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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The laboratory school has been an integral part of institutions of teacher education for many years. Controversy concerning the role this agency should play in the education of teachers has continued throughout the history of the laboratory school. The need for further study of the function or functions of the laboratory school has been recognized by many people in various ways, and is specifically suggested by Rose Lammel. She writes:

When is a "laboratory" school a laboratory? What makes an "experimental" school experimental? These are questions that have stirred up controversy in educational circles for some time. There seems to be some consensus that a laboratory school's function is to serve as an instrument for the study of significant educational problems in such a way as to discover and define broad principles. The adjective "laboratory" has been used in some cases where the school serves primarily as a practice school or as a demonstration school.¹

The study reported in the following pages represents an investigation of the "experimental" or research function of laboratory schools.

In this chapter, the purposes of the present study will be stated, as well as the underlying assumption, the limitations and the basic hypothesis of the present study. The methods by which data were

GATHERED WILL BE DESCRIBED, AND AN OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS TO FOLLOW WILL BE PRESENTED.

PURPOSE OF STUDY, ASSUMPTION, LIMITATIONS OF STUDY AND HYPOTHESIS

Several educators have conducted studies relating to the function or functions of the laboratory school. Some of these studies will be summarized in Chapter Three. However, insofar as could be determined, no other studies have been focused upon the research function of the laboratory school.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

It is the purpose of this study to investigate the extent to which administrators and faculty members of laboratory schools at the elementary level, connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education are engaged in educational research. A corollary purpose is the investigation of the areas and types of experimentation and other research being conducted in laboratory schools at the elementary level associated with state-supported colleges and universities.

ASSUMPTION

Basic to the stated purpose is the assumption that laboratory schools are proper centers for experimentation and other types of educational research relating to the elementary school, and for the dissemination of the results of such research.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

Only those laboratory schools connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education will be considered in the present study.

It is recognized that many laboratory schools connected with non-public universities and colleges are settings for some outstanding contributions to our knowledge about children and ways of improving our
METHODS OF WORKING WITH THEM IN CLASSROOMS. HOWEVER, THE SPECIAL CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THEY OPERATE APPEAR TO BE SUCH AS TO MAKE COMPARABILITY OF DATA UNCERTAIN.

A SECOND LIMITATION IS PROVIDED BY THE METHOD OF STUDY AND WILL BE DISCUSSED IN MORE DETAIL IN THAT SECTION OF THIS CHAPTER. STATEMENTS FROM THE ADMINISTRATORS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS WILL BE CHECKED AND SUPPLEMENTED BY VISITS TO A SAMPLING OF SCHOOLS AND INTERVIEWS WITH FORMER LABORATORY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AS WELL AS THOSE WHO ARE AT PRESENT DIRECTORS OR PRINCIPALS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS. REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFFS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS WILL BE SURVEYED. THESE MAY REFLECT SOME INACCURACIES.

HYPOTHESIS

The major hypothesis to be tested is that the great majority of personnel connected with laboratory schools associated with state-supported institutions of teacher education do not consider a major function that of conducting educational research, including experimentation with new and as yet untried or inadequately tried techniques, methods and procedures, as well as sharing the results of such research with interested educators.

IMPLIED IN THE HYPOTHESIS STATED IN THE PRECeding PARAGRAPH IS A SECOND HYPOTHESIS WHICH MUST ALSO BE TESTED. THAT IS, THAT THE LIMITED RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS MEETS GENERALLY ACCEPTED CRITERIA FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.
I. METHODS OF GATHERING DATA

Many factors must be considered in determining the methods to be employed in gathering data concerning the laboratory school as an agency in educational research. Of primary importance is the employment of a method or methods which will tend to ensure representative and accurate data. Other considerations, of secondary importance, will probably include the selection of a method or methods which are not impractical in terms of time and money.

The methods of gathering the data basic to the present study were selected after careful consideration of all the factors mentioned above. Questionnaires were sent to the administrators of laboratory schools connected with teacher education institutions receiving state financial support. It was determined to survey the administrators of pre-school and elementary laboratory schools, since other recent studies of the function or functions of laboratory schools have been concerned with schools at the secondary level. However, data concerning research in the secondary schools were usually included by the respondents to the questionnaire which was the means of gathering data basic to the present study. That is, if the laboratory school included kindergarten through grade twelve, the administrator of that laboratory school usually included data concerning both the elementary and the secondary school in preparing his responses.

Data gathered from the responses to the questionnaire were supplemented by visits to laboratory schools, and interviews, in out-of-school settings, with administrators of laboratory schools, and with former administrators of laboratory schools.
The methods selected have several obvious weaknesses. Many laboratory school administrators are asked to complete many, many questionnaires. Responding to a questionnaire is admittedly a time consuming task. Although no administrator wishes to have his school presented in an unfavorable light, completing a questionnaire as quickly as possible is often of primary importance, even if some misinterpretation may result. Visits to schools were necessarily brief. Only short conferences with teachers could be arranged, because of their classroom responsibilities. Conferences with teachers were considered important, and a great deal of time was spent conferring with them during the visits. It is likely that the brevity of the visits resulted in some inaccuracies and a slightly distorted image of the faculty-administration concept of their roles in educational research.

Interviews were not necessarily brief. Some were, in fact, quite lengthy. However, it should be pointed out that these were highly subjective, each one being the product of one person's experiences with educational research as a laboratory school administrator.

**Questionnaires**

A proposed questionnaire was sent to five leading educators, and they were asked to respond in terms of additional items which should be included, superfluous items that probably should be omitted, the intelligibility of the various items, and the professional terminology used. Suggested changes that appeared desirable were incorporated in the questionnaire sent to laboratory school administrators.

Lists of laboratory schools were obtained from the United States office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the
Association for Student Teaching, and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. These lists were compared and questionnaires were sent to schools listed by at least two of the organizations named. The usual procedure of sending reminder letters and a second questionnaire to administrators who had not responded within a reasonable period of time was followed.

Visits

Visits to laboratory schools were arranged for the following purposes:

1. To ascertain the interest in, and concern for, educational research in laboratory schools visited.
2. To discuss with directors the problems relative to conducting educational research in the institutions visited.
   a. Is the faculty interested?
   b. Where does the leadership (for research projects) arise? In the department of education, the laboratory school faculty, administration, or from parents of laboratory school pupils?
3. To observe, first-hand, "research in action," see teachers and visit with them concerning actual projects underway.
4. To determine whether interest in research has increased, decreased, or stayed at same level in recent years.
5. To clarify any items on the questionnaire which seemed obscure, or needed further explanation.
6. To determine, in general, the attitude of parents toward research (as the faculty and administration view them).
No special effort was made to visit schools in which outstanding research was being conducted, although one school has been the setting for major contributions to knowledge of children's growth and development. Schools visited were in Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio. Every laboratory school visited was connected with a state-supported teacher education institution. Visits usually began with a brief conference with the principal or director, and occasionally other members of the administrative staff. This was usually followed by visits to classrooms and conferences with teachers. A final "summing up" conference with the principal or director usually concluded the day.

Interviews

Interviews, like the visits, were not highly structured. However, an attempt was made to get expressions of opinion concerning the following:

1. Have laboratory schools outlived their usefulness?
2. What should be the relationship of the laboratory school to public schools in its area? Should the laboratory school serve as a leadership agency or exemplify typical practice?
3. Should the laboratory school serve a district, or should tuition be charged, making the school semi-private or private?
4. Can observation, demonstration, student teaching and research go forward in same school? In the same classroom?
5. In general, what is the attitude of parents toward experimentation in the laboratory school? What changes would you expect if the laboratory school were to assume a more active role in educational research?
6. **What is the attitude of the staff toward research?**

It is not particularly important that the conferences mentioned be considered as differing from the interviews to be discussed here. The primary difference is that interviews were not held in laboratory schools, and in fact, an effort was made to gain a more general impression of attitudes concerning educational research in the laboratory school as an institution rather than in a specific laboratory school. No notes were taken during the discussions and it was considered best to let the administrators or former administrators talk rather freely about educational research in the laboratory schools with which they had been or were at present associated. A written summary of the interviews was submitted to the administrator with whom the interview was held in order that any inaccuracies or misconceptions might be corrected.

Several administrators indicated that schools with which they were associated had ceased to be laboratory schools and that these schools were no longer parts of institutions of teacher education, but were public schools, under the control of local school district boards of education. Correspondence with these administrators elicited some of the reasons for such action, and gave some interesting data concerning research activity in the schools prior to and since their change of status.

Published courses of study and articles written by laboratory school administrators and faculty members were read for indications of interest in educational research, concepts held concerning the function of the laboratory school, and actual research projects.
UNDER WAY.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Definitions are presented here in order that meanings of basic terms, as used throughout this report, may be understood and communications between reader and writer be improved.

Laboratory School: a school that is under the direct control of or closely associated with a teacher-preparing institution, whose facilities may be used for demonstration, participation, experimentation and practice teaching. ²

Teaching Station: any one of a number of places or positions in a school that requires the services of a full time teacher.³

Research: careful, critical disciplined inquiry, varying in technique and method according to the nature and conditions of the problem identified, directed toward the clarification or resolution (or both) of a problem.⁴

Action Research: use of scientific research principles for the study of actions that are aimed at a comprehensive goal. Generally the research is done by some of the participants in a program of action. In action research the activities studied are undertaken in the hope of achieving certain useful results, and the research is designed to effect improvement in the ongoing process, not

³Ibid., p. 554.
⁴Ibid., p. 464.
MERELY IN SOME FUTURE PROCESS. IN PURE EXPERIMENT, BY CONTRAST, ACTIVITIES ARE PRESCRIBED PRIMARILY TO OBTAIN DATA THAT MAY BE ANALYZED FOR SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNOLOGIC GENERALIZATION. WHEN, HOWEVER, PRACTICAL PROBLEMS OF ACTION ARE MODIFIED IN SUCH FASHION AS TO FACILITATE RESEARCH ANALYSIS, THE DISTINCTION IS ONE OF DEGREE. \(^5\)

**Experiment:** 1) THE TRIAL OF A PLANNED PROCEDURE ACCOMPANIED BY THE CONTROL OF CONDITIONS TOGETHER WITH OBSERVATIONS OF RESULTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCOVERING RELATIONSHIPS AND EVALUATING THE REASONABLENESS OF A GIVEN HYPOTHESIS.

2) THE ADMINISTRATION, UNDER CONTROLLED CONDITIONS, OF TREATMENTS TO A GROUP OR GROUPS THAT HAVE BEEN SPECIALLY CONSTITUTED FOR THE PURPOSE, AND THE ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS PRODUCED OR INDUCED IN THE OBJECTS OR UNITS AS A RESULT. \(^6\)

**Observation:** usually the first in a series of professional laboratory experiences in which one or more prospective teachers watch an experienced teacher work with pupils. Observation is often the beginning phase or stage of participation or student teaching. If the prospective teachers and the classroom teachers know beforehand what is to be taught, this is often termed "demonstration." Observation is frequently a required part of several professional education courses, and may continue to be required along with and following student teaching.


\(^6\) Good, op. cit. p. 215.
Participation: the act, on the part of a student of education, of assuming various responsibilities in the classroom as an introduction or prerequisite to actual teaching as for example, the collection of reference materials, the supervision of seat work and the correction of test papers.7

Student Teaching: observation, participation and actual teaching done by a student preparing for teaching under the direction of a supervising teacher or general supervisor; part of the pre-service program offered by a teacher education institution.8

Overview of Chapters to Follow

Chapter Two is entitled "History of the Laboratory School." It includes a brief survey of the European origins of the laboratory school, and the American beginnings of this institution. Chapter Two is concluded with a brief description of some early research-centered laboratory schools.

Chapter Three is entitled "Research and Related Literature." Studies similar to that being reported here are surveyed, and some representative examples of recently published professional opinion concerning the function or functions of the laboratory school are summarized.

In Chapter Four, the data basic to this study are reported. The tabulated responses to questionnaires are included in this

7 Good, op. cit. p. 385.
8 Ibid., p. 530.
CHAPTER, AS WELL AS DESCRIPTIONS OF THE VISITS TO SCHOOLS AND INTERVIEWS WITH THOSE WHOSE EXPERIENCE INCLUDES ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY IN A LABORATORY SCHOOL. CHAPTER FOUR INCLUDES AN ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS, PARTICULARLY AS THESE FINDINGS TEND TO SUPPORT OR REFUTE THE HYPOTHESIS STATED IN A PRECEDING SECTION OF THE PRESENT CHAPTER.


CHAPTER TWO

HISTORY OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL

A study of the laboratory school would be incomplete without some attempt to view this institution from an historical perspective. The laboratory school is not a new institution, and concepts held by educators concerning its proper function or functions have undergone several marked changes. The most fundamental of these changes will be presented in the present chapter. The major concern of the study being reported here is usually termed the research and experimentation function of the laboratory school. For this reason, there will be a more detailed description and history of a few laboratory schools in which, from the time of their founding, recognition has been given to the significant contributions laboratory school personnel could make to the field of educational research.

In the section entitled "European Origins," the writer has attempted to explore the background of certain American theories concerning the proper function or functions of the laboratory school. The implementation of these theories in the United States is discussed in the section entitled "American Beginnings." The chapter is concluded with a description of some of the first schools in which educational research was considered a proper, even an essential function.
AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION IN ANY HISTORICAL DISCUSSION IS DETERMINING WHEN "HISTORY" STOPS, AND THE PRESENT BEGINS. RATHER THAN NAMING A SPECIFIC DATE FOR THE CONCLUSION OF THE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS, THE WRITER HAS ARBITRARILY DECIDED TO CONCLUDE THIS CHAPTER WITH A DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUNDING OF SEVERAL LABORATORY SCHOOLS.
I. EUROPEAN ORIGINS

While laboratory experiences for students and demonstration teaching by "expert" teachers have long been considered valuable components of most teacher education programs, there is some disagreement as to exactly when and where laboratory schools were first established.

Schools Established by Religious Orders and Members of Nobility

Williams credits the Franciscan Friars, in what is now the state of New Mexico, with providing student teaching experiences for prospective teachers as early as 1600.¹

Cubberly indicates that the Abbe de la Salle was the first to establish normal schools, and that the origins of such institutions are French. He states that the first normal school "anywhere" was established at Rheims, France, in 1685. The Abbe had founded the religious order called the "Brothers of the Christian Schools" the preceding year with the purpose of providing free religious instruction for the children of the working classes. The Brothers of the Christian Schools established another seminary in Paris, with a teacher training program which included student teaching.²

Duke Ernest of Gotha willed a sum of money, administered by his grandson, Frederick II, to establish schools in order that prospective


TEACHERS MIGHT, "THROUGH PRACTICE, LEARN THAT FOR WHICH THEY WILL, IN
THE FUTURE, BE EMPLOYED." 3

Contributions of European Educators

Another religious order, the Pietists, founded a school at Basedow, in Dessau, in 1774, where teachers were trained, and as part
of that training, worked directly with children. 4

Pestalozzi was instrumental in the establishment of two schools
where prospective teachers were given the opportunity to observe and
instruct children. The first such school was founded at Burgdorf,
Switzerland, and was superseded by the more famous school at Yverdon,
which Pestalozzi operated from 1805 to 1825. 5

Hall writes that Herbart founded a "practice" school at the
University of Konigsburg, soon after joining the faculty of that in-
stitution in 1809.

Karl Volkmann Stoy, a pupil of Herbart's, established his own
seminary and practice school in Jena, Germany, in 1843. Stoy was suc-
ceeded by Professor W. Rein, who continued to operate the school ac-
cording to Herbartian principles. 6

3 A. F. Perrodin, "The Development of Laboratory Schools,"
Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education (Lockhaven,

4 Williams, op. cit., p. 1.

5 Ibid.

6 J. W. Hall "Professor Rein's Practice School at Jena,
Germany," National Education Association, Journal of Addresses and
882-884.
A SEMINARY AND PRACTICE SCHOOL WERE ESTABLISHED IN LEIPZIG, GERMANY, IN 1857. PROFESSOR ZULLER, ALSO A FOLLOWER OF HERBART'S OPERATED THIS SCHOOL UNTIL HIS DEATH IN 1883.7

INFLUENCE OF HERBART AND PESTALOZZI ON AMERICAN TEACHER EDUCATION

Herbart and Pestalozzi, among others, directly influenced American concepts of teacher education. Good writes:

*It will not be denied that the normal school was an academy with reviews of the common branches and a few professional studies and skills added. It would have been purely American if it had not incorporated Pestalozzi's theory and practice into its professional work.*8

Herbart's influence on teacher education in the United States, and on laboratory schools in particular, came through the work of F. W. Parker, and the organization now known as the National Society for the Study of Education.9

Ryan indicates that

"...in the seventies, belated waves of Pestalozzian and Herbartian influence struck this country, and the laboratory school again blossomed under the benign influence of the fact that here were again some definite methods to be taught to new teachers and to be exemplified for them."10

7HALL, OP. CIT., PP. 882-884.
9IBID., P. 13.
European educators, for the most part, conceived the laboratory school as fulfilling one or both of the following functions: These schools furnished places where prospective teachers might "practice" with the specific guidance and supervision of an experienced teacher, and/or they provided "stages" on which currently approved methods and techniques of teaching could be illustrated. There is almost no indication that experimentation or any other type of educational research was encouraged or was carried on in European laboratory schools. It was quite enough that schools were provided where examples of approved educational programs were exhibited, and opportunities provided for supervised student teaching. The laboratory school came to the United States with these functions well established.
Laboratory schools have been important adjuncts of most, if not all, teacher education institutions in the United States. The titles assigned to the schools give some indication of their primary function. Perrodin writes:

Providing for professional laboratory experiences in the pre-service education of teachers is not a recent innovation. From its earliest beginnings, a distinctive feature of teacher education has been the use of an actual school for children. Names given to these children's schools have varied according to their purposes. In the early days of teacher education in this country, they were named "model schools." Later, some were designated as "practice schools," then "training schools," "demonstration schools," "experimental schools," "campus schools," and more recently, the term "laboratory schools" has come into usage.  

Private Schools

The first model or practice schools were privately owned and operated, as were the teacher training institutions with which they were associated. An example was, "Mother Seaton's Teacher Training School," located in Emmitsburg, Maryland, which was founded in 1808.  

Samuel Hall opened his school at Concord, Vermont, on March 11, 1823. Perrodin notes that: "From its beginning....a few children were admitted to this school for demonstration and practice.

---

12 Ibid., p. 2.
13 Williams, op. cit., p. 2.
purposes." Hall's school was in existence for seven years.

The struggles for public support for normal schools were related to the efforts to gain financial support of education at other levels, and some of the same men, Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, for example, were involved in both. The first volume of Barnard's two-volume work, Normal Schools and Other Institutions, Agencies and Means Designed for the Professional Education of Teachers, is a carefully detailed compilation and analysis of the newspaper articles, speeches, and the eventual legislation which resulted in the establishment of state-supported normal schools in the New England States, New York and Pennsylvania.

Publicly Supported Schools

The first publicly supported normal school was opened at Lexington, Massachusetts, on July 3, 1839, with Cyrus Pierce as principal. Concerning this school, Gordy writes:

We have seen that the school opened with three pupils. Before the end of the term,

---

14 Perrodin, op. cit., p. 2.


17 Ibid., p. 179.


19 Perrodin, op. cit., p. 2.
THERE WERE A DOZEN. THE NEXT TERM, A MODEL SCHOOL WAS ORGANIZED. IT CONTAINED 33 PUPILS, WHOSE AGES RANGED FROM 6 TO 10.20

GOOD REPORTS THAT IN 1860, THERE WERE TWELVE STATE NORMAL SCHOOLS, AND THAT FOLLOWING THE CIVIL WAR, APPROXIMATELY TWENTY-FIVE NEW TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS WERE ESTABLISHED EACH YEAR.21 BARNARD'S FINDINGS INDICATE THAT MODEL OR PRACTICE SCHOOLS, AND OCCASIONALLY BOTH, WERE ESTABLISHED ALONG WITH OR SOON AFTER THE OPENING OF MOST OF THESE SCHOOLS.22

DAVID P. PAGE FOUNDED AN "EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOL" IN CONNECTION WITH THE FIRST STATE NORMAL SCHOOL IN ALBANY, NEW YORK IN 1845.23

PERRODIN NOTES:

DAVID PERKINS PAGE WAS PROBABLY THE FIRST MAN IN THE COUNTRY TO HAVE A CLEAR-CUT NOTION OF THE PLACE OF THE TRAINING SCHOOL IN TEACHER EDUCATION. HE BELIEVED THAT THERE MUST BE ACTUAL PRACTICE TEACHING OVER A SUFFICIENT PERIOD OF TIME AND UNDER REAL SCHOOL ROOM CONDITIONS. HE SAW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE "MODEL" AND THE "PRACTICE" FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY PHASES OF TEACHER EDUCATION. AT ALBANY, TWO LARGE ROOMS WERE AT ONCE FITTED UP TO ACCOMMODATE THE TWO DEPARTMENTS OF THE TRAINING SCHOOL. EACH OF THESE DEPARTMENTS WAS UNDER THE IMMEDIATE SUPERVISION OF A PERMANENT TEACHER.24


21 GOOD, OP. CIT., PP. 213-214.

22 BARNARD, OP. CIT., P. 69, P. 247, P. 251, P. 261.

23 PERRODIN, OP. CIT., P. 4.

24 Ibid.
Edward A. Sheldon established the "Oswego New York Primary Training School." Connected with this institution was a model school in which students were expected to spend one year in observation and practice teaching. This was a considerably longer period of time than was typically required.\textsuperscript{25} The school became a state normal school in 1867, and in 1869 Sheldon resigned his position in the city school system in order to devote more time to teacher education.\textsuperscript{26}

During the War Between the States, there was a decrease in the rate at which new laboratory schools were established. Perrodin quotes a United States Commissioner of Education report as showing that, by 1875, "Forty seven of the sixty seven states normal schools had laboratory schools attached to them."\textsuperscript{27} Good states that:

All the books point to the rapid expansion of the normal schools after the Civil War, but actually, they had to multiply rapidly in order to maintain their position. At the end of the century most rural teachers still obtained their licenses upon examination after attending a school for teachers for a short time, or even without any professional training.\textsuperscript{28}

It has been noted that there was some disagreement concerning the function of the laboratory schools which were connected with normal schools. While some felt that the school's primary function

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{25}Perrodin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.
  \item \textsuperscript{26}Good, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 219.
  \item \textsuperscript{27}Perrodin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.
  \item \textsuperscript{28}Good, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 214.
\end{itemize}
SHOULD BE THAT OF DEMONSTRATING SUPERIOR TEACHING TECHNIQUES, OTHERS FELT THAT THE SCHOOL'S PURPOSE WAS THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING. The school founded by Page at Albany provided for both, but in separate departments.

THE SCIENTIFIC MOVEMENT AND THE NORMAL SCHOOLS

Ryan, writing in 1929, notes the emphasis on a comparatively new function, research and other types of experimentation.

Judd states:

During the decade between 1890 and 1900, which may be regarded as the earliest period of the scientific movement in education, there were a number of studies made of school processes and of the achievement of students, which reflected very unfavorably on the methods which were then in use in the common schools of the United States. Against these the normal schools reacted with vigor, and often with acrimony.

He adds, "The normal schools have, in the course of time, however, found the scientific studies to be so fruitful...that they have gradually introduced the material collected from scientific investigations into their courses of study."

---

29 BARNARD, OP. CIT., P. 127.
31 PERRODIN, OP. CIT., P. 4.
33 CHARLES H. JUDD, "THE INFLUENCE OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES IN EDUCATION ON TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS" PEABODY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION II (MAY, 1925), P. 296.
34 Ibid., P. 297.
In 1907, W. A. Clark, in a paper read before the National Education Association, emphasized the importance of a "pedagogical laboratory." He suggested two types: "...the research laboratory for the discovery of educational facts and principles, and the teaching laboratory for the illustration of educational laws in their practical applications..."35

The laboratory school soon became an active participant in the "scientific movement" in education. Indeed, a few of the outstanding "research centered" schools were established before the beginning of this movement, placed by Judd in the period from 1890 to 1900.36

The laboratory school came to the United States as an established institution, with rather specific and well defined purposes. Functions were usually confined to the provision of facilities for student teaching for normal school pupils, and the demonstration of approved educational techniques and methods by competent classroom teachers, or occasionally by the principal of the normal school. Some educators were convinced that these functions could not be performed in the same school, and certainly not in the same classroom, and recommended the establishment of both "model" and "practice" schools.

