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ABSTRACT

This research study attempts to explain and compare two language arts programs, THINK and OPEN COURT. These programs are incorporated in the instructional program at Interim Junior High School, Rochester, New York, hereafter called Interim, an alternative, non-graded, open classroom school where this researcher is an English staff member. The strengths and weaknesses of both programs will be compared in an effort to comment on which of the two would help students meet any state tests in reading.

As an alternative school, Interim was in a unique position to field test a combination of programs. After days of inservice, team meetings, and consultation with the principal, Interim's Language Arts team elected both THINK and OPEN COURT. Through those choices the team would be able to offer students a selection and a challenge in the language arts instructional program. Also, by offering both programs, this researcher could evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each program and try to match staff, students, and programs.

Since THINK requires a teacher and a paraprofessional for its operation, the Language Arts team felt a need for both programs to be structured in a team teaching approach so that class size would be equally matched.

The seventh and eighth grade students in OPEN COURT and THINK were separated according to the grade level scores.
obtained on the Metropolitan Reading Test given district-wide.

The team divided into sections. A section taught OPEN COURT, totalling five classes; and another section piloted THINK, totalling five classes. The OPEN COURT classes were designed as a control group. This control group was to be diagnosed and evaluated with the five THINK classes, which were designated as the experimental group.

OPEN COURT classes were divided heterogeneously, and individual classes had students of remedial (1.0 - 4.9), average (5.0 - grade level), or accelerated (above grade level) abilities.

THINK classes consisted of students grouped heterogeneously too. Groupings again combined remedial (1.0 - 4.9), average (5.0 - grade level), and accelerated (above grade level) students.

After OPEN COURT and THINK students took the Metropolitan Reading Test, it was determined that THINK students demonstrated some growth in their reading scores.

It may be said that certain remedial and average students enrolled in THINK received significant growth in their reading scores because of the double exposure to language arts they received daily. These students were given THINK as an English class and a supplementary Reading class with OPEN COURT as its basal reader.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

There has been widespread community pressure on school boards to take appropriate measures in making certain that secondary school curriculums meet minimum competency requirements in reading and writing. This concern has been reinforced by state legislation.

Reasons for an interest in minimum competency are based on demonstrated deficiencies in secondary students' reading and writing abilities when they enter college or the business world. Other reasons for promoting competency were clearly conveyed by Rexford G. Brown at the Fourth Buffalo Language Arts Education Conference.¹ Brown outlined nine concerns minimum competency supporters feel must be addressed:

1. That education is worse than it has ever been.
2. That educators are not trying as hard as they can to educate America's children.
3. That education is like an industry and is susceptible to the same efficiency programs as industry is.

4. That experts and outsiders can solve the school problems.

5. That laws will make lazy teachers try harder.

6. That America has a sophisticated, scientific educational technology at its disposal.

7. That multiple choice tests will identify specific educational weaknesses.

8. That these weaknesses will be remediable.

9. That schools exist in a social vacuum and do not reflect the culture at large.

Although Brown did not agree with the nine propositions backed by supporters of competency, he did mention that outsiders such as parent groups, community leaders and politicians supported some or all of the propositions and were working to make sure school curriculums changed. He further said that as of 1978, about forty-two states either have adopted or have studied minimum competency legislation.

Therefore, the requirements set by New York State's Board of Regents for offering standardized tests (the Metropolitan Reading Test and the Preliminary Competency Test) coincide with the seventh proposition Brown mentioned regarding the advantages of multiple choice testing in identifying educational weaknesses, especially in reading.

This research study attempts to explain and compare two language arts programs, THINK and OPEN COURT. These programs are incorporated in the instructional program at Interim Junior High School, Rochester, New York, hereafter
called Interim, an alternative, non-graded, open classroom school where this researcher is an English staff member. The strengths and weaknesses of both programs will be compared in an effort to comment on which of the two would help students meet any state tests in reading.

Purpose of the Study

Since reading and writing are essential for literacy, Interim wanted a language arts program that would develop these two skills for its students.

Guidance and assistance had come from the office of the Director of Reading, emphasis being placed on the need for junior high school language arts programs to continue the good reading base functioning in the elementary buildings and thus to prepare the students to meet basic competency requirements issued by the Board of Regents. The Director of Reading felt at that time that the OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS program was the best vehicle district-wide in meeting the reading and writing needs of junior high school students.

At that very same time, the Director of Instruction for the City School District asserted that a program was needed not only to develop junior high school students' reading and writing skills but also to improve their thinking abilities in reading and in the content areas. This Director's intention was to focus on three inner city schools to try an experimental program called THINK,
published by Innovative Sciences, Inc. (I.S.I.). Interim was one of the schools offered the program.

As an alternative school, Interim was in a unique position to field test a combination of programs. After days of inservice, team meetings, and consultation with the principal, Interim's Language Arts team elected both THINK and OPEN COURT. Through those choices the team would be able to offer students a selection and a challenge in the language arts instructional program. Also, by offering both programs, this researcher could evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each program and try to match staff, students and programs. To match these variables, this researcher found the following questions pertinent to the purpose of this study:

1. Which of the two programs was better for Interim Junior High School's instructional program?

2. Which approach in reading was stronger or weaker?

3. Based on personal observation, what influence did the programs have on students' writing ability?

4. What are the recommendations for the continuation of this study?

Definition

OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS program introduces its instructional purposes in the following manner:
The program is designed for the average class, taking into consideration such individual differences as point of view, background of information, and mastery of skills. Reading and writing, the two essentials of literacy are carefully developed so that they can provide mutual support. The lessons are arranged so that the program will be stimulating for the bright pupil, yet not too difficult to help the slower pupil develop more complex reading and writing skills.

OPEN COURT introduces students to the correct pronunciation of words through its unique phonics program. Along with this phonics program that emphasizes decoding skills, OPEN COURT integrates reading, oral activities, composition, grammar, and spelling into one whole lesson procedure. It introduces "Great Literature" as an integral part of its structure and allows students to learn and imitate particular techniques in writing so that they can develop their own writing styles to their full potential.

