with meaning and use them in purposeful activities. Greene and Petty (10) note:

> Correct language habits are acquired by practicing the use of acceptable forms rather than by discussing them or memorizing rules and generalizations supposedly governing their use...the child acquires mastery of new words by using them. He learns about sentences not by talking about them, but by constantly forming them and writing them correctly. He learns correct usage, not by studying easily forgotten rules, but by repeating the usages themselves until the correct responses become habitual. These skills must therefore be developed with some subject matter vehicle sufficiently rich in content to provide interesting activities and thus stimulate extensive expression.

Such experience learning is in accordance with the present approach of individualizing our teaching. It provides for an individual method of attacking problems. When each pupil writes something that is meaningful to him, he is doing something that has purpose for him. When it has purpose, the individual feels a need

to do his best and set high standards for himself.

Wolfe (25) states, "Only when the pupil finds a need to speak correctly, to punctuate correctly, or to improve the structure of his written sentences, does he use the grammatical knowledge every profession thinks necessary."

Meaningful, individualized activities also tend to promote better spelling and handwriting which are an important part of any language program. According to Shane, Mulry, Reddin, and Gillespie (22), a general cause "of poor spelling may be a faulty approach to the teaching of spelling. Children are presented with words they do not need to use and, in consequence, there is little interest on their part to spell them."

The same authors also note that "writing, like spelling should function in the lives of children. The child who has acquired a reason for symbolizing his message on paper will endeavor to do a better job than the child who resents the teacher-enforced duty of writing something for which he sees no reason that is acceptable to him."

The meaningful approach to language instruction is bringing about a change in the teaching of grammar also. Instead of formal grammar instruction, there is a functional grammar approach. Tidyman and Butterfield (23) explain the intention of functional grammar:

> The purpose of the functional grammar approach is not for the purpose of understanding language as in the formal approach, but the correction of crudities. Functional grammar implies teaching grammatical principles in

> relation to faults of construction. Need for grammar grows out of need for accurate, vivid expression. Grammar is learned not as formal study but incidentally as a means of resolving problems of expression in particular situations.

The learning of grammar has gained some recent impetus from the work of linguists who are concerned with the structures of our language. According to Burns and Lowe (6), linguists believe that "language is made up of working units of sounds, phonemes; these are built into morphemes, some of which can be classified into form classes; and the constructions can be further analyzed according to degree of pitch, stress, juncture and sentence patterns; commonly called syntax." Linguists urge that attention to these characteristics of our language should begin in the elementary grades so that children's ears become tuned to the systematic patterns that are typical of our English language. Linguists are concerned not only with accurate observation of the phenomena of English speech, but with the discovery of the interrelations of the system within which the language operates.

Lamb (16) emphasizes that linguists do not want to abolish traditional grammar, but to devise ways of dramatizing the parts of speech and the grammar of the sentence in daily lessons so that through observation and inductive reasoning a pattern emerges which children use in their own language.

In the study of grammar, and in the other aspects of written and oral expression, the two concepts mentioned--the increased interest in the importance of language and the idea of providing

more functional approaches to language study--are bringing about a change in the language programs. Instead of former formal methods, the new concepts are leading to more direct, personal, and meaningful approaches in order to make the acquiring of language skills more effective.

The Use of Literature as a Medium of Language Instruction

A recent approach to making the study of language more meaningful and practical is that of using literature as a medium of study. Literature is currently being given more consideration in the language program. Heretofore most textbooks neglected the study of literature almost completely.

Artley (17) makes the following statement regarding the neglect of literature and its importance:

> In their concerns about providing the multiplicity of needs in language learning--expression skills, reading and study skills, spelling techniques, and all the others--teachers fail to recognize the importance of literature. Literature provides much of the content for language study and represents the product of skills which children struggle so long to perfect. It is the basis for thinking and further learning. Reading development as well as creative composition is dependent upon literature and children's needs for it.