The laboratory schools were relatively reluctant participants in the "scientific movement" in education. Educators recommended the


36 Judd, op. cit., p. 296.

JUDD WRITES:

IN THE EARLY DAYS, THE NORMAL SCHOOLS WERE NOT ALWAYS IN SYMPATHY WITH THE SCIENCE OF EDUCATION. THE EARLIEST EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH SUCH A SCIENCE DID NOT ORIGINATE IN THE NORMAL SCHOOLS. IN ITS FIRST STAGES THE SCIENCE OF EDUCATION WAS CRITICAL OF EXISTING SCHOOL PRACTICES AND RESULTS. AT THAT TIME, NORMAL SCHOOL TEACHERS OFTEN JOINED WITH TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN WHAT MIGHT BE CALLED A "VIGOROUS DEFENSIVE REACTION."37

REMNANTS OF THIS INSECURITY APPARENTLY ARE STILL ACTING TO RETARD THE ACCEPTANCE BY MANY LABORATORY SCHOOLS OF A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN CONDUCTING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. FEAR AND INSECURITY WERE CLEARLY SUGGESTED IN THE ATTITUDES AND REMARKS OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS WITH WHOM THE WRITER DISCUSSED THE CLASSROOM TEACHER'S ROLE IN CONDUCTING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. ONE ADMINISTRATOR REMARKED THAT HE WISHED THE TEACHERS WITH WHOM HE WORKED WERE MORE SOPHISTICATED, MORE LITERATE CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. HE EXPRESSED

37 JUDD, OP. CIT., P. 296.
THE OPINION THAT THEY MIGHT THEN FEAR IT LESS. THERE ARE, HOWEVER, A FEW OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTORS TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATED WITH THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS ESTABLISHED IN THE NINETEENTH OR EARLY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.
III. RESEARCH CENTERED SCHOOLS

F. W. Parker became principal of the Cook County Normal School in 1883. Concerning this school, Rugg has written: "The entire work of the practice school was concentrated, through experiments and investigation, on the work of teaching." A model school, in which "professors of education might experiment with curriculum and methods of teaching as professors of science experiment in a laboratory" was opened concurrently with Teachers College, Columbia University, in New York City, on September 12, 1887.

The University of Chicago Department of Education and Philosophy included the laboratory school founded by John Dewey in 1896. Rugg quotes Dewey as stating that the school was operated "especially for the purpose of scientific investigation and research into problems connected with psychology and sociology of education. Its aim was to further the application of scientific concepts and methods to the conduct of school work."

---

38 Perrodin, op. cit., p. 6.
40 Perrodin, op. cit., p. 6.
41 Rugg, op. cit., p. 91.
42 Ibid., p. 94.
Boyd comments:

...Dewey's educational philosophy has grown out of his experiments in the establishment of an ideal school in connection with his pedagogical work at the University of Chicago. The University Laboratory School was intended by him to prepare the way for the school of the future. 43

Good notes that Dewey's school was experimental in two senses:

It was experimental in its constant use of experiment and inquiry as to the children's method of learning; and also in its purpose to serve as a laboratory for the transformation of schools and their relation to society. 44

Teachers College, Columbia University, established a second laboratory school in 1899. At the Speyer School, every effort was made to relate the school to the community in an effective manner, and research and experimentation were conducted as important corollaries of the instructional program. McMurry writes: "The school proper is primarily a school of practice and experiment. It is used mainly by college seniors and graduate students." 45

Another "experimental" school of some importance was established by J. L. Meriam at the University of Missouri. Four ninety minute "exercises" took the place of the "large number of ten to thirty minute classes" typical in public schools.

Lincoln School became Teacher College's third laboratory school. It was established in 1917 under the leadership of Dr. Otis Caldwell. Rugg writes:

From the beginning the school has been kept as a laboratory institution. No practice teaching is permitted, and group observation is restricted. The teachers in the school are trying to discover new and better materials of instruction and improved methods of organization and teaching.

A laboratory school at Ohio State University was opened in 1930. The director of this elementary school was Dr. Laura Zirbes, who had been a faculty member at Lincoln School, Teachers College. Lindquist notes that it was the recommendation of the Ohio State University College of Education's Committee on Organization and Control which brought together the already existing elementary and nursery schools with the new secondary school. The faculty of the University School met for the first time in September of 1932, and the school was opened to pupils in October of that year.

---

46 Perrodin, op. cit., p. 9.
47 Rugg, op. cit., p. 105.
48 Perrodin, op. cit., p. 10.
In 1941, Lincoln School and the Horace Mann School of Teachers College, Columbia University, were merged. After a protracted legal struggle, which included a ten-month trial, beginning April 21, 1947 (Teachers College vs. Nathaniel Goldstein, Attorney General, et. al.), the laboratory schools were abandoned and the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation was organized "to develop cooperative curriculum experimentation." Recorded trial testimony suggests the major reasons for the abandonment of the schools were:

1) Campus schools possess enrollments of highly selected pupils.
2) Today, public schools, in terms of facilities, equipment, and personnel are equipped to do as good a job as the laboratory school; and
3) Private laboratory (campus) schools fail to meet current educational needs.

Acceptance of Research Functions by Laboratory Schools

The function of the laboratory school with which this study is primarily concerned, the research function, was the last to be accepted by this institution. While the laboratory school, in some form, has existed for approximately three hundred years, the first truly research centered laboratory schools were not established until late in the last century. The problem of co-existence of rather disparate functions in one institution has not been solved. Three

Laboratory schools were established in connection with Teachers College, Columbia University, each designed to perform functions different from those of the other two. Although each of the other institutions mentioned in this section established only one laboratory school, there was agreement that the research function should be among those receiving the major portion of available time and money. The provision of facilities for student teaching, participation, and observation, as well as demonstration teaching were given less prominent roles in the schools described in this section. It is of interest to note that the university's responsibility for encouraging educational research was recognized, although not to the extent of continuing the necessary financial support for the schools where important research was being conducted.

Summary

While there is some controversy over the location and date of establishment of the first laboratory school, it is clear that persons concerned with the education of teachers have, for several centuries, recognized the value of providing facilities for guided, supervised practice teaching, and the importance of the demonstration of approved educational methods.

Early laboratory schools typically served one or both of the functions suggested above, and their titles, "model schools," "practice schools," "demonstration schools," give some indication of the purpose or purposes for which the schools were established. As the schools assumed more functions, more general titles, such as "campus schools," or "laboratory schools" were more frequently used. It would be a mistake to assume that the advent of relatively free,
PUBLICLY SUPPORTED NORMAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES MEANT THAT MOST BEGINNING TEACHERS HAVE THE BENEFITS OF SOME PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, INCLUDING SUPERVISED WORK WITH CHILDREN. HOWEVER, PARTICULARLY DURING THE PERIOD IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE CIVIL WAR, THERE WAS A GREAT INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF NORMAL SCHOOLS ESTABLISHED, AND MORE PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS WERE GIVEN SOMETHING MORE THAN REVIEW OF THE COMMON BRANCHES AS PART OF THEIR PREPARATION. LABORATORY SCHOOLS WERE INTEGRAL, EVEN CENTRAL PARTS OF THESE NORMAL SCHOOLS.
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A review of the research and of the professional literature concerning the function of the laboratory school reveals some lack of agreement as to the proper role of this institution. If there is an area of close agreement it is that those most directly concerned with the education of teachers at an institution, whether a teachers college or a university, ought to be involved in the determination of the manner in which the laboratory school can be utilized to facilitate an optimally effective contribution to the institution as a whole, to the schools of the state, and, most important, to the children and youth it directly serves.

In this chapter, the writer will survey some of the research relating to the function of the laboratory school and other pertinent professional writing which has appeared since 1944. Criteria for the selection of the research summarized in this section were difficult to establish. Typically, the research consists of dissertation studies, published and unpublished, and/or studies sponsored by a college or university in an effort to establish or clarify the role of function of its laboratory school. Relevance to the central problem of this
STUDY WAS PROBABLY THE MAJOR CRITERION, RATHER THAN ADEQUACY OF SAMPLING, OR OTHER STANDARDS FREQUENTLY APPLIED WHEN RESEARCH IS BEING JUDGED.

The method of gathering data basic to the studies served as the means of categorizing the research surveyed in this chapter. A majority of the studies were general surveys of practice in laboratory schools. These will be reported in chronological order beginning with the earliest and concluding with the most recent studies. Four of the studies involved rather detailed analysis of laboratory school function, as observed in certain selected laboratory schools. This has sometimes been termed the "case study" approach. Other studies have data gathered, primarily, from interviews and correspondence with leading educators. The case studies of laboratory schools and surveys of professional opinion will also be reviewed in chronological order.
1. STUDIES CONCERNED WITH FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Articles in which the authors recommend increasing emphasis on laboratory school research appeared as early as 1899.1 Learned and Bagley entitled a chapter of their book, The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools, "Should the Practice School Experiment With the Curriculum?"2 The authors wrote: "...it would seem inadvisable for the normal school to attempt, through its practice school, both to teach teachers how to teach and to demonstrate to public schools innovations in the subject matter of instruction."3 The authors recommend the establishment of both an experimental and a practice school. This is representative of the point of view of most leading educators of the period.

Although such recorded expressions of opinion were not uncommon, few attempts were made to discover precisely what functions laboratory schools were performing.

General Surveys of Practice in Laboratory Schools

For purposes of convenience, the writer has classified the various individual surveys under major headings. These are:


3Ibid., p. 220.
Sponsored Surveys, Surveys of Practices in Selected Teacher Education Institutions, and Surveys of Laboratory School Functions in Institutions Holding Membership in American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

**Government sponsored survey.**—Findings of the National Survey of the Education of Teachers, reported in 1933, indicate that 90% of the universities, colleges, and junior colleges surveyed use the campus school for observation, 90% for practice teaching, 80% for demonstration teaching, and 30% for experimentation. The results of the survey of teachers colleges and normal schools were tabulated as follows: 100% of the teachers colleges and normal schools use their campus schools for demonstration; 96.8% used the schools for observation; 93.7% used the schools for practice teaching, and 50% of the campus schools were used for experimentation and research. The great majority of the schools affiliated with teacher education institutions, (off-campus schools), were used for practice teaching and observation, to the exclusion of other functions. It is noted: "To the extent that experimentation is desired in the work of such institutions, it is clearly shown that experimentation is much more frequently employed in campus schools — partly because the institution has more control of campus schools and partly because of the advantage of proximity."

In commenting on these findings, Evenden stresses the importance of a close relationship between the teacher education institution and

---

THE SCHOOL OR SCHOOLS WHOSE FUNCTIONS INCLUDE THE PROVISION OF VARIOUS TYPES OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES. HE WRITES:

ALL INSTITUTIONS PREPARING TEACHERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUPPLY PRACTICE TEACHING FACILITIES OVER WHICH THEY HAVE SUFFICIENT CONTROL TO ASSIGN AND SUPERVISE THE WORK OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS, AND ADEQUATE IN QUANTITY TO FURNISH THE AMOUNT OF PRACTICE TEACHING SATISFACTORY TO THE STATE CERTIFICATION AUTHORITIES...SOME OBSERVATION OR DEMONSTRATION OF TEACHING THE SUBJECT TO PUPILS SHOULD BE PART OF ALL SUBJECT MATTER COURSES IN FIELDS WHICH ARE TAUGHT IN THE TRAINING SCHOOL.5

WILLIAMS6 INCLUDES EVENEND WITH SEVERAL OTHER AUTHORITIES NOT FAVORING EXPERIMENTATION IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL.

SURVEYS OF PRACTICES IN SELECTED TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

ARMENROUT CONDUCTED ONE OF THE EARLY SURVEYS OF PRACTICE IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS. HE WRITES: "THE TRAINING SCHOOL IS USED QUITE LARGELY FOR PURPOSES OF OBSERVATION AND STUDENT TEACHING. IN ONLY A FEW SCHOOLS IS IT USED FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES. SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA; GUNNISON, COLORADO; AND EMPORTIA, KANSAS UTILIZE THE TRAINING SCHOOL TO SOME EXTENT FOR SUCH PURPOSES."7


7WINFIELD D. ARMENROUT, THE CONDUCT OF STUDENT TEACHING IN STATE TEACHERS COLLEGES. (GREELEY, COLORADO: COLORADO TEACHERS COLLEGE, 1928).
Armentrout concluded his report with the recommendation that one or more of three types of laboratory schools be established at teacher education institutions: a school for observation, one for practice and one for experimentation. The author indicates that the majority of the state teachers colleges have little need for experimental schools.

In 1938, Carrington reported on a survey of practices in 194 laboratory schools. One hundred and thirteen of the respondents indicated that the schools with which they were affiliated accepted functions other than the provision of facilities for student teaching. Ninety percent of those surveyed indicated the acceptance of observation as a function; 49% listed experimentation as a function; 20% demonstration; and 11% participation. Carrington notes that student teaching can be carried on in off-campus centers with little or no appreciable loss to the students. He writes:

The belief that affiliated schools provide opportunities for students in situations similar to those they will experience after employment can be supported. Furthermore, there are advantages to be gained in teacher education by having the teachers and administrative officers of public and private schools share the responsibility in the education of teachers.

After suggesting five possible and "desirable" functions which the campus laboratory school might serve, Carrington states: "The consideration that has been given to these five functions leads to

---

8 Ibid.

THE CONCLUSION THAT THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL SHOULD BE A DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL. "10

Rucker's study is summarized in Perrodin's "The Development of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education." Rucker gathered data from 185 teacher education institutions of various types; 93.5% of the respondents reported that their campus laboratory schools were used for student teaching, 86.4% of the schools were used for demonstration teaching, 85.7% were used for participation, and 94.5% were used for observation. More than one third of the laboratory schools were used for research, according to Rucker's data, and slightly less than ten per cent of the schools are used for post-student teaching internship, a relatively new function. Perrodin notes:

Rucker also made an attempt to determine what changes are taking place in the uses of campus laboratory schools. His findings indicate a trend toward increased use of the campus laboratory school for student teaching, other laboratory experiences, and for laboratory research. 11

Saunders made a survey of selected teachers colleges in 1954. The major purpose of the study was the discovery of factors affecting relationships between the faculties of the laboratory schools and education departments, and data were gathered concerning the function or functions of the laboratory schools in the institutions taking part in the study. Saunders summarizes these data as follows:

10Ibid., p. 75.

THE CAMPUS SCHOOLS ARE MAINLY USED FOR SUCH LABORATORY EXPERIENCES AS OBSER-
VATION, PARTICIPATION AND STUDENT TEACH-
ING. THERE IS SOME USE OF CAMPUS SCHOOLS
FOR EXPERIMENTATION AND POST-STUDENT
TEACHING. EXPANSION OF TEACHER EDUCA-
TION PROGRAMS HAS LED TO MORE USE OF OFF-
CAMPUS FACILITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING
EXPERIENCES. IF ALL STUDENT TEACHING EX-
PERIENCES ARE EVENTUALLY CONDUCTED OUT-
SIDE OF THE CAMPUS SCHOOL THERE WILL BE
MORE OPPORTUNITY FOR RESEARCH AND EX-
PERIMENTATION. 12

SAUNDERS RECOMMENDS FURTHER USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR RE-
SEARCH CONDUCTED BY BOTH CAMPUS SCHOOL AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS. 13

SURVEYS OF LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS IN INSTITUTIONS HOLDING
MEMBERSHIP IN A.A.C.T.E.- WILLIAMS SENT QUESTIONNAIRES TO 161 MEMBERS
OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES IN 1933-1934, AND
AGAIN IN 1937-1938. IN ADDITION TO COMPILING THE DATA SECURED FROM
COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES, WILLIAMS SURVEYED STATE SCHOOL LAWS RE-
LATING TO LABORATORY SCHOOLS, INTERVIEWED AND CORRESPONDED WITH EDUCA-
TIONAL AUTHORITIES, AND NOTED THE PROVISIONS OF CONTRACTS BETWEEN VAR-
IOUS SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS USING SCHOOLS
IN THOSE DISTRICTS AS FACILITIES FOR LABORATORY EXPERIENCES. IN SUM-
MARIZING THE DATA SECURED FROM THE SOURCES SPECIFIED ABOVE, WILLIAMS
WRITES:

MORE INSTITUTIONS USE THE SCHOOL FOR STUDENT TEACHING THAN FOR ANY OTHER
PURPOSE (95.4%), ALTHOUGH ALMOST AS LARGE A PROPORTION OF THE INSTITUTIONS,
(94.5%) USE IT FOR OBSERVATION. THE

12ROBERT W. SAUNDERS, "INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LABORATORY
SCHOOLS AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF TEACHERS COLLEGES," (UNPUBLISHED DOCTO-
RAL DISSERTATION, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY, 1954), P. 199.

13IBID., P. 206.
FACT THAT ALL BUT 4.6% EMPLOY IT FOR STUDENT TEACHING INDICATES A RATHER GENERAL BELIEF THAT IT SHOULD BE SO USED. ONLY ABOUT ONE IN TWENTY INSTITUTIONS FAILS TO USE THE SCHOOL FOR ONE OR BOTH OF THESE FUNCTIONS. A FIFTH OF THE INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED DO NOT USE THE CAMPUS SCHOOL FOR PARTICIPATION, ALTHOUGH MOST AUTHORITIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION ADVOCATE SUCH USE. A FOURTH OF ALL OF THE INSTITUTIONS DO NOT EMPLOY THE CAMPUS SCHOOL FOR DEMONSTRATION PURPOSES.14

WILLIAMS STATES THAT HIS STUDY INVOLVED NO INVESTIGATION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL FUNCTION OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL,15 AND, AMONG OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS, HE INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING: "LITTLE EMPHASIS SHOULD BE PLACED UPON EXPERIMENTATION, AND SUCH AS THERE IS SHOULD BE PRIMARILY TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SCHOOL AS A SCHOOL."16

HE INDICATES AGREEMENT WITH THOSE EDUCATORS WHO OPPOSE THE USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES. HE WRITES: "INNOVATIONS IN THE SCHOOLS CANNOT BE MADE ON THE BASIS OF JUDGMENTS FORMED AS A RESULT OF DATA SECURED UNDER ATYPICAL CONDITIONS WHERE STUDENT TEACHING IS DONE."17

HENDERSON MADE A SURVEY OF 37 SCHOOLS HOLDING MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES OF TEACHER EDUCATION. HE FOUND THAT ALL THE COLLEGES USED THE TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR STUDENT TEACHING. FINDINGS ALSO DISCLOSED THAT SIX OF THE HIGH SCHOOLS WERE NOT USED FOR DEMONSTRATION OF OBSERVATION, AND IN ONLY SEVEN OF THE SCHOOLS WAS ANY

14 Ibid., p. 110.
15 Ibid., p. 112.
16 Ibid., p. 224.
17 Ibid., p. 112.
EXPERIMENTAL WORK ATTEMPTED. Henderson states: "Any member of the college faculties whose qualifications would justify his doing so should be permitted to teach a class in the Training School for demonstration purposes."

It is Henderson's contention that few teachers are qualified for research work, and that only a few highly selected student teachers can be, or need be prepared for experimentation and other types of research work.

Carey T. Southall states the central issue of his study as follows: "How much are the functions of laboratory schools affiliated with institutions which are members of the A.A.C.T.E. being emphasized in actual practice to develop selected teacher competencies?" A related problem concerned the contribution, real and potential, of laboratory experiences in teacher education to the development of these competencies. Questionnaires were returned by the directors of 115 laboratory schools. These directors listed the following functions as primary; 55% listed student teaching, 20% listed observation, 14% observation and participation, 7.8% participation, 2.6% experimentation and research, and no schools were utilized for post-student teaching laboratory experiences.

It is of particular relevance to

---

18 Elisha L. Henderson, The Organization and Administration of Student Teaching in State Teachers Colleges, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1937), p. 120.

19 Ibid., p. 111.


21 Ibid.

THE PRESENT STUDY TO NOTE THE REASONS STATED BY THE DIRECTORS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION AS A FUNCTION. FOUR SAID THAT THE REASONS WERE RELATED TO ADEQUACY OF PLANT AND APPROPRIATENESS OF FACILITIES; TWO STATED THAT EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH WERE FUNCTIONS IN KEEPING WITH THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOL, AND TWO STATED THAT CONDUCTING RESEARCH WAS PART OF THE MORE GENERAL FUNCTION OF PROVIDING LEADERSHIP FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.\textsuperscript{23} SOUTHALL COMPUTED COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE RATINGS GIVEN BY LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS AND JURORS CONCERNING THE RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF VARIOUS LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS TO TEACHER COMPETENCIES. PARTICIPATION WAS HELD TO MAKE THE HIGHEST CONTRIBUTION, WITH A HIGH DEGREE OF AGREEMENT (.91); NEXT WAS OBSERVATION (.81); FOLLOWED BY STUDENT TEACHING (.66); EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH (.61); AND EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING (.45).\textsuperscript{24} SOUTHALL COMMENTS:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Since research and experimentation play such a small part in the development of teacher competencies of prospective teachers, it is apparent that the professors of education, in cooperation with laboratory schools, should attempt to develop this in the laboratory school. No less important than other functions it makes its contribution indirectly.}\textsuperscript{25}
\end{quote}

\textbf{Research Involving Detailed Study of Selected Laboratory Schools}

LINDQUIST'S STUDY WAS PRIMARILY CONCERNED WITH THE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM OF EDUCATION AT OHIO STATE'S UNIVERSITY SCHOOL.

\textsuperscript{23}IBID., P. 27.
\textsuperscript{24}IBID., P. 39.
\textsuperscript{25}IBID., P. 53.
Included in this study, however, was a survey of the rank, pay, qualifications, and training of laboratory school administrators and teachers. Lindquist writes:

This examination seems to lead to the conclusions:
1. That a university laboratory school, in theory and in practice, is primarily a school for providing practice and observation opportunities for teachers in training.
2. To say that it should demonstrate the best practice in teaching, or that it should make significant contributions to the development of the secondary school program would seem to be asking too much in view of the training of the teachers there employed, and the salaries paid them.
3. The experts' opinion that these schools can and should make such a contribution seems to be only a pious hope, for they evidently do not think of the staffs of these schools as on a parity, professionally and academically, with the members of their own education departments.
4. There is evident a recurrent questioning, in one form or another, of the autonomous nature of the school and the control of it by the principal and his staff. The suggestion that other persons whose primary responsibility is for the training of teachers rather than for the development of children should have a deciding voice in the policies of the school itself indicates a queer quirk in our thinking about such schools. Admittedly the caring for children by thoroughly competent instructors and the caring for teachers in training for observation and participation in the same institution may come into conflict with each other. However, couldn't it be accepted as a principle that unless a school is, first of all, the best possible school it can be for the children enrolled, it cannot make the contribution to teacher training and curriculum which a department of education should expect of it? And if it is to be such a school, must not the quality of those who work directly with children be
RELIED UPON TO MAKE OF IT SUCH A SCHOOL, RATHER THAN TO EXPECT THAT MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHOSE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY IS THE TEACHING OF ADULTS, SHALL, THROUGH SOME MYSTERIOUS DIRECTIVE INFLUENCE WHICH THEY CAN EXERT UPON AN AVERAGE GROUP OF TEACHERS, MAKE OF THE SCHOOL WHAT IT SHOULD BE FOR CHILDREN.26

LINDQUIST FOLLOWS THIS STATEMENT OF BELIEF WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THAT

...THE SCHOOL MUST BE A LABORATORY PRIMARILY FOR THOSE WHO TEACH THERE, AND THOSE WHO TEACH MUST BE OF A CALIBER TO MAKE IT A LABORATORY IN AS SCIENTIFIC A SENSE AS POSSIBLE, CONSIDERING THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM STUDIED, AND THE TYPE OF DATA THAT ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION.27

EVERLY DISAGREES WITH THOSE WHO CLAIM THAT EXPERIMENTATION AND STUDENT TEACHING ARE INCOMPATIBLE IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. HE WRITES:

If it is true that experimentation and directed teaching are incompatible in a laboratory school, we are indeed on the horns of a dilemma. Student teachers are, in themselves, a great source of influence for the advancement of educational practice, if properly prepared. To deny these people the best that we have to offer in teaching preparation seems a denial of their right to develop maximally. On the other hand, if laboratory schools are unable to develop advanced programs and become experimental because of the presence of student teachers, the democratic


27Ibid., p. 20.
CHOICE SEEMS TO FAVOR ELIMINATION OF STUDENT TEACHING IN TERMS OF THE GREATEST COMMON GOOD.  

