ABSTRACT
        The purpose of this pilot study was to collect
information on the feasibility of designing a controlled experimental
project to test the effectiveness of a new grammar called "sector
analysis" on improving student writing. The fourth, seventh, and
ninth grade materials used in this study were based on this new
approach to teaching writing. Both classes with disadvantaged and
classes with non-disadvantaged students at these three grade levels
were included in the project. Conclusions were that teachers who had
some training with the materials tended to be more comfortable and
imaginative in their teaching; an examination of student work-texts
showed that the content could be understood by most classes; the
materials were difficult to comprehend for students with severe
language problems; and the most frequent comments by participating
teachers were that their students were more aware of structure in
composing sentences and were more willing to experiment with new
patterns at the end of the project. An examination of writing samples
of the students further indicated growth at all three levels with the
most dramatic growth occurring at grade four. It was recommended that
a longitudinal study be undertaken to determine if the improvement of
the students was directly a result of the "sector analysis"
materials. (RB)

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

33 West 42 Street

New York, New York 10036

A Pilot Project for Testing Linguistically-Oriented Materials for the

Teaching of Writing in New York City Schools

By: Richard D. Allen, Doris Stotts and Edward M. Ouchi

This report details a project funded by the Center for Urban Education. The project was under the direction of Professor Robert Allen, Teachers College: Doris Stotts and Edward M. Ouchi Associates; Teachers College.

Period of Project:

    School year 1966-67.

Number and Location of Participating Schools:

    Manhattan - 3; Bronx - 2; Brooklyn - 4; Queens - 2; Richmond - 1. (See Appendix A.)

Number and Grade Levels of Participating Teachers:

    Grade 4 - 7; Grade 7 - 7; Grade 9 - 7. (See Appendix B.)

Materials Being Used:

    Discovery I (Grade 4); Exploration I (Grades 7 and 9).

Number of Observations by Project Directors:

    90. (See Appendix C for sample of the Classroom Observation Form.)

In-service Training Sessions:

    Elementary teachers - 30; secondary teachers - 30.

I. THE PROBLEM

One of the most important forms of communication in our modern world is the kind of communication that goes on between a writer and his readers. It is only through various systems of written language that writers of the past continue to communicate with us today and we, through our ability to understand those systems of written language, with them. And, as Ralph B. Long says,

> Recorders and television notwithstanding, it seems safe to predict that in the foreseeable future complex thought will still be communicated most satisfactorily by the written language.[1]

For this reason the ability to read and write is the key to becoming a truly educated person, and effective instruction in reading and writing is basic to a program of quality education in our schools. Yet the number of remedial reading classes and the complaints of colleges and industry about the writing deficiencies of high school graduates indicate that our schools are not doing a very satisfactory job of teaching these basic skills.

In recent years linguistic science has made significant advances in the study of the English language, and many linguists have begun to address themselves to the problem of improving instruction in the basic language skills in our schools. One of the most promising developments is a new grammar of English developed by Professor Robert L. Allen of Teachers College, Columbia University. He calls it "sector analysis." Sector analysis, unlike other linguistic grammars that focus on spoken English or on words or on complicated sequences of rules, is a grammar

---

[1] Ralph B. Long, The Sentence and Its Parts: A Grammar of Contemporary English (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 6.

of written English and emphasizes both the word order of written-sentences and the kinds of constructions (not individual words) that may occupy the different positions, called "sectors," in a sentence.

There is evidence to suggest that the ability to identify the sectors in a sentence will, more than anything else, help a child to recognize the structure of a sentence and thus to read the sentence intelligently. There is also reason to believe that students can learn to write, and especially to edit their own writing, more effectively when they are made aware of the different kinds of constructions (of which there are only ten) and of the different sectors they may occupy, and when this knowledge is reinforced by practice in making up such constructions, in manipulating them, in shifting them around.

Reports from teachers using sector analysis in other parts of the country have clearly indicated that the essentials of this approach to sentence structure can be taught in the elementary grades, where it can provide students with a guide for the extension of their own writing and with an instrument that they can use when, in the upper grades, they examine good writing.

II. OBJECTIVES

This pilot project was intended to achieve these objectives:

1. To collect information that would be useful in evaluating the project materials and to investigate the feasibility of designing a controlled experimental project to test the effectiveness of these linguistically-oriented materials in improving student writing. For example:

   a. How much preparation in linguistics and in the use of

these materials do teachers need in grades four,

seven, and nine?

b. How effective are the materials as assessed by the

subjective judgments of the participating teachers

and the project directors?

c. What revisions or adaptations of the materials, if

any, are needed for effective use with disadvantaged

students?

2. To see whether, after a year's work with sector analysis,

intermediate school students can use the tools provided by

this kind of analysis to their own reading and writing and

to the analysis of the styles of different writers.

III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The materials used in this pilot study were based on Robert L.

Allen's approach to the teaching of grammar, known as sector analysis.

The seventh- and ninth-grade materials (Exploration series) were written

by a team of writers from Teachers College, headed by Dr. Allen, as were

the elementary materials (Discovery series).

In order to determine the effectiveness of these materials in

classes with disadvantaged students as well as in classes with non-

disadvantaged students, this project included both kinds of classes on

the three grade levels. To determine how much training the teachers in

the larger experimental study would need to use the materials most ef-

fectively, the project included four groups of teachers with each group

representing a different level of training. The levels of training and

procedures for training and supervision may be described as follows:

GROUP I: These teachers had two semesters or more of preparation in sector analysis (but not neces-sarily including the actual teaching of sector analysis to their students). There were no training classes for this group, but weekly con-ferences were held for consideration of problems which occurred with their use of the materials and/or their methods of presentation.

GROUP II: These teachers had a one-semester course in sector analysis. They received thirty (30) training and consultation sessions with Group III.[1] During this training period, they used the materials with their students.

GROUP III: These teachers had no previous courses in sector analysis. They were required to attend the thirty in-service training sessions during which time they also used the sector analysis materials in their classrooms.

GROUP IV: These teachers had no previous courses and did not attend the training classes. They did, how-ever, meet with a consultant once each week during the initial stages of the project to discuss prob-lems which occurred in their use of the materials and/or their methods of presentation. (Whenever possible, pairs of teachers were selected from schools in which a principal or supervisor had already been trained in sector analysis.)

The in-service training classes for Groups II and III included instruction in sector analysis and in the use of the materials to be used the following week as well as discussion of problems encountered by the teachers in the preceding week. The conferences with Groups I and IV dealt with the materi-als used the previous week, and with those to be used in the succeeding weeks.