Leland B. Jacobs (14), Professor of Education at Columbia University, notes that literature is making a comeback in the elementary schools of America because of the vast amount of literature and what it can do for them. He states that "...literature is coming back because it contributes to the creativity that all

children possess to agree; because literature helps children maintain their openness to life; because literature gives children insight into themselves; because literature reflects the beauty of form and order."

According to Dr. Alfred Grommon (11), Professor of Education and English at Stanford University, English is not only the study of language and composition but the study of literature also. "It includes the consideration of values therein and of the processes essential to critical thinking and problem solving; it also includes ...the nourishing of students' imagination and creativeness."

Literature is a means of teaching values, critical thinking and a means of nourishing imagination and creativity. Herrick and Jacobs (12) state the "...literature by reason of its imaginative approach and emotional power, can develop social awareness and understanding of people, of principles, and of social and historical scenes for boys and girls."

The importance of literature in nourishing creativity is noted by Herricks and Jacobs (12):

> Literature can stimulate children to creative endeavors of their own. A story about an everyday experience can be the incentive for the child to tell or write his personal, everyday experience. A fanciful story may lead a child to create his own original world of imaginary characters, situations, happenings that can be told, written, or dramatized. Biography can lead children into their own family backgrounds for descriptions, incidents, 'tall tales', pranks, and the like.

Besides the developing of values, thought, imagination, and

creativity, literature strengthens a child's language skills proficiency. Shane, Mulry, Reddin, and Gillespie (22) indicate that sharing literature with children is one of the most important means of strengthening their total communications skill. "Literature plays an important part in vocabulary building. Grammar and usage ...tend to be improved through the child's continuous exposure to good English in stories. ...The purpose of capitalization and punctuation are sensed by children through their reading."

Literature, then, may be the vehicle to foster good oral and written communication. Not only does literature provide vicarious experiences for children to talk about and write about, but it acquaints them with an endless variety of expression which can become a part of their own expression. (Burns and Lowe, 6)

Besides being a practical and meaningful approach to language skills building, literature adds interest and entertainment to the English curriculum so that children do not dread English as is often the case with traditional language instruction.

The Nebraska English Curriculum

The Nebraska Curriculum, with which the writer experimented in this study, was developed with the idea of using literature as the medium of language instruction. This curriculum is the result of close collaboration between Nebraska classroom teachers and scholars from Nebraska and throughout the United States. It was developed in

the years between 1961 and 1964. (A Curriculum for English, 1)

The entire Nebraska English Curriculum includes complete units of work for all grades from kindergarten through high school and makes some suggestions for the first year of college. The authors explain: "It is not a panacea for present problems in the teaching of English; it is more like a half formed slave struggling to free itself from the stone."

The elementary school phase of the Nebraska Curriculum, with which the writer was concerned, is divided into units of work that center in the study of literature. This literature is often read aloud to the students. According to the authors, oral exposure to literature may quicken children's ears to the "tunes" of language, sharpen their sense of sentence structure, and widen their vocabulary.

The units include work in language and composition integral to literature study. It is not a reading program; its concern is to acquaint children with such literature that will make reading worth the effort, composition in the imitation of excellence, and language study less of a bore.

The Nebraska Curriculum is designed to teach students: "1. to comprehend literature composed for young children, 2. to control linguistic and literary conventions in their own writing, and 3. to comprehend consciously the grammatical conventions which they can handle in their speaking and writing."

Core selections of stories, books, and poems are recommended

for each unit. Suitable substitutes for the core selections are listed, also, for teacher preference and variety. Enrichment works are suggested for students who have mastered the concepts in the core work.

Each unit has background information for the teacher. This section discusses stylistic characteristics of the works, their structure, motif, theme, and the author and his style. It is presupposed that the teacher can teach more efficiently if she understands something of the literary nature of the stories and their place in the curriculum.

The authors consider the most important single facet of the Nebraska Curriculum as being the child's experience with the literature itself. Composition and language activities are to grow directly out of this experience. It is a basic premise of this curriculum that probably the best basis for building a child's competence in composition and his understanding of the nature and possibilities of his native language is an exposure to literature of superior quality over a relatively long period of time.