Everly selected six laboratory schools for rather detailed study, with emphasis on their philosophy, function, curriculum and physical plant. Three of these schools accepted the provision of facilities for student teaching as their primary function. Everly continues:

Three others make only limited use of student teachers and express concern as to their effect on the demonstration and experimentation functions of the school. All schools see a responsibility to help prepare student teachers, provided their presence does not disrupt other functions.

Only three schools demonstrated programs that were interpreted by Everly as being consistent with a democratic philosophy. Three of the schools visited provided observation facilities, and only one disclaimed demonstration as a function. The staffs of four schools accepted responsibility for the in-service growth of teachers in their "service area," participating in workshops, acting as consultants to other faculties, etc. Concerning the experimentation function, Everly writes:

All schools agree that this is an important function of a laboratory school, but only half of the schools are actually conducting a carefully planned and organized program of experimentation.

---


29 Ibid., p. 301.

30 Ibid., p. 458.

31 Ibid., p. 459.

32 Ibid., p. 460.

33 Ibid., p. 462.
Administrators suggested that research was lagging because of inadequate funds and insufficient staff. Everly took the position of advocating a great deal more participation in educational research by laboratory school personnel, including the faculty of the laboratory school at the University of Hawaii, the institution which served as the focal point of his study.

Ramseyer's study involved direct observation in ten laboratory schools, visits in 15 schools and school systems, and the detailed study of twelve schools "selected" because each of them presents a slightly different approach to improvement.34

From his study of school improvement in the institutions mentioned above, and his survey of the literature, Ramseyer concluded:

1. The laboratory concept of teacher education is growing among teachers colleges. Experiments are underway to give teachers more experience, and to bring theory and practice together in the process of inducting the prospective teacher into the process of teaching.
2. Most laboratory schools find these teacher education duties so burdensome that they are handicapped in opportunity to develop new ideas.
3. The laboratory school has been one of the very effective instruments in school improvement by contributing greatly to experimental work.
4. A few laboratory schools have been leaders in experimental approaches to school improvement. In these schools the immediate teacher education duties ...have been lighter than in the others.

34 Ibid., p. 461.
51

5. A system of controlled and uncontrolled schools is suggested to care for the several laboratory functions of teacher education, including experimentation.35

Ramseyer's major recommendation is of special interest to those interested in and concerned about the future of the laboratory school. He advocates the abandonment of the laboratory school as soon as public schools are capable of assuming leadership roles in experimental and teacher education.36

Himmelman's study involved visits to nine state colleges in Wisconsin, interviews with administrators in these institutions, and a survey of opinion as indicated by responses to questionnaires completed by the directors of laboratory schools. Three of the nine directors responding to the questionnaire indicated that they felt the campus school should engage in research, and that they, the directors, attempted to provide leadership in this area.37 Himmelman notes:

The Directors reported that activity was limited in regard to research and experimentation as a result of 1) lack of time, 2) insufficient finances, and 3) the need for more staff.38


36 Ibid., p. 377.


38 Ibid., p. 441.
Five of the directors felt that the laboratory school curriculum should imitate that of the public school, but, in a seemingly contradictory position, held that laboratory schools should serve as a leadership agency for the public schools in the area served by the teacher education institution.

Surveys of Professional Opinion

B. T. Baldwin surveyed educators at thirty-three state universities, twenty-five privately endowed universities, and fifteen colleges.\(^39\) In summarizing his findings, Baldwin writes:

There is an increasing emphasis on observation work and practice teaching in state universities. This emphasis is also present, but to a less marked degree, in the privately endowed universities and colleges.\(^40\)

Baldwin makes no statement concerning the representativeness of the sampling of laboratory schools in his study, nor are the responses of the educators surveyed reported in much detail. The purpose of this study was to give some assistance and direction to those responsible for planning the laboratory school at the University of Texas, rather than to provide data for more general interest. In discussing the proposed school, Baldwin writes: "The school will be a laboratory for the department of education, and will offer opportunities for educational research, the testing of educational theories,

---


\(^{40}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 459.
AND THE ACCUMULATION OF STATISTICS AND OTHER DATA FOR THE SCIENCE OF EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION. It is possible that the author's study made more obvious the need for such an experimental school.

JARMAN'S STUDY WAS PRIMARILY CONCERNED WITH LABORATORY SCHOOLS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL. HE MADE INQUIRIES OF PRINCIPALS OF TWENTY UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOLS, AND SURVEYED CURRENT PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE AND OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS FOR INDICATIONS OF ACTUAL AND OFFICIALLY STATED FUNCTIONS. ALTHOUGH HE FOUND THAT EXPERIMENTATION WAS MENTIONED AS A FUNCTION NINE TIMES IN OFFICIAL UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS, AND TEN TIMES IN PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE, AS ACCEPTED FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOLS, TEN OF THE PRINCIPALS INDICATED THAT NO STUDIES WERE BEING CONDUCTED IN THEIR LABORATORY SCHOOLS WHICH COULD NOT BE CONDUCTED IN TYPICAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS. JARMAN NOTES THAT:

"RESEARCH STUDIES HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED IN LESS THAN HALF OF THE UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOLS WHICH COULD NOT HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED JUST AS WELL IN COOPERATING SCHOOLS." Ninety percent of the college deans, and of the laboratory school principals who responded to JARMAN'S QUESTIONNAIRE FAVORED THE INCLUSION OF "A UNIVERSITY CONTROLLED SCHOOL FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES." THE ONLY FUNCTION LABORATORY SCHOOLS FAVORED BY A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF THOSE RESPONDING WAS STUDENT TEACHING. ACCORDING TO JARMAN, THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE

41 Ibid., p. 462.

42 ARTHUR M. JARMAN, "THE ADMINISTRATION OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS" (UNPUBLISHED DOCTORAL DISSERTATION, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, 1932).

43 Ibid., p. 100.

44 Ibid., p. 100.
CHECK LIST DID NOT FACILITATE MENTIONING WHETHER OR NOT SEPARATE SCHOOLS FOR SEPARATE FUNCTIONS WERE CONSIDERED TO BE DESIRABLE. He concludes, however, that: "The general approval of these functions for a university high school seems to indicate that separate schools are not intended. This assumption is in accord with practice since no state university has more than one campus school on the secondary level."

Young's study had as its central purpose the discovery of possible contributions of campus schools to curriculum change in public schools. The educators interviewed by Young suggested three areas in which they felt the laboratory school could make unique contributions: serving as demonstration school, acting as "pilot schools" for the testing of new ideas, and providing leadership for public school teachers in developing processes and techniques of curriculum change. Commenting on the problem of multiple, and, at times, disparate functions in laboratory schools, Young writes: "Most educators referred to in this study believe campus schools to be indispensable institutions, which must choose among areas of endeavor, instead of trying, simultaneously and ineffectively, to serve as a

\[45\] Ibid., p. 121.


\[47\] Ibid., p. 158.
LABORATORY FOR EXPERIMENTATION, DEMONSTRATION TEACHING, AND PRACTICE TEACHING. 148 Fifteen educators were questioned by Young with reference to laboratory school function. They were in general agreement that campus schools were not necessarily the best experimental schools, nor the best situations for student teaching, but rather should provide facilities for observation, participation, and demonstration. The educators interviewed indicated that more than one type of laboratory school was needed and stressed the ever-increasing competence of public school personnel, suggesting that public schools might well provide better facilities for student teaching and post student teaching laboratory experiences. 149

Ashmore made a study of state supported laboratory schools in the southeastern United States. 50 A questionnaire was sent to deans, principals, college instructors, and laboratory school teachers. The respondents were asked to evaluate the effectiveness with which the particular laboratory school being judged performed its research-experimental function. Most of the respondents (one-third of the teachers, and three-fourths of the deans, for example,) gave the rating of "poor." Only ten principals, and no deans, applied the "very good" rating. Commenting on the research being conducted in these schools, he writes:

48 ibid., p. 148.
49 ibid., p. 148.
One school had records of two experimental studies having been published in some form, one had a record of one experimental study which had been published, and nine had no record of any study having been published in any form. 51

Ashmore makes the following summary:

The evidence presented would lead to the conclusion that the primary function of the laboratory school should be that of demonstration and participation with a second major function being that of experimentation. 52

Summary of Findings

Surveys of practice, professional opinion, and detailed case studies of laboratory schools have revealed that the laboratory schools were, and are, being used most frequently for student teaching. Observation and participation are functions common to the great majority of laboratory schools, followed in frequency by demonstration teaching. Data reported from the National Survey of the Education of Teachers suggest that half of the laboratory schools were being used for educational research. Everly and Carrington report similar findings. In each of the other studies summarized in this section, the data suggest a much smaller percentage of laboratory schools are research centers. It should be noted that definitions of and criteria for research vary widely, and this variation may well account for some of the findings reported by the investigator. In only one study, that conducted by Ashmore, was any effort made to secure an evaluation of the research

51 Ibid., p. 84.
52 Ibid., p. 90.
Conducted. Results were not encouraging to anyone interested in seeing the laboratory school assume a more prominent role as a leadership agency, or as an institution whose function consists of much more than maintaining an educational equilibrium. There was rather consistent agreement that the pursuit of research for the sake of research was of less value than research which has as its aim the improvement of the curriculum, or the development of specific teaching competencies.

The problem of conflicting functions has not been solved. Many of the reports of the studies summarized in this chapter referred to the rather serious conflicts resulting when student teaching and experimentation and research are functions of equal or nearly equal status in the laboratory school. Those who assume the conflict also seem to assume that the student teaching situation should be typical or representative of public school situations. The expense of maintaining a laboratory school can hardly be justified on this basis, particularly since public school teachers are increasingly better prepared, in terms of years of education, and public school facilities are improving at a very rapid rate.

Stiles provides an excellent and concise summary of the research relating to the function or functions of the laboratory school. He writes:

The most typical provision with respect to laboratory facilities is that of a campus laboratory or training school (also designated as a practice, demonstration or experimental school) supplemented by public schools (off-campus schools) located in close proximity to the college or university... The utilization of the campus laboratory school for observation and limited participation and the use of
OFF-CAMPUS SCHOOLS (LOCATED AWAY FROM THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY) FOR FULL TIME STUDENT TEACHING PROPER IS A PATTERN WHICH IS BECOMING MORE GENERALLY ENDORSED.53

STILES CONTINUES:

CONSIDERABLE CONCERN HAS BEEN ADVANCED REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL. A SYNTHESIS OF OPINIONS EXPRESSED AND OF STUDIES COMPLETED INDICATE THAT EFFORTS ARE NOW UNDERWAY TO CLARIFY ITS FUNCTIONS. PURPOSES AND FUNCTIONS MOST FREQUENTLY STRESSED INCLUDE: EXPERIMENTATION, RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND THE TRANSMITTAL OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION.54

IN THE OPINION OF THIS WRITER, YOUNG'S RECOMMENDATION SEEMS TO BE OF GREAT WORTH. THE FACULTIES OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION WITH WHICH IT IS ASSOCIATED NEED TO GIVE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO A RE-EXAMINATION OF LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS, IN TERMS OF THE GOALS AND PURPOSES OF THE INSTITUTION AS A WHOLE. FACULTIES OF STATE SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS MUST ALSO CONSIDER THEIR OBLIGATIONS TO TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT THEY SERVE. RAMSEYER AND YOUNG HAVE BOTH DRAWN ATTENTION TO THE OBLIGATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO PLAY AN INCREASINGLY MORE SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN TEACHER EDUCATION, BOTH PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE.

53 LINDLEY STILES, "STUDENT TEACHING AND INTERNSHIP" ENCYCLOPEDIA OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (REV. ED.), P. 1363.
54 Ibid.
II. PROFESSIONAL OPINION CONCERNING
THE FUNCTION OR FUNCTIONS OF
THE LABORATORY SCHOOL

Brief mention was made in the introductory portion of the preceding section to the wealth of professional opinion concerning the function of the laboratory school. Educators became concerned about the purpose and role of the laboratory school quite early in the history of that institution. That is, those who saw the laboratory school as a "model" school soon began to see that there would be value as well in providing facilities for "practice" or student teaching.

It is not claimed that the following summary of professional opinion is exhaustive. It is the writer's hope, however, that it is representative of the writing concerning the function of the laboratory school published during the period 1944-1959.

This survey of professional opinion will be organized into the following sections: First, articles written by laboratory school administrators and laboratory school faculty members will be summarized. The next section will include articles written by those who are interested in teacher education, but who are not directly connected with laboratory schools. The final two sections include contributions to conferences of professional organizations and contributions to publications of professional groups and learned societies.
ARTICLES WRITTEN BY FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Efforts of the faculty of the University School at Ohio State University to evaluate its contribution to teacher education are summarized in an article by Margaret Koopman, published in 1944. After quoting from the original statement of functions, Miss Koopman comments in some detail concerning the function of experimentation, as it was operating in the school:

A study of research and experimentation in University School reveals an experimental attitude and a much greater readiness to accept change than is generally found. Rapid adaptations to the demands of a wartime situation are to be seen in the guidance program, the curriculum, the increased emphasis upon work service, and the Lower School, in the extension of the school day. Thirteen research and experimental studies were underway during 1942... In general, experimentation has stemmed from the interest which an individual or a small group has had in a problem; in a very few cases, it has resulted from the faculty's concerted attack upon a basic school problem.55

The author follows this observation with the recommendation that future research should be more carefully planned, be concentrated on problems of an "all-school character" which can be attacked cooperatively and should be more experimental.56 In commenting on the committee's report, the director of the school is quoted as making the additional

55MARGARET KOOPMAN, "A LABORATORY SCHOOL EVALUATES ITS CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHER EDUCATION," EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN, XIII (January, 1944), P. 10.
56Ibid., P. 12.
Recommendation of closer coordination between school and college in carrying on research. 57

Jaggers, who was the director of a laboratory school at the time he wrote the article discussed here, stated that the laboratory must be more than a "proving ground" for educational theories. "It is, first of all, a place where those who plan to teach may learn how to teach by teaching under the guidance of a master teacher." 58

Wagenhorst shares the point of view of Jaggers, and, like Jaggers, was the director of a laboratory school at the time his article was published. Wagenhorst writes: "The first and most important function of this school is the demonstration of superior classroom management and teaching." He adds that this function should extend to include such demonstrations to teachers in the field, not merely to pre-service teachers. 59

Klohr notes that student teaching, participation, and demonstration tend to overshadow "other vital functions which have more recently evolved. One such important function is experimentation and research." 60 He classifies the types of research being conducted at

57 Ibid., p. 13.


60 Paul Klohr, "Research in a Campus Laboratory School," Graduate School Record, VIII. (July, 1955), p. 4.
the Ohio State University School as follows:

1) Research and experimentation with teaching methods (broadly conceived) and curriculum design, and

2) Research in fields of specialization other than education problems, problems, however, clearly oriented toward the child in a school setting.

Klohr takes the position that both applied research and basic research are compatible, indeed essential, in a laboratory school:

"...A campus school makes a unique contribution to the field of education when it functions as a laboratory for the interpretation of the two."

One of the more recent published statements of laboratory school functions, as agreed upon by a laboratory school faculty, is included in Harley Lautenschlager's article, "The Role of the Laboratory School."

He writes:

The staff of the laboratory school has identified and accepted the following four broad functions of our school:

1. To provide the best instructional program, designed to meet the needs of the boys and girls attending the laboratory school.

2. To assist in every way we can in the teacher education program of our college, including such things as observation, participation, demonstration lessons, student teaching, etc.

3. To try out the findings of research, exemplify modern practices, carry on experimentation, and active research of our own; cooperate with research and publicize our work.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid., p. 7.
4. To provide ways and means for meeting the physical, emotional, intellectual and social needs of our pupils, staff, parents, and all with whom we work.

Survey of Articles Written by Teacher Educators

Morgan, President Emeritus of a teachers college, wrote very forcefully of the need for the laboratory school to become a more active agency in educational research:

It is my sincere hope that, ere long, some teachers college will be able to inspire its laboratory school to pioneer in the field of experimentation and research to discover ways of more interesting and effective teaching on the elementary and secondary levels. Such pioneering should involve every staff member, on the campus and off of it.

Anthony places himself in the group seeing the campus school as an atypical, research centered institution: "It must emphasize the function which, thus far, it has emphasized the least - experimentation." The experimentation favored by Anthony is "social experimentation," with the purpose of improving specific aspects of community life.

Tanreuther is among those who favor the establishment of more

---


64 W. P. Morgan, "Teachers College Laboratory Schools," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXVII (February, 1946), p. 168.


66 Ibid., p. 276.
THAN ONE LABORATORY SCHOOL. HE WRITES:

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ONE SCHOOL TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE LABORATORY EXPERIENCES PRIOR TO, DURING, AND AFTER STUDENT TEACHING, AND AT THE SAME TIME SERVE THE RESEARCH PURPOSE, EVEN THOUGH THE TERM RESEARCH BE BROADLY INTERPRETED. 67

HE RECOMMENDS MORE EXTENSIVE UTILIZATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES FOR LABORATORY EXPERIENCES SUCH AS STUDENT TEACHING AND PARTICIPATION, AND INCREASING USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IN CONDUCTING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. 68

GASKILL INDICATES THAT OVERLOADING THE CAMPUS SCHOOLS WITH PROFESSIONAL SERVICE ACTIVITIES, STUDENT TEACHERS, OBSERVERS, PARTICIPANTS, ETC., ACCOUNTS FOR THE DECLINE OF INTEREST IN AND ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT BY FACULTIES, AND ADMINISTRATORS, IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. HE CITES THE OPTIMUM CONDITIONS IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS (SMALL CLASSES, WELL QUALIFIED FACULTY, ETC.) WHICH SHOULD AID THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IN ASSUMING A ROLE AS A LEADERSHIP AGENCY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND OTHER EXPERIMENTATION. HE STATES THAT THE CAMPUS SCHOOL SHOULD RE-EXAMINE AND CLARIFY ITS FUNCTIONS, PRIMARY AND COROLLARY, AND CHOOSE THOSE MOST APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF FACILITIES, FUNDS, AND LEVELS OF ABILITIES REPRESENTED IN THE FACULTY, RATHER THAN FULFILLING, OR ATTEMPTING TO FULFILL, ALL THE FUNCTIONS WHICH MIGHT BE DELEGATED TO IT. 69


68 Ibid., p. 221.

Bettelheim notes the earlier emphasis on laboratory school research, and the movement away from this function to student teaching, participation, etc. In stressing the need for experimentation in the laboratory school, he writes:

New ideas in education need a great deal of experimentation. The ideal setting for this experimentation is the small school that is not hamstrung by predetermined requirements, a school that permits great flexibility and easy readjustments.70

He adds:

In recent decades, the laboratory schools, which should have been the testing ground for new ideas, have perhaps, like most schools, rested on their laurels... While the laboratory schools usually remained in the vanguard of development, and thus did not act too late, they, at times, were satisfied with being leaders in doing, if not the trite, the obvious.71

Survey of Contributions to Conferences of Professional Organizations

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education sponsored a "School for Executives" at Estes Park, Colorado. The Study Groups concerned with laboratory schools suggested ten functions, from which faculties might select those most appropriate to their own situations:

1. The function of furthering the development of professional laboratory experiences.
2. The function of integrating theory and practice.
3. The practicum laboratory.

71Ibid., p. 62.
4. A laboratory for the study of school and community integration.
5. A laboratory for later observation and participation.
6. The service function.
7. The pioneering, exploring, developing, publishing function.
8. The research function.
9. The follow-up function.
10. The curriculum development function in teacher education.\textsuperscript{72}

The "practicum laboratory" function referred to by the committee members is that function often called participation. By omitting the listing of student teaching as a function, the committee evidently intends to support those who favor the assignment of this function to the public schools.

Committee members make the following statement concerning research:

The campus laboratory school should serve as a center in which research can be carried on, looking toward the improvement of practices in the education of children and in teacher education. Much of the actual research may be carried on by outsiders working within the school temporarily. In any event, however, the entire college faculty should consider carefully the resources and the real functions of the institution before embarking on any elaborate program of research, especially any that involve extensive scientific experimentation.\textsuperscript{73}


\textsuperscript{73}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 2.
Dead of the College of Education, University of Michigan, Willard Olson, addressed the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Midwest Laboratory School Administrators. He, of course, indicated support for the type of longitudinal research in child development for which the laboratory school at the University of Michigan has become famous. He noted that inasmuch as a school with an enrollment of 300 to 500 pupils is still the average in the United States, the small laboratory school occupies a position of particular prominence and leadership potential. In the discussion which followed the address, it was suggested that ideally, one member of a laboratory school staff, talented in writing, should have the responsibility of writing and editing reports of research carried on in the school.74

In the summary of the proceedings of a conference of laboratory school administrators, Frazier writes:

> We have been saying, or so it seems to me, that all of the other roles we play, valuable and essential as they are in teacher education, are often shared with, or even assumed altogether by other schools around us. But our location and our nature are such that for us the research role, or at least the role of research leadership, must be considered primary. Indeed, because of some elements that are unique to us, we may feel a necessity for assuming this as our major role.75


75Alexander Frazier, "How Can Laboratory Schools Work Together to Fulfill Their Roles?" Role of the Laboratory School in Teacher Education (Gainesville: University of Florida, 1959), p. 27.
Frazier lists five reasons for the engagement of laboratory school faculties in educational research; first, because research is a discipline in itself, it leads to further growth and development as a faculty; it is excellent in-service education, because it will lead to the implementation of present knowledge, and "finally, research is important...because there are so many things we desperately need to know." 76

Addressing this same conference, Myers stated:

A research program should be the basic ingredient of curriculum development. It is our assumption that the research activities of a laboratory school should be guided by the needs of the program. It is our assumption that curriculum development based on research evidence is the best means of assuring increased learning by the students. 77

In summary, Myers listed four major functions of the laboratory school. These include provision of the best possible program for children and youth, fulfilling both the teacher education and research roles, and the service function, to the college, university, and state. 78

Commenting on these same four functions, Wiles states:

"...no laboratory school fulfills its role completely unless

[76] Ibid., p. 28.


[78] Ibid., p. 5.
PROVISION IS MADE FOR RESEARCH.  He cites the need for research of two types, that commonly called "action" research and "basic" research. Wiles sees the major distinction between these two types as one of carefulness of design. He sees most faculties engaged in the evaluation of the results of one type or method of instruction as compared with another. Thus, the need in educational research is for a "more definitive type of research activities." Wiles specifically recommends that the research program of the laboratory school cover a period of not less than ten years. Long-term research needs to be supplemented by studies of shorter duration. Wiles strongly favors the involvement of the entire faculty in the planning and execution of a program of research, and the assignment of major responsibility for the coordination and direction of the program to one faculty member or administrator. This, then, should be considered a major part of that person's "load." Wiles writes:

If the development of a research program is left for someone to do after he has completed his other work, the chances are very great that the school will never have a research program.

He states his belief that: "Research in a college of education should center in a laboratory school." He concludes with the recommendation


80IBID.

81IBID., p. 20.

82IBID., p. 25.
that the: "Laboratory school should guide the schools in a state desiring to do research."\(^3\)

**Contributions to Publications of Professional Groups and Learned Societies**

W. E. Armstrong was among those favoring the establishment of more than the "practice center" for laboratory experiences at differing levels. In his report on the cooperative study sponsored by the American Council on Education, Armstrong writes: "Most institutions in the cooperative study that had the opportunity found it profitable to work with both campus and public (or for that matter, private) schools.\(^4\) He continues:

> The ideal arrangement appears to be approximated when preparation for student teaching can be undertaken with the resources of a campus school to draw upon, and when the practice teaching itself is done in some school independent of the college, and at a distance from campus.\(^5\)

In a chapter in the 1951 yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Olson deals with the role of the laboratory school in graduate education. After noting that little has been written on this topic, and of course, stressing the need for laboratory school leadership in child development research, he writes:

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 83.