THINK, on the other hand, is a language arts program that not only concerns itself with the teaching of language usage, creative writing, composition, and English literature, but also concretely helps students to improve their thinking abilities. In fact, a primary objective of the program is to introduce students to six thinking skills: Thingmaking, Qualification, Classification, Structure Analysis, Operation Analysis, and Seeing Analogies. In addition, the Moderator's Resource Manual which accompanies the text promotes the program philosophy that "Learning a language is,
litely, learning to think."

THINK is divided into two major components: Language Analysis and Developmental Reading.

Language Analysis consists of the following points: 123 Audio tape lessons and Response Sheets; Answer Keys, Quick Check Tests, Student Progress Records, and a Moderator's Guide which contains more detailed lesson summaries, Quick Check Test guide and operations guide.

Language Analysis is designed to teach basic phonics, vocabulary, and grammar and usage through Audio tape lessons.

Language Analysis complements the other components of THINK in that it is based largely upon phonics "decoding" approach to language. But, more importantly, Language Analysis enables students to manipulate the complexities of language usage and, simultaneously, allows them to improve their thinking abilities.

The Developmental Reading aspect concentrates on having students improve their vocabulary skills and their logic and comprehension of reading selections.

Summary

This research study attempts to explain and compare two language arts programs, THINK and OPEN COURT. The strengths and weaknesses of both will be compared in this study in an effort to comment on which of the two would help students meet any state tests regarding reading ability.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Background of Programs

Interim's Language Arts team has found through past experiences that certain language arts programs could not meet the varied learning styles of the students. The team sought programs which would enable students to work on their own learning instructional levels and at their own pace. Incorporating programs of broader magnitude would correlate with the school's alternative philosophy. The underlining principle of this philosophy was to enhance and develop individual creative skills and potentials. Gerald G. Duffy's, Reading in the Middle School, concisely outlines a survey study regarding the unique features of an academic program in a middle school; this survey appears to juxtapose with Interim's own philosophy. The characteristics are as follows:

1. A home base and teacher for every student to provide for continuing guidance and assistance to help him make the decisions he faces almost daily, regarding special needs and learning opportunities.

2. A program of learning opportunities offering balanced attention to the three major goals of:
   a. personal development of the between-ager.
   b. skills of continued learning, and
   c. effective use of appropriate organized knowledge.

3. An instructional system focused on individual
progress, with many curriculum options and with individualized instruction in appropriate areas.

4. The use of interdisciplinary team arrangements for cooperative planning, instructing, and evaluating.

5. A wide range of exploratory activities for the socializing, interest-developing, and leisure enriching purposes of the bridge school.2

For Interim's instructional program to be successful, motivating, and challenging for students, the team agreed that any language arts program implemented at the school must focus on individualized needs and programs.

Interim implemented Lippincott's Basic Reading basal because its approach was to have students concentrate on the proper pronunciation of words as they appear in print, rather than have them sound words out aloud with the aid of an alphabetized process.3 The principal of Interim and the language arts team members at that time were impressed with the description of the non-sounding, decoding techniques expressed in the Teacher's Guide to the Basic Reader:

To put it another way, we teach the word as wholes while we lead the child to see how the sounds that he knows occur in each word and are systematically represented by the letters in it. Remember we recommend 1) hearing the whole word,

---

2Gerald G. Duffy, Reading in the Middle School (Delaware: International Reading Association, 1974), p. 11.

2) identifying its phonemes, and 3) THEN learning how the letters "picture" those sounds.4

The program was also instituted because the principal felt that since most of the elementary students were taught OPEN COURT, Interim students would benefit more if they were exposed to a totally different approach.

At this point, after a full year of teaching the Lippincott method, the language arts team became concerned about the illiteracy problem affecting not only the community but society too. Nearly half of Americans were considered to be functionally illiterate.5 Since there were specific concerns expressed by the community and the local media regarding low reading scores achieved on standardized tests and the introduction of New York State's competency tests in reading and writing, Interim's principal and language arts team at this time studied OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS program and concluded it would be a hopeful vehicle in helping students obtain good reading scores. This conclusion was also drawn because of the positive results other junior high schools in the District were experiencing.

Unlike Lippincott, OPEN COURT stressed the importance of sounding out loud letters and blending those sounds to form words, and it correlated language arts activities

4 Ibid, pp. 11-12.

which emphasized grammar and usage and creative and expository writing.6

THINK's educational philosophy, dating back several years ago, is a theory developed and defined by Dr. Albert Upton. His theory is expressed by the statement: "Learning a language is, literally, learning to think." Language arts curriculums not only focus on reading comprehension, writing, spelling, and grammar but also encourage students to strengthen their creative potentials.

To a junior high school student, what is thinking? To explain it in a complex manner, thoughts derived from thinking are transitory, moving from one idea to another, from one experience to another.7 But such a difficult definition would dazzle a junior high school student, so the question can be approached simply by relating the definition and demonstrations offered in Richard W. Samson's, Thinking Skills:

If we are to improve our thinking, we must first understand what thinking is. According to Professor Upton's "system", thinking (or the functioning mind) may be divided into seven basic phases:

1. Words: We let words (together with numbers and other symbols) mean things.

2. Thing-making: We make mental pictures of things when we interpret sensations.

3. Qualification: We notice the qualities of things: how things are alike and how they differ.


4. Classification: We mentally sort things into classes, types or families.

5. Structure Analysis: We observe how things are made; break structured wholes into component parts.

6. Operation Analysis: We notice how things happen; in what successive stages.

7. Analogy: We see how seemingly unconnected situations are alike, forming parallel relations in different "worlds of thought."  

Dr. Upton, along with Richard Sampson, proposed a study at Whittier College, California, which produced I.Q. test results higher for a treatment group than they were for the control group.

The study demonstrated that students in the treatment group were exposed to exercises which dealt with sensory motor skills. They carefully examined activities such as classifying things, stating the common relationships shared in analogies, and structure analyzing the parts of a whole.