The Nebraska Curriculum provides for a wide variety of creative composition based upon the literary study. The purpose of this creative writing is to get the children to represent their own thoughts and creations in their own language. Through creative writing it is believed by the authors that children can learn to control a wide variety of grammatical resources of the language in

their compositions if they are given literary models and are invited to do model writing based on the literature given them. Also, they can be led to realize that written language includes certain signals as capitalization and punctuation that oral language does not. They should understand that the thought of any writing is important--important enough to require the signals that will make the thought accessible to others.

In addition to, and as a further means of strengthening the skills of expression, the Nebraska Curriculum offers linguistic explorations in language. The linguistic study of language in the elementary phase of the curriculum is not a formal study, but provisions are made toward giving children some sense of phonology (the science of speech), morphology (the study and description of word formation), and syntax (sentence structure). This linguistic study is directed toward displaying to children that English is primarily a word-order language in which syntax is often of utmost importance, toward giving children an understanding of the sound or "music" of the language, and toward giving them an understanding of the language's historical dimensions--where our vocabulary comes from and how our spelling system has evolved. The authors of the Nebraska Curriculum are of the opinion that these principles of phonology, morphology, and syntax have a place in the elementary language program because they help children to strengthen their grasp of language and its use.

The Nebraska English Curriculum has essentially the same goals as other traditional English programs--that of developing good oral and written skills. The basic difference between the programs is that the Nebraska Curriculum relies on literature as its principal medium of study where traditional programs rely on a variety of experiences to teach language skills.

Summary

Through the consideration of the four aspects of language instruction cited--the need for improvement, the development of new concepts in language instruction, and the Nebraska English Curriculum--it is apparent that the teaching of English is being researched, revised, and modified. Better methods of teaching language skills are needed, are being developed, and are being utilized in order to bring about a better student attitude toward English and a greater language proficiency among the students in our schools. One of the methods being used as an attempt to uplift the language program is the Nebraska English Curriculum.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Population

The population for this study consisted of two heterogeneous groups of 5th grade students in the Wilson School of Bozeman, Montana.

The first group, the experimental group, consisted of 50 students who were taught by the writer through the Nebraska English Curriculum during the 1968-1969 school term. The second group, the control group, also consisted of 50 students. This group was taught by another teacher through a traditional English curriculum where the MacMillan English series was used during the 1966-1967 school term. This particular school term was used from which to select the control group because it was the most recent term in which a traditional curriculum was employed.

In selecting the control group of students the writer selected students who had I. Q. scores similar to those in the experimental group. These I.Q. scores were those obtained on the Otis Quick-Scoring Test of Mental Maturity which was administered to both groups when the students were in the 5th grade. The sex of the students was matched along with the I. Q.'s.

The experimental group will be designated as Group I and the control group as Group II throughout the remainder of this paper.

Procedures

Group I was instructed through the Nebraska English Curriculum during the 1968-1969 school term. The writer taught this group of 5th graders and attempted to follow the designated curriculum as closely as possible.

Group II was instructed through a traditional 5th grade English curriculum where the MacMillan English Series was used. This group was taught by another teacher during the 1966-1967 school term.

Because of school policy, both groups were given additional work in spelling through a traditional spelling series. Also, both groups did some self-instruction work in Lessons for Self-Instruction in Basic Skills, published by the California Test Bureau.

At the end of the year, both Groups I and II were given the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. The grade equivalent scores were obtained on the language section of the test which consisted of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and usage. These scores were compared with the language grade equivalents obtained by the students the previous year on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills when they were 4th graders. This information was obtained from cumulative folders.

Upon obtaining the scores for both groups, the year's growth or regression in language skills was determined for each child. The mean growths were calculated for both groups in the four areas of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and usage, and also in the composite growths.

The difference of the means between Group I and Group II were evaluated, and the significance between the two methods of teaching English were determined at the .05 alpha level. This information is given in Table 1 on page 24. Tables showing the individual growths of the students of both groups, the total growths, and the mean growths are given in Tables 2 and 3 of the appendix.