\(^5\)Ibid.
In conclusion, a laboratory school engaged in graduate education should have some of the philosopher's regard for the integrity of the research process in the determination of truth, and the engineer's regard for ingenuity of design and application for use. Such an operation constitutes an important adjunct to graduate preparation for both research and professional advancement. 86

Windrow asks a very pertinent question in his discussion of the "typical situation" problems: "Is it the mission of the teachers college to perpetuate average situations?...From somewhere I have the impression that it was the function of the laboratory school to create and keep the best educational environment possible." 87

Lindsay writes that the trend is away from the use of laboratory school for research and experimentation, and that facilities are more often provided for demonstration and student teaching. He quotes a spokesman for "one of our large Midwestern Teachers Colleges" as stating:

We have, as a matter of fact, played down the research and experimental function of our laboratory school in an effort to develop a stabilized


A university faculty member is quoted by Lindsay as saying: "We do not see how experimentation can be carried on in a school used largely for student teaching." 89

In the 1955 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, a "symposium" on the present and future uses of the laboratory school is reported. The discussion and comments of several leading educators who took part in the symposium is summarized as follows:

It has been stated that the modern teacher education program will include one or more college controlled laboratory schools to serve some or all of the following functions:

A. To provide convenient and excellent opportunities for a wide variety of professional laboratory experiences, including observation, demonstration, and specialized student teaching.

B. To provide opportunity for research and experimentation in order that 1) more knowledge can be acquired concerning theories of learning, better teaching techniques, more effective school organization, and the development of proved teaching materials, 2) better procedures of utilizing what we already know concerning the educational process may be tested in an ideal environment.


89 Ibid.
C. TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP IN IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE AREA SERVED BY THE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION.

Blair lists six principles useful in guiding a laboratory school faculty in a study and evaluation of the roles and functions of their school:

1. The functions anticipated for the laboratory school should be performed at a high level of quality.
2. The anticipated functions of a laboratory school should enable the teacher education institution to provide a highly functional, meaningful program in teacher education.
3. Development of an emphasis on function should be determined chiefly by emphasis in and peculiar needs of the teacher education institution.
4. The extent of the functions performed by the laboratory school should be determined by emphasis in and peculiar needs of the teacher education institution.
5. Projection of the potential degree of emphasis and the quality of anticipated function is necessary to facilitate planning.
6. The functions anticipated for the laboratory school should be determined according to established goals.

Summary of Professional Opinion

There is no single direction pointed by this review of the literature. Those who recommend increasing emphasis on research in the laboratory school are seldom very definitive as to the proper


character or aims of this research. There is some agreement that the laboratory school ought to be a good school for children, and that it should be in the process of becoming better. However, when this process of becoming "better" involves new approaches to instruction, trying different methods or techniques of teaching, so that the school becomes atypical and unrepresentative, many say that it cannot then fulfill its major functions; the provision of facilities for student teaching and/or the demonstration of accepted educational practice to teachers, in-service as well as pre-service.

The review of the literature also suggests that some are beginning to see the personnel in the public schools as playing a much more significant role in the education of teachers. Student teaching is frequently mentioned as one laboratory experience which the public schools are extremely well qualified to provide. Those writers who wish to see the public schools assume a major portion of the responsibility for laboratory experiences often mention that it is one way of freeing laboratory schools for more work in the areas of research and other experimentation.
III. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the reported research and the general literature related to the function of the laboratory school reveals the fact that while much has been written concerning the role of the laboratory school in educational research, very little has been done in the majority of laboratory schools. Those schools claiming research as a function seldom number more than half of the schools surveyed as part of the studies summarized in this chapter. Data from Ashmore's study suggest that research being conducted is not given a very high rating, even by those involved in directing it. Results of Jarman's study reveal that there was little research being conducted which challenged the faculties of the laboratory schools, or capitalized upon those qualities which tend to make the laboratory school unique; small classes, and above-average plants and facilities, among others.

The reasons specified for the laboratory school's apparent apprehension or apathy concerning educational research usually resolve themselves to three; lack of funds, insufficient staff, and responsibility for the fulfillment of so many other functions, that the result is a dissipation of money and staff energies.

It seems rather evident that the laboratory school cannot be viewed in isolation from other agencies involved in the professional education of teachers. It is a part of a teacher education institution, and if that institution receives state financial support, it is also a part of the school system of a state. Its functions, stated
AND OPERATIONAL, CANNOT BE VIEWED APART FROM THESE SETTINGS. A HIERARCHY OF FUNCTIONS SELECTED IN TERMS OF THE VALUES, SIZE, FACILITIES OF ONE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION IN ONE STATE WILL Seldom BE ENTIRELY APPROPRIATE FOR ANOTHER LABORATORY SCHOOL WHICH IS PART OF ANOTHER COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY IN A DIFFERENT STATE. THERE IS, HOWEVER, SOME AGREEMENT THAT FACULTIES OF EACH INSTITUTION, CONSIDERING THE FACTORS MENTIONED ABOVE, AND OTHERS, SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN A CRITICAL RE-APPRAISAL OF THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL.
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CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In this chapter, the data basic to the present study will be summarized. The chapter will include the tabulated responses to "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research in Laboratory Schools." Also included in the present chapter will be reports of visits to five laboratory schools in Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana, and of interviews with educators who hold or have held administrative positions in laboratory schools or whose general interest in teacher education involves specific concern with the level and type of laboratory experiences provided for prospective teachers. These data will be interpreted and the chapter will be concluded with a summary of the data gathered relating to educational research in laboratory schools, at the elementary level, connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education.

Certain statements relating to the objectivity of these data reported in the present chapter were included in Chapter One. To avoid repetitiveness, these are not presented again here. The data reported in this chapter have been analyzed and interpreted with careful consideration for the limitations detailed in Chapter One.
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES

Administrators of laboratory schools connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education were asked to complete "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research in Laboratory Schools." One hundred fifty-four administrators received copies of this instrument. One hundred and thirty-five questionnaires, or 87.6% were returned.

Lists supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, United States Office of Education, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the Association for Student Teaching, were combined, and questionnaires were sent to administrators of schools listed by at least two of the organizations named above. Due to slight inaccuracies in these lists, some institutions not operating laboratory schools were contacted. It could be assumed that some of the nineteen institutions who made no response to the questionnaire did not complete the instrument for this reason. Eight faculty members in institutions not supporting laboratory schools returned the questionnaire with a note explaining that necessary laboratory experiences were provided by nearby public schools. One questionnaire was completed by the director of a laboratory school which received no state support. This response was not tabulated with those returned by administrators of laboratory schools associated with state-supported institutions of teacher education. One questionnaire was returned with a note explaining that it was not completed because the laboratory school had not been and was not at present engaged in educational research. Four responses included the statement that the teacher-education institutions had
RECENTLY CEASED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

FIVE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE COMPLETED BY PRINCIPALS OR DIRECTORS OF
LABORATORY SCHOOLS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL. SINCE THE PRESENT STUDY IS
PRIMARILY CONCERNED WITH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS AT
THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL, THESE RESPONSES ARE NOT INCLUDED WITH THE
DATA REPORTED IN THIS CHAPTER.

TABLE 1
RESPONSES TO "AN INQUIRY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses Received</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>87.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses from State-Supported</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>74.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Schools, Elementary Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE UNUSUALLY HIGH PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES WOULD SEEM TO INDICATE A HIGH DEGREE OF PROFESSIONAL INTEREST IN RESEARCH IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. WITHIN THE LIMITATIONS STATED IN CHAPTER ONE, IT WOULD SEEM REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT ENOUGH RESPONSES WERE RECEIVED TO MAKE POSSIBLE SOME VALID CONCLUSIONS RELATING TO RESEARCH IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS ASSOCIATED WITH STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS OF TEACHER EDUCATION.

THE RESPONSES TO ITEMS IN "AN INQUIRY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS" WILL BE SUMMARIZED IN AN ORDER RELATING
DIRECTLY TO THEIR PLACEMENT IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. UNLESS OTHERWISE IN-
DIATED, TABLES WILL CONSIST OF A STATEMENT RELATING TO THE ITEM IN THE
QUESTIONNAIRE, THE NUMBER OF RESPONSES, AND THE PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES.
Percentages, in all cases, will be percentages of responses received (115) not of questionnaires sent (154).

**Data Relating to Size of Teacher Education Institution, Size of Laboratory School, and Positions of Respondents**

Following the name of the teacher education institution and that of the campus school, information was requested relating to the number of undergraduate and graduate students majoring in elementary education. It was felt that there might be some relationship between the size of the institution and the level of research activity. It will be seen, in the tabulation of other items in the questionnaire, that there were too few institutions listing research as a function to test this hypothesis or express the relationship statistically.
# TABLE 2

## ENROLLMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS (ELEMENTARY EDUCATION MAJORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just beginning graduate program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or under</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 201</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A possible explanation of the large number of respondents who did not complete this item is the difficulty a laboratory school administrator might encounter in obtaining information regarding registration from an office which is often in another building. Campus communications are often complex and difficult, particularly on a large campus. Undoubtedly, some of those not completing the item relating to graduate enrollment wished to indicate that there was no graduate program. This could only be surmised, however, and only those who stated "none" were included in that category. Over one-third (34.9%) of the respondents reported on enrollment of one hundred graduate students or less.
MAJORING IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, AS CONTRASTED WITH SLIGHTLY MORE THAN ONE-FOURTH (25.3%) REPORTING GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS OF MORE THAN ONE HUNDRED STUDENTS. NEARLY ONE-HALF OF THE INSTITUTIONS (47.0%) ENROLL FEWER THAN 501 UNDERGRADUATES, COMPARED WITH FEWER THAN ONE-THIRD ENROLLING MORE THAN 501 STUDENTS MAJORING IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

Almost twice as many respondents did not complete the graduate enrollment item as compared with those leaving blank the item relating to undergraduate enrollment. This suggests, perhaps, that undergraduates make more frequent use of laboratory school facilities than graduate students, and that the laboratory school, at present, has a closer relationship to the pre-service phase of teacher education than to the in-service or graduate phase.

There was no uncertainty concerning enrollment of the laboratory school itself, and few (or no) omissions of response to this item on the questionnaire.

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment of Laboratory School (Elementary)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 or under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-300</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-500</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 501</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the vast majority of laboratory schools enroll from 100 to 500 pupils in the elementary school, with more than half in the 101-300 interval. It should be noted that some laboratory schools consider nursery school through the eighth grade, and others
INCLUDE CHILDREN ENROLLED FROM KINDERGARTEN THROUGH THE SIXTH GRADE, AS THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. THE DEFINITION OF "ELEMENTARY" VARIES FROM STATE TO STATE AND FROM ONE AREA OF THE COUNTRY TO ANOTHER.

The position as well as the name of the person completing the questionnaire was requested. In each case, the questionnaire was mailed to the director of the laboratory school, by name, where this was known. It was assumed that laboratory school administrators would be those best equipped to supply the requested data. Names of directors and principals were obtained from lists supplied by the Midwest Laboratory School Administrators Association and a national association of laboratory administrators. The director or principal usually accepted the responsibility for completing the questionnaire, as will be noted in the data summarized in Table 4.
TABLE 4
POSITION OF RESPONDENT TO QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal-Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant or Vice Principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman or Dean, Department of Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other College of University Officials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory of Student Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Elementary Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal or director of the laboratory school was involved in completing three-fourths (77.4%) of the questionnaires. An additional six respondents held other administrative positions directly concerned with the laboratory school. It would seem that responses to this questionnaire reflect the thinking and judgment of laboratory school administrators.

The number of teacher stations in laboratory schools, as reported by respondents to the questionnaires, is summarized in Table 5. These data were thought to have some bearing on the level of research activity in laboratory schools. Apparently, so little research seems to
BE CARRIED ON IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS, IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO DISCOVER SUCH A RELATIONSHIP OR REPORT IT IN STATISTICAL TERMS.

TABLE 5
TEACHER STATIONS IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear that the typical laboratory school provides for one or two sections of each grade level. It is of interest to note the large percentage of laboratory schools (40.9%) which have only one section of each grade level. These data, along with the data relating to size of laboratory schools would suggest that laboratory schools are, typically, rather small, and limited in both number of pupils and sections at each grade level.

Data concerning additional staff was requested because of the general belief that more research would be carried on in laboratory schools if laboratory school teachers were not "tied to the classroom" from the beginning of the school day to dismissal, and if teachers had the help of a specialist in educational research. The large number of respondents who did not complete this item (31.3%) makes it difficult to make judgments concerning the availability of specialized help in various curricular and administrative areas. These data are summarized in Table 6.
### ADDITIONAL LABORATORY SCHOOL STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School, Nursery School Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten, Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Area Supervisors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitian, Lunch Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Assistants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Consultant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Consultants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools which included grades 7 and 8 also reported additional staff employed in the Home Economics and Business Areas. Five schools, or 4.3% had faculty members responsible for teaching home economics, and one school, or .9%, employed a "business" teacher for the seventh and/or eighth grade.

From one-fifth to slightly more than one-fourth of the respondents indicated the availability of specialized help in art, music, physical education and in the library. Fewer than ten percent of those completing this item reported help in other areas.

**Data Relating to Functions of the Laboratory School**

Item B on the questionnaire relates directly to functions of the laboratory schools. Respondents were asked to list the functions of the laboratory school with which they are associated in the order in which these functions are officially stated, and as these functions are performed in the ongoing activities of the faculty and administration. It was considered possible for faculty members and administrators of laboratory schools to be performing quite different functions than those listed in official statements. These data are reported in Tables 7 through 10. In Tables 9 and 10, the rank order of all functions listed by respondents is reported.
### TABLE 7

**OFFICIALLY STATED FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1 (Number)</th>
<th>1 (Percent)</th>
<th>2 (Number)</th>
<th>2 (Percent)</th>
<th>3 (Number)</th>
<th>3 (Percent)</th>
<th>4 (Number)</th>
<th>4 (Percent)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of College Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work in Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Experimentation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Experiences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of College Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work in Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Experimentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Weighted Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Student Teaching&quot;</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Demonstration&quot;</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Observation&quot;</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Participation&quot;</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Research and Experimentation&quot;</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Education of Children&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Service to State&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teacher Education&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cadet Teaching&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In-Service Education&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Orientation of College Students&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Child Study&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Laboratory Experiences&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Project Work in Teaching&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teacher Training&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Administrator Training&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Weighted Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Student Teaching&quot;</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Observation&quot;</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Demonstration&quot;</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Participation&quot;</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Research, Experimentation&quot;</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Education of Children&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teacher Education&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Project Work in Teaching&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Administrator Training&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Orientation of College Students&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cadet Teaching&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In-Service Education&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teacher Training&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Service to State&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three spaces were provided for the listing of functions, as suggested in the preceding paragraph. Many respondents included a fourth function. Three respondents listed, in a fifth position, Research and Service to the State. One respondent stated that functions were not ranked; another, that there were no "officially stated" functions. Three respondents stated that functions were officially stated, but not ranked. One respondent did not complete this item in listing officially stated functions and five did not list "operational" functions. It is recognized that terminology may differ. The difference between the "teacher training" listed by one respondent and "teacher education" listed by another can only be surmized. Terminology used in tabulating responses is that of the respondent.

In order to determine the relative positions of importance with which the functions are viewed by the respondents, a weight of four was assigned to each first choice, three to each second choice, two to each third choice and one to each fourth choice. The arithmetical weightings were based on the numbers of choices which the respondents were invited to make. The weighted total for each function was computed by means of multiplication of the rank order of functions in each respondent's list by the number of respondents listing a function, and totaling these products. For example: research was listed by seven people in the first position of importance, which was assigned a weight of four. The product of seven times four is twenty eight. Eight listed research second, eight times three is twenty four. Twenty seven listed research in third place. Twenty seven times two is fifty four. Seven listed research in fourth position. The product is seven. The total weight assigned to research and experimentation is 113, the sum of the
products noted above. Data reported in Tables 9 and 10 indicate the rank order of importance of functions to be nearly the same on both the operational and stated lists for the six most important functions. The positions assigned demonstration and observation are reversed on the two lists.

It is apparent that laboratory schools are primarily devoted to the functions of student teaching, demonstration, observation, and participation. Ninety six and six-tenths percent of the respondents indicated that the schools with which they were associated were fulfilling these functions. Slightly less than one-fourth of the respondents listed research in the third position of importance, the only position in which research was listed by more than eight percent of the respondents. Comparing "stated" and "operational" lists, it is of interest to note that 94% of the respondents stated that student teaching, demonstration, observation, and participation were of primary importance in actual practice, compared with 96.6% of those listing these as stated functions of greatest importance. Seven respondents listed research as being in first position in the hierarchy of operational functions, as compared with nine who placed it first in statements of functions.

It should be noted that percentage totals in the listing of functions will be more than 100% because some respondents listed more than one function in the same position.

In comparing "weighted totals", on the operational list it will be noted that almost twice as much importance is given observation as is given research, and more than twice as much weight is
assigned student teaching as research. On the "stated" lists, both student teaching and observation are assigned far more than twice the weight of research. It is significant to note that research in the fifth position, not close to fourth, on both lists. This is most interesting in view of the expectation that respondents would list three functions. If respondents had listed only three functions, research would not have appeared on most lists at all.

Several respondents listed functions which were not suggested in the questionnaire. A few of these functions are apparently quite important in some laboratory schools, since respondents listed them in the first position of importance. Six respondents listed "education of children" as the school's most important function. Several of the educators interviewed by the writer and administrators of laboratory schools visited indicated that this function was of great importance, and seemed to be basic to the functions more frequently discussed or listed. Child Study, Laboratory Experiences, and Orientation of College Students were each listed by one respondent as being the most important function of the laboratory school. Two general terms which it is difficult to interpret are "service to the state" and laboratory experiences.

Student teaching, observation, demonstration, and participation are evidently the functions occupying major portions of the time, money, and energies of administrators and faculty members of laboratory schools. An additional note of caution is necessary to those
interpreting these responses. The listing of stated functions, it is hoped, was fairly objective. Administrators needed only to refer to the most recent statement of functions in order to complete these items. In making judgments concerning the functions actually receiving the most emphasis, however, an administrator probably relied upon his opinion as the basis for completing the items. The fact that there is a high degree of agreement in the two lists suggests, first, that laboratory schools are doing what they say they are doing, and also that perhaps the "stated" list colored or influenced the administrator's judgment in completing the "operational" list. A survey of the literature relating to the function of the laboratory school makes clear the current emphasis on educational research. It is commendable that laboratory school administrators have not claimed activity in an area which is in such favor, but have honestly reported emphasis in function as it exists in their schools.

Scattergrams, in the appendix, will give some indication of the relationship between research, as listed in various positions of importance, and enrollment of the laboratory school, enrollment of prospective teachers or graduate students in elementary education, funds budgeted for research, and the practice of releasing members of the laboratory school staff from teaching assignments. Since in no case did more than 24.3% of the respondents indicate emphasis on research as a function of the laboratory school, it was concluded that expression of this relationship, in a statistical sense, would be inappropriate and would lack significance.
Responses to the question "Has the faculty of the laboratory school engaged in a study and re-examination of the function or functions of the laboratory school?" are summarized in Table 11.

**TABLE 11**

Has faculty recently engaged in a re-examination of functions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in study now</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is of interest to note that four respondents stated that a study conducted in 1958 was "not recent", and six stated that a "recent" study of functions was completed in 1958. "Recent" is obviously one of many relative terms.

Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they were presently engaged in a re-examination of functions and 4.3% of the respondents indicated that faculties in the laboratory schools with
WHICH THEY WERE ASSOCIATED WERE ENGAGED IN A CONTINUOUS STUDY OF FUNCTIONS. THIS SUGGESTS THAT ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS ARE AWARE OF CHANGES IN TEACHER EDUCATION AS THEY IMPINGE UPON THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. HOWEVER, ONE-FOURTH OF THE RESPONDENTS (25.2%) INDICATED NO STUDY OF FUNCTIONS, OR AT LEAST NO STUDY WITHIN THE PAST TEN YEARS.

IN ANSWERING THE QUESTION "HOW WERE THE FUNCTIONS OF YOUR LABORATORY SCHOOL ORIGINALLY DETERMINED?" RESPONDENTS GAVE SUCH A VARIETY OF ANSWERS THAT CATEGORIZING THEM WAS A RATHER DIFFICULT TASK. ANSWERS SEEMED TO RELATE TO ONE OF SIX DIFFERENT AREAS, HOWEVER, AND THESE PROVIDED THE CATEGORIES USED IN TABULATING THE RESPONSES TO THIS ITEM. RESPONSES ARE SUMMARIZED IN TABLE 12.

**TABLE 12**

**HOW WERE FUNCTIONS ORIGINALLY DETERMINED?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STATE POLICY, LEGISLATIVE DECISION, COLLEGE BOARD</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>COLLEGE FACULTY</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SOME COMBINATION OF STATE- ADMINISTRATIVE-FACULTY ACTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RECOGNITION OF NEED FOR LABORATORY FACILITIES</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BY STUDY OF EXISTING PRACTICE</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BY CHANCE</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NOT KNOWN</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NO RESPONSE</strong></th>
<th><strong>NUMBER</strong></th>
<th><strong>PERCENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses total more than one hundred percent because a few respondents gave more than one answer, or supplied an answer which seemed to require classification into more than one of the classifications. Terminology in the classifications was suggested by that used in responses.

The classification "Recognition of the need for laboratory facilities" implies recognition by someone. The writer's experience would suggest that such recognition did not originate in state legislative committees. Nor does it seem likely that a legislative committee would make a study of existing practice relating to laboratory schools. If these responses were tabulated with the "Same combination of State-Administrative-Faculty Action", it would appear that college faculty members and administrative officials constitute the group most responsible for the founding of laboratory schools. There were no responses to this item which indicate that laboratory schools represented in this study were founded as centers for educational research. One respondent commented, "Our school was not originally planned as a research center. We do, however, study our situation from time to time." There is, apparently, a sound reason for the emphasis upon the provision of laboratory experiences in campus schools. Most laboratory schools were evidently founded primarily for the provision of pre-service laboratory experience, and the majority of faculty members and administrators have seen little need to add to or alter these original functions. However, inquiries made concerning the reasons for closing two laboratory schools have disclosed that state education officials have been instrumental in transferring pre-service laboratory experiences to public schools and using laboratory school buildings for department or college of
education classrooms. This suggests that the influence of state legislative committees or department of education officials should not be ignored in any consideration of the future role or roles of the laboratory school.

One respondent commented, "Research may become one of our functions but not in the near future. The State Department of Education has long held a policy that the State College may not do research. Last June this was relaxed to a degree, but as yet all of the implications are not clear. We expect to begin exploratory discussions concerning our role in research now that we are permitted to engage in some research activities."

A survey of present writing on the subject of the laboratory school's role in educational research shows a concern for and recognition of the need for dynamic, creative leadership on the part of the administrator. The Dean of a College of Education emphasized this factor almost exclusively in his discussion of laboratory school research with the writer. Therefore, it was determined to attempt to gather some data concerning leadership in laboratory school research. The responses to the question, "Who Directs and Coordinates the Research?" are summarized in Table 13.
TABLE 13

WHO DIRECTS AND COORDINATES RESEARCH?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory School Faculty Committee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined College-Laboratory School Committee</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Director of Laboratory School</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator or Director of Research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Testing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Not Connected with College or Laboratory School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor in Graduate Course in Educational Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants in Special Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Does Not Apply&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Being Studied at Present</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that more than one-fifth of the respondents either did not complete this item or stated that the problem was being studied tends to lend support to the position taken by the Dean; that lack of positive dynamic leadership is a serious inhibiting factor to the conduct of educational research in the laboratory school. Leadership, where provided, comes from the principal or director of the laboratory school and/or from a committee of faculty members from the laboratory school and college faculty. One respondent noted, "This is our
problem. We have no one to direct or coordinate our experimentation." Many respondents checked more than one item, indicating shared or divided responsibility for research leadership. The following note is representative of the few who added note to the completed item. "Those wishing to do research contact Director, describe project and go ahead. Director initiates same and brings in other staff members." One principal of a laboratory school where the writer visited recognized his responsibility for leadership, and stated that he felt the need for help in this area. Responses to this item indicate that only eight schools have someone in a position of direct responsibility for the conduct of educational research in laboratory schools. One might well question the feasibility of expecting an administrator already burdened with responsibilities to exert leadership in curriculum change, supervise the school plant, act as personnel director and give effective guidance in parent-school relationships to assume the added burden of leadership in educational research. However, it might also be questioned whether or not educational research can go forward as a separate and discrete function, divided from other areas of laboratory school administration. Perhaps leadership in educational research must inevitably be the final responsibility of the director or principal.

The "Does not apply" category included the five respondents who completed the item in such manner as "We have no formal research." It is probable that some of those not responding to this item wished to suggest either no research, no leadership for research, or both.