Dr. Upton believed that the senses are key to one's creativity and learning process. In his study, signs, representations, and symbols were used consistently with the students.  
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ABSTRACT

This research study attempts to explain and compare two language arts programs, THINK and OPEN COURT. These programs are incorporated in the instructional program at Interim Junior High School, Rochester, New York, hereafter called Interim, an alternative, non-graded, open classroom school where this researcher is an English staff member. The strengths and weaknesses of both programs will be compared in an effort to comment on which of the two would help students meet any state tests in reading.

As an alternative school, Interim was in a unique position to field test a combination of programs. After days of inservice, team meetings, and consultation with the principal, Interim's Language Arts team elected both THINK and OPEN COURT. Through those choices the team would be able to offer students a selection and a challenge in the language arts instructional program. Also, by offering both programs, this researcher could evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each program and try to match staff, students, and programs.

Since THINK requires a teacher and a paraprofessional for its operation, the Language Arts team felt a need for both programs to be structured in a team teaching approach so that class size would be equally matched.

The seventh and eighth grade students in OPEN COURT and THINK were separated according to the grade level scores
obtained on the Metropolitan Reading Test given district-wide.

The team divided into sections. A section taught OPEN COURT, totalling five classes; and another section piloted THINK, totalling five classes. The OPEN COURT classes were designed as a control group. This control group was to be diagnosed and evaluated with the five THINK classes, which were designated as the experimental group.

OPEN COURT classes were divided heterogeneously, and individual classes had students of remedial (1.0 - 4.9), average (5.0 - grade level), or accelerated (above grade level) abilities.

THINK classes consisted of students grouped heterogeneously too. Groupings again combined remedial (1.0 - 4.9), average (5.0 - grade level), and accelerated (above grade level) students.

After OPEN COURT and THINK students took the Metropolitan Reading Test, it was determined that THINK students demonstrated some growth in their reading scores.

It may be said that certain remedial and average students enrolled in THINK received significant growth in their reading scores because of the double exposure to language arts they received daily. These students were given THINK as an English class and a supplementary Reading class with OPEN COURT as its basal reader.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

There has been widespread community pressure on school boards to take appropriate measures in making certain that secondary school curriculums meet minimum competency requirements in reading and writing. This concern has been reinforced by state legislation.

Reasons for an interest in minimum competency are based on demonstrated deficiencies in secondary students' reading and writing abilities when they enter college or the business world. Other reasons for promoting competency were clearly conveyed by Rexford G. Brown at the Fourth Buffalo Language Arts Education Conference.¹ Brown outlined nine concerns minimum competency supporters feel must be addressed:

1. That education is worse than it has ever been.
2. That educators are not trying as hard as they can to educate America's children.
3. That education is like an industry and is susceptible to the same efficiency programs as industry is.

4. That experts and outsiders can solve the school problems.

5. That laws will make lazy teachers try harder.

6. That America has a sophisticated, scientific educational technology at its disposal.

7. That multiple choice tests will identify specific educational weaknesses.

8. That these weaknesses will be remediable.

9. That schools exist in a social vacuum and do not reflect the culture at large.

Although Brown did not agree with the nine propositions backed by supporters of competency, he did mention that outsiders such as parent groups, community leaders and politicians supported some or all of the propositions and were working to make sure school curriculums changed. He further said that as of 1978, about forty-two states either have adopted or have studied minimum competency legislation.

Therefore, the requirements set by New York State's Board of Regents for offering standardized tests (the Metropolitan Reading Test and the Preliminary Competency Test) coincide with the seventh proposition Brown mentioned regarding the advantages of multiple choice testing in identifying educational weaknesses, especially in reading.

This research study attempts to explain and compare two language arts programs, THINK and OPEN COURT. These programs are incorporated in the instructional program at Interim Junior High School, Rochester, New York, hereafter
called Interim, an alternative, non-graded, open classroom school where this researcher is an English staff member. The strengths and weaknesses of both programs will be compared in an effort to comment on which of the two would help students meet any state tests in reading.

Purpose of the Study

Since reading and writing are essential for literacy, Interim wanted a language arts program that would develop these two skills for its students.

Guidance and assistance had come from the office of the Director of Reading, emphasis being placed on the need for junior high school language arts programs to continue the good reading base functioning in the elementary buildings and thus to prepare the students to meet basic competency requirements issued by the Board of Regents. The Director of Reading felt at that time that the OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS program was the best vehicle district-wide in meeting the reading and writing needs of junior high school students.

At that very same time, the Director of Instruction for the City School District asserted that a program was needed not only to develop junior high school students' reading and writing skills but also to improve their thinking abilities in reading and in the content areas. This Director's intention was to focus on three inner city schools to try an experimental program called THINK,
published by Innovative Sciences, Inc. (I.S.I.). Interim was one of the schools offered the program.

As an alternative school, Interim was in a unique position to field test a combination of programs. After days of inservice, team meetings, and consultation with the principal, Interim's Language Arts team elected both THINK and OPEN COURT. Through those choices the team would be able to offer students a selection and a challenge in the language arts instructional program. Also, by offering both programs, this researcher could evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each program and try to match staff, students and programs. To match these variables, this researcher found the following questions pertinent to the purpose of this study:

1. Which of the two programs was better for Interim Junior High School's instructional program?
2. Which approach in reading was stronger or weaker?
3. Based on personal observation, what influence did the programs have on students' writing ability?
4. What are the recommendations for the continuation of this study?

Definition

OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS program introduces its instructional purposes in the following manner:
The program is designed for the average class, taking into consideration such individual differences as point of view, background of information, and mastery of skills. Reading and writing, the two essentials of literacy are carefully developed as that they can provide mutual support. The lessons are arranged so that the program will be stimulating for the bright pupil, yet not too difficult to help the slower pupil develop more complex reading and writing skills.

OPEN COURT introduces students to the correct pronunciation of words through its unique phonics program. Along with this phonics program that emphasizes decoding skills, OPEN COURT integrates reading, oral activities, composition, grammar, and spelling into one whole lesson procedure. It introduces "Great Literature" as an integral part of its structure and allows students to learn and imitate particular techniques in writing so that they can develop their own writing styles to their full potential.