Limitations

There were four limitations to this study: 1. the two groups of students used in the study were taught by two different teachers; 2. Group I was taught by a teacher who had had several years of experience with the traditional method, while this was the writer's first experience with the Nebraska Curriculum used with Group II; 3. the two groups of students used in the study were from two different school terms; and 4. the test used to measure the achievement growths measured growths only in the areas of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and language usage. Other factors contributing to language proficiency could not be measured by any standard means. These immeasurable factors include composition skills, oral expression skills, listening skills, personal attitudes, and interest in the subject.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

The results of the analysis of variance between achievement scores of students taught by a traditional English curriculum and those taught by the Nebraska English Curriculum, computed by a method recommended by Guilford (9), are shown in Table 1:

TABLE I

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN THE NEBRASKA ENGLISH CURRICULUM AND A TRADITIONAL ENGLISH CURRICULUM ON THE BASIS OF FIVE SELECTED AREAS IN ENGLISH

	Mean			
	Traditional	Nebraska	t-statistic*	Significance
Spelling	1.018	.734	2.536	is significant
Punctuation	1.022	.778	1.987	not significant
Capitalization	1.068	.780	1.973	not significant
Usage	.840	.680	1.221	not significant
Composite	.980	.720	3.095	is significant

*Critical value of t at .05 alpha level is 1.987

Table I shows that the mean growths of students taught through the traditional English Curriculum were higher in all the areas measured, but the analysis of variance shows that there was no significant difference in achievement as a result of the teaching methods in the areas of punctuation, capitalization, and usage.

There was a significant difference between the two methods in the areas of spelling and in the composite scores.

Conclusions

Since the purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of two methods of teaching language skills on the basis of gains in achievement, it can be concluded that there is not a marked difference in achievement between the two methods.

The composite gains for the traditional curriculum appeared to be greater at the .05 significance level. However, three of the four categories investigated were not significantly different.

It is the opinion of the writer that if the areas of vocabulary growth, student interest, and student attitude could have been measured, the students under the Nebraska Curriculum would have exhibited superior gains.

Through personal teaching experience with both the traditional and the Nebraska Curriculum, the writer feels that students experiencing the Nebraska Curriculum display more interest and have a more positive attitude toward English than do the students under the traditional method.

Since the students taught through the Nebraska English Curriculum seem to show a greater interest in and a better attitude toward English, and since they show achievement growth comparable to students taught through a traditional method, it appears to the

writer that the Nebraska English Curriculum merits a place in the English programs of our schools.

Recommendations

The following recommendations based on this study are suggested:

1. Further research and experimenting needs to be done in the field of language instruction.

2. Further studies in using the Nebraska English Curriculum as opposed to the traditional method of teaching English should be made with other groups of students, with the same teacher conducting both groups, and perhaps over a longer period of time.

3. Studies might be done where the traditional method of English teaching is used to supplement the Nebraska English Curriculum.

4. Studies might be done using the Nebraska English Curriculum to supplement the traditional method of teaching English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A Curriculum for English, University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

2. Anderson, Paul S., Language Skills in Elementary Education, The MacMillan Company, 1968.

3. Anderson, Veran Dieckman; Anderson, Paul S.; Ballantine, Francis; and Howes, Virgil M., Readings in the Language Arts, The MacMillan Company, 1964.

4. Applegate, Mauree, Easy in English, Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.

5. Buchan, Vivian, "An Open Letter to a Beginning Language Arts Teacher", Elementary English, October, 1966.

6. Burns, Paul C. and Lowe, Alberta L., The Language Arts in Childhood Education , Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

7. Dawson, Mildred and Zollinger, Marian, Guiding Language Learning, World Book Company, 1957.

8. Dawson, Mildred A.; Zollinger, Marian; and Elwell, Ardell, Guiding Language Learning, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

9. Guilford, J. P., Fundamental Statisics in Psychology and Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

10. Greene, Harry A. and Petty, Walter T., Developing Language Skills in the Elementary Schools, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963.