The teachers in Groups I and II were selected from class lists of courses at Teachers College or institutes in which sector analysis has been taught. Teachers in Groups III and IV were selected from teachers who evi-denced an interest in the materials even though they had never had actual

---

[1] The elementary and secondary teachers met in separate sessions because of the varying degrees of complexity of the materials on the two grade levels.

trainihg in sector analysis. Wherever possible, these teachers were selected from a list of recommendations submitted by principals and supervisors who had expressed an interest in this pilot project.

The distribution of teachers and classes are summarized in Table I:

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS AND CLASSES BY TYPES

Teachers:		FOURTH GRADE				TOTALS	SEVENTH GRADE				TOTALS	NINTH GRADE				TOTALS	GRAND TOTALS
	Type	I	II	III	IV		I	II	III	IV		I	II	III	IV		
	No.	2	1	2	2	7	1	2	2	2	7	3	1	2	2	8	22
Classes:	Disadv.	1	1	1	2	5			1	2	3	1	1			2	10
	Non-disadv.	1		1		2		1	1		2						4
	Mixed						1	1			2	2		2	2	6	8

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Linguistics Project began with a general meeting of all participating teachers at Teachers College, Columbia University, on September 21, 1966. The group was addressed by Professor Robert L. Allen, project director, who gave the background of linguistics in general as well as a specific orientation to sector analysis.

During the first three weeks in October, teachers received weekly consultation or in-service training sessions with the associate directors prior to their using the linguistic materials in their classrooms. Actual classroom use of the materials began the last week of October. Samples of student writing were collected before initial presentation of the linguistic materials.

Beginning in November, the teachers were observed teaching the materials in their classrooms on a regularly scheduled basis. Their presentations were, for the most part, consistent with the content and procedures outlined in the

materials. Generally, the teachers were found to be both cooperative and
enthusiastic.

The teachers reported, and the directors observed, that the degree
of students' enthusiasm toward the materials was extremely high in almost
all classes. In many instances, for example, the students requested addi-
tional grammar time. True insight as to the nature of language relation-
ships was evidenced in many of the classes observed at all three grade
levels.

At the end of the first semester, a mid-year evaluation questionnaire
was distributed to each participating teacher. (See Appendix E for a sample
questionnaire.) The responses of the teachers are summarized in Table II on
page 10.

During the second semester, most of the teachers began to work more
freely with the materials. Several teachers were observed teaching lessons
which were creative and extremely stimulating. The responses of the students
in these classes, both elementary and secondary, indicated an increasing
command of the grammar as well as a willingness to utilize their newly-
learned concepts in oral and written communication.

At the end of the project, each participating teacher completed an
evaluation questionnaire. (See Appendix F for sample.) The responses of
the teachers are summarized in Table III on pages 11 and 12.

Student work-texts were collected in June even though some classes
had not completed their books. Pages were selected for examination in
order to determine how successful students were in completing exercises
at different stages in the project.

Samples of student writing were also collected at that time for

comparison with the samples which had been collected at the beginning of
the project.

V.   EVALUATION

The following evaluative procedures were used:

1. A suitable form to collect pertinent biographical and
    professional data on the participating teachers. (See
    Appendix D.)

2. A mid-year evaluative questionnaire for teachers. (See
    Appendix E.)

3. A year-end evaluation of the project by each participating
    teacher. (See Appendix F.)

4. Analysis of selected completed pages from the work-texts,
    used in the project.

5. The collection of pre- and post-project samples of
    student writing for comparative purposes.

An examination of the information gleaned from the biographical
and professional data form, in the light of the performance of teachers
as observed by the directors and of subsequent student success in the
work-texts, indicated that age and years of experience seemed to be less
relevant to the success of any particular teacher than that teacher's
commitment to the goals of the project and to teaching in general. Even
teachers with little previous experience in the classroom and no previous
training in linguistics were able to produce exceptionally fine results
through imaginative teaching and extra effort. Students whose teachers
explicitly (rather than implicitly) directed application of skills acquired
through use of the materials to the students' own writing seemed considerably

more capable of utilizing that knowledge in their writing--and specifically in editing their own work.

Table II, on page 10, summarizes the responses of the participating teachers to the mid-year evaluation questionnaire; Table III, on pages 11 and 12, summarizes the responses to the year-end questionnaire. The general intent of both questionnaires was to obtain the teachers' subjective evaluation of the materials and of their students' response to them. The mid-year questionnaire was, of course, oriented more towards identifying any points of difficulty in the materials and the types of teaching problems encountered by the teachers. Actually, some of this information was already known to the associate directors, who had maintained continuous contact with the teachers and their students through regular classroom observations. The year-end questionnaire, on the other hand, concentrated on obtaining the teachers' evaluation of their year's experience with the materials in these general areas: the appropriateness of the materials for their type of class, the response of the students to the materials, and the effects, if any, on their students' other language arts skills.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF TEACHER RESPONSES TO MID-YEAR QUESTIONNAIRES
(See Appendix E for the Questionnaire itself)

Item	Response	Grade 4	Grades 7 & 9	Total
	yes	3	10	13
	no	0	0	0
1	qualified yes	4	2	6
	qualified no	0	2	2
	no problems	2	4	6
	lessons take too many class periods	0	4	4
2*	format unsuitable for slow students	2	4	6
	heterogeneous classes	3	2	5
	exercises boring	0	2	2
	not enough drill	1	0	1
3	yes (some carry-over)	7	9	16
	no (too early to tell)	0	5	5
	yes (some difficulty in teaching)	3	4	7
4	no (no difficulty in teaching)	2	10	12
	qualified yes	2	0	2
5	yes (sufficient help received)	7	13	20
	no	0	1	1
6	none (no unmet needs)	7	14	21
	1-2 periods a week	0	7	7
7	2-3 (Grade 4 period = 30 minutes)	0	6	6
	3-4	5	1	6
	4-5	2	0	2
	more (than previously)	5	9	14
8	less	0	0	0
	same	2	5	7
	1 hour or less (preparation time)	4	7	11
	2 hours or less	3	7	10
9+	more (than previously)	5	6	11
	less	0	2	2
	same	2	4	6
	students are learning	3	6	9
	appealing approach (to students)	5	7	12
10*	students motivated by success	0	1	1
	some "C" exercises (Exploration)	0	1	1
	teacher self-improvement	3	0	3
	none (no least satisfactory aspects)	3	4	7
	difficulty of some lessons	3	6	9
11*	not enough drill	1	0	1
	lack of creative writing exercises	0	1	1
	difficulty of reconciling old and new approaches	0	2	2

* The items marked with an asterisk are those with variable responses; that is, the grade 4 responses will not total 7, and the responses for grades 7 and 9 will not total 14.

+ Two grade 9 teachers are beginning teachers; they could not compare their preparation time for these materials with previous years. The total responses for grades 7 and 9, therefore, total only 12.