THINK, on the other hand, is a language arts program that not only concerns itself with the teaching of language usage, creative writing, composition, and English literature, but also concretely helps students to improve their thinking abilities. In fact, a primary objective of the program is to introduce students to six thinking skills: Thingmaking, Qualification, Classification, Structure Analysis, Operation Analysis, and Seeing Analogies. In addition, the Moderator's Resource Manual which accompanies the text promotes the program philosophy that "Learning a language is,
literally, learning to think."

THINK is divided into two major components: Language Analysis and Developmental Reading.

Language Analysis consists of the following points: 123 Audio tape lessons and Response Sheets; Answer Keys, Quick Check Tests, Student Progress Records, and a Moderator's Guide which contains more detailed lesson summaries, Quick Check Test guide and operations guide.

Language Analysis is designed to teach basic phonics, vocabulary, and grammar and usage through Audio tape lessons.

Language Analysis complements the other components of THINK in that it is based largely upon phonics "decoding" approach to language. But, more importantly, Language Analysis enables students to manipulate the complexities of language usage and, simultaneously, allows them to improve their thinking abilities.

The Developmental Reading aspect concentrates on having students improve their vocabulary skills and their logic and comprehension of reading selections.

Summary

This research study attempts to explain and compare two language arts programs, THINK and OPEN COURT. The strengths and weaknesses of both will be compared in this study in an effort to comment on which of the two would help students meet any state tests regarding reading ability.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Background of Programs

Interim's Language Arts team has found through past experiences that certain language arts programs could not meet the varied learning styles of the students. The team sought programs which would enable students to work on their own learning instructional levels and at their own pace. Incorporating programs of broader magnitude would correlate with the school's alternative philosophy. The underlining principle of this philosophy was to enhance and develop individual creative skills and potentials. Gerald G. Duffy's, Reading in the Middle School, concisely outlines a survey study regarding the unique features of an academic program in a middle school; this survey appears to juxtapose with Interim's own philosophy. The characteristics are as follows:

1. A home base and teacher for every student to provide for continuing guidance and assistance to help him make the decisions he faces almost daily, regarding special needs and learning opportunities.

2. A program of learning opportunities offering balanced attention to the three major goals of:
   
   a. personal development of the between-ager,
   
   b. skills of continued learning, and
   
   c. effective use of appropriate organized knowledge.

3. An instructional system focused on individual
progress, with many curriculum options and with individualized instruction in appropriate areas.

4. The use of interdisciplinary team arrangements for cooperative planning, instructing, and evaluating.

5. A wide range of exploratory activities for the socializing, interest-developing, and leisure enriching purposes of the bridge school.²

For Interim's instructional program to be successful, motivating, and challenging for students, the team agreed that any language arts program implemented at the school must focus on individualized needs and programs.

Interim implemented Lippincott's Basic Reading basal because its approach was to have students concentrate on the proper pronunciation of words as they appear in print, rather than have them sound words out aloud with the aid of an alphabetized process.³ The principal of Interim and the language arts team members at that time were impressed with the description of the non-sounding, decoding techniques expressed in the Teacher's Guide to the Basic Reader:

To put it another way, we teach the word as wholes while we lead the child to see how the sounds that he knows occur in each word and are systematically represented by the letters in it. Remember we recommend 1) hearing the whole word,

²Gerald G. Duffy, Reading in the Middle School (Delaware: International Reading Association, 1974), p. 11.
identifying its phonemes, and 3) THEN learning how the letters "picture" those sounds.  

The program was also instituted because the principal felt that since most of the elementary students were taught OPEN COURT, Interim students would benefit more if they were exposed to a totally different approach.

At this point, after a full year of teaching the Lippincott method, the language arts team became concerned about the illiteracy problem affecting not only the community but society too. Nearly half of Americans were considered to be functionally illiterate.  

Since there were specific concerns expressed by the community and the local media regarding low reading scores achieved on standardized tests and the introduction of New York State's competency tests in reading and writing, Interim's principal and language arts team at this time studied OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS program and concluded it would be a hopeful vehicle in helping students obtain good reading scores. This conclusion was also drawn because of the positive results other junior high schools in the District were experiencing.

Unlike Lippincott, OPEN COURT stressed the importance of sounding out loud letters and blending those sounds to form words, and it correlated language arts activities

---

4 Ibid, pp. 11-12.

which emphasized grammar and usage and creative and expository writing.

THINK's educational philosophy, dating back several years ago, is a theory developed and defined by Dr. Albert Upton. His theory is expressed by the statement: "Learning a language is, literally, learning to think." Language arts curriculums not only focus on reading comprehension, writing, spelling, and grammar but also encourage students to strengthen their creative potentials.

To a junior high school student, what is thinking? To explain it in a complex manner, thoughts derived from thinking are transitory, moving from one idea to another, from one experience to another. But such a difficult definition would dazzle a junior high school student, so the question can be approached simply by relating the definition and demonstrations offered in Richard W. Samson's, Thinking Skills:

If we are to improve our thinking, we must first understand what thinking is. According to Professor Upton's "system", thinking (or the functioning mind) may be divided into seven basic phases:

1. Words: We let words (together with numbers and other symbols) mean things.

2. Thing-making: We make mental pictures of things when we interpret sensations.

3. Qualification: We notice the qualities of things: how things are alike and how they differ.

---


4. Classification: We mentally sort things into classes, types or families.

5. Structure Analysis: We observe how things are made; break structured wholes into component parts.

6. Operation Analysis: We notice how things happen; in what successive stages.

7. Analogy: We see how seemingly unconnected situations are alike, forming parallel relations in different "worlds of thought."  

Dr. Upton, along with Richard Sampson, proposed a study at Whittier College, California, which produced I.Q. test results higher for a treatment group than they were for the control group.

The study demonstrated that students in the treatment group were exposed to exercises which dealt with sensory motor skills. They carefully examined activities such as classifying things, stating the common relationships shared in analogies, and structure analyzing the parts of a whole.

Dr. Upton believed that the senses are key to one's creativity and learning process. In his study, signs, representations, and symbols were used consistently with the students.  