11. Grommon, Alfred H., "Once More---What Is English?", Elementary English, March, 1967.

12. Herrick, Virgil E. and Jacobs, Leland B., Children and the Language Arts, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

13. Jacobs, Leland B., "Give Children Literature", Education Today, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Bulletin No. 22.

14. Jacobs, Leland B., "Literature Stages a Comeback", Education Today, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Bulletin No. 26.

15. Jenkins, William A., "The State of English Teaching", Elementary English, March, 1968.

16. Lamb, Pose, Guiding Children's Language Learning, Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1967.

17. MacCampbell, James C.,Readings in the Language Arts in the Elementary School, C. C. Heath and Company, 1964.

18. Marckwardt, Albert H., Linguistics and the Teaching of English, Indiana University Press, 1966.

19. Martin, Bill, Jr., "Helping Children Claim Language Through Literature", Elementary English, May, 1968.

20. Miller, James E., Jr., "Literature as a Way of Knowing", Elementary English , March 1969.

21. Moffett, James, A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

22. Shane, Harold G.; Mulry, June Grant; Reddin, Mary E.; Gillespie, Margaret C., Improving Language Arts Instruction in the Elementary School, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1962.

23. Tidyman, Willard F. and Butterfield, Marguerite, Teaching the Language Arts, McCraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

24. Trauger, Wilmer K., Language Arts in Elementary Schools, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

25. Wolfe, Don M., Language Arts and Life Patterns, The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961.

APPENDIX

TABLE II

ACHIEVEMENT GAINS FOR GROUP I

Student	Sex	I. Q.	Spelling	Punctuation	Capitalization	Usage	Composite
1.	F	135	1.5	1.1	1.3	.6	1.2
2.	M	130	1.1	.7	1.5	2.2	1.4
3.	F	129	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1
4.	M	128	1.6	1.5	1.0	-.1	1.1
5.	F	127	.7	1.2	.5	.2	.7
6.	F	126	1.9	1.5	.5	.6	.8
7.	F	126	-.2	1.2	3.2	1.1	1.5
8.	M	125	1.4	2.0	1.1	1.7	1.5
9.	M	125	1.1	2.1	1.3	1.6	1.6
10.	M	123	.9	.4	.5	1.6	.8
11.	M	123	-.4	.3	.2	-.6	-.2
12.	M	122	1.5	.2	-.7	.2	.3
13.	F	121	1.1	1.3	.2	1.0	.9
14.	M	119	-1.1	.0	.9	-.4	-.1
15.	F	119	.0	.7	1.5	.5	.7
16.	F	119	1.8	2.7	1.8	1.9	2.0
17.	M	119	.5	1.1	-1.5	.1	.2
18.	M	118	-.4	.9	.1	-.7	.0
19.	F	118	.9	1.1	2.2	2.1	1.6
20.	M	118	1.4	-.5	-1.0	1.6	.3
21.	M	117	1.2	.5	.9	1.5	1.0
22.	M	117	.9	.9	.1	2.0	.9
23.	F	117	1.1	.9	.8	.2	.7
24.	F	116	.5	.3	.7	-.4	.3
25.	M	115	.5	1.4	.6	-.5	.5
26.	F	114	1.5	2.5	.8	-.1	1.2
27.	M	114	.0	.6	1.1	.6	.6
28.	F	114	1.1	1.7	.2	.5	1.2
29.	M	114	-.1	.5	1.4	-.5	.3
30.	F	113	.3	.7	.3	.1	.3
31.	M	112	-1.1	.6	2.0	1.0	.6
32.	M	112	.5	.8	.8	1.0	.9
33.	F	112	.3	.0	1.1	.6	.5
34.	F	111	.9	2.6	1.3	2.1	1.7
35.	M	111	.6	-.6	1.0	1.9	.7
36.	F	110	-.8	-2.1	1.5	1.3	-.7
37.	M	109	.6	-.4	.2	.7	.2
38.	F	107	-.3	.3	-2.6	.5	-.6