The question "Are any laboratory school faculty members released from teaching assignments in order to carry on research" was asked because of the general opinion that released time for teachers is an
ESSENTIAL FACTOR IF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS TO ACT AS A LEADERSHIP
AGENCY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. THE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION ARE
SUMMARIZED IN TABLE 14.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are members of the Laboratory School Staff, or faculty released in order to carry on research?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Full Time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Part Time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the generally held opinion that the burden of participating in educational research cannot and should not be added to the burden of full-time responsibility for a group of children, only 14.8% of the respondents indicated released time for faculty or staff. Several respondents made notes in completing this item - "At present, none are released"; "Probably would be if adequate study were undertaken"; "Not at present. This is in the offing, to release one per year." One respondent explained that no faculty members were released because "No Replacement Personnel" was available.

In Table 15, responses to the inquiry; "Are the services of graduate students made available for help in research?" are summarized.
Table 15

Are the services of graduate students made available for help in research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Involved Varies</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Involved Varies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to Release</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Not Available</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear that in only 22.6% of the laboratory schools represented in this study are graduate students available to provide research assistance in the laboratory school. Since 32.7% of the respondents supplied information relating to graduate enrollment, it may be assumed that graduate students are not active participants in laboratory school research in many institutions where such involvement is possible.

Several respondents made comments relating to graduate work and laboratory school research. One Director of Teacher Education commented: "This institution moved into graduate work in the summer of 1958. Research is not a required part of graduate study but a course in methodology is required and a problem is prescribed. Some students
HAVE DONE CASE STUDIES AND OTHER PROJECTS IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL AS THEIR PROJECT. THIS IS VERY LIMITED AT PRESENT BUT WILL EXPAND. WE MAY MOVE TOWARD A THESIS." A PRINCIPAL COMPLETED THE ITEM "NO. SERVICES NOT AVAILABLE," WITH THE COMMENT "BUT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IT". ANOTHER PRINCIPAL ANSWERED THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE AVAILABILITY OF GRADUATE STUDENTS WITH THE COMMENT: "NOT AT PRESENT BUT EXPECT TO HAVE SOME SOON."

ONE RESPONDENT NOTED: "SINCE THE COLLEGE IS NOW APPROVED FOR OFFERING GRADUATE WORK, IT IS HOPED THAT NEEDED RESEARCH PROJECTS CAN BE STARTED WITH THE HELP OF THOSE DOING GRADUATE WORK IN THE COLLEGE."

RESPONDENTS SEEM TO SUGGEST RATHER STRONGLY THAT RESEARCH CAN ASSUME GREATER SIGNIFICANCE AS A FUNCTION IN CAMPUS SCHOOLS CONNECTED WITH COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES OFFERING GRADUATE WORK.

RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED TO INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY TIME DELIBERATELY BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITY. THEIR REPLIES ARE SUMMARIZED IN TABLE 16.
TABLE 16
PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY TIME DELIBERATELY BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little, Negligible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Fixed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two respondents made the following replies: one stated that one half of one person's time was devoted to research. Another stated that one third of the director's time and one half day each week of faculty time was made available for research. An interesting response to this inquiry came from a laboratory school director who said "None budgeted. It's done on top of everything else."

It is assumed that money is made available for purposes considered sufficiently significant by administrative officials and faculty members of teacher education institutions. In Table 17, responses to the question "Are any funds specifically budgeted for research," are summarized.
It would seem that many administrators have not seen the need for special funds for research. Fewer than ten percent of the requests for additional funds for research were denied. One respondent mentioned a grant of Ford Foundation funds. Another reported "The State has just recently allotted one-half time person for research for each state college." One respondent implied that funds made available for one purpose constituted a block to research. He stated: "Our main obstacle to research is 1) We are in the process of building a $3.5 million dollar laboratory school." Further reference to the relationship between the availability of funds for research and the level of research activity in the laboratory school will be included in the discussion of blocks to educational research.

Data Relating to Areas and Types of Research in the Laboratory School

Areas of experimentation and research as reported by respondents do not lend themselves particularly well to tabulation. Some respondents indicated that this was a weakness in the design of the
questionnaire. "This questionnaire does not enable us to describe our situation. We have obtained one grant ($28,800) from the U. S. Office of Education to do research in evaluating teacher merit. The Director of the campus school will direct the research, but much of the data will come from public schools.

We are in the process of applying for a grant for research on physical development of elementary school children. This is longitudinal and data are being recorded for pupils in our school.

We are doing some research on testing and guidance in our elementary school under the supervision of the Director of Testing in the University. We are financing this ourselves."

Another respondent reports "We have a non-graded Junior High School (7-9) with a track system in math, and science. All 'grades' have a large block of time for general education core".

The director of elementary education and principal of a laboratory school include a study of arithmetic involving one hundred children from the second through the sixth grade in three categories. The respondents comment "A faculty member desired to do research with children in the sixth grade. This stimulated another faculty member to run a test series on the same topic with other grades." Under "descriptive studies," these respondents include "use of conference in college laboratory school." Presumably, they refer to reporting to parents through the use of parent-teacher conferences. The Director of a laboratory school makes the following summary of research in progress in the school with which he is associated: "We are completely reconstructing our curriculum on the basis of a sequential list of concepts, skills, etc., to be taught. These are being carefully
ARRANGED WITHOUT REGARD FOR ARTIFICIAL GRADE OR CLASS BARRIERS. THEY WILL LATER BE TAUGHT UNDER A NEW FORM OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION WITH WHICH WE ARE WORKING AT THE THEORETICAL LEVEL. ALL WILL BE TESTED UNDER CONTROLLED CONDITIONS AT SOME LATER DATE." THIS APPEARS TO BE PRECISELY THE TYPE OF RESEARCH RECOMMENDED BY SEVERAL EDUCATORS INTERVIEWED BY THE WRITER.

Another respondent indicated that the questionnaire was inadequate. He stated: "I do not feel the above questionnaire adaptable to a description of our situation. Our contribution to education will fall under the area of "action research" or trying things out "in a school situation". For example, we have recently reorganized our system of pupil classification in accordance with the "continuous progress" or "non-graded" system. We have not, however, established rigid controls, matched pairs, etc."

The principal of a laboratory school who did not check any specific areas of research on the questionnaire, comments:

"From time to time, individual undergraduates undertake short term studies (e.g., correlation of left handedness to reading success) as part of work in course." "Professional Writing and Research."

Individual faculty members also have done short term studies. We all recognize the need for more research in this school."

The director of a campus school summarized the research projects planned or already going forward under his direction as follows:

"We have obtained one grant from the U.S. Office of Education to do research on evaluating teacher merit. The Director of the Campus School will direct the research, but much of the data will
COME FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

We are in the process of applying for a grant for research on the physical development of elementary school children. This is longitudinal and data are being recorded for pupils in our school.

We are doing some research in testing and guidance in our elementary school under the supervision of the Director of Testing in the University. We are financing this ourselves."

Two respondents note that foreign language is being taught in the elementary grades, but since control groups are lacking, they decline to list this as research.

The principal of a laboratory school makes the following general summary of research activity in the school where she is administrator:

"Curriculum for gifted children. We have four classes of children, grades 4-6, whose group test I.Q.'s range between 120 and 154. We are trying to find better techniques and more suitable materials of instruction for these children."

The Director of Teacher Education of a state teachers college makes the following brief statement relating to research in the laboratory school:

"Our reading consultant is doing some experimenting in the area of language arts, including additional phonics training in the first grade reading program."

Classification of types of research evidently proved to be a very difficult task for respondents. Terminology used in the classification of various types of research was adapted from that used in
Good and Scates, Methods of Research,\textsuperscript{1} with only minor changes effected for the purpose of brevity. However, some respondents listed the same project under each research type and included under one classification projects which clearly, and by definition included in the instrument, belonged in another classification. Respondents also neglected to complete all items in a classification. Information concerning the number of children involved, the grade level or levels included and the specific research technique or techniques employed was not supplied by a large number of respondents who specified certain research projects in which laboratory school faculties were engaged.

It is felt that percentages would be misleading in summarizing these data concerning type or types of research. Percentages of the total group of respondents to An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research in Laboratory Schools would be quite small and inconclusive. Percentages of those respondents who indicate research activity would tend to be inconclusive due to the listing of one research project under several classifications and the failure of so many respondents to complete each item within a classification. For these reasons, numbers of respondents responding to each item will be reported, without an indication of the percentage of respondents represented.

The first research type suggested in the questionnaire is "Experimental." The brief definition states "involving the critical

\textsuperscript{1}Carter V. Good and Douglas Scates, \textit{Methods of Research}, New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc., 1945. Ch. 5, 6, 7, 8.
TESTING OF HYPOTHESES UNDER CONTROLLED CONDITIONS. Responses to the "Area of Experimentation" portion of this item are summarized in Table 18.

**Table 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Experimentation</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Power</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Perception</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Circuit Television for College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Cerebral Dysfunction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Grade Elementary School:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Skill Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Skill Usage; No Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Report Cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Adjustment of Unaccepted Child</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Changes in Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the majority of experiments relating to areas of the curriculum are concerned with language, arts, and arithmetic. From comments made on another page of the questionnaire, it is known that a few respondents listing experimentation in foreign language included this in language arts classification without special notation of this point. Respondents listing foreign
LANGUAGE IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSIFICATION MADE A SPECIAL NOTE DIFFERENTIATING IT FROM OTHER AREAS OF THE LANGUAGE ARTS.

ITEMS LISTED FOLLOWING MUSIC WERE INCLUDED AS AREAS OF EXPERIMENTATION BY RESPONDENTS. ONE RESPONDENT INCLUDED THE TITLES OF RESEARCH PROJECTS. ONE IS "IMPROVEMENT OF CREATIVE WRITING IN GRADES 4, 5, AND 6." THIS WAS INCLUDED IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSIFICATION. ANOTHER TITLE, "MODIFICATION OF ARITHMETIC GRADE PLACEMENT IN GRADES 1-6" WAS INCLUDED IN THE ARITHMETIC CLASSIFICATION. IN TABLE 19 THE GRADE LEVEL OR LEVELS CONCERNED IN THE EXPERIMENTS ARE REPORTED.

TABLE 19
GRADE LEVELS CONCERNED IN VARIOUS AREAS OF EXPERIMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Elementary School</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVIDENTLY, THE MAJORITY OF EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS CONCERN THE WHOLE SCHOOL, RATHER THAN SPECIFIC GRADE LEVEL OR LEVELS. TEN PROJECTS HAD THEIR FOCAL POINTS IN THE FIFTH GRADE. ELEVEN, THE MAJORITY, CENTERED IN THE SIXTH GRADE GROUPS. IT WILL BE RECALLED THAT
Several respondents neglected to complete this item. Eighty three areas of research are reported in Table 18, and only 72 respondents included the grade level or levels concerned.

Only 34 respondents noted the research technique employed. These responses are summarized in Table 20.

**TABLE 20**

RESEARCH TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Technique</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equated Groups</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Subjects</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation of Groups, Two Methods</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Progress in Foreign Language, Grades 2-3, Grades 2-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Opinionnaire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Pupils Only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents reporting the research technique utilized indicated that the experimentation involved employing different methods, techniques, or materials with groups equated according to teacher judgment, test results, etc., or the use of two methods or teaching techniques or groups which have not been equated. The last four techniques reported were suggested by the respondents.
In Table 21, data concerning the source of interest in the project are summarized.

TABLE 21

HOW DID THE PROBLEM OR PROBLEMS ORIGINATE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Identification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Classroom Teacher or Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Faculty Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members from Laboratory School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members from College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members from Both</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Administrative Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Individual College Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by State Department of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Institute of Social Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by College Graduate Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Director of the Reading Clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several respondents checked more than one item in this classification. It would seem that the majority of needed experimentation in the laboratory school has been identified by the classroom teacher or a group of teachers. Research committees have identified only one less area of needed research than the administrative staff.

The next type of research specified in the questionnaire is longitudinal, defined as "involving the regular, relatively frequent, and repeated measurement or observation of the same individual or group of individuals, conducted over a considerable period of time." Data relating to this type of research are reported in Tables 22 to 26. One respondent reported planned research in the area of physical
DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, AND ACADEMIC PROGRESS. HE NOTES:
"THIS RESEARCH WILL INVOLVE ALL GRADE LEVELS, MORE THAN THREE HUNDRED
CHILDREN, AND WILL CONTINUE FOR SIX YEARS." IN TABLE 22, AREAS OF
RESEARCH ACTUALLY UNDERWAY ARE SUMMARIZED.

**TABLE 22**
LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH AREAS OF RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Development</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Progress</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Teaching for Creativity&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Adjustment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness Test Validity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OF THE "LONGITUDINAL" STUDIES, MORE THAN ONE THIRD, 35.7%, WERE
IN THE AREA OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS, 27.6% WERE IN THE GENERAL AREA OF
PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT, AND 23.8% WERE IN AREAS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.
IT IS PROBABLE THAT FOREIGN LANGUAGE, ARITHMETIC, AND READINESS TEST
VALIDITY COULD BE INCLUDED IN THE ACADEMIC PROGRESS CLASSIFICATION.
HOWEVER, SINCE RESPONDENTS LISTED THEM SEPARATELY, IT WAS CONSIDERED
BEST TO LIST THEM SEPARATELY IN THE TABULATION.

IN TABLE 23, THE GRADE LEVEL OR LEVELS CONCERNED IN THE AREAS
OF LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH REPORTED IN TABLE 22 ARE SUMMARIZED.
### TABLE 23
GRADE LEVEL OR LEVELS CONCERNED IN LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Elementary School</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Pupils Only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be recalled that most of the experimental studies involved the entire Elementary School, with most studies involving specific levels were concentrated at the fifth and sixth grade level. Most of the longitudinal studies also involved the entire elementary school, and the specific grade levels where studies were in progress were third and fourth. Eighty three experimental studies were reported, compared with forty four longitudinal studies.

In Table 24, responses relating to the number of children involved in longitudinal studies will be summarized.
TABLE 24
NUMBER OF CHILDREN INVOLVED IN LONGITUDINAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-110</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-130</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 130</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervals were planned to correspond, in general, to classroom enrollments. This would make easier the comparison of numbers of children involved in studies with grade levels represented. It will be noted that the greatest frequency of responses occurs at the "More than 130" classification. This is to be expected, since the respondents also indicated the involvement of the total enrollment of the elementary school. Only 21 of the respondents reporting longitudinal research also reported the number of children involved.

In Table 25, data concerning the beginning dates of longitudinal research are summarized.
### Table 25

**When Did Longitudinal Research Begin?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1930</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1940</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1950</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1960</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 27 respondents completed the item concerning the beginning date of studies. However, it seems apparent that the vast majority of laboratory school research of the longitudinal type is of recent origin.

While the titles and areas of research suggested in this category by respondents might have been classified differently by writers in educational research, research criteria established by faculty members and laboratory school administrators are evidently met.

Fewer respondents completed this item than completed the item in which areas of longitudinal research were listed.

The definition of longitudinal research included in the questionnaire concludes with the phrase "conducted over a considerable period of time." It is of interest, therefore, to note the length of time it is planned to continue the longitudinal studies specified by respondents. In Table 26, data regarding the planned conclusion of longitudinal studies are summarized.
TABLE 26

HOW LONG DO YOU EXPECT LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH TO CONTINUE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Study</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now completed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinitely</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that ten of the respondents forecast the completion of the studies now in progress within two to four years suggests some misconception of the term "longitudinal" as it is most frequently used in literature pertaining to educational research. Respondents completing this item also completed the preceding item, relating to the date the research was begun.

Table 27 consists of a summary of responses to the question, "How did the problem or problems specified in 2, preceding page, originate?"
### TABLE 27
HOW DID LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH PROBLEM OR PROBLEMS ORIGINATE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Identification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Classroom Teacher or Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Faculty Committee Members from College</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Faculty Committee Members from Laboratory School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Faculty Committee Both</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Administrative Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Psychologists and Pediatricians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Graduate Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Total Faculty (Laboratory school)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Individual Faculty Member - one from College, one from Laboratory School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is of interest to note that two-thirds of the problems selected for study were identified by faculty members individually and/or in committee. This raises doubts concerning the general validity of the comment made by one respondent. "Neither by training nor situational factors can staff engage in research."

The third general type of research in which it was felt laboratory school faculty members and administrators might be engaged was termed "Short-Term Studies of Group and Individual Adjustment." In an effort to further clarify the type of research intended for inclusion in this category, it was further stated, "Similar to longitudinal, but covering shorter periods of time; more than ordinary
RECORD KEEPING. It is probable that a few of the studies respondents classified as longitudinal might better have been included in this category, particularly those studies which respondents indicated would be completed within two years. Two types of short-term studies were suggested; Sociometric, and Case Studies. The latter classification was subdivided into individual and group case studies, but most respondents replied only to the general item. Responses to the inquiry concerning types of short-term studies are summarized in Table 28.

### TABLE 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Variance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Program in Junior High Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal Records</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of short-term studies reported were case studies.

One respondent noted that these were done regularly, and were not considered research. It will be recalled that "sociometry" was listed as a research technique in the type of research termed "Experimental." It is possible that the respondent referred to sociometric research, in which case it should have been included in this "short-term studies" classification.

Data relating to grade levels included in short-term research are summarized in Table 29.
TABLE 29
GRADE LEVELS INCLUDED IN SHORT-TERM RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of short-term studies apparently involve the entire elementary school, rather than specific grade levels, although a large number of studies involved children in the middle and upper grades. Thirty respondents listed short-term studies as a type of research in progress in the laboratory school with which they are associated, the total number of grade levels involved is 47. This is due to the number of respondents checking more than one grade level.

Data were requested regarding identification of problems being investigated through short-term studies. These data are summarized in Table 30.
TABLE 30
HOW DID SHORT-TERM RESEARCH PROBLEM OR PROBLEMS ORIGINATE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Identification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Classroom Teacher or Teachers</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by School Psychologist, Psychiatrist, and/or Physician</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Administrative Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by College Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Parent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty three of the thirty nine responses to this item credited the classroom teacher with identification of the problem or problems leading to the research. Several respondents checked more than one item in this classification.

The final classification of research types was termed "Descriptive Studies". The parenthetical definition stated: "Involving the collection of data and their interpretation." Twenty areas of research within this classification were reported. These data are summarized in Table 31.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Curriculum Variations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in the Laboratory School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Innovations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic in Grades 1, 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Reading in Primary Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of its pertinence to the present study, the respondent's note concerning the study of research in the Laboratory School will be included here. He states that a five year study is underway; its title: "Effects upon a Laboratory School Faculty and Upon Selected Public School Personnel of an In-Service Program Aimed at the Development of Research Skills and the Application of These to Instructional Problems." The respondent, the Director of the Laboratory School, further notes that this problem was identified by the administrative staff.

Another respondent included curriculum innovations, specifically, in the fields of mathematics and foreign language, in this category. Most respondents included studies of this type in the "Experimental" classification. However, the manner of treating the data gathered may suggest inclusion in the "Descriptive" rather
than the "Experimental" category.

The Director of Elementary Education and the Laboratory School principal report that the faculty is engaged in a study of parent-teacher conferences in the Laboratory School; a classroom teacher is given credit for the identification of this area of study. A summary of the responses to the inquiry, "How did the problem or problems identified in 4 originate?" is included in Table 32.

### Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Identification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Classroom Teacher or Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by a Parent Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Parent-Teacher Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Administrative Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by Individual College Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified by College Staff Experts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of the classroom teacher in identifying areas for intensive study is again made clear; more descriptive research studies were originated by classroom teachers than by all other identified sources combined.
Data Relating to Dissemination of Findings, Appropriateness of Role of Research, and Blocks to Educational Research in the Laboratory School

If the faculty and administrative staff of a laboratory school are involved in educational research, and the results of their study contribute significantly to present knowledge of children and their learning, it would seem important that this information be shared. Item F in "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research in Laboratory Schools" was included in an effort to gather data relating to the extent to which results of research are made available to public school personnel and, also, to interested personnel connected with other laboratory schools. The responses to the question "Are the results of your research made available to public school personnel?" are summarized in Table 33.
TABLE 33
ARE RESEARCH FINDINGS MADE AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{RESULTS ARE PUBLISHED}</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{TEACHERS DISCUSS WORK IN \textit{COLLEGE CLASSES}}</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{TEACHERS ACT AS CONSULTANTS TO \textit{PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS}}</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS OBSERVE IN LABORATORY SCHOOL}</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{RESEARCH A NEW FUNCTION; NO DEFINITE FINDINGS}</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{RESULTS NOT APPLICABLE ANYWHERE ELSE}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{TEACHERS RELUCTANT TO WRITE ABOUT, DISCUSS WORK}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{NUMBER NOT LARGE ENOUGH, EVIDENCE NOT CONCLUSIVE}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{DATA RELEASED ONLY BY PSYCHOLOGIST}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{NO RESPONSE}</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attempting to interpret these data is difficult due to the large number of respondents who did not complete this item. However, it seems that the majority of respondents accept responsibility for sharing the results of research with interested educators.

Findings would have widest circulation through publication of articles in professional journals. Only a limited number of teachers can benefit from the efforts of laboratory school faculty members to carry on research either by observing the laboratory school teacher at work with children or by enrolling in a college class taught by laboratory school teachers. It is encouraging to note that 28.7% of the respondents indicated that faculty members acted as consultants.
TO SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN THE AREA SERVED BY THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. IT CAN BE HOPED THAT IMPETUS IS GIVEN TO INTEREST IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, AND THAT THE OUTCOMES OF RESEARCH AND STUDY IN VARIOUS AREAS ARE DISCUSSED.

The next question asked was: "Is research assuming an appropriate role in your school?" It was considered important to gather data relating to the respondents' opinion of the role of research in the laboratory school with which they are associated. It is recognized that two respondents completing the questionnaire concerning the same laboratory school might have completed these items differently. No claim is made for objectivity; "appropriate" was not defined, nor were specific criteria suggested.

Responses to the question, "Is research assuming an appropriate role in your laboratory school?" are summarized in Table 34.

**Table 34**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness of Role of Research in Laboratory School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased with results thus far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within limits imposed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and size of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So far; research a new function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain; opinion divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is taking too much time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is usurping other functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be doing more research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, interpretation is made difficult by the number of respondents who did not complete this item. Forty-five respondents, or 39.1%, stated that research was assuming an appropriate role in the laboratory schools with which they were associated. Forty respondents, five less, replied that they were dissatisfied with the research activity or the lack of it in the laboratory school for which they were reporting.

In addition to the two respondents who stated that research was taking too much time, two respondents stated they could not complete the item because the laboratory school with which they were associated was undergoing re-examination and change was anticipated. These were included in the "no response" classification. Three respondents suggested blocks to educational research. These were included with data summarized in Table 35.

The final area of consideration in the questionnaire concerned blocks to educational research in the laboratory school with which the respondent was associated. Comments made on previous pages of the questionnaire relating to blocks have been included with the discussion of specific responses to previous items. Data summarized in Table 35 were supplied in the response to the request to "Please check, on the following list, those items which represent "blocks" to educational research in your institution."
### TABLE 35

**BLOCKS TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AT LABORATORY SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blocks</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH IS NOT A FUNCTION, STATED OR OPERATIONAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER FUNCTIONS ASSUME GREATER IMPORTANCE</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ONE HAS ASSUMED RESEARCH LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE FACULTY INTEREST IN OR ENTHUSIASM FOR RESEARCH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS ARE INADEQUATE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSUFFICIENT CLERICAL HELP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL TOO SMALL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE POLICY INHIBITS RESEARCH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH SPECIALISTS NEEDED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE REFUSES TO INCREASE PERSONNEL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL STAFFED WITH GRADUATE STUDENTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREVITY OF TENURE OF FACULTY MEMBERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEED MORE TIME, PERSONNEL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF NOT RELEASED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF LACKS RESEARCH SKILLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three respondents (2.6%) added notes indicating that they expected research to assume increasing importance in their schools in the near future.