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF TEACHER RESPONSES TO YEAR-END QUESTIONNAIRES
(See Appendix F for the Questionnaire itself)

Item	Response	Grade 4	Grade 7	Grade 9	Total
1	Reading level:				
	Above grade	2	1		3
	Grade level			1	1
	Below grade	2	2	2	6
	Mixed	1	2	3	6
	Scholastic ability:				
	Very good	1	1		2
	Average	1	1	1	3
	Limited	3	2	1	6
	Mixed		1	4	5
	Ethnic composition:				
	Mainly white	2	1	4	7
	Mainly non-white	3	2	2	7
	Mixed		2		2
2	Appropriate	3	1	2	6
	Qualified appropriate	2	4	4	10
	Inappropriate	0	0	0	0
2a	Work-text format	3	1	2	6
	Subject-predicate marking system	3			3
	Word-games	3			3
	Meaningful terminology & concepts	2	1	2	5
	X words		2	2	4
	Multi-level analysis		2		2
	Sequential approach		2	4	6
	Gives students feeling of achievement		1	1	2
	Different kinds of English		1	1	2
2b	Difficult vocabulary and directions	2	2	1	5
	Difficult refinements	1			1
	More exercises needed	1			1
	Boinguage patterns		1		1
	Uninteresting sentences		1	2	3
	Exercise C			2	2
	Difficulty with advanced concepts			1	1
	None	2	2	1	5
3	Work too difficult	1		1	2
	Need for readiness preparation	1		1	2
	Need for lesson plans		1		1
	Lessons required too much time		2	2	4
	Loss of interest			2	2
	None	3	1		4
4	Yes	4	3	2	9
	Qualified yes		1	2	3
	No	1	0	1	2
	Qualified no			1	1
	Don't know		1		1

TABLE III

Item	Response	Grade 4	Grade 7	Grade 9	Total
5a	Better	4	4	4	12
	Worse		1	1	2
	Same	1		1	2
5b	Better	4	5	6	15
	Worse	0	0	0	0
	Same	0	0	0	0
5c	Better	4	3	4	11
	Worse	0	0	0	0
	Same	1	2	2	5
5d	Better	3	2	3	8
	Worse	0	0	0	0
	Same	2	3	3	8
5e	Exceptional enthusiasm	2		1	3
	Individual training	1			1
	Ability to work alone	1			1
	More oral participation		1		1
	Wrote more		1		1
	Wrote more imaginatively		1		1
7	Yes	5	5	6	16
	No	0	0	0	0
8	Prior acquaintance of materials	1			1
	One semester	2	3	1	6
	Consultation services			1	1
9	Yes	5	3	4	12
	Qualified yes		1	2	3
	No	0	1	0	1

At the mid-year point in the project the teachers who reported difficulty in using the linguistic materials were most often teaching in disadvantaged areas of the city or in heterogeneously grouped classes in which the differences in students' abilities posed problems. Many of the difficulties encountered were in those items that relied heavily on a native speaker's feeling for the English language--which many language-disadvantaged children lack. This difficulty may be overcome by revising the materials to take into account the differences in the linguistic backgrounds of such students.

The reports of carry-over to other language activities ranged from evidence of keener awareness of the structure of English to claims of actual improvement in writing and reading skills. Some teachers reported more consistent use of complete standard English sentences in classes in which fragmentary sentences

had previously been the usual sentence type found orally and on papers.
Since direct carry-over was not anticipated before the completion of at
least the first book in each series, these reports were somewhat surprising.

The most satisfactory element in the project at mid-year seemed to be
the enthusiastic response of the students to the materials as well as the
very real learning evidenced both by students and teachers. The exchange
of experiences in the in-service sessions proved to be very stimulating to
many of the project teachers. The least satisfactory part of the project
seemed to lie in the frustrations of teachers of the disadvantaged students.
Disadvantaged students tend to find most language activities difficult.
Certain revisions in the format and presentation of the materials may be
able to counter some of these problems.

The responses on the year-end questionnaire repeated, for the most
part, both the favorable and unfavorable comments made on the mid-year
evaluations. Teachers of disadvantaged classes reported that the major
difficulties encountered by their students were in connection with lessons
dealing with concepts which seemed to require a native speaker's feeling for
the language: e.g., filling out elliptical sentences, understanding and re-
producing embedded constructions. Some of these teachers stated, however,
that if they had had more time to spend on teaching these concepts, instead
of the other areas of the total curriculum required by their courses of
study, their students would have achieved as much as the other students.
Even the teachers of the most noticeably language-disadvantaged classes
reported progress in all language-arts areas (item 5 on the year-end
questionnaire).

The following represent the range of comments made in response to

item 10:

> I think that the project needed more time. In the high
> school we were hampered by required reading, mid-terms; etc..
> Perhaps if the project lasted for two years I could have seen
> more progress.

> The material is excellent for bright children who welcome
> an intellectual challenge. It is often too abstract for slow
> children.

> My students became excited about language. They began to
> consider the many ways they used and misused words. They be-
> gan to develop ways to sharpen their speech, to listen more
> critically, to edit their writing. They began, finally, to
> learn the distinction between spoken and written English, be-
> tween formal and informal language, between standard English and
> the many dialects spoken in America. They began, in short, to
> develop a healthy curiosity about their own language.

In tabulating the answers of students on selected exercises in the

work-texts, the classes were coded in terms of grade level, the prior

linguistic training of the teacher, the language competence of the class

in general, and the range of ability in the class. Table IV explains

the coded designations for each class in the project:

TABLE IV

CLASSIFICATION OF CLASSES BY GRADES[1]

Grade Code	Teacher Code	Class Code	Class Type	General Ability
4	I	1	mixed	average to bright
4	I	2	disadvantaged	slow to average
4	II	1	disadvantaged	slow to average
4	III	1	non-disadvantaged	extremely bright
4	III	2	disadvantaged	slow
4	IV	1	disadvantaged	slow
4	IV	2	disadvantaged	slow to average
7	I	1	mixed	slow to above average
7	II	1	non-disadvantaged	bright
7	II	2	mixed	slow to above average
7	III	1	non-disadvantaged	bright
7	IV	1	disadvantaged	slow
7	IV	2	disadvantaged	slow
9	I	1	disadvantaged	average
9	I	2	mixed	slow to average
9	I	3	mixed	slow to average
9	II	1	disadvantaged	slow to average
9	III	1	mixed	average
9	III	2	mixed	average
9	IV	1	mixed	slow to bright
9	IV	2	mixed	slow to bright

[1] The Roman numeral designation assigned to each class corresponds to the classification by teacher types in Table I.