39.	F	106	2.6	1.6	1.7	.2	1.6
40.	F	106	1.3	1.1	1.8	.2	1.1
41.	F	106	.9	1.1	.9	1.6	1.1
42.	F	105	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.1	.9
43.	F	104	.5	-.2	1.0	-.5	.2
44.	M	103	1.1	-1.4	-.7	.4	.0
45.	F	103	1.9	.1	2.1	.3	1.1
46.	M	102	2.0	-.1	1.0	.0	.7
47.	F	102	1.7	2.8	1.1	-.8	.6
48.	M	97	-1.2	-.6	.8	.8	-.1
49.	M	95	.4	1.1	-.3	2.1	.8
50.	M	95	.5	-.3	.3	.8	.3
Total Growth			36.7	38.9	39.0	30.4	36.0
Mean Growth			.734	.778	.780	.680	.720

ACHIEVEMENT GAINS FOR GROUP II

Student	Sex	I. Q.	Spelling	Punctuation	Capitalization	Usage	Composite
1.	F	136	.6	.7	1.8	.7	1.1
2.	M	130	.8	1.8	.9	-.3	.7
3.	F	129	1.2	1.8	.7	1.6	1.2
4.	M	127	.9	1.3	.7	1.8	1.3
5.	F	128	2.0	1.2	1.3	.9	1.3
6.	F	125	.4	1.5	.7	1.1	.9
7.	F	124	1.6	1.0	1.7	.9	.9
8.	M	126	.3	1.2	1.3	-.5	.3
9.	M	125	1.0	1.1	-.1	1.5	.9
10.	M	125	2.3	1.2	1.0	.6	1.3
11.	M	122	2.1	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.3
12.	M	122	-.2	1.0	-.4	-.8	-.1
13.	F	120	1.5	1.6	.8	.0	.8
14.	M	117	2.8	.8	1.3	-.3	1.4
15.	F	119	2.2	1.7	1.9	1.4	1.7
16.	F	117	.9	1.9	2.0	.4	1.3
17.	M	117	.8	.2	-.9	1.2	.4
18.	M	117	1.0	1.6	1.1	1.5	1.0
19.	F	118	1.1	.5	1.6	1.7	1.3
20.	M	116	1.5	2.3	1.2	2.9	1.7
21.	M	116	-.2	2.5	.9	1.9	1.3
22.	M	116	-.4	-2.7	-.4	-.9	-1.1
23.	F	117	.8	1.1	1.7	-.5	.7
24.	F	115	1.1	.7	1.2	.7	1.0
25.	M	115	.8	.2	-.5	1.1	1.0
26.	F	113	2.0	1.8	1.5	.4	1.4
27.	M	114	2.3	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.6
28.	F	113	.8	1.2	2.2	-.5	.7
29.	M	114	.8	1.4	1.8	1.5	1.4
30.	F	113	1.2	.8	.6	-.6	.5
31.	M	113	.8	.2	-1.0	1.1	.2
32.	M	113	1.5	.9	-.1	.4	.8
33.	F	112	.9	.4	1.4	1.5	1.1
34.	F	111	1.1	-.6	.1	1.5	1.1
35.	M	112	-.2	1.0	1.2	1.0	.9
36.	F	110	.7	1.4	1.2	2.0	1.2
37.	M	107	1.0	.4	2.4	-.2	.9
38.	F	107	.7	2.3	1.5	1.6	1.5

39.	F	107	.7	-1.1	2.3	.6	.6
40.	F	106	1.8	1.8	1.2	1.3	1.6
41.	F	105	2.3	1.0	1.2	2.0	1.7
42.	F	105	1.0	.0	1.6	1.0	1.0
43.	F	105	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.3	1.5
44.	M	105	.2	3.3	4.2	.6	2.0
45.	F	103	1.0	.1	-.3	.4	.4
46.	M	101	.1	.7	.9	-.9	.2
47.	F	101	.1	-.3	1.0	1.0	.6
48.	M	99	1.4	.8	1.7	.8	.3
49.	M	95	.0	-.5	.4	2.2	.5
50.	M	95	.3	1.5	2.7	.7	1.3
Total Growth			50.9	51.1	53.4	42.0	49.0
Mean Growth			1.018	1.022	1.068	.840	.980