---


The concepts used in the Whittier College study are associated with the design of Richard Sampson's THINK program, which has secondary students react to the way simple and complex words change their meanings in the context of sentences and passages. A cognitive approach to studying symbols of words helps students improve their thinking abilities. Students of THINK are regularly introduced to sensory "hands-on" activities dealing with listening, writing, and vocabulary skills. So, if results were a reality in a college study, Interim, along with the City School District's Administration, wanted to know whether THINK's concepts and approach would, in fact, benefit students' basic skills and improve standardized test scores. Therefore, THINK became an experimental program for the City School District.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Pilot Study

Since THINK requires a teacher and a paraprofessional for its operation, the Language Arts team felt a need for both programs to be structured in a team teaching approach so that class size would be equally matched.

The team divided into sections. A section taught OPEN COURT, totalling five classes; and another section piloted THINK, totalling five classes. The OPEN COURT classes were designed as a control group. This control group was to be diagnosed and evaluated with the five THINK classes, which were designated as the experimental group.

Placement

The seventh and eighth grade students in OPEN COURT and THINK were separated according to grade level scores obtained on the Metropolitan Reading Test given district-wide.

OPEN COURT classes were divided heterogeneously, and individual classes had students of remedial (1.0 - 4.9), average (5.0 - grade level), or accelerated (above grade level) abilities.

THINK classes also consisted of students grouped heterogeneously. Groupings again combined remedial (1.0 - 4.9), average (5.0 - grade level), and accelerated
(above grade level) students. Placement of THINK students was completed according to THINK's Orientation Workshop suggested placement table found on page 35 in the appendix.

OPEN COURT students were classified according to a Reader's title:

1. Remedial (1.0 - 4.9) - the phonics program
2. Average (5.0 - grade level) - What Joy Awaits You - But Life Is Calling You
3. Accelerated (above grade level) - Awake To Worlds Unfolding

THINK students were specifically divided according to the program's Logic and Comprehension workbook levels and numbers:

1. Remedial (1.0 - 4.9) - THINK level I - books 1, 2, 3
2. Average (5.0 - grade level) - THINK level II - books 4, 5, 6
3. Accelerated (above grade level) - THINK level III - books 7, 8, 9

The experimental and control classes were grouped in the manner shown on the chart below. Students abilities of the two groups were closely matched according to reading levels.

(Grouping chart found on next page, p. 15.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(5.0-grade level)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(5.0-grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(5.0-grade level)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(5.0-grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(1.0-4.9) &amp; (5.0-grade level)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(1.0-4.9) &amp; (5.0-grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(5.0-grade level) &amp; (above grade level)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(5.0-grade level) &amp; (above grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(above grade level)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(above grade level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials**

OPEN COURT's basic Readers are hardcover. Although reference is made in the introduction to each book that the basal series covers grades one through six, it should be said that the books have been revised for a secondary reading program. Furthermore, as stated by OPEN COURT's teacher manual: "These Readers offer challenging library selections and a wide range of informational reading. The carefully selected subject matter enables the teacher to maintain a high level of student interest and provide the stimulation necessary for developing skills in thinking, discussing, and writing, as well as reading."

The following OPEN COURT Readers' content is briefly described in the preface of each book:

**Reader 3:2 A Trip Around the World**, takes the children on an imaginary trip around the world and teaches them
something of the legend and lore of England, France, Germany, Italy, Greece, the Soviet Union, the Holy Land, Africa, India, China, Australia, South America, and our nearer neighbors, Mexico and Canada. The children are also introduced to the people, the customs, and the heroes of these countries.

Reader 4, What Joy Awaits You, is designed for all the fourth grade. The nine parts of this book contain subject matter which varies from ancient myths to modern poetry, from the lore of American history to stories of America today, from legends of ancient heroes to biographies of famous Americans, Tales of fantasy, folk tales and fables, stories of animals, and stories which have been the favorites of children for generations are included.

Reader 5, But Life Is Calling You, is intended for all of the fifth grade. The eleven parts of this Reader contain selections which cover the field of literature from the myths of the ancients to the science fiction of today, from the songs of the Bible to the poetry of living Americans. A wide variety of selections is offered: folk tales, tall tales, legends, myths, American history, adventure stories, mysteries, biographies, classics of children literature, nature stories, and fantasies.

Reader 6, Awake to Worlds Unfolding, is designed for all of the sixth grade. The twelve parts of this Reader expose the students to a wide range of prose and poetry. Folk
tales, legends, stories of our Greek heritage, stories of and by famous authors, stories of America's past, adventure stories, science fiction, biographical sketches, nature stories, stories from world history, and stories of life today help show the child what he can find in his own world and in the world of literature.

In THINK, students are given a workbook. They receive preprinted mini-quizzes which correlate with the vocabulary section of each unit.

In the Listening Center the students are given a chance to work independently and become accountable for their own learning development in the area of grammar. They are given a tape recorder, head set, and one of the one hundred and twenty-three language usage Audio tapes. They keep track of their own progress throughout this phase of the program on the Student Progress Record form issued them. A copy of this form is found on pages 36 and 37.

Referring to the sample copy of the Student Progress Record, one notices that it contains a brief description of each lesson with a series of boxes for notations both at the right and left. Note that the middle box gives the correlation key for the Developmental Reading lessons.

The boxes to the left contain the lesson numbers and the dates students begin certain lessons. The students enter a date they began a lesson at the time they listen to an Audio tape.
The "Tries/Errors" boxes have the students record the times they had to listen to a lesson and the errors made for each listening. The "Quick Check Test" merely receives a (✓) check if the students were successful with the oral test they take with the teacher. "Quick Check Test" are only taken after students have completed the appropriate Audio tape lesson.

The "Date Completed" box allows students to begin and progress to the next taped lesson.

Implementation of OPEN COURT

Since there was no prerequisite as to a classroom management system for OPEN COURT, the teachers took the initiative to either divide their classes into mini-instructional groups or maintain them as a whole. Some classes in the control group divided students into three groups, and classified them in the following manner: 1. Phonics, 2. Readers, and 3. Workshop or Independent Study.