Tables V, VI, and VII, below, summarize the results of checking

each participating student's work-text. (See Appendices G and H for

samples of the check lists used.) The purpose of the examination of ,

'these texts was to ascertain for each individual, and then for each class,

the number of correct responses for each selected exercise in relation to,

the number of items tried in that exercise. Because the work-text was

carefully structured to progress from fairly easy exercises to more compli-

cated ones, exercises were chosen by the evaluators which seemed to best

reflect the progress which students were making at various significant

stages of this sequential presentation. Almost every exercise examined

was one in which the student was asked to write sentences or constructions

according to the instruction which he had previously received. Some of

these writing assignments were closely structured, while others allowed for

free writing on the part of the students. A student who, for one reason or

another, did not complete more than half of his work-text was eliminated

from the sample. This procedure was necessary due to the fact that it was

not possible to determine whether his failure to complete the text was due

to absence, withdrawal from school, or inability to do the work. In some

instances, the whole class failed to complete the text. In these cases,

the items are reported as Q in the tables.

TABLE V   17.

SUMMARY OF GRADE 4 RESULTS FOR DISCOVERY I

Page		I_1	I_2	II_1	III_1	III_2	IV_1	IV_2
20-21	No. Right	339	227	234	400	325	283	257
	No. Tried	360	260	256	405	329	309	283
22-23	No. Right	118	63	79	127	82	78	76
	No. Tried	125	76	81	135	89	92	93
39-40	No. Right	139	86	73	230	0	112	159
	No. Tried	240	114	90	259	0	131	178
50	No. Right	185	71	96	205	0	0	132
	No. Tried	199	85	113	216	0	0	152
57	No. Right	146	147	134	263	173	167	165
	No. Tried	237	157	173	270	192	196	210
70	No. Right (a)	42	43	38	64	46	28	58
	No. Tried	96	54	44	108	77	38	68
	No. Right (b)	42	39	34	61	37	25	56
	No. Tried	96	51	42	108	71	37	67
	No. Right (c)	1	11	0	3	1	2	5
	No. Tried	16	12	0	13	5	6	8
73-74	No. Right (a)	59	31	55	189	94	32	0
	No. Tried	65	100	96	223	160	174	0
	No. Right (b)[1]	17	12	32	11	6	35	0
	No. Tried	65	100	96	223	160	174	0
93	No. Right (a)	63	9	0	33	0	6	0
	No. Tried	120	14	0	135	0	31	0
	No. Right (b)	55	5	0	97	0	9	0
	No. Tried	120	14	0	135	0	31	0
94	No. Right (a)[2]	85	6	0	139	0	103	0
	No. Tried	110	6	0	146	0	120	0
	No. Right (b)[2]	50	4	0	118	0	69	0
	No. Tried	110	6	0	146	0	120	0
	No. Right (c)[2]	81	7	0	192	0	127	0
	No. Tried	110	6	0	146	0	120	0

[1] A small number is preferred in this item.

[2] Number correct may be larger than number tried.

TABLE VI   18.

SUMMARY OF GRADE 7 RESULTS FOR <u>EXPLORATION I</u>

Page		I_1	II_1	II_2	III_1	IV_1	IV_2
7	No. Right	112	155	104	130	65	124
	No. Tried	115	155	120	130	65	125
13	No. Right (a)	61	68	9	70	33	33
	No. Tried	209	300	228	260	105	250
	No. Right (b)	62	9	8	4	6	0
	No. Tried	209	300	228	260	105	250
	No. Right (c)	5	0	1	4	0	0
	No. Tried	209	300	228	260	105	250
15	No. Right	342	446	315	389	185	371
	No. Tried	342	449	345	390	195	380
25	No. Right	209	246	132	212	120	120
	No. Tried	225	296	212	288	130	202
28	No. Right (a)	79	169	86	135	74	82
	No. Tried	96	172	117	146	78	88
	No. Right (b)	74	137	58	132	66	32
	No. Tried	96	172	117	146	78	88
34	No. Right	64	95	25	87	32	0
	No. Tried	84	95	68	88	34	0
37	No. Right	132	185	116	155	0	0
	No. Tried	132	185	136	156	0	0
49	No. Right	176	240	114	232	0	0
	No. Tried	204	300	197	252	0	0
52	No. Right	72	195	85	172	0	0
	No. Tried	78	196	126	174	0	0
55	No. Right	0	189	75	182	0	0
	No. Tried	0	192	145	182	0	0
59	No. Right	0	103	25	56	0	0
	No. Tried	0	109	43	57	0	0

TABLE VII   19.

SUMMARY OF GRADE 9 RESULTS FOR __EXPLORATION I__

Page		I_1	I_2	I_3	II_1	III_1	III_2	IV_1	IV_2
7	No. Right	90	150	129	80	78	88	119	95
	No. Tried	90	150	129	88	78	90	119	95
13	No. Right (a)	42	111	51	17	49	46	60	37
	No. Tried	180	310	126	193	166	174	238	182
	No. Right (b)	2	20	13	3	18	11	8	16
	No. Tried	180	310	126	193	166	174	238	182
	No. Right (c)	1	6	0	7	0	3	0	0
	No. Tried	180	310	126	193	166	174	238	182
15	No. Right	267	470	365	247	250	265	347	279
	No. Tried	283	480	381	266	255	268	356	285
25	No. Right	114	164	70	97	60	162	150	133
	No. Tried	150	248	99	152	94	189	183	158
28	No. Right (a)	85	40	23	94	78	97	96	71
	No. Tried	86	40	26	102	95	103	104	76
	No. Right (b)	61	36	22	75	71	62	85	47
	No. Tried	86	40	26	102	95	103	104	76
34	No. Right	8	78	94	15	48	83	87	57
	No. Tried	10	85	103	28	58	96	93	62
37	No. Right	71	167	129	85	95	106	132	101
	No. Tried	71	168	131	98	95	109	135	106
49	No. Right	98	33	148	108	100	137	186	144
	No. Tried	125	40	192	159	130	169	215	179
52	No. Right	69	53	64	115	56	91	127	112
	No. Tried	70	54	66	117	56	109	130	112
55	No. Right	70	0	0	77	42	61	105	91
	No. Tried	70	0	0	110	42	67	114	98
59	No. Right	8	0	0	57	0	17	59	33
	No. Tried	8	0	0	69	8	23	61	34

The results for Grade 4 show that two classes, I_1 and III_1, did noticeably better than all the others. While one of the two teachers had prior linguistic training, the other had in-service training concurrent with the project. Both of these teachers had classes with superior children. Unfortunately, the project did not include a teacher without prior linguistic training who had a superior class. For this reason, it is not possible to state definitely whether it was the training of the two teachers or the ability of their children which was the controlling factor in their superior performance. Both teachers were also strongly committed to the goals of the project and were considered excellent teachers by the investigators. Without a controlled study, however, it is not possible to determine just how relevant these factors of commitment, teaching ability, and student ability are since some, but not all, disadvantaged classes also performed well.