The factor constituting the primary block to educational research in the laboratory school is the assumption by the administrators and
FACULTY MEMBERS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS OF OTHER "MORE IMPORTANT" FUNCTIONS. THE DATA SUMMARIZED IN TABLE 35 GIVE CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF THIS FACT, WITH STRONG SUPPORTING DATA IN THE RESPONSES TO LIST FUNCTIONS IN THEIR ORDER OF IMPORTANCE, SUMMARIZED IN TABLES 7 THROUGH 10. COMBINATION OF THE "NOT A FUNCTION" RESPONSES AND THE "OTHER FUNCTIONS MORE IMPORTANT" RESPONSES REVEALS THAT 78.1% OF THE RESPONDENTS CONSIDER THE MAJOR BLOCK TO INCREASED ACTIVITY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH THE FACT THAT RESEARCH IS NOT CONSIDERED A VERY SIGNIFICANT FUNCTION OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. TWENTY SIX AND ONE-TENTH PERCENT OF THE RESPONDENTS ALSO NOTED A LACK OF INTEREST ON THE PART OF ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS. SINCE MORE THAN EIGHTY PERCENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE COMPLETED BY SOMEONE IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION, IT IS OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO NOTE THAT NEARLY ONE-FIFTH OF THE RESPONDENTS SPECIFIED LACK OF LEADERSHIP AS PROVIDING A SERIOUS BLOCK TO THE ASSUMPTION OF INCREASING ACTIVITY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS WERE ALSO CONSIDERED AN IMPORTANT BLOCK TO LABORATORY SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. HOWEVER, IT MAY BE WORTH NOTING THAT ONE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS INTERVIEWED BY THE WRITER CALLED THIS AN IMAGINARY BLOCK, STATING THAT FUNDS WERE USUALLY AVAILABLE TO DO THAT WHICH IT WAS CONSIDERED IMPORTANT TO DO.

MORE THAN ONE-FOURTH OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED DISSATISFACTION WITH THE AMOUNT OF CLERICAL HELP PROVIDED. INSUFFICIENT CLERICAL HELP PLACES AN ADDITIONAL BURDEN UPON THE ADMINISTRATOR, AND HE MAY HESITATE TO GUIDE HIS FACULTY INTO MORE RESEARCH ACTIVITY WHEN THE TABULATION OF DATA, THE EDITING AND TYPING OF ARTICLES CONNECTED WITH RESEARCH PROJECTS WOULD HAVE TO BE DONE BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OR BY A TEACHER.
It is interesting to note that only two respondents indicated that lack of a Director of Research inhibited research involvement of the Laboratory School. It will be recalled that committees of teachers, administrators, and individual classroom teachers, in that order, were given major credit for the origination of the research projects in laboratory schools. The aid of a specialist in educational research is not the most significant factor in increasing the laboratory school's contribution to educational research. The major block appears to be the general acceptance by administrators and faculty members of functions other than research.

**Data Relating to Areas of Research in Which Laboratory School Has Made Greatest Contribution**

Twenty-nine respondents, 25.2%, completed the item in which they were requested to describe, briefly, the areas of research in which the laboratory school with which they were associated has made the greatest contribution. These areas of research have been grouped into three general classifications; teacher education, both in-service and preservice; child development; and curriculum. Unless otherwise noted, the terminology is that of the respondents.
Teacher Education (In-Service, Pre-Service)

"Study of Unit Teaching"
"Teaching of Foreign Languages to Elementary Children"
"Methods and Materials of Teaching"
"Content, Selection, Grade Placement of Content and Methods of Presentation"
"Use of Specialists"
"Teaching of Industrial Arts"
"School Organization"
"Elementary Curriculum"
"Procedures in Staff Study of Curricular Areas"
"Methods of Instruction"
"Reporting to Parents"
"Parent-Teacher Conferences; Parent-Teacher Homeroom Meetings"
"Identification of Problems Faced by Primary Children"
"Screening Students Prior to Student Teaching"
"Use of Television in Observation and Participation"
"Methods Courses Offered in Professional Areas"
"Supervision of Student Teachers"
"Study of Teacher Education with Emphasis on Student Teaching"
"Evaluation of Student Teaching"

Child Development

"Creativity"
"How Children Develop"
"Level of Aspiration of Students"
"Personality Development"
"Intellectual Development of Children; Factors Related to Learning"
"Emotional Adjustment"
"Growth and Development"

Two studies reported had the same title;
"Child Growth and Development"

Curriculum

"Acceleration or Enrichment in Arithmetic"
"Arithmetic"
"Integrated Music-Instrumental, Vocal-Kindergarten to Grade 6"
"Visual Aids in Science"
"Validation in Areas of Readiness"
"Grouping for Individualized Learning Opportunities in Basic Skills"
"Outdoor Education-Grades 6, 7"

Two studies were reported which had the same title: "Listening"
Two studies were reported in Elementary French; three in Elementary Spanish
Nineteen of the studies reported were in areas relating to teacher education, both pre-service and in-service. Faculty members and administrators in schools where these studies had been or are in progress apparently accept responsibility for studying and improving their own professional competence, and also for making significant efforts to improve their methods of working with prospective teachers.

Several studies in foreign language and arithmetic were listed as important educational contributions in the area of curriculum. Many of the respondents added notes in which certain studies of curricular areas were characterized as "action" research. The research technique called "equated groups" would seem particularly suited to answering the question "Acceleration or Enrichment in Arithmetic?" However, this, too, may have been studied by "action" research techniques.

Nine of the forty-two studies considered significant were in the area of child development. Our knowledge of children's growth and development should be expanding, and sound educational programs have their foundations in the research data concerning every area of this growth and development—physical, emotional and mental. Of particular interest is the study bearing the title "Personality Development."

The next two sections of the present chapter will report data gathered through visits to laboratory schools and interviews with educators whose professional experience includes administration in laboratory schools or who have shown unusual interest in the role of the laboratory school.
REPORTS OF VISITS AND INTERVIEWS

The purpose of the five visits and seven interviews was to gather data which would supplement and further clarify the data collected from the tabulation of "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research in Laboratory Schools". Neither the visits nor the interviews were highly structured, in planned contrast to the highly structured questionnaires. While the conversations held with administrators and teachers during the visits concerned the laboratory school being visited, an attempt was made to keep the interviews more general, concerned with research in the laboratory school as an institution rather than discussing the level of research in a specific laboratory school.

Reports of visits are highly subjective. Where information was given the writer by a teacher or an administrator this is indicated in the report. Opinions formed or general impressions gained during visits are labeled opinion and/or impressions.

Written summaries of interviews were submitted to the educators with whom the discussions were held, in order that they might make any changes deemed desirable. It can be said that the subjectivity inherent in the interview reports is the interviewee's, not the writer's.

Interview Number Four is the only interview held with an educator without direct administrative experience in a laboratory school. The dean has evidenced unusual interest in the laboratory school as an institution and specifically in the laboratory school on the campus of the teachers college where he is an administrator.

Specific questions asked during the interviews and information sought during school visits are detailed in Chapter One.
VISIT NUMBER ONE - SCHOOL A

Administrators exhibited a tremendous interest in and concern for research in this laboratory school, connected with a large, state-supported university in the Midwest.

The continuing, long-term research is related to child growth and development. While teachers have access to this detailed information, and administer the achievement tests which form part of the wealth of data gathered about each child, the psychometrists, psychologists, and medical staff have almost complete direction of the total study. A "Coordinator of Research" has the responsibility of coordinating the work of his rather large group.

Not all children are involved in this longitudinal research. A large percentage of younger children are "on the study," but very few high school pupils (three from last year's graduating class, according to one source of information). This is because of the large "turnover" in pupil population, few children remaining in this school from nursery school through high school graduation.

The faculty is involved in the research through representation on the Committee on Research and Publications. It is the responsibility of this committee to approve proposed research projects dealing with areas other than child growth and development. Many doctoral candidates wish to center their research in the laboratory school, and requests are often received from various campus departments, the psychology department in particular, to study aspects of academic achievement, or specific factors in the social-emotional adjustment of the children enrolled in this school. After approval for a research project is given, the
STUDY IS UNDER THE GENERAL SUPERVISION OF A MEMBER OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF, EITHER THE COORDINATOR OF RESEARCH, OR THE COORDINATOR OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES. THERE IS A CONCERTED EFFORT TO AVOID EXPLOITING THE CHILDREN, AND THERE IS EVIDENT THE CONTINUOUS STRIVING TO MAKE THIS, ABOVE ALL, A GOOD SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN.

THERE WAS SOME DISAGREEMENT CONCERNING THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUTH ENROLLED IN THIS LABORATORY SCHOOL. IT WAS CLAIMED THAT NO GROUP STUDIED COULD BE CONSIDERED REPRESENTATIVE IN ALL AREAS (INTELLIGENCE, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND, ETC.) AND, ALSO, THAT THESE CHILDREN WERE NOT ATYPICAL OF CHILDREN IN THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE, WHICH IS DOMINATED BY THE UNIVERSITY. FOR EXAMPLE, THE MEDIAN INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT, ACCORDING TO SCORES ON THE STANFORD BINET, FOR ALL CHILDREN IN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL IS 120, COMPARED WITH A COMMUNITY-WIDE MEDIAN OF 118, PRESUMABLY ACCORDING TO THE RESULTS OF THE SAME INSTRUMENT. IT WAS NOTED HOWEVER, THAT THIS IS NOT TYPICAL OF RESULTS OF TESTS GIVEN TO CHILDREN ON OTHER COMMUNITIES, EVEN THOSE ADJACENT TO THE COMMUNITY WHERE THIS LABORATORY SCHOOL IS LOCATED. A FEE OF $75.00 A YEAR IS CHARGED, BUT MANY "SCHOLARSHIPS" ARE GIVEN, IN ORDER THAT THIS MIGHT BE A MORE TYPICAL SCHOOL SITUATION FOR CHILDREN.

THE LONGITUDINAL STUDIES IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT, WHICH APPARENTLY FORMS THE CORE OF THE RESEARCH CARRIED ON IN THIS LABORATORY SCHOOL, WERE BEGUN MORE THAN TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO. ONE STAFF MEMBER SUGGESTED THAT SOME NORMS, HEIGHT AND WEIGHT FOR EXAMPLE, WERE NO LONGER AS TYPICAL OF A SPECIFIC AGE LEVEL AS THEY WERE FORMERLY. IT IS NOT QUESTIONED, HOWEVER, THAT THE DATA ARE STILL MOST VALUABLE FOR ANY STUDENT OF VARIOUS PHASES OF CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT.
Parents enroll their children in the laboratory school by choice, and with the knowledge that research of various kinds goes forward in this school. Apparently, there is no feeling, on the part of parents, that their children are "quinea pigs", or are being exploited. The many services provided by the school, which typical schools cannot and do not provide, may help parents see the advantages in having their children enrolled. Although the psychometrists, the school psychologists, the psychiatrists, and the entire medical team, work primarily for the purpose of gathering validating research data, they are readily available to help children who are emotionally disturbed, or need medical care supplementary to that provided by private physicians.

Research is the first of the four stated purposes of the University School, and dissemination of the results of the research is second. It is clear that every effort is being made to fulfill these purposes, particularly by those concerned with the administration and supervision of the school, and the collection tabulation of data.

Visit Number Two - School B

This school is connected with a state teachers college located in the downtown section of a medium-sized midwestern city. Increasing college enrollments have made necessary the purchase of many immediately adjacent residences. Thus, the number of children in the school district served by the laboratory school has decreased in recent years, and classes are small, usually under 25 in the elementary school, and often under 20.

The pupils in the laboratory school come from a relatively poor socio-economic background. Their scores on standardized
Measures of academic achievement and intellectual capacity are slightly below average, according to nationally established norms, and well below scores reportedly achieved by most laboratory school pupils.

The principal indicated that parent interest in school affairs was limited, and he expressed the belief that the assumption of a more active role in educational research on the part of the faculty would be met with little or no active resistance from parents. He expressed the belief that neither insufficient time nor limited money provided true blocks to educational research. "You take time to do what is important to you," he declared. He saw no conflict in attempting to serve more than one function, but one teacher with whom the writer talked stated that she did not wish to work with student teachers because of data she was collecting relative to an individualized reading program in her classroom. Student teachers, she said, should see typical programs.

The principal assumes responsibility for the direction of the research carried on in this school, and stated that he keenly felt the need for the assistance of a director or coordinator of research. This person, according to the principal, should have both academic background and background of experiences necessary to equip him for research leadership. He stated the belief that members of the faculty need much "in-service" work in many aspects of educational research; research design was mentioned specifically. The principal indicated a preference for informal "in-service" work, rather than the typical graduate classes in educational research.

Members of the faculty with whom the writer talked suggested
THAT THE OBSERVATION-PARTICIPATION STUDENT TEACHING FUNCTIONS LEFT LITTLE TIME OR ENERGY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. A PUBLISHED STATEMENT OF PURPOSES, CREDITED TO THIS FACULTY, GIVES THE ABOVE-MENTIONED SERVICE-FUNCTIONS PRECEDENCE OVER THE RESEARCH FUNCTION, WHICH IS LISTED SECOND.

ONE TEACHER SUGGESTED THAT EXPERIMENTS INVOLVING THE COMPARISON OF GROUPS WAS FACILITATED BY HAVING TWO SECTIONS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL. THIS TEACHER WAS KEEPING CAREFUL RECORDS OF SCORES ON VARIOUS STANDARDIZED TESTS OF READING ABILITY. SHE WAS WORKING WITH HER CHILDREN IN AN INDIVIDUALIZED READING PROGRAM. THE SCORES OF THESE CHILDREN, WITH EMPHASIS ON RATE OF IMPROVEMENT, WOULD BE COMPARED WITH SCORES OF CHILDREN IN THE OTHER SECTION OF THE SAME GRADE LEVEL WHO WERE READING IN THE MORE TRADITIONAL THREE READING GROUPS. THE READING SPECIALIST ON THE COLLEGE FACULTY IS WORKING VERY CLOSELY WITH HER. THIS TEACHER SUGGESTED THE NEED FOR A CLOSER RELATIONSHIP WITH FACULTY MEMBERS TEACHING COLLEGE COURSES, IN CONTRAST WITH THE PRINCIPAL WHO INDICATED THAT THE HELP OF SPECIALISTS ON THE COLLEGE FACULTY WAS READILY AVAILABLE.

THE WORK IN READING INSTRUCTION, ALREADY DESCRIBED, CONSTITUTES THE ONLY RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. THE WRITER HESITATES TO CALL THIS RESEARCH, SINCE COMPLETE DATA WERE NOT AVAILABLE. IT IS CERTAINLY A SYSTEMATIC, CONTROLLED EFFORT TO CONTRAST ONE METHOD WITH ANOTHER. IT IS MORE THAN A TEACHER'S EFFORT TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES. SIXTH GRADERS PARTICIPATE IN A RATHER AMBITIOUS PROGRAM IN OUTDOOR EDUCATION. FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION FORMS PART OF THE CURRICULUM IN GRADES FIVE THROUGH EIGHT.
These are ventures into new fields, and interesting areas of learning, but controls are lacking, and record keeping is so limited as to question their inclusion as "research."

There is increasing interest in research on the part of the principal of this laboratory school. It appears to this writer that the faculty does not share this enthusiasm.

Visit Number Three - School C

This laboratory school is located on the campus of a large midwestern university. Offices and classrooms of the School of Education occupy several wings in the same building.

The laboratory school serves a school district of the city in which the university is located. According to administrators, laboratory school classes are much too large. There are two sections of kindergarten, first and second grades, and additional sections of intermediate grades are planned. Classes of thirty-five or thirty-six pupils are typical in the intermediate grades. A nursery school for four year olds was recently discontinued because of insufficient facilities, and limited space, an administrator stated. Difficulties created by crowding received much emphasis in conversations with administrators. A new laboratory school is planned, and administrators expressed belief that many problems will be alleviated by the move to newer, more spacious quarters.

The administrative hierarchy includes principal, an assistant principal, whose primary interest is secondary education, and a supervisor of the elementary school. None of these assumes major responsibility for the direction of research, although research is one of the
school's stated functions. Such direction as is given is evidently informal, and is the result of cooperative administrative-faculty action.

There were 11,000 "official" observations in this school during the school year 1958-59. Because of this tremendous burden, administrators are attempting to relieve faculty members of responsibilities for participants and student teachers. At present, there are only five student teachers in the elementary school. The number of participants was not specified.

Usually faculty members at this school have not stayed long. Many are wives of doctoral candidates, and/or graduate students whose primary concerns centered around completing requirements for a degree. The implications of this in terms of a continuity in the program long-range planning are fully realized by administrators, and this writer was informed with much pride that last year's elementary staff and this year's are identical, with one exception. Administrators are hoping to attract more "career" teachers, although salaries in the city school system are in general higher than those of the laboratory school. There is no salary schedule, and since mention of this was not made, it is assumed that university faculty rank is not accorded members of the laboratory school faculty.

Although many laboratory school faculty members hold master's degrees, and several are working on doctorates, only two secondary school teachers have doctor's degrees.

Administrators and teachers with whom the writer talked expressed the belief that there would be little or no parent opposition to the faculty's assumption of a more prominent role in educational research.
A teacher who was working in the area of revised grade-placement of social studies materials indicated that parents were delighted with results.

Teachers expressed little interest in conducting research, and felt that a high pupil-teacher ratio and a large number of observers constituted more than a full teaching "load." Administrators anticipated more activity in the area of research, after moving to the new building.

Many faculty meetings have been devoted to a review and reassessment of the laboratory school's purposes, and there is evidently widespread agreement that more attention should be given to the research function. This is based on the assumption that classes will be smaller, and that student teachers and participants with very few exceptions will be placed in public schools. One administrator suggested that having two sections of each grade would facilitate fulfilling both the observation and research functions, since some rooms in which research projects were going forward could be closed to observers, without limiting the opportunity to observe children at all grade levels.

A fourth grade teacher has been developing materials in connection with a unit involving study of the state's history and geography. It is her contention that fourth graders are able to understand many historical concepts, and place them in correct chronological sequence. She feels that not enough of this has been done at the fourth grade level, due to the assumption that fourth grade children were too immature to secure meaning from historical dates and facts. Results of tests designed by this teacher, suggest that nine and ten
YEAR OLDS NOT ONLY CAN UNDERSTAND HISTORICAL CONCEPTS IN CORRECT CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE, BUT RETAIN THESE CONCEPTS THROUGH SUCCEEDING YEARS IN SCHOOL. ADMINISTRATORS AND THE TEACHER HERSELF CONSIDERED THIS RESEARCH.

EVERYONE CONNECTED WITH THIS SCHOOL SEEMS TO EXPECT MANY CHANGES AND MUCH PROGRESS WHEN THE NEW LABORATORY SCHOOL IS BUILT. IF THE FACULTY EXHIBITS LITTLE INTEREST IN RESEARCH AT PRESENT, IT IS DIFFICULT TO SEE HOW MOVING TO A NEW BUILDING WILL PROVIDE THE NEEDED IMPETUS IN THIS DIRECTION. SMALLER CLASSES MIGHT HELP, BUT THIS IS ADMITTEDLY A RATHER OPTIMISTIC POINT OF VIEW. UNQUESTIONABLY, THE PURSUANCE-OF RESEARCH PROJECTS REQUIRING MORE THAN A YEAR'S TIME WILL BE FURTHERED IF MORE TEACHERS STAY LONGER THAN ONE OR TWO YEARS. THE ALTERNATIVE TO THIS WOULD APPEAR TO BE PLACEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROGRAM UNDER THE DIRECTION AND DOMINATION OF ADMINISTRATORS, AS DESCRIBED IN SCHOOL A, AND "BY-PASSING" THE FACULTY, AT LEAST IN THE MAJORITY OF RESEARCH PROJECTS.

VISIT NUMBER FOUR - SCHOOL D

THIS LABORATORY SCHOOL IS LOCATED IN A SMALL TOWN LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEASTERN SECTION OF A MIDWESTERN STATE. THE LABORATORY SCHOOL BUILDING IS ADJACENT TO A NEWER, MORE MODERN BUILDING HOUSING COLLEGE OF EDUCATION OFFICES AND CLASSROOMS.

BRIEF CONTACTS WITH TOWNSPEOPLE LEFT THE DISTINCT IMPRESSION THAT THE UNIVERSITY IS A MAJOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTOR IN THE COMMUNITY. THERE IS ALMOST NO HEAVY INDUSTRY AND MOST BUSINESSES IN THE TOWN APPEARENTLY ARE SMALL AND INDIVIDUALLY OWNED, RATHER THAN EXTENSIONS OR BRANCHES OF LARGE CORPORATE ENTERPRISES. THERE IS EVIDENTLY SOME
SOCIAL PRESTIGE ATTENDANT TO BEING ENROLLED IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL, AND THE PRINCIPAL AND SEVERAL TEACHERS SUGGESTED THAT THE LEVEL OF TEACHING IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WAS MEASURABLY SUPERIOR TO THAT IN THE TOWN'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS. THIS LATTER COMMENT WAS MADE IN CONNECATION WITH CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE STUDENT TEACHING FUNCTION OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL, ONE FACULTY MEMBER GOING SO FAR AS TO SAY THAT THERE WERE FEW PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE COMMUNITY WHERE PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS COULD BE ASSURED WORTHWHILE LABORATORY EXPERIENCES.


NO OBSERVERS WERE IN EVIDENCE IN THE CLASSROOMS. HOWEVER, THIS VISIT IMMEDIATELY PRECEDED SPRING VACATION, AND JUDGMENT CONCERNING THE NORMAL NUMBER OF OBSERVERS SHOULD PROBABLY BE RESERVED.

THE SCHOOL ENROLLS APPROXIMATELY TWO HUNDRED CHILDREN. THERE IS A KINDERGARTEN WITH TWO SECTIONS, FOR FOUR AND FIVE YEAR OLDS, AND ONE SECTION OF EACH GRADE, ONE THROUGH SIX. ROOMS WERE ADEQUATELY FURNISHED AND PAINTED IN BRIGHT, ATTRACTIVE COLORS, BUT THE LIGHTING WAS RATHER OUTMODED, AND WAS BEING IMPROVED AS FINANCES PERMITTED. THE BUILDING IS QUITE OLD, BUT HAS BEEN KEPT IN GOOD REPAIR. PLAYGROUND SPACE SEEMED LIMITED, BUT STAGGERED PLAY PERIOD MADE POSSIBLE FULL USE
OF THE SPACE WITHOUT CROWDING.

In the brief conference with the principal, he pointed out that there had been seven administrators in this laboratory school in the past ten years. Each administrator had resigned to accept a "better" position in a public school administrative post or on a college or university faculty. The present administrator had previously been the principal of an elementary school in the town where the university is located.

The school is not a public school, in the sense that it serves a school district. However, it does receive reimbursement from local school funds for the pupils enrolled. Most of the money necessary to finance the school comes from the university through the college of education. Financial matters were of particular concern to the principal. The portion of the college funds allocated for the laboratory school were quite inadequate, he stated. The summer school, in reality an extension of the regular school year, was being financed by money from the regular school budget rather than through a special fund as previous policy had permitted.

The principal expressed a need for the faculties of the laboratory school and the college to work together much more closely than they had in the past. He stated that a major portion of his energies were devoted to bringing about a more satisfactory working relationship.

The principal noted the number of student teachers, said it was being reduced each quarter and provided no deterrent to the school's acceptance of a more active role in educational research, which he favored. At least one teacher disagreed with this position,
STATING THAT TEACHING CHILDREN AND GUIDING TWO AND SOMETIMES THREE STUDENT TEACHERS PRECLUDED MUCH RESEARCH ACTIVITY BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS.

There is a limit to a teacher's time and energies, she stated. This same teacher made favorable comments about a speech heard at a national conference of educators in which increasing activity in educational research was urged.

Another teacher explained a new plan for organizing children in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades for summer school. Organization will be through interest groups, which will cut across grade lines. The community will be the center or focus, with several specific areas of living in the community studied by children who indicate an interest in recreation, communication, and transportation, etc.

This plan was developed through staff meetings, and shared with and further developed in meetings with college faculty members and parents of laboratory school pupils.

This venture would be termed by some "action" research and was so considered by the principal and the teachers concerned. With the addition of a few graduate studies from the department of psychology, this constitutes the research contribution of this laboratory school. The interest of the principal and the high level of teaching competence exhibited leads one to hope that these are significant beginnings, and more can be expected in the future.

Visit Number Five - School E

This campus school is located in a small town in the Midwest. Brief conversations with townspeople and automobile drives through the area adjacent to the university left the impression that there was little heavy industry and few factories in the community. The university has a
beautiful setting and is surrounded by residential areas. Houses in this area are relatively new, and quite attractive. University faculty members own many of these homes, and concern was expressed that the extensive building program would bring campus buildings closer than many felt would be desirable.

There are approximately 270 pupils enrolled in this laboratory school, which includes a kindergarten and one section of each grade from first through eighth. Pupils are selected through the application of a rather complex priority formula, and pay a fee of $15.00 each semester. There was a high school in a separate building, but this has been transferred to the public school system of the community. The principal expressed the opinion that the program of the high school had suffered as a result of this recent transfer, but he did not elaborate.