All of OPEN COURT students were immediately introduced to the techniques of the phonics program. The program familiarized students with proper sounds of letters in the alphabet and had them blend those sounds to form words. Students were taught forty-three sounds and ninety spelling variations. The intention here was to have students sound out letters (decode) correctly, then pronounce words with the appropriate sounding and blending of those letters. Each
letter had a picture care associate with it. A sample phonics card appears on page 38 of the appendix. To sound letters, students learned the name of the card and learned all the possible spelling combinations by having the teacher use two different colored chalks to blend letters on the blackboard to form words.

The phonics process was completed in thirty lessons. Each lesson was taught in a class period and was reinforced throughout the school year.

After students went through the phonics program, the teacher gave general introductions to assigned stories students were to read from their specific Readers. In acquainting students with the subject matter of each story, the teacher used other related resources (magazines, books, pictures, films, etc.) to motivate the students. After introducing the objective and purpose of a story, they received a list of words and their given definitions. The words were found in the context of the story. If they could not properly pronounce certain words on the list, the teacher used the decoding, sounding and blending process with them. The students were also assigned various vocabulary worksheets and were tested on the words studied and applied to a story.

In finishing this procedure, the students read the story in its entirety. Slow readers in the class were assigned to small groups and read passages from the story aloud with the
teacher monitoring. Other students read the story independently.

The students were then responsible for answering the questions posed to them at the end of each story. Before they answered these questions, they were asked to label the type of question being asked of them. They labelled the question: factual, inference, or evaluative. In a whole group the teacher assisted the students in the labelling process.

At the end of each story, OPEN COURT Readers emphasized an English skill. For example, students were asked to examine certain sentences from a story and to locate auxiliary (helping) verbs in them.

After students completed the questions in the Reader, the teacher assigned a composition. Below are the steps taken when students wrote a composition:

1. After everyone in class finishes reading the assigned story and answered all questions asked of them at the end of the story, the class writes an assigned composition.

2. The teacher tells the students or writes on blackboard what the students are to write.

3. The teacher reads all compositions for content.
   a. If a composition is error free (grammar and usage and punctuation are correct), the teacher writes "OK" at the top of the paper and then writes a positive comment.
   b. If errors exist in form of paper, the teacher writes "R" (remedy) at the top of the paper without indicating where the errors are, and then writes a positive comment.
4. The teacher records from students' papers sample sentences of two or three most common errors for the entire class to examine and correct. The class as a whole makes appropriate corrections along with the teacher's assistance. (The mistakes are placed on an overhead projector.)

This self-correcting technique was introduced to the students early in the school year and used consistently every two weeks.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THINK

In implementing THINK, the students were immediately introduced to the six important thinking skills. Beginning with Thingmaking, the students brainstormed and formulated a written list of things found in the classroom. Sufficient time was allotted them to complete a list, and a few volunteers were asked to share their items. Those items were placed on the blackboard, and the students were told that they were identifying things which have received specific titles or names.

Qualification was defined as the concept that all things are unique according to their description. The students were asked to freely contribute descriptive words (stressing the usage of adjectives) which would apply to objects shown them. While the objects were displayed and answers accepted, the students' suggested adjectives were written on the blackboard under the appropriate item's name.
As an introduction to Classification, the students were told that all things are classified into general and specific categories. They were presented with a list of things which had to be placed into a distinct class. For example, the word "car" appeared on a worksheet, and the students had to signify that it is classified as "a means of transportation."

Next, the students received clear definitions of Structure Analysis and Operation Analysis. Both thinking skills divide things into their parts, but Operation Analysis demonstrates the order of those parts -- it is similar to sequencing. The students were asked to bring to class a picture of a person or thing and to name all the parts, then list them in specific order: beginning to end, top to bottom, etc.

The last stage of the introduction cycle concerned analogies. The students received a worksheet on analogies. One part of the given analogy was missing:

```
boy ___ as _____
man    woman
```

and students were to supply its missing term. They were also to write a logical reason to defend their answer that would later become known as the "relating factor."

THINK's uniqueness is in its classroom management system. There are a few suggested processes for teachers to consider, all of which are clearly described both verbally
The three cycle method was used at Interim. It divides the class in the following manner: Group Work, Listening Center and Independent Study. The classroom furniture is separated to enable students to identify the appropriate learning center. The illustration in page 39 in the appendix shows a sample set up of this particular classroom management system.

In the three cycle method, students are also divided into three groups and rotate on a daily basis so that they have equal exposure to each center. For the students' and teachers' convenience, students were arranged in Groups A, B, and C. This rotation schedule is shown on page 40 in the appendix. After students have been to all learning areas, they received a full group independent study period, knowing that the next day they would again begin the rotating process.

Having a total class size ranging from thirty to thirty-five students, this researcher managed three subgroups of approximately twelve.

In the three learning centers, students apply the six thinking skills in specific exercises. In Group Work, students are given their appropriate THINK workbook. Each workbook unit has a reading passage. On a cassette, an instructor reads the passage while the students follow along; the emphasis here is on vocabulary development, not reading
improvement. Students are not asked to read sections of the passage aloud but asked to carefully examine the way in which certain words are used in the context of the reading. The instructor on the cassette rather thoroughly pronounces words in the passage which may be unfamiliar to the students and directs their attention to the glossary that follows at the bottom of each page of the reading passage. The instructor defines the words according to the way they are used in the context of the passage.

After the reading and vocabulary have been studied and reviewed, the students take a preprinted mini-quiz that complements the unit under consideration. If a student misses more than three answers on any mini-quiz, he must retake the test until he receives a perfect score or misses a minimum of two answers.

Next the students complete questions in the Logic and Comprehension section of the workbook, which pertain to each reading passage. Frequently they are presented with analogies:

\[
\text{cast} \quad \text{as} \quad \text{---------------} \\
\text{play} \quad \text{baseball game}
\]

and are sometimes given four possible answers (team; sport; catcher; and attitude). They are then asked to give a relating factor because they are stating the similarity that both relationships share. In Group Work, students are only
confronted with analogies which directly or indirectly relate to the reading selection of the unit they are working on, and not to their own personal experiences.