The results for Grade 7 show that the two bright classes, II_1 and III_1, performed appreciably better than the others. One of the two teachers had had some prior linguistic training, but not a course in sector analysis, and both received in-service training concurrent with the project. Again, the controlling factor seemed to be the ability of the students, but this inference is open to question due to the fact that the students in I_1, a group of slow to above average students, also performed very well on the parts they completed. It is worth noting that the scores for Lesson 4, Exercise B (page 13 on Table VI), show that class I_1 did better than either of the two bright classes, II_1 and III_1. The better performance of I_1 is directly attributable to the teacher's efforts. This exercise asks the student to write his own subject nominals for the predicates given in the exercise. He is free to use single words or constructions, but the teacher of class I_1 urged her

students to write subject nominals of more than three words. The score
of 6½ on (b) shows that this encouragement resulted in her class using
more post-nuclear adjectival phrases than all the other seventh-grade
classes put together.

The two classes that did not perform as well as the others were
IV_1 and IV_2. It should be noted that these two classes were composed of
students with severe language handicaps. In both classes the students
came from homes in which "standard" English was not spoken, and in the
case of IV_1, many came from non-English speaking homes.

The results for Grade 9 are even more difficult to evaluate inasmuch
as all the classes were heterogeneously grouped. The two classes that per-
formed very well, IV_1 and IV_2, were taught by the same creative teacher.
It should also be noted that his students ranged in ability from slow to
bright, whereas those in the other classes ranged from slow to average.
Once again, the ability of the students seemed to be the controlling factor,
but further evidence of a statistical nature would be needed to substantiate
this conclusion, since some of the scores for the other classes are comparable
to, or better than, those of IV_2. Classes I_2 and I_3, for example, performed
appreciably better on item 13 (a) than either IV_1 or IV_2. As with the seventh-
grade results, however, this superior performance by a group with less ability
is attributable to the direct encouragement given by the teacher on this
exercise. It appears, therefore, that the teacher plays a vital role in
the transfer stage of instruction. Another teacher, for instance, reported
that on one occasion when she had received a set of compositions full of
fragments and run-on sentences, she returned the papers to the students with
the explicit directions to edit them by applying the concepts of full sen-
tences, X words, and sentence signals. When she collected the papers again,

to her surprise and pleasure nearly all the fragments and run-ons had
been corrected.

In general, then, the results for all three grades do not clearly
isolate any one single factor as crucial in determining the appropriateness
of the tested materials inasmuch as all classes were able to perform well
in terms of their abilities.

It was not possible to do any kind of systematic objective evalua-
tion of the pre- and post-project writing samples of the students due to
(1) the high rate of attrition and absenteeism, particularly on the fourth-
grade level, and (2) the extreme variations in numbers of lessons completed
at all grade levels. Consequently, this section of the report can only give
representative samples of improved writing on all three grade levels. It
seems worth repeating here that all but four of the project teachers felt
that their students had improved their general writing ability. (See item
5 in Table III.) The seventh- and ninth-grade teachers also commented
frequently in conference periods that they were finding fewer sentence
fragments and fewer run-on sentences in the students' written assignments.
The fourth-grade teachers reported considerably more sentences begun with
capital letters and punctuated properly.

Three kinds of writing samples were chosen from the fourth-grade
population. The first sample shows the pre- and post-project composition
of one student in a disadvantaged class. There was a time lapse of exactly
eight months between compositions.

<div align="center">my Favarte TV Prgoram   October 6, 1966</div>

> I watch television on a carootn i super man i hree stoges
> supee rhierolik

Mr. Terrific is on Monday   June 6, 1967

I like Mr. Terrific because he Is a good guy. He fights
spies and he takes his one pill and he is very funny. He
Fights bad guys. His friend is Stanley.

It is extremely difficult to account for the dramatic growth in the
writing of this child. Certainly, it would be impossible to claim that
all of his progress was the result of having used the Discovery materials.
What can be said is that he did use the materials, and he did grow. Further
conclusions would be speculative.

The other two samples of fourth-grade writing consist of one example
of a student's ability to edit her own writing and another complete post-
project composition. (See Appendix I for replicas of these compositions.)
Both of these samples show the actual use of concepts taught in the Discovery
materials. Both the positions and the kinds of constructions studied in
Discovery 1 are found in these two samples. It should also be noted that
students seem to use constructions that are not directly taught in the
Discovery materials. This may be attributable to a natural maturing of the
child, but it may also be due to the child's increased awareness of struc-
tures possible in his language, as reported by some teachers on the ques-
tionnaires. Only controlled research can delimit the exact reasons.

The writing samples from the secondary students did not show the kind
of dramatic growth reflected in the fourth-grade sample above. They did,
however, indicate growth in the use of more complex structures, including
embedded constructions. Compare, for instance, these pre- and post-project
compositions written by a seventh-grade student in one of the disadvantaged
classes expressing his reactions to two different abstract pictures:

November 2, 1966

In the picture it looks like the statue of Liberty.
Another thing that it reminds me of is like big rocks and
the city in front of it.   It looks like its leaning on a
building and her head is leaning back and she's holding
up the torch in the sky.   It looks like she's lighting up
the whole city or if thats the sun then maybe its just
lighting the certain parts.   And another thing I just
found out is that it looks like she's in the rocks or
comming out of the rocks.

June 30, 1967

The picture that I'm looking at is similar to a
castle and/the man in the picture looks like, when he
pushes the curtains he's going to probably bow in front
of a king, cause he took his hat off and that is done
with kings.
Another thing it looks like is an explorer comming
from his voyage and telling his discoveries to the king as
he goes past the curtain. And he also looks like a spy
trying to listen on to some information

Superficially, both compositions appear to be quite similar. Both,
for instance, have subject clusters with clauses as post-nuclear adjectivals
and both favor the "looks like" pattern: But a closer examination of the
"looks like" patterns reveals this striking difference between those in the
pre-project compositions and those in the post-project ones. In the pre-
project sample, like is followed either by a cluster or by a trunk (i.e.,
a subject plus a predicate), which, when expanded, is done so by means of
compounding.

In the post-project composition, on the other hand, there is greater
variety and complexity in the types of constructions used after like: the
first like is followed, not by a simple trunk, but by a sentence-unit (i.e.,
a trunk that has been expanded by adding front and end sentence adverbials
to it); the second like is embedded in the predicate of the post-nuclear
adjectival clause which is, in turn, embedded in the subject cluster so that

the _like_ is followed not by a construction that is directly related to the
like itself but by the predicate of the sentence; the third _like_ is followed
by a clausid (i.e., a clause with the X word, or time-orientation, deleted),
which is a very sophisticated construction.