The administrative staff consists of an acting principal and a graduate assistant completing requirements for a graduate degree in school administration.

The school is housed in an older building which also houses classrooms used by the School of Education. Campus school classrooms are small with three rooms comprising a "unit" for each grade level. The way the rooms on either side of the classroom were used was not immediately apparent, but one room evidently served as a workroom and storeroom, and the other room was probably used for small-group work.

The seventh and eighth grades utilize what has been commonly termed the "core" curriculum.

There was evidence of much staff agreement and efforts to provide continuity of pupil growth in social studies, particularly.

Two new teachers joined the faculty this year, two are
leaving and will need to be replaced next year. Teachers expressed much satisfaction with their work particularly with respect to parent relations, which one teacher indicated were the best in her teaching experience. The principal said that it was increasingly difficult to get teachers, and that he no longer is the only administrator involved in the selection of new faculty members. The Dean of the School of Education is becoming increasingly involved in matters relating to the laboratory school, the principal added. Criteria suggested for the new staff members to be hired for next year include completion of the requirements for the master's degree. Faculty members of the laboratory school hold college rank, and like university faculty members, have no salary schedule.

The principal and several staff members teach extension courses for the university.

Unquestionably the function receiving most emphasis at present is student teaching. There are many observers; too many, some teachers feel. One teacher mentioned an unofficial count of one thousand observations during the school year 1958-59. Rather elaborate arrangements are made in order to minimize the disruption of classroom activities by observers (they are to use certain specified doors, place books and wraps in lockers designated for that purpose, etc.). Every room visited had six, eight or ten chairs occupied by observers.

The principal and several faculty members expressed a desire to place student teachers in public schools and use the laboratory school for participation. A number of students had expressed a need for a laboratory experience before student teaching. Tentative plans for
LABORATORY EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO BUT SIMILAR IN NATURE TO STUDENT TEACHING WOULD PLACE TEN PARTICIPANTS IN CLASSROOMS AT VARIOUS TIMES DURING THE DAY.

Teachers and the principal agreed that little writing of a professional nature was contributed by laboratory school faculty members. Pressure to do much more writing is being applied by college and university administrative officials, according to several teachers. The principal stated that little research was being done. Inadequate funds and insufficient clerical help were suggested as two serious blocks to increased research activity.

Two college students, juniors majoring in speech therapy, were working with the first grade children in an effort to improve the quality of the children's speech. The teacher expressed doubts concerning the effectiveness of this "whole-group" approach, but agreed it was worth trying.

Longitudinal studies of physical development begin when children enter kindergarten and continue through the eighth grade. The use of these data and the purpose of the studies were not made clear. This research is a cooperative venture involving School of Education and laboratory school faculty members.

A laboratory school faculty member mentioned "experimenting" with a correlated music-physical education program. For one-half hour, two days a week the children spend a half hour with the music specialist, and on the fifth day they participate in rhythms, square dancing or some activity relating to music and physical education.

The examples of research briefly outlined in the preceding
PARAGRAPHS SUGGEST THAT THE FACULTY OF THIS LABORATORY SCHOOL IS ALERT TO NEW IDEAS IN EDUCATION, AND NOT AFRAID TO PUT THEM INTO PRACTICE. WHETHER OR NOT THESE CONSTITUTE "BASIC" RESEARCH OR "ACTION" RESEARCH WILL DEPEND UPON ONE'S DEFINITION OF THESE TERMS.

INTERVIEW NUMBER ONE

THIS FORMER PRINCIPAL OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL IS NOW ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF OF A STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE.

HE EXPRESSED THE BELIEF THAT THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS REQUIRED AND FORCED TO MOVE IN THE DIRECTION OF AN ACTIVE ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IF IT IS TO CONTINUE TO EXIST. PUBLIC SCHOOLS COULD, AS ONE EXAMPLE, PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING, PARTICIPATION, AND OBSERVATION.

IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT THE LABORATORY SCHOOL BECOME MORE OF A LEADERSHIP AGENCY THAN IT IS AT PRESENT. IT IS NOT ENOUGH FOR A LABORATORY SCHOOL TO BE A "GOOD" SCHOOL, IN TERMS OF FACILITIES, CLASS SIZE, AND INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS. ACCORDING TO THIS EDUCATOR, "THIS TYPE OF SCHOOL CAN GIVE THE CLOSEST APPROXIMATION TO A LABORATORY SITUATION WHERE THIS DEFINITION INCLUDES BROAD OPPORTUNITIES TO BRING IN AS MANY INDIVIDUALS AS IS NECESSARY TO WORK ON A PROBLEM, BOTH IN RESPECT TO LENGTH AND DEPTH. SUCH A CONDITION OF AN INCLUSIVE ATTACK MAKES THE LABORATORY SCHOOL AN OPERATING LOCUS WHERE RESOURCES OF AN ENTIRE INSTITUTION ARE BROUGHT TO BEAR ON A PROBLEM. CENTRAL TO THE ROLE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ORGANIZE AND DIRECT THESE EFFORTS."

THIS FORMER ADMINISTRATOR INDICATED THAT THE ADVANTAGES ACCRUING TO THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WITH A PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT
outweighed those of serving a school district. Most laboratory schools, even those serving a school district, do not claim to have representative pupil populations. The fact that parents have chosen to send their children to a particular school usually will result in increased parent support for the total program of the school. This former principal expressed the opinion that there would be less opposition on the part of parents to increased activity in educational research in the laboratory school.

Connotations and variations of meaning applied to the term "research" were discussed. There is latent insecurity and fear on the part of teachers and administrators because of the narrow restricted definition of research transferred from the biological and physical sciences to education. However, it was suggested that all efforts to improve the instructional program should not be given the name "research" since adequate and reliable data may not be available, and the statistical reliability of results may not hold for even similar situations.

Insufficient funds for conducting educational research was mentioned as a serious deterrent to increased activity in this area as was a serious shortage of competent well-trained clerical help.

Interview Number Two

The former principal of a laboratory school in a western state is now on the faculty of a midwestern state teachers college. He teaches courses in the area of educational administration.

After an expression of confidence in the future of the laboratory school as a leadership agency in education, he stated the belief
That the administrators and faculty members of laboratory schools should play a more vital, active role in educational research. It was suggested that the provision of facilities for student teaching, participation and/or observation were insufficient justification for the continued existence of an institution as expensive to support as the laboratory school.

The problem of faculty rank for laboratory school teachers was discussed. Because the role of the laboratory school teacher differs markedly from the role of the instructor of college classes, this former administrator stated the opinion that college faculty rank is inappropriate for laboratory school teachers. Differences in daily and annual schedules were cited in support of this belief. Typically, the laboratory school teacher is tied to a less flexible schedule, although the total number of hours spent in professional activities may not be greatly different. Briefly since the jobs are not the same, the titles or ranks should not be the same.

It was suggested that one of the major blocks to increased activity in the area of educational research was the laboratory school teacher's limited background in educational research and limited knowledge of research methodology. Successful public school teaching experience is usually a major criterion in the selection of laboratory school teachers. This is not necessarily the most important qualification for the selection of one who will direct or at least be involved in experimentation and other research activities. A long-term of in-service education was considered preferable to a series of courses in educational research. It was also recommended that administrators consider a prospective laboratory school teacher's
This former administrator expressed the opinion that the laboratory school should accept a role of leadership in curriculum change, improved teaching methods, and the solution of many problems of concern to professional educators. He admitted that this was a much more challenging and difficult role than that required by the exemplification of approved current practice, in order that student teachers might be better prepared for positions in typical public schools.

It was stated that parents of pupils enrolled in laboratory schools were generally quite cooperative, and would provide little serious opposition to the conduct of educational research. However, the concept of the laboratory school being, first of all, a good school for children, was questioned. If seeking the answers to current educational problems is a real and vital goal of the faculty and administration of a laboratory school, some controls will need to be established. Each child will probably receive a better education in a laboratory school than he would in a public school, but many will benefit even more by membership in a group where a newer, better way of teaching and learning is being pursued.

Interview Number Three

This educator is the principal of a laboratory school connected with a state teachers college in the Midwest.

Much of this interview centered around genuine and imaginary blocks to educational research in the laboratory school. The primary block, according to this administrator, is misunderstanding and confusion concerning the nature of research in the behavioral sciences.
Research is usually narrowly conceived, and the result is fear of methodology only partly understood and a vague feeling that children should not be treated as "guinea pigs".

Administrators themselves provide serious "blocks" to the acceptance of a more active role in educational research by laboratory school personnel. Many remain in positions too long and this principal defined "too long" as the point at which an administrator knows in advance all the reasons the school with which he is connected cannot move forward or make needed changes.

In contrast to positions taken by other administrators, this principal stated that insufficient funds represented an excuse rather than a real reason for inactivity in the area of educational research. He stated that at least partial answers to persistent educational problems could be found without special grant and foundation funds. There is money, as there is time, to do what is considered important.

Parents frequently object to innovations in curriculum and method, and this administrator took the position that research in the laboratory school might have to proceed over some parental objections. This principal is associated with a laboratory school which serves a school district. He suggested that a more active role in educational research might be assumed if the laboratory school were not a public school, but one to which parents choose to send their children.

In the future, laboratory school faculty members might well see their positions in terms of research projects underway, rather than years of service. It was also suggested that groups of children attending laboratory schools could also be selected in terms of the specific problem or problems to be solved. A team of teachers and
SEVERAL GROUPS OF PRIMARY-GRADE PUPILS MIGHT BE ASSOCIATED WITH A LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR A SUFFICIENT PERIOD OF TIME TO GET ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE USE OF BASAL TEXTS AS COMPARED WITH A SELF SELECTION READING PROGRAM IN BEGINNING READING INSTRUCTION.

This administrator took the position that the faculties of departments of education and laboratory schools should cooperate more fully on research projects. The solutions of significant educational problems is of more importance than the person or institution gaining credit for the direction of the research involved in the solution.

INTERVIEW NUMBER FOUR

The Dean of Instruction of a teachers college in the Midwest indicated support for increased emphasis on research as a function of the laboratory school. The term research, as he defined it, included the types commonly referred to as "basic" research, than rather carefully structured and controlled efforts to seek answers to educational problems, and what has been called "action" research, with less formal structure and controls. It was suggested that both types were important. The opinion was expressed that the public schools in an area served by a laboratory school would benefit if administrators and faculty members of laboratory schools gave effective leadership to public school personnel interested in and financially and professionally equipped for increased activity in educational research. Findings of so-called "pilot studies" conducted with the necessarily restricted population of a laboratory school might well be expanded and/or further tested on the more typical and larger populations of public schools. Student teaching, participation, observation, and demonstration teaching could conceivably be
ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL IN WHICH EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTATION ASSUMES A MAJOR ROLE. IN FACT, THE INVOLVEMENT OF MATURE PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN THE CONDUCT OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH MIGHT GIVE NEEDED IMPETUS TO A MORE EXPERIMENTAL ATTITUDE WITHIN FACULTIES OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

THE Dean stated that he believed parents would not object to an increased emphasis on research in laboratory schools in which their children were enrolled. THIS IS PARTICULARLY SIGNIFICANT SINCE THE Dean speaks as a parent of children enrolled in a laboratory school. IT WAS POINTED OUT THAT IN STUDIES UTILIZING THE RESEARCH TECHNIQUE OF COMPARISON OF MATCHED GROUPS, EVEN THE CONTROL GROUP WOULD LOSE LITTLE OR NOTHING, SINCE THE METHODS, TECHNIQUES OF MATERIALS INVOLVED WOULD BE THOSE GENERALLY ACCEPTED AS EDUCATIONALLY SOUND.

ALTHOUGH THE Dean expressed a high degree of confidence in the quality of teaching in laboratory schools, he noted a need for increased understanding of educational research on the part of faculty members as well as administrators. He stated that laboratory school teachers were often selected on the basis of outstanding performance in public school teaching. LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHING MAKES MANY PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEMANDS, AND THE ASSUMPTION OF AN INCREASINGLY ACTIVE ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH WOULD PLACE AN ADDITIONAL BURDEN UPON THE CONSCIENTIOUS TEACHER. THE CASE OF AN EDUCATOR OF DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING WHO PROVED TO BE QUITE UNEQUAL TO THE ADDITIONAL TEACHER-EDUCATION RESPONSIBILITIES OF LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHING WAS CITED. IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT ONE CRITERION FOR THE SELECTION OF LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS MIGHT WELL BE EVIDENCE
of open-mindedness to new ideas, if not demonstrated ability in con-
duction educational research. In-service programs could be of at least
as much value as the typical courses in educational research in help-
ing faculty members overcome feelings of insecurity and inadequacy in
trying and testing new educational methods, techniques, and materials.
It was pointed out that laboratory school teachers usually possess
master's degrees, and most programs leading toward the master's degree
involve at least minimum exposure to methods and findings in education-
al research. It would seem that more of this type of experience would
be of little help.

Multiple demands upon the time of laboratory school teachers and
administrators constitute a much more serious deterrent to increased re-
search activity than insufficient funds, although the two are not en-
tirely separable. Teachers involved in research activities need to be
relieved of at least some routine classroom duties.

The Dean expressed confidence in the future of the laboratory
school as an agency making significant contributions at several points
in the teacher education process. The laboratory school need not con-
fine its functions to those for which it was originally conceived, but
should work toward justification of its leadership position through
contributions in many areas, including educational research.

Interview Number Five

The Director of the laboratory school connected with the College
of Education of a large midwestern university stressed the need for an
experimental attitude which should pervade the laboratory school. An
attitude within faculties of questioning, of seeking better ways of
WORKING WITH CHILDREN WOULD BE AT LEAST AS PRODUCTIVE AS ATTEMPTS TO STUDY ASPECTS OF CHILD BEHAVIOR OR SELECTED METHODS OF TEACHING THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF RESEARCH TECHNIQUES ORIGINATING IN AND PERHAPS BEST RESERVED FOR THE PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES. POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE HIGHLY COMPETENT FACULTIES AND ADMINISTRATORS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS HAVE BEEN IMPEDED BY RESTRICTED CONCEPTS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.

THIS EDUCATOR STATED THAT HE STRONGLY FAVORED THE INVOLVEMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN ANY RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS. LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS SHOULD BE MORE THAN THE KEEPERS OF "GUINEA PIGS" USED FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS BY VARIOUS CAMPUS DEPARTMENTS AND DOCTORAL CANDIDATES. FACULTY MEMBERS NEED SOME TIME WHEN THEY ARE FREE FROM ROUTINE CLASSROOM DUTIES IF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS TO MAKE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE.

USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR OBSERVATION AND DEMONSTRATION TEACHING NEED NOT PROVIDE A SERIOUS DETERRENT TO THE CONDUCT OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. INDEED IN FULFILLING THESE FUNCTIONS, THE LABORATORY SCHOOL MAY BE HELPING TO MAKE PROSPECTIVE AND IN-SERVICE TEACHERS MORE RESEARCH-MINDED. THE LARGE NUMBER OF OBSERVERS USING THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WHERE THIS EDUCATOR IS AN ADMINISTRATOR WAS CITED IN SUPPORT OF THIS CONTENTION.

THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS CONNECTED WITH INSTITUTIONS RECEIVING STATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS THROUGHOUT THE STATE, IN EXPANDING AND EXTENDING PRESENT KNOWLEDGE IN FIELDS RELATING TO THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN. A STUDY IN INDIVIDUALIZED READING INSTRUCTION IN THE PRIMARY GRADES WAS DESCRIBED.
The findings of this "pilot study", which originated in the laboratory school, are being checked and verified in public schools throughout the state, with the director of the laboratory school serving as a resource person and guiding the work of the teachers cooperating in the study.

The director took the position that laboratory schools did not necessarily have to have representative or typical pupil populations. The study referred to in the previous paragraph was cited as an example of the manner in which findings of studies originating in laboratory schools might be expanded and verified through the use of public school pupils.

It was noted that the tuition paid by pupils attending the laboratory school where this educator served as director contributed only a small portion of the cost of maintaining the school. It was inferred that the laboratory school must justify this considerable expense through consistent and significant contributions to educational knowledge, leaving to public schools such functions as participation and student teaching.

Concerning the faculty of the laboratory school, it was agreed that laboratory school teachers frequently have brief tenure, often moving into college teaching after completion of requirements for the doctorate. The director stated that this did not provide a serious impediment to effective faculty cooperation or a consistent educational program if at least half the faculty members could be regarded as permanent. In fact, a staff which remains relatively unchanged for a period of years may tend to foster quite the opposite of the "experimental" attitude held to be fundamental of educational progress.
The director mentioned that there had been altogether too few new ideas relating to the curriculum of the elementary school in the past few years. The importance of the laboratory school serving as a leadership agency in curriculum change was stressed several times. While it was not suggested that highly structured, formal research in restricted areas of child behavior, for example, was not important, the director seemed to suggest that the laboratory school could make most significant contributions in the area of curriculum development. This would involve questioning and testing present concepts of grade placement and content of subject matter in the curriculum in the elementary school.

**Interview Number Six**

The Dean of the College of Education of a large midwestern university served as the director of a laboratory school prior to the acceptance of his present position.

Public schools are becoming increasingly better in almost all respects, it was stated. Their quality has improved to such an extent that teacher-educators should no longer feel that a desirable type of laboratory experience is available to prospective teachers only in a campus-related school. Laboratory schools are still essential in any community where the quality of public school teaching is poor or where the public school system offers insufficient positions in which to place student teachers or participants.

The Dean called outmoded the belief that the level of teaching can be miraculously upgraded by the process of sending to public schools enthusiastic, energetic beginning teachers whose student
TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL HAS EQUIPPED THEM WITH MIS-
SIONARY ZEAL AND THE ANSWERS TO PERSISTENT EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, RATHER,
EXPERIENCE HAS TAUGHT THAT THE BEGINNING TEACHER SOON ADOPTS METHODS,
TECHNIQUES, AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS WHICH MAKE IT DIFFICULT TO
DIFFERENTIATE HIM FROM THE TEACHER WITH SEVERAL YEARS EXPERIENCE.

The Dean concluded that research must become a more important
function of the laboratory school if that institution is to survive.
The expense of maintaining a laboratory school was mentioned, and it was
suggested that a laboratory school which concentrates on functions which
could be performed equally well by public schools was hardly justifying
its existence. It was noted that the expense of the laboratory school
has been cited in nearly every case where teacher education institu-
tions have ceased to operate campus schools. Significant research,
must assume a more important position in the hierarchy of functions of
the laboratory school.

The area of curriculum was cited as a particularly important field
for study. Laboratory school personnel should exhibit creative leader-
ship in trying and testing the effectiveness of new approaches in grade
placement of subject matter as well as the content of the subject matter
area. While much significant curriculum research has been done in the
past, new ideas need to be tested, and the laboratory school seems to
be a particularly appropriate place in which to test them. Research
in curriculum would utilize aspects of, but not be restricted by, ex-
perimental techniques specifically designed for the biological and
physical sciences.

The Dean indicated that a high quality of leadership was the
PRIMARY REQUISITE FOR INCREASED RESEARCH ACTIVITY IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. This, he held, is a more important factor than a faculty experienced in the conduct of research. The names of several laboratory school directors who possessed this quality of leadership in addition to administrative ability were mentioned to support the claim that dynamic, creative leadership is essential if a laboratory school is to make effective educational contributions.

Parents will probably not object to having the laboratory school assume an increased role in educational research. The Dean noted that in the laboratory school where he had been the director, parents encouraged experimentation, and all attempts to improve the quality of their children's education. He stated that they evidently realized that their children would gain, not lose.

The Dean has expressed himself on many occasions, as well as throughout this interview, as believing that the laboratory school has a definite place in the future of teacher education, and will continue to make contributions in this field. Its major contributions, however, will be as a center for experimentation and research which will add, regularly and significantly, to our educational knowledge.

Interview Number Seven

The former principal of a laboratory school for the past three years has served on the faculty of the Department of Education of a Teachers College in the Midwest. This educator's experience also includes mathematics teaching at a laboratory school associated with a Western State Teachers College.

The laboratory school with which he was associated as an
ADMINISTRATOR IS LOCATED ON THE CAMPUS OF A SMALL MIDWESTERN TEACHERS COLLEGE. THE TOWN IN WHICH THE COLLEGE IS LOCATED HAD A POPULATION OF THREE THOUSAND, AND THE COLLEGE ENROLLED APPROXIMATELY 700-800. IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE LEVEL OF TEACHER-EDUCATION IN THE STATE FROM WHICH THIS COLLEGE DREW MEAGER SUPPORT PROVIDED ESSENTIAL BACKGROUND TO UNDERSTANDING THE FUNCTION OR FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. THIS EDUCATOR CAUTIONED THAT CONDITIONS IN THE STATE, IN THE COLLEGE, AND IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL MAY HAVE CHANGED IN THE PAST THREE YEARS. AT THAT TIME, THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE WAS NOT AN ESSENTIAL QUALIFICATION FOR A TEACHING CERTIFICATE IN THIS STATE. THE MAJORITY OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN THE STATE HAD LESS THAN TWO YEARS OF EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL. INDEED, SOME HIGH SCHOOLS OFFERED "TEACHING" COURSES. A STUDENT GRADUATING FROM A SECONDARY SCHOOL WITH CREDITS FOR SUCH COURSES COULD TEACH THE FOLLOWING FALL IN A RURAL SCHOOL, IF HE WERE WILLING TO ATTEND SUMMER SCHOOL FOR ONE TERM. BRIEFLY, THEN, IN THIS STATE, THE TEACHER WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE WAS NOT COMMON, AND THE MASTER'S DEGREE-HOLDING TEACHER WAS A RARITY.

THE LABORATORY SCHOOL ON THIS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE CAMPUS WAS DEVOTED ALMOST ENTIRELY TO THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING. TEACHERS HELD MASTER'S DEGREES, AND CONSTITUTED A CONSCIENTIOUS AND DEVOLE FACULTY. THEY DID NOT HAVE FACULTY RANK, BUT NEITHER DID THE TEACHERS OF COLLEGE COURSES. WHEN COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS WERE ACCORDED FACULTY RANK, SO WERE LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WAS FINDING IT INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR THE GROWING NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS, AND PROVIDED A SOLUTION BY PLACING MORE STUDENT TEACHERS IN EACH CLASSROOM. IT WAS ADMITTED THAT THIS LIMITED THE RANGE OF EXPERIENCES FOR A
prospective teacher, but since many beginning teachers lacked even such limited supervised experiences with children, this seemed to be a rather minor problem.

This former administrator noted that there was no thought of changing the function of this laboratory school, even when a new and larger building was planned and constructed. Other laboratory schools have encountered threats of their existence which this laboratory school has yet to meet. It is, at present, fulfilling a function which public schools cannot adequately fulfill, because of the level of preparation of the typical public school teacher in the state.

A need for the laboratory school to change function was expressed, but this educator did not suggest the direction this change should take.

The final section of the present chapter summarizing the data gathered will be devoted to a brief overview of the materials submitted by respondents or presented to the writer during visits to schools.
MATERIALS SUBMITTED BY RESPONDENTS TO
AN INQUIRY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Several respondents to "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Re-
search in Laboratory Schools" very generously contributed material, re-
lating to research in the laboratory school, which had been developed by
or for the faculties of specific laboratory schools. Additional materials
of a similar nature were presented to the writer during visits to labora-
tory schools. Most of this material was unpublished, and was originally
intended for consideration by laboratory school or college faculties, or
for circulation to interested public school personnel in the areas served
by laboratory schools.

No claim is made concerning the representativeness of these data.
It may be assumed that respondents presented data which tend to reflect
favorably upon the faculties concerned. It is also likely that addition-
al materials would have been contributed if they had been requested. How-
a brief summary of such unpublished materials relating to research in
specified laboratory schools as were made available to the writer is con-
sidered to be of sufficient significance to be included with other data
reported in this chapter.

GENERAL STATEMENTS CONCERNING RESEARCH

The faculty of the Noss Laboratory School, State Teachers Col-
lege, California, Pennsylvania, prepared the following statement of
"Functions of the Noss Laboratory School". As stated above the func-
tions and services of the Noss Laboratory School are numerous and
varied. Herein is a summarized list of these services:
1. It provides for the education of approximately two hundred twenty-five children from the surrounding area of the California community school district.

2. It provides thirty-two student teachers each year with opportunities to grow, experiment, evaluate, and crystallize their educational thinking while working with students in the classrooms in worthwhile situations.