When students enter the Listening Center they receive preprinted Response Sheets, shown on page 41 in the appendix, for answering of grammatical questions posed on the Audio cassettes. They are also accountable for the correcting of their responses by using the answer keys provided by the teacher.

The students in the program, at times, encountered drills which had them repeat tapes consistently until they mastered language usage skills to their specification. A copy of a drill Response Sheet is located on page 42 in the appendix. After the taped Instructor sounds out words, the student is to find its spelling on the Sheet. The following is the procedure students pursued during an Audio drill session:

a. The student is asked to check to be sure he has the correct Response Sheet.

b. When the student completes the drill tape, he checks his answers by using the appropriate key in the Answer Key Book.

c. The answer key is the same as the student's Response Sheet except that it has the answers filled in. The student should line up his Response Sheet with the answer key using a ruler or piece of paper as a horizontal guide to match answers. The student should mark his errors with a red pencil and immediately report his performance to the Instructor.

d. If the student makes fewer than three errors, he proceeds to the Quick Check Test. If he makes three or more errors, he is to repeat the Drill lesson.
Finally, in the Independent Study or Free Reading Center, the students are given an opportunity to complete Logic and Comprehension assignments or any extra language arts activities prepared by the teacher. The expectation here is for students to demonstrate sound choices in the activity to be done as well as work habits while doing it.

Personal Writing Assignment for Observation

Near the end of the school year, while THINK and OPEN COURT students were given a variety of writing assignments, this researcher sought information as to how well students in both groups would do on a creative writing assignment.

For example, the teachers of the control and contact groups gave the following writing assignment to the students. The directions of this assignment were given orally. None of the directives was placed on the blackboard nor on a duplicate.

The students of OPEN COURT and THINK were to:

1. Recall an event that was an actual happening in your life.

2. Write about the event in the first person but content should be in the past tense.

3. Change the names of the characters, if you so desire.

4. You may exaggerate your stories to certain extents. You may make them humorous, mysterious, or suspenseful.

5. You will be given thirty-five minutes in which to complete this assignment.
Summary

Interim's language arts team divided into sections. A section taught OPEN COURT, totalling five classes; and another section piloted THINK, totalling five classes. The seventh and eighth grade students in both programs were separated according to grade level scores obtained on the Metropolitan Reading Test given district-wide. Both program groups were divided heterogeneously and classes were closely matched according to reading levels.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Reading Test Results

After OPEN COURT and THINK students took the Metropolitan Reading Test, it was determined that THINK students demonstrated some growth in their reading scores. But, certain remedial and average students, representing a third group in this study, enrolled in the A, B, C, D classes of THINK received significant growth in their reading scores because of the double exposure to language arts they received daily. These students were given THINK as an English class and a supplementary Reading class with OPEN COURT as its basal reader. There was no third group of students in the E class of THINK and OPEN COURT Supplementary Reading. The following chart shown below gives an approximate yearly or monthly growth difference in reading between the experimental and control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINK</th>
<th>OPEN COURT</th>
<th>THINK AND OPEN COURT Supplementary Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A .9</td>
<td>A .5</td>
<td>A 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B .8</td>
<td>B .7</td>
<td>B 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C .9</td>
<td>C .6</td>
<td>C 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D .4</td>
<td>D .7</td>
<td>D 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E .1</td>
<td>E .5</td>
<td>E -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Observation in Writing

The end of the school year writing assignment given the experimental and control groups indicated to this researcher that THINK students demonstrated signs of being able to manipulate their auditory skills to their fullest by following directions more accurately. THINK students appeared to have organized and outlined their ideas in writing compositions properly. This was demonstrated by the way THINK students had divided their sentences into separate paragraphs.

Although sentence structure, the use of run-on and awkward sentences; language usage, incorrect usage of verb tense; and spelling and punctuation errors remained almost the same between the two groups, it may be said that THINK students had written more because they had more to express than those in the control group.
CONCLUSION FOR
THINK AND OPEN COURT

As determined by the reading resource teacher and this researcher, THINK students in the A, B, and C classes received better scores than those students in the A, B, and C classes of OPEN COURT. The students in the D and E classes of OPEN COURT received better scores than those students in the D and E classes of THINK. Because the majority of those THINK students received the highest possible reading score on the previous year's test, they simply maintained those accelerated scores on this test and this resulted in the small monthly growth differential.

The students in the third group were given THINK to develop their writing and vocabulary skills and the supplementary Reading class with OPEN COURT as its basal reader to improve their phonetic skills and reading comprehension. When the reading resource teacher and this researcher looked at the individuals' Metropolitan Reading Test scores, it was found these students made an approximate year and a half's (1.5) growth in their reading grade levels. The reading growth and differential are found on page 43 in the appendix.

Recommendation

Interim is continuing its field test of the hypothesis in this study. The second year's experimental group will be
structured differently. Based on the significant reading
growth for the third group indicated in the conclusion, it
was recommended by the reading resource teacher and
language arts team that remedial and average students
enrolled in THINK be given a supplementary READING class,
which has OPEN COURT as the basal foundation. And remedial
and average students in OPEN COURT classes receive a
supplemental language arts class that stressed writing
skills.

Questions to be Addressed in Continuing this Study

1. How effective and flexible are the objectives
and suggested lessons in both programs? Is
there room for teacher creativity?