Although clausids, as a construction-type, are not taught in _Explora-
tion 1_, X words, front and end shifters (i.e., sentence adverbials), and
the concept of levels (i.e., of constructions "nested," or embedded, in
other constructions) are not only taught but also emphasized. And since
a clausid is formed by deleting the X word in it which carries the time-
orientation of the whole clause, a necessary deletion before the resultant
clausid can be nested in a larger construction, the concept of a clausid
is implicit in some of the concepts taught in _Exploration 1_. Consequently,
although it cannot be categorically stated that these concepts were directly
responsible for the differences in the student's handling of the "looks like"
patterns in the two compositions, it would appear that the emphasis the ex-
perimental materials place on constructions and on constructions nested inside
other constructions helps students to think in terms of manipulating larger
syntactic units. As one ninth-grade teacher commented in a conference with
an investigator, Lesson 4, Exercise B (item 13, Table VII), which asks the
student to write original subject nominals for the predicates given in the
exercise, "gave my students a new freedom--many of them had not realized
that the subject of a sentence could be made up of many words."[1]

---

[1] The teacher who made this comment also pointed out that his students
had had traditional grammar training, which was borne out by their subsequent
objection to calling words like _he_, _she_, _it_, and _they_ pro-nominals instead of
pronouns, even though they recognized the fact that all pronouns do not take
the place of nouns. For this reason, it would seem that the way traditional
grammars regularly use the label "subject" to refer to the "simple subject"
does encourage students to think in terms of words instead of larger con-
structions.

The post-project writing of other students from a different class in the same school from which the examples above were taken also showed the use of longer and more complex constructions and sentences. For example, a student who apparently is not a native-speaker of "standard" English used a sentence unit after _like_ with a _because of_ phrase as a sentence adverbial in which an adjectival clause is embedded in the post-nuclear position of the cluster functioning as the object of the preposition: "The people looks like they had to hold up traffic because of the tree that fell in the front of the driveway." (See Appendix J for more examples of the use of longer and more complex constructions and sentences.)

Another kind of improvement shown in the post-project samples was in the kind of editing done by the students. In the pre-project compositions, the kind of editing done by students was, by and large, limited to mechanical corrections such as spelling and to choice of words. These corrections still accounted for most of the editing on the post-project samples, but a number of samples showed evidence of editing involving restructuring of sentences and constructions. For example:

(1) ~~Although~~ I greatly enjoy all the T.V. programs I watch, _but_ my favorite one is "Occasional Wife."

(2) The author gives you ~~a definite~~ a question or a statement ~~and you must watch~~ _which makes you_ watch the whole program before you know "whats; what".

(3) My favorite T.V. program is "The Avengers." In this program Dianna Riggs and Patrick Macknee. are ~~the stars of this show~~.

(4) I've knowen h#r ever since I was five years old and

we stick together through thick and thin. When she

first came to my house. (I can rember it as if it

were yesterday), I saw a small girl with golden hair

and pi with.

(5) Donna lives two blocks away from me, We do a lot

of things together.

(Appendix K shows a pre- and a post-project composition and the kind of

editing that the writer did on them.)

Although the majority of the changes made in the editing of the post-

project compositions were similar to those made in the pre-project samples,

the examples above show that the students have made some progress. It

should be stated here that those teachers who made a conscious and continuous

effort to get their students to edit their writing achieved the best results

in this respect. The examples above were taken from the classes of such

teachers. It would appear, therefore, that training in editing is a task

that must rely on the teacher more than on printed instructions.

In general, then, the writing of the secondary students did show im-

provement both in the complexity of sentences and constructions used and

in the kinds of changes made in editing. A longitudinal study involving

the use and completion of both Exploration 1 and 2 and the use of controlled

groups would be needed to determine the nature of the relationship between

the materials used in this study and the kinds of improvement shown in the

students' writing.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This pilot project sought to gather data in four areas relative to the linguistically-oriented materials used in this study. The first area explored was that of the amount of preparation in linguistics teachers would need in order to use the materials most effectively. The conclusion is that teachers who have had some training, either concurrent with or prior to use of the materials, feel most comfortable with the materials and tend, according to the investigators' observations, to be more imaginative in their teaching of language. In instances in which this training is not possible, it is deemed highly advisable for the teacher to receive consultation service or to have a resource person in his school.

The second area investigated was the effectiveness of the materials as subjectively evaluated by the participating teachers and the project directors. Examination of student work-texts showed that the content could be understood by most classes. The greatest success, needless to say, was achieved by bright students with good teachers. Slow to average students were, however, able to achieve well in relation to their abilities--that is, they did not progress as far as the better students, but what they did, they did well.

The third question explored was the appropriateness of the materials for disadvantaged as well as non-disadvantaged students. It is generally concluded that students with severe language problems will probably have difficulty with these materials, particularly with Exploration 1. However, in some slow classes, teachers used the methods and materials from Discovery before introducing the Exploration lessons on the same topic. This procedure seemed to be quite effective. This would tend to indicate that the concepts

in sector analysis are not, in themselves, too difficult for mastery even
by language-disadvantaged students. It seems to be a matter of down-grading
vocabulary and the use of simple illustrative sentences and syntactic pat-
terns. In the case of the fourth-grade language-disadvantaged students, it
seems that specially designed materials might be helpful, e.g.,more language
games and even more simplified vocabulary, particularly in the instructions
for the more difficult lessons.

The last question addressed itself to the problem of transfer of
grammatical knowledge to the students' own reading and writing. It should
be noted that transfer was not expected short of the completion of both
texts in each series. It is also held to be unlikely that any real transfer
can take place as a result of a single year's exposure to a new grammatical
system. However, in the final subjective evaluation of the participating
teachers, all but four teachers indicated varying degrees of carry-over to
other language arts work. The most frequent comments made by the teachers
were that their students were much more aware of structure composing their
own sentences and that the students seemed more willing to experiment with
new patterns.

An examination of the actual writing samples of the students indicated
that there was growth at all three grade levels, but that the most dramatic
growth occurred on the fourth-grade level. But without a longitudinal con-
trolled study, it is not possible to state that this growth is a direct
result of the use of these materials. It is recommended, therefore, that
such a study be undertaken.

APPENDIX A

NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN LINGUISTICS PROJECT.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

<u>Manhattan</u>

P.S. 9
P.S. 83

<u>Bronx</u>

P.S. .105'

<u>Brooklyn</u>

P.S. 54

<u>Richmond</u>

P.S. 31

<u>Queens</u>

None

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

<u>Manhattan</u>

J.H.S. 44

<u>Bronx</u>

None

<u>Brooklyn</u>

Enrico Fermi J.H.S. (111K)

<u>Richmond</u>

None

<u>Queens</u>

J.H.S. 158

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

<u>Manhattan</u>

None

<u>Bronx</u>

Grace Dodge Vocational H.S.