2. Which approach in writing is stronger or
weaker?
   a.) An on-going evaluation of students'
       writing needs to be devised and
       assessed.
   b.) Writing evaluation needs to assess:
       - effectiveness
       - sentence structure
       - grammar and usage
       - spelling
       - punctuation
       - capitalization
       - format

3. What effect would result in reading and writing
   if all remedial and average students in both
   the experimental and control groups were given
double treatment in language arts?
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SUGGESTED INITIAL PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL READING Workbook</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ANALYSIS Tapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.5</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>5 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 2.0</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>5 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 - 3.0</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>5 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 - 4.0</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>5 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 - 5.5</td>
<td>11:4</td>
<td>46 - 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 - 7.0</td>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 - 8.5</td>
<td>111:7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>111:7 - 9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Description of Lesson Content</td>
<td>Tries/Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identification, discrimination, and reproduction of the shapes and sounds of printed letters (capital-lower case)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identification, discrimination, and reproduction of the shapes and sounds of script letters (capital-lower case)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identification, discrimination, and reproduction of two-letter words; long or short vowel sound.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identification, discrimination, and reproduction of twenty of the most common words in the English language. Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Long vowel words with silent 'e' (ape, ate, ame, ake, ane, ale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Short vowel words (ad, en, ip, op, us, ig)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drill o Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Long vowel words, with silent 'e' (ine, ave, one, aze, iie, ike)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Short vowel words (am, od, od, ug, un, ut, et)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Drill o Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Long vowel words with silent 'e' (ase, ime, 1ve, ole, ore, ode, ike)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Short vowel words (ai, ed, en, or, um, an, id)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Drill o Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Long vowel words (ope, 1me, ote, are, ure, ire, ove)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Drill o Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single initial consonant o Short vowel words (ar, im, ag, ob, ii, og, ib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Drill o Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Two initial consonants o Long vowel words with silent 'e' (bl, br, cr, dr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Two initial consonants o Long vowel words with silent 'e' (fl, gr, pr, gl, cl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Two initial consonants o Short vowel words (bt, br, cl, cr, dr, tl, tr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Drill o Upon completion, student ready for Developmental Reading I.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Homophones: creek (water), creak (noise)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Homophones: break (apart), brake (car)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Stubborn vowel mixes: ie, ier, ie (diet), ei (vein), ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Vowels preceding ing: wing, hang, fang, song, change,inger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Adding -ing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Adding ed, -er, -y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Adding -ly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Three consonants (initial: thr, scr, spl, shr, phr, str) or initial and terminal (terminal: rch, lch, nth, rsh, rst, nth, lth, nth, rght)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Stubborn vowel mixes (aw, ow, au, augh, aught)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Stubborn vowel mixes (eigh, ould, ou, augh, aught)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Initial consonants, one silent (kn, gn, wn, ps, schl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Terminal consonants, one silent (rk, gn, ck, lm, mb, mn, bl, ght)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Stubborn vowel mixes (oi, ool)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Homophones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Homophones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Consonant endings and ‘qu’ (not, nse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Terminal ‘le’ preceded by a variety of consonants (tile, ple, ckle, cle, gie, die, tie, ilia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Prefixes: reearn, unmade, presoak, intermarray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Nouns introduced: A house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a
a_e
ai_
_a_y
Suggested classroom organization for 30-student class divided into 3 or more homogeneous groups.

Figure IV-2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP A</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>GROUP C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Analysis</td>
<td>Independent Activities</td>
<td>Developmental Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lessons Quick Check Test</td>
<td>1) Introduction 2) Reading Selection 3) Additional Items 4) Assign. Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 lessons Quick Check Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Activities</td>
<td>Developmental Reading</td>
<td>Independent Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Introduction 2) Reading Selection 3) Additional Items 4) Assign. Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading</td>
<td>Language Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lessons Quick Check Test</td>
<td>1) Introduction 2) Reading Selection 3) Additional Items 4) Assign. Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Analysis</td>
<td>Independent Activities</td>
<td>Developmental Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lessons Quick Check Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Vocabulary Study 6) Mini-Quiz 7) Oral Reading Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Activities</td>
<td>Developmental Reading</td>
<td>Language Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Vocabulary Study 6) Mini-Quiz 7) Oral Reading Check</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 lessons Quick Check Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance:

- One circle or less, go on to the next Lesson.
- Two circles or more, repeat this Lesson.

### Notes

- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________
- _____________

---

**Lesson 25**

1974 Edition
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a) case</td>
<td>b) base</td>
<td>c) daze</td>
<td>d) vase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a) dime</td>
<td>b) fine</td>
<td>c) lime</td>
<td>d) time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a) case</td>
<td>b) vase</td>
<td>c) haze</td>
<td>d) base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a) dime</td>
<td>b) time</td>
<td>c) lime</td>
<td>d) dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a) live</td>
<td>b) jive</td>
<td>c) five</td>
<td>d) hive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a) base</td>
<td>b) case</td>
<td>c) gaze</td>
<td>d) chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a) cite</td>
<td>b) bite</td>
<td>c) site</td>
<td>d) vile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a) time</td>
<td>b) dime</td>
<td>c) lime</td>
<td>d) chime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a) live</td>
<td>b) dive</td>
<td>c) wire</td>
<td>d) hive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a) score</td>
<td>b) core</td>
<td>c) sore</td>
<td>d) wore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>a) dole</td>
<td>b) mole</td>
<td>c) pole</td>
<td>d) role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>a) more</td>
<td>b) wore</td>
<td>c) tore</td>
<td>d) sore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>a) site</td>
<td>b) bite</td>
<td>c) rite</td>
<td>d) mite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a) store</td>
<td>b) bore</td>
<td>c) tore</td>
<td>d) fore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a) hole</td>
<td>b) role</td>
<td>c) bole</td>
<td>d) pole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a) strode</td>
<td>b) code</td>
<td>c) rode</td>
<td>d) mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a) site</td>
<td>b) cite</td>
<td>c) bite</td>
<td>d) kite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a) role</td>
<td>b) mole</td>
<td>c) sole</td>
<td>d) stole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a) strive</td>
<td>b) live</td>
<td>c) hive</td>
<td>d) five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a) mode</td>
<td>b) rode</td>
<td>c) strode</td>
<td>d) code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a) more</td>
<td>b) core</td>
<td>c) shore</td>
<td>d) bore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>a) strife</td>
<td>b) hive</td>
<td>c) five</td>
<td>d) live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>a) sore</td>
<td>b) wore</td>
<td>c) store</td>
<td>d) more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>a) sole</td>
<td>b) hole</td>
<td>c) dole</td>
<td>d) role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>a) core</td>
<td>b) more</td>
<td>c) lore</td>
<td>d) store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THINK AND OPEN COURT -
SUPPLEMENTARY READING

Reading Metropolitan Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSES</th>
<th>1978 READING GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>1979 READING GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN GRADE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>