<u>Brooklyn</u>

Abraham Lincoln H.S.
Eli Whitney H.S.

<u>Richmond</u>

None

<u>Queens</u>

Newtown H.S.

APPENDIX B

TEACHERS IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN LINGUISTICS PROJECT

GRADE 4

Phyllis Berse[1] P.S. 54   Judy Robinson P.S. 83

Dorothy Dunbar P.S. 105   Marcia Sagal P.S. 9

Selma Grossman P.S. 9   Eileen Simon P.S. 54

Geraldine Osti[2] P.S. 31

GRADE 7

Ida Canales   JHS 111K   Arlyne Samuels   JHS 158

Victor Kagan   JHS 111K   Robert Thatcher   JHS 44

Betsy Kaufman   JHS 44   Herbert Wilcov[3]   JHS 44

Edith Novod   JHS 44

GRADE 9

Edward Blaine   Abraham Lincoln   Herbert May   Dodge Vocational

Thomas Dolan   Eli Whitney   Helen Morrissey   Newtown

Naomi Hausman[4]   Abraham Lincoln   Judith Schwartz   Newtown

Leslie Kingon[5]   Newtown

---

[1] Did not finish year because of maternity leave.

[2] Did not finish year because of school change.

[3] Dropped from project.

[4] Left after first semester for maternity leave. Mr. Blaine assumed her class.

[5] Had 2 classes.

'CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

EDUCATIONAL PRÁCTICES DIVISION

/ CLASSROOM OBSERVATION EVALUATION FORM - LINGUISTICS

School_____ Grade_____ Date_____

Name of Teacher _____Topic _____

To What Extent:

	Low			High	
1. Did the lesson follow the procedures suggested in the materials? (If the program was modified in any way, describe on back of this page).	1	.2	3	4	5
1a. Did the modifications further the objectives of the lesson?	1	2	3	4	.5
2. Were facts or explanations introduced consistent with the program?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Was the vocabulary used by the teacher appropriate for this class?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Did an atmosphere of spontaneous participation and free inquiry exist in the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Did the teacher evidence enthusiasm in her presentation?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Did the teacher manifest acceptance of the program as a whole?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Were the blackboard and other AV materials used? (Note nature of these materials and their quality on back of this page.)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Were follow-up activities assigned or discussed?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Was the pace of the lesson appropriate for this class?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Was the content of the lesson appropriate for this class?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Did the students manifest mastery and application of concepts from previous lessons?	1	2	3	4	5

	Poor			Excellent	
Overall Evaluation of Lesson	1	2	3	4	5

Observer_____

APPENDIX D

NEW YORK CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

LINGUISTICS PROJECT 1966-67

NAME _____ AGE _____

HOME ADDRESS _____

HOME TELEPHONE _____

SCHOOL _____

GRADE TAUGHT _____

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE _____

MID-YEAR EVALUATION OF LINGUISTICS PROJECT

Name of Teacher_____

School_____

Grade taught in project_____

Title of text used_____

Last lesson completed _____

Are you in one of the in-service training classes?   Yes No

1. Is the material provided for the project suitable for your class?

    Yes No   Qualified
              . yes or no

2. What general problems, if any, have you encountered?_____/_____

_____

_____

3. Is there any evidence of carry-over to the students other language arts

    work? Yes No   Explain_____

4. Have you encountered any difficulty in teaching the material? Yes, No

5. Has the help (in courses or consultation) given by the project directors

    been sufficient? Yes No

6. What needs have not been met, if any?_____

_____

7. How much time each week do you spend using these materials in class?

_____

8. How does this time compare with time spent on grammar in other years?

    More Less Same

9. How much preparation time do you spend each week yourself for teaching

    these materials?_____ Is this more or less than spent in

    previous years?_____

10. Which aspects of the program have been most satisfactory?_____

_____

11. Which aspects have been least satisfactory?_____

_____

12. What suggestions do you have for bettering the project and/or the

    materials?_____

Further Comments:

APPENDIX F

CENT^? FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street
New York, 10036

FINAL EVALUATION FOR LINGUISTICS PROJECT

Name of teacher _____

School _____

Grade taught in project _____

Title of text or texts used, _____

Last lesson completed _____

1. In general terms, describe the type of class with which you used the linguistic
   materials (e.g.; reading level, ethnic composition, verbal, ability, general
   scholastic ability, etc.)

2. Assess the appropriateness and value of the materials for the class described above.

2a. Which features of the approach seemed most valuable for your class?

2b. Which were least effective?

3. What problems, general and specific, have you encountered since the mid-year
   evaluation?

4. Has there been any evidence of carry-over to the students' other language arts
   activities? Yes   No   Explain _____

   _____

   _____

5. How, would you compare the project students' progress with students using tradi-
   tional materials in regard to the following:

   5a. attitude toward language study   Better   Worse   Same

   5b. awareness of structure   Better   Worse   Same

   5c. geneal writing ability   Petter   Worse   Same

   5d. reading comprehension   Better   Worse   Same

   5e. other _____

6. What suggestions do you have for improving the materials for your type of class?

7. Was the help given by the project directors sufficient to prepare you to use the materials?   Yes   No

   7a. If not, what needs were not met?

8. How much training in sector analysis do you feel a teacher <u>must</u> have in order to use the materials most effectively?

9. If you were allowed to select your own texts for a future time, would you elect to use these materials in your classes?   Yes   No

   Please explain:

10. Additional comments about materials, training, and project in general:

Return to attention of: Professor Robert Allen
                            Box 66, Teachers College
                            Columbia University
                            New York, New York 10027

School & Bor. _____   Grade _____

Teacher _____   Student _____

CHECK LIST FOR DISCOVERY 1

Page

		No. Tried

20-21   Number of properly marked sentences   _____ (   )

22-23   Number of properly completed items   _____ (   )

39-40   Number of trunks brought down correctly (but not
         necessarily marked correctly on the T level)   _____ (   )

50   Number of blanks filled in as instructed   _____ (   )

57   Number of well-formed clusters   _____ (   )

70   (a) Number of well-formed clusters   _____ (   )

      (b) Number of well-formed sentences   _____ (   )

      (c) Number of well-formed sentences for item 5   _____ (   )

73-74   Number of well-formed sentences

         (a) with proper sentence signals   _____ (   )

         (b) without proper sentence signals   _____ (   )

93   (a) Number of well-formed sentences   _____ (   )

      (b) Number of well-formed sentences as instructed   _____ (   )

94   (a) Number of well-formed sentences   _____ (   )

      (b) Number of phrases in items 1 and 2   _____ (   )

      (c) Number of clusters in items 1 and 2   _____ (   )

APPENDIX H   38.

School & Bor. _____   Grade _____

Teacher _____   Student _____

CHECK LIST FOR EXPLORATION 1

Page		No.	No. Tried
7	Sentences expanded to well-formed full sentences	_____	( )
13	(a) Subjects with two or more pre-nuclear modifiers	_____	( )
	(b) Subjects with post-nuclear modifiers	_____	
	(c) Subjects with both pre- and post-nuclear modifiers	_____	
15	Sentences marked correctly	_____	( )
25	Shifters of more than one word	_____	( )
28	(a) Well-formed sentences on the U level	_____	( )
	(b) Trunks brought down correctly (but not necessarily marked correctly on the T level)	_____	
34	Well-formed sentences	_____	( )
37	Well-formed "C" sentences correctly combining A and B	_____	( )
49	Blanks filled by constructions (i.e., not single words)	_____	( )
52	Sentences joined with appropriate joiners	_____	( )
55	Well-formed sentences with appropriate included clauses	_____	( )
59	Sentences analyzed correctly on the N, U, and T levels	_____	( )

APPENDIX I

SAMPLES OF FOURTH-GRADE WRITING

May 25, 1967

The Chair

~~Once upon a time~~ *Once* there was a ~~little~~ girl named Mary who lived on
a farm with her father and mother. Mary had a rocking chair which was
about a hundred years old. ~~because Mary's had it when she was little and~~
~~her mother~~ *had when she was little.* Almost every generation in Mary's family had it ˄ Even though
it was so old it looked new because it was painted very bright red and had
a pretty red pillow on it. *Indent* One day Mary went to her aunt and uncle's house,
~~and she~~ wanted to take the chair with her but her mother and father said no.
That day Mr. Big came to collect the junk. He said "Do you have any junk
for me today." "Yes said Mary's mother "Come right on the porch and take
it all." Mary's mother didn't know that the rocker was in the pile ~~and she~~ *so Mr. B took it away.*
~~didn't see Mr. Big take it away either~~. When Mary came home from her aunt
and uncle's house she looked for the rocker but could not find it so she
asked her mother *and* her mother ~~thought for a while and~~ said "Oh dear, when
Mr. Big came he must have took the chair." Mary was so sad she ran upstairs
and slammed the door. She was crying for about five minutes when her mother
came to her room and said "Lets go to Mr. Big's house and see if he still
has the chair." they asked him and he said no so they went home. This
time Mary didn't cry she was unhappy for a few days because she still loved
the chair and then she forgot all about it.

APPENDIX I - CONTINUED

May 25, 1967

The Haunted Rocking
Chair.

In the creepy house of mystery down the road, peering through the window I saw a long, dark, hall which led to an open, bare, room. In the middle of this mysterious room there was one solitcery thing. This brown wooden object was a rocking chair.

Walking about this room, I crept silently into the chair. But suddenly, breaking the peace, as I rocked in it, it squeeked and squeeled. I, as my own opinion, thought it must just be one of those old rocking chairs.

I explored this house every day and after I explored I'd flop down into the rocking chair to rest.

Now I (sometimes with my brother) had been doing this for quite a while, and I got tired of the squeek. So I ran home and came back with an oil can.

I, all alone, started oiling in all the places I could find. But that smelly gooey oil was to much for the--why it's a mouse!

A mouse had been getting many babies. And the cute little thing had built her home on a shelf of the chair! And she had squeeked every time I rocked!

APPENDIX J

EXAMPLES OF LONGER AND MORE COMPLEX SENTENCES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

IN THE STUDENTS' POST-PROJECT COMPOSITIONS

Seventh Grade

(1)   His boss, President of Brahms Baby Food Co., believes in "married

executives"; and Peter can't get a promotion without a marriage.

(2)   That is what gave me the idea of him being a crook. It can also be

that he is admitting the King and Queen and maybe he is planning to

poison them to finish his plans.

(3)   She is always arguing with her mother about wearing dresses at

places but some how her mother keeps on winning.

(4)   I find that I enjoy the stories that are written as if the events

that are related were happening today.

(5)   It somewhat embellishes the "glamorous" life of a spy, and leaves

you wondering if the plot is written for the sole purpose of filling

in space between commercials.

Ninth Grade

(6)   Each series Richard Kimbel who is the fugitive is hounded by police

and one lieutenant who is (as the prologe of the program says) obsessed

with his capture.

(7)   Then as I heard more and more I became interested, thus forgetting

about the "Late Show Special," I had intended to watch.

(8)   To pick my favorite television program this season is going to be

quite hard for it seems as the summer months come near the good shows

loose their flair.

(9)   What I find most interesting is how they combine fiction with non-

fiction to make a truely wonderful story about things that might

some day come true to our everyday life.

APPENDIX J - CONTINUED

(10) Now he is on the run, looking for a one-armed man and hiding,

hiding in fear of being caught.

Pre-Project Sample Written by Seventh Grader with Editing Shown

by Handwritten Parts:

My Favorite Person

Her real name is K---F---

My favorite person is ~~Eggie~~. He is one of my best friends.ʌ When

ever someoneś feeling sad he knows how to cheer them up. Every~~one~~ *Cody* like's *because of it.*

Eggie,ʌ You would to ~~if~~ you knew him. Eggie isn't a party poo-per he knows

how to ~~live it up~~ *have fun*. To ~~discribe~~ *discribe* Eggie you would have to say he's ~~a clown~~. *full of fun.*

I guess that's why I like him so much.

Post-Project Sample Written by the same Seventh Grader:

My Favòrite Person

My favorite person is ~~my girlfriend~~ K___ F___. I like her mostly

because she likes to have fun. She just made sixteen; now she could get a

job.ʌ She likes to ~~dress~~ *with her money she makes buy* in mini dresses with pettie panties underneath.

On July 4, she is taking me on a boat ride, for my birthday. We are

planning on having fun. If we don't go she is taking me to Rye Beachʌ *on* July

12, with the P.A.L..

On Sundays when there's nothing to do we sit around and eat cookies

while lisenting to records. We listen to them

~~I like people for the way they act toward life. In my book Karen passes with flying A's.~~

until something exciting happens.

~~I like most people. Karen is the best one I met so far.~~

I like people who acts like themselves, not like other people. Karen

is one person who acts like what she is

(Note: Although no editing marks appeared at the following points,
the neatly recopied final form showed these additional changes: (1) a
single period after P.A.L., (2) a comma after do in the first sentence of
the third paragraph, (3) lisenting spelled correctly as listening, (4) acts
changed to act in the last two sentences, and (5) a period at the end of the
last sentence.)