3. By providing for college class observations, both individual and group, college students have an opportunity to see live classroom teaching. These college students have the opportunities of seeing educational theories implemented into desirable teaching situations.

4. College students have opportunities to engage in pre-laboratory teaching experiences. They may teach a lesson which is the outgrowth of a methods course. They can conduct assigned physical education classes. They may tell stories, teach poems, or utilize various teaching activities.

5. The Noss School is a center for demonstrating teaching through a Unit of Study, and other special methods of instruction.

6. The Noss School maintains a worthwhile library of the most recent published textbooks, other instructional material and a collection of "Unit of Study". College students, faculty members, and in-service teachers are constantly utilizing and evaluating these materials.

7. The Noss School staff do use those new textbooks in their classrooms for experimental and evaluative purposes.

8. Classroom demonstrations for in-service teachers are conducted frequently.

9. Visiting groups of Future Teachers of America find the Noss School most interesting. They enjoy the visitation into the classrooms after the orientation on the school's educational program by faculty members.

10. The basic philosophy at Noss School encourages experimentation with subject areas and with teaching methods to foster highly desirable teaching and learning situations.

11. In each grade level there are homogeneous groupings to provide for a maximum level of performance for each child commensurate with his ability. An enriched educational program is provided for the fast learner.
12. The members of the teaching staff at Noss serve as speakers, consultants, and active participants in workshops and in-service educational meetings.

13. Many in-service teachers visit Noss School after school hours and a Saturday to cull ideas for bulletin board displays, appropriate room decorations, units of work in progress, new materials, and textbooks.

Comments relating to the dedication of the new P. K. Yonge Laboratory School were included in the "Edu-gator", the newspaper of the College of Education, University of Florida. The new plant is designed to contribute to a research program which is "shaping up along new and previously uncharted lines".

"As the functional design of the plant contributes to pupil learning and to teacher education, it also ultimately contributes to experimentation and research. Experimentation can demand flexibility in space, observation facilities, adequate materials and resources and movable furniture. Additional office and conference space is available in the building housing the psychological and nursing facilities for research activities. Adequate calculating and other research equipment are available to individual staff members and to team research projects. Experimentation by faculties of other departments in the university in cooperation with the school is encouraged. The planning for school research is primarily the responsibility of a committee consisting of the Director, Principal, Elementary Curriculum Coordinator, Secondary Curriculum Coordinator, Assistant Dean for Curriculum in the College, and the Dean of

---

1"The Objectives, Organization and Functions of the Noss School" (Noss Laboratory School, Pennsylvania State Teachers College, California, Pennsylvania, 1958), p. 4. (mimeographed).
the College, ex officio. However, experimentation and research by individual teachers is supported.²

Robert Fox makes some very pertinent comments concerning research in the laboratory school, with specific reference to the laboratory school associated with the School of Education, University of Michigan. In an article entitled "Needed Research in the Elementary Curriculum", he writes: "A laboratory school, such as the University Elementary School at the University of Michigan, is an example of another means by which coordinated research may be facilitated. Data of many types with regard to the development and achievement of boys and girls enrolled in the school are carefully and cautiously collected and recorded. These records constitute a source of information available to research workers which is far richer than any they might have, otherwise. Analysis of growth records of the same children for different purposes often brings to light interrelationships not otherwise discernible. Familial, interpersonal and emotional needs of children as based on programs can be studied with much knowledge of the human material.

Several other opportunities are open to the graduate student for engaging in research related to broader problems. He may call upon (1) individual faculty members with special interests who may be coordinating the work of several students in particular fields, (2) the committee assigned to guide the student in his dissertation project, and (3) university research councils or committees whose

SPECIAL FUNCTION IT IS TO DEVELOP LARGE-SCALE PATTERNS OF RESEARCH IN WHICH INDIVIDUALS CAN PARTICIPATE.\(^3\)

Concerning the value of "action" research in the laboratory, Dr. Fox continues, "Action research does not negate the need for the more highly controlled type of research, but it does hold that there may be instances in which superior results will be obtained if research utilizes the natural real-life situation with all its complex interrelationships as the context for investigation of particular problems... Action research should be an invaluable part of any curriculum improvement program. Its utilization as a learning experience, however, does not alter the need for continuing, careful application and refinement of procedures in accordance with the scientific method.\(^4\)

The Bulletin of the University School, associated with the School of Education, Indiana University, includes the following statement of purposes: "University School is dedicated to serve those children enrolled in its program. In so doing, it complements the program of the School of Education. The purpose of the school is to serve children from the pre-school level through the high school level in the best possible educational environment. The men and women of the faculty put into practice methods and techniques that are designed to motivate the student in performing at his most capable level.

---


\(^4\) Ibid., p. 40.
As part of the program in teacher education at Indiana University, the school provides a stimulating environment for observation and participation, for demonstration teaching, and for student teaching.

As a laboratory of learning, the school has an obligation to establish a setting in which research in educational methods and techniques can be carried out by a faculty that is cognizant of current activities in educational research.

In serving the child and the educationist through both pre-service and in-service activities, the school exemplifies educational leadership in the community, the state; the nation and the world.5

Reference was made to experimentation and other types of research in the original statement of purposes of the school: "With the opening of the University School in 1938, special facilities for training of teachers were provided at this time, the functions of the University School, as conceived by the School of Education Faculty, were as follows:

1. To provide a superior type of instruction for the children attending the University School.
2. To train prospective teachers, supervisors, and administrators through an opportunity to observe superior teaching and an opportunity to teach under the direction of superior teachers.

3. To promote sound educational theory and practice through experimentation.

4. To provide a progressive public school whose practices may be critically observed by educators throughout the state, and thus promote educational growth.

The following statement concerning functions is included in the Bulletin: "To exercise the role of research as the third function, the University School serves as strategically-located environment for experiments (closed-circuit television is the most recent) and other forms of research by faculty members and graduate students. Because University School provides an atmosphere in which practitioners, researchers and theorists work together, the school is an integral part of the school of Education."⁷

A statement of purposes of Burris Laboratory School, Ball State Teachers College, was prepared by the faculty of that school in 1959.

"Burris Laboratory School has the following purposes:

1. To create for children and youth a living and learning environment wherein each child will develop as a unique personality to his optimum capacity; wherein each child will experience cooperative living and learning, and wherein he will obtain the knowledges and skills which will help him at each particular

⁶Ibid., p. 2.

⁷Ibid., p. 10.
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Stage of his development to become a worthwhile member of his group.

2. To provide a laboratory in which students of education and prospective teachers at Ball State Teachers College may have first hand experiences with children and in which they may observe methods of working with children.

3. To demonstrate through school practices a philosophy which is consistent with living in a growing democratic society.

4. To meet its responsibilities for helping to improve educational practices through the development of a research and development program. 8

"A New Look at the University Elementary School" is the title of a mimeographed bulletin circulated to the faculty of the University Elementary School, University of California, Los Angeles, California. The following statement relating to research in University Elementary School is included:

"We found that although a certain amount of graduate study had been done at University Elementary School, we had been operating primarily as a center for teacher-training and demonstration on an undergraduate level. Some research projects had been carried out at the school by members of other campus departments, but no important

8"The Purposes of Burris Laboratory School", Burris Laboratory School, (Muncie Indiana: Ball State Teachers College), 1959, p. 1. (mimeographed).
research had originated here."^9

To correct this situation, the following proposals are described:

"We are now developing a Research Center with a Director of Research at the University Elementary School. Elementary school teachers are not normally trained in research theories and methods; however, they often make observations or have hunches which should be explored. Our Director of Research will be available to advise teachers on their research ideas, to apply for research grants, and to suggest new projects. We believe that our research effort should be as wide as possible. There is currently a tendency in some laboratory schools to choose one big problem in education and spend twenty years on it. This approach is somewhat fruitful, but we think that a balance between large and small projects is best."^10

James Becker is the author of "The Laboratory School, Its Present Existence and an Emerging Concept", a statement submitted for consideration to the faculty of the Laboratory School, State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania. He notes: "Laboratory schools have been organized as practice, model, training, demonstration and experimental schools. Indeed, at times more than one type of program has been carried on concurrently, thus resulting in complexity and

---


^10 Ibid., p. 1.
confusion. Such chaos need not occur."

No mention is made of research as a function of the laboratory school of Millersville. The functions are detailed as follows:

"1. Student teaching program - At the present time each teacher as the laboratory school supervises one student teacher each semester including conferences.

2. Observations - During the past school year 1957-58 a number of observations were scheduled in the laboratory school. A breakdown of these observations would show:

A. 295 college students scheduled individual observations for at least thirty minutes in duration. Some subject areas included were art, psychology, social studies, reading, etc.

B. 133 observations were scheduled for professional orientation classes. These observations were scheduled for three hours a week over a four week block of time throughout the year.

C. Eight school districts sent classroom teachers to the laboratory school for classroom visitation and observation. Visits such as these comprised a school day per observation.

3. Participation - College students were afforded an opportunity to participate in a limited sense.

A. The Physical Education and health department utilized the laboratory school students in a participating activity to culminate the "Teaching of Health and Physical Education in the Elementary School".

B. Under the existing speech program Mr. Cumpston was able to have limited participation.

---

c. The reading clinic provided rich opportunities for student participation. Under Mr. Forchia's guidance a number of college students were able to increase their relationships between theory and practice in the teaching of reading.

4. Demonstration teaching - Fourteen specific demonstrations were conducted for classes in the Language Arts, Teaching of Arithmetic and Health.

The previous statements indicate quite briefly how the laboratory school has been serving the college for the school year 1957-1958.12

A Bulletin entitled "The New Metcalf School" contains the following statement of purposes for the Metcalf School of Illinois State Normal University:

"The program of the Metcalf Elementary Laboratory School is an integral part of the total teacher education program of Illinois State Normal University. In order to make a major contribution to the teacher education program, it must be a good school for the education of boys and girls from Kindergarten through Junior High School.

In meeting its responsibilities in teacher education, Metcalf School provides university students and faculty members the opportunity to observe the education of children, to study child growth and development, to participate in the educational activities of the school, and to assume student teaching responsibilities.

The school experiments with ideas and techniques which give

12 Ibid., p. 9-11.
promises of improving elementary and junior high school education. It serves as a demonstration school for students, university faculty, teachers in public schools, school boards and other citizens of the state. Metcalf School provides leadership for the elementary schools of Illinois.

The Metcalf Elementary School makes a distinct contribution to the education of boys and girls in the community and a major contribution to teacher education."13

Examples of Research Studies in Laboratory Schools

The following descriptions of completed, current, and proposed studies are not necessarily typical or representative in laboratory schools. It may be supposed that administrators who included study summaries with their completed questionnaires considered them contributions to knowledge of children’s growth, development, and educational needs. Detailed descriptions of research were not requested. The following summaries represent the descriptions which were included with the questionnaires. Administrators and faculty members of the University Elementary School, University of California, Los Angeles, report:

Three full-scale research studies are about to be launched at the University Elementary School. They are:

1. University Elementary School Follow-up Study.
   This will be a study of the academic and social adjustment of University Elementary School graduates now attending local junior high

SCHOOLS, AS COMPARED TO THEIR CLASSMATES WHO
graduated from public elementary schools. This
study will be limited to relatively simple and
short-range measures of the influence of the Univer-
sity Elementary School on a child's subse-
quent behavior. Three groups will be sampled:
1) University Elementary School students graduated
between June, 1956 and June, 1958; 2) their junior
high school classmates and 3) University Elementary
School applicants rejected between June, 1950 and
June, 1955 who are still in junior high school.

2. Successful Child Project.
Much research has already been done on children who
do not get on well at school for different reasons, but
very little attention has been given to those who do
well. The University School Study will attempt to
answer the question: "What is a successful child?"
A pilot study will consider 50 successful children
selected by teacher nominations. Data on academic
record, social adjustment, family background, intel-
ligence, interests, abilities, health, etc. will be
collected.

3. Gifted Child Study Project.
A study project on the gifted child, directed by Dr.
Ruth Martinson of the State Department of Education,
will be located at the University Elementary School.
NEXT YEAR."

The authors of this mimeographed bulletin state "We believe that the University Elementary School should be a laboratory not only for the School of Education but for other departments of the University as well. In general, we favor increased connections with other departments; the Elementary School is now officially governed by the University Elementary School Advisory Committee, members of which are appointed by the Chancellor from among the various University departments. It is our policy to encourage members of other departments to do research at the University Elementary School: a) because it makes for improved inter-departmental relations, and b) because it helps to justify the continued existence of the University Elementary School. At present, fourteen new research projects are going on at the school, under the sponsorship of seven University departments. A list of these projects follows:

1. "University Elementary School French Language Project."
   Subjects: 32 4th and 5th grade children, 16 parents.
   Two 30 minute periods each week throughout the school year.

   Subjects: 25 84 children, 30 minutes each.

   Subjects: 48 B6 and A6 children, 10 minutes each.

---

4. "The Use of Mediating Analogues in the Learning of an Abstract Concept."

Subject: 15 Junior Kindergarten, 15 Senior Kindergarten, 15 B5, and 15 A5 children, 30 minutes each.

5. "The Analysis of Functional Movement of the Blind Child Compared to that of the Sighted Child."

Subjects: 25 A5 children, 50 minutes (groups of 5)


7. "Comparison of Graduates of University Elementary School, Los Angeles City Schools, and other University Laboratory Schools in Achievement in Mathematics."

Subjects: Arithmetic Test Scores of children enrolled over the last 5 years.

8. "The Teaching of Understanding in Arithmetic by Teaching Machines."

Subjects: 30 children of grades 4, 5, and 6. 1 hour for 15 children of control group; 3 hours for the other 15 children of the experimental group.


Subjects: 48 A2, B2 children, 50 minutes each.

10. "Genetic Changes in the Meaning of Words."

Subjects: 50 B6, A6 children, 30 minutes with total group.
Subjects: 25 B5 children, 30 minutes each.

Subjects: B4, A4, B5 classes, 10 minutes per class, in class.

13. "Incentive Reinforcement and Perceptual Thresholds of Vision."
Subjects: B4, A4 children, 30 minutes each.

Subjects: All children in school, nursery through 6th grade.15

Campus Laboratory School Publication #1 from San Diego State College, San Diego, California is entitled "The Campus Laboratory School, Closed Circuit Television, and Teacher Education". The authors of this publication state:

"Implementation of the study was preceded by the formulation of these broad objectives:

1. To study the use of a campus laboratory school through closed circuit television for purposes of teacher education.

2. To determine the types of demonstration lessons which are most helpful to a professor of education in illustrating vital points in the theory of teaching the elementary school subjects.

3. To determine personnel requirements and study appropriate load in demonstration work for television.

15 Ibid., p. 2-4.
4. To explore technical and operational problems involved in the use of closed circuit television for teacher education.

5. To be of service to other institutions of higher education by adding to the growing body of information on television instruction."16

The second grade and fifth grade groups were selected for participation in the demonstration lessons. The lessons were twenty minutes in length, involved no more than ten children, and covered such subject-matter areas as Arithmetic, Reading, Science, and the Social Studies. It is noted that "Professors and Students were asked to make emulations regarding technical and professional aspects of the project. However, no attempt was made to compare the learning of students through television with their learning through conventional methods of instruction. Reactions generally were favorable, although a number of deficiencies were indicated."17

The University School of the College of Education, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, has been the setting for outstanding contributions to knowledge of child growth and development. Of the following studies, the longitudinal growth studies is the only one involving a majority of the pupils in University School. Other studies concern selected segment of the school population. Many of the following are


17 Ibid., p. 5.
STUDIES CONDUCTED BY DOCTORAL CANDIDATES WITH THE GUIDANCE OF HIS
MAJOR ADVISOR AND COMMITTEE. THE FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF RESEARCH PRO-
JECTS CURRENTLY UNDER WAY IN THIS LABORATORY SCHOOL:

1. **Longitudinal Growth Studies** - A continuing program of data
collection on growth of children from age 3 through graduation from
high school. Physical, mental, social, and school achievement mea-
surements are systematically taken.

2. **Social Adjustment and Influence Development** - (A.I.D. pro-
ject). Study of elementary school children's "social power" and in-
fluence skills, together with experimental procedures for aiding the
"low power" child to improve. Project is in final stages of data
analysis and preparation of report.

3. **Predictions of College-level Success from High School Records
and Performance.**

4. **Relationship between Affectivity and School Achievement of
Elementary School Boys.**

5. **Relationship between Certain Specialized Aptitudes and Mea-
sures of Physical and Psychological Growth.**

6. **Leadership Qualities of University High School Captains of
Athletic Teams from 1950-58.**

7. **Comparison of the School Achievement and Physical Growth of
Gifted Students in the University High School with the Achievement of
Retarded Students from Wayne County Training School.** Groups represent
4% of the general population.

8. **Relationship between Manifest Anxiety with Low Achievement
on Primary Mental Abilities Test.**
SUMMARY OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE CLOSING
OF CHANGING STATUS OF SELECTED LABORATORY SCHOOLS

MEMBERS OF THE FACULTIES OF FOUR COLLEGES OF TEACHER EDUCATION
WERE CONTACTED AND ASKED TO SUPPLY INFORMATION CONCERNING THE REASONS
FOR THE CLOSING OR CHANGED STATUS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS OF THEIR
RESPECTIVE CAMPUSES. THREE REPLIES WERE RECEIVED, AND THESE, PERHAPS,
SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS REPRESENTATIVE. BECAUSE OF THEIR BEARING
ON THE MAJOR CONCERN OF THE PRESENT STUDY, HOWEVER, THESE REPLIES WILL
BE SUMMARIZED.

ONE RESPONDENT NOTED: "BRIEFLY THE REASONS FOR CLOSING WERE:
THE SCHOOL HAD TO BE FINANCED THROUGH THE COLLEGE BUDGET WITHOUT RE-
MUNERATION FROM THE STATE. IT WAS DIFFICULT WITHIN OUR BUDGET TO SECURE
THE TYPE TEACHERS NEEDED TO CARRY ON THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM WHICH WAS
DESIRED. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE SCHOOL WAS NOT PERFORMING THE
DESIRED FUNCTION.

THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WAS USED FOR STUDENT TEACHING, BUT IT WAS
DECIDED THAT MORE PRACTICAL SITUATIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHING COULD BE
SECURED IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. ALSO, THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT WAS GROW-
ing SO RAPIDLY THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO TAKE THE BUILDING OCCUPIED BY
THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR REGULAR EDUCATION COURSES AND ACTIVITIES.

ONE LABORATORY SCHOOL WAS CLOSED SOME TIME AGO. THE CHAIRMAN OF
THE DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION WRITES:

"THE INFORMATION WHICH HAS COME TO ME THROUGH THE YEARS INDICATES
THAT OUR LABORATORY AT THIS INSTITUTION WAS CLOSED FOR THE FOLLOWING
REASONS:
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1. It was quite expensive.

2. The number of students was very limited due to the fact that we were in a small town and the great majority of youngsters attended the public school.

3. The student teaching situation in this kind of school was far from a typical experience.

4. It was possible to make arrangements with the public schools in ___________ to provide demonstrations, observations, and student teaching experiences for our teacher education students... who wished to observe or participate in laboratory experiences in the public school. This arrangement was made at a fraction of the cost of operating our own laboratory school. It has proved quite successful over the years and seems to be the envy of other institutions like ours in the state.

The third letter suggests that the laboratory school had been changed from a 1-12 school to a 1-6 school for two reasons:

"1. The policy of the Department of Public Instruction over the last several years has changed so that in general campus laboratory schools with the State colleges are being established on grades kindergarten through sixth only.

2. The large increase in enrollment on this campus and no classroom building in the immediate plans necessitates measures be taken on the part of the local state college officials to procure that facility. Therefore, in line with the first reasons a campus laboratory school will be established on kindergarten-sixth grades with secondary teachers being distributed over a greater geographical area and
THOSE CLASSROOMS THAT HAVE BEEN USED FOR THE SECONDARY PROGRAM WILL BECOME COLLEGE CLASSROOMS."

Summarizing these responses it could be stated that the expense of maintaining a laboratory school was an important factor in all three cases. There appears to be an underlying assumption that the provision of the laboratory experiences typical in pre-service teacher education was in each case laboratory school's major, if not its sole, function. This function could be performed at considerably less expense in the public schools, and some value seems to be attached to the "typical" situation for student teaching which could be provided by public schools. Only one respondent noted the desire for an "experimental" program, made impossible to fulfill because of budget inadequacies.
SUMMARY OF DATA RELATING TO RESEARCH
IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize and interpret the data basic to the study of educational research in the laboratory school. Data were gathered from several sources; questionnaires were sent to administrators of laboratory schools, laboratory schools were visited and educators with experience in laboratory school administration or evident interest in the laboratory school were interviewed.

Responses to Questionnaires

Lists supplied by the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the Association for Student Teaching were combined, and questionnaires were sent to administrators of schools listed by at least two of the organizations named. A total of one hundred fifty-four questionnaires were sent to directors and principals of laboratory schools, at the elementary level, connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education. One hundred and thirty-five responses were received, but due to errors in the original list, twenty of these responses could not be used. The total number of usable responses was 115, or 74.66%. The fact that nearly three-fourths of the administrators contacted completed "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research in Laboratory Schools" is considered evidence of a high degree of interest in educational research in the laboratory schools. Since efforts were made to contact administrators of all laboratory schools connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education and responses were received from nearly three-fourths
OF THE ADMINISTRATORS, THE DATA REPORTED IN THIS CHAPTER MAY BE CONSIDERED REPRESENTATIVE.

ALTHOUGH MANY RESPONDENTS DID NOT COMPLETE THE ITEM CONCERNING GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENTS, RESPONSES RECEIVED INDICATE THAT THE GRADUATE ENROLLMENT IS SMALL, UNDER 100 IN THIRTY OF THE INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED, AND THAT UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENTS WERE LESS THAN 501 IN NEARLY HALF THE INSTITUTIONS REPORTING.

MORE THAN 60% OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED LABORATORY SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS BETWEEN 101 AND 300 PUPILS. RESPONSES TO ANOTHER ITEM SUGGEST THAT, TYPICALLY, A LABORATORY SCHOOL HAS ONLY ONE OR TWO SECTIONS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.

SPACE WAS PROVIDED FOR THE NAMES OF TWO RESPONDENTS. THE DIRECTOR OF THE PRINCIPAL OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WAS INVOLVED IN COMPLETING MORE THAN THREE-FOURTHS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES.

DATA RELATING TO ADDITIONAL STAFF AVAILABLE TO ASSIST CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL, PERHAPS FREEING THEM FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITY, ARE RATHER INCONCLUSIVE. LIBRARIANS AND SPECIALISTS IN ART, MUSIC, AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION WERE MOST FREQUENTLY LISTED AS ADDITIONAL STAFF.

RESPONDENTS WERE ASKED TO LIST THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WITH WHICH THEY WERE ASSOCIATED, BOTH AS THEY APPEARED ON A FORMAL STATEMENT OF FUNCTIONS, AND AS THE ADMINISTRATOR SAW THEM, "IN ACTION". IT IS CLEAR, FROM A SUMMARY OF RESPONSES, THAT LABORATORY SCHOOLS ARE PRIMARILY DEVOTED TO THE FUNCTIONS OF DEMONSTRATION TEACHING, STUDENT TEACHING, OBSERVATION, AND PARTICIPATION. FEWER THAN ONE-FOURTH OF THE RESPONDENTS LISTED RESEARCH IN THE THIRD POSITION OF IMPORTANCE, THE ONLY POSITION IN WHICH RESEARCH WAS
Listed by more than eight percent of the respondents. There was little
difference between the "stated" and "operational" lists, suggesting
that administrators believe laboratory schools are doing what they claim
to be doing, or perhaps that formal statements influenced administra-
tors in completing this item. Rank order was computed for each of the
functions. Student teaching, observation, participation, research and
experimentation, and education of children, in that order occupied the
first five positions on the rank order lists.

Original plans included indication of a statistical relationship
between research in laboratory schools and certain other factors - the
availability of funds for research, for example. Since in no case did
more than 24.3% of the respondents indicate emphasis on research as a
function of the laboratory school, it was concluded that expression of
this relationship, in a statistical sense, would be inappropriate
and would lack significance.

Forty four percent of the respondents indicated present or con-
tinuous engagement in a re-examination of laboratory school functions
by the faculty and administration.

Responses to the question "How were functions originally deter-
mined?" suggest that college faculty members and administrative of-
ficials constituted the group most responsible for founding laboratory
schools. Laboratory schools were not founded as centers for educa-
tional research, but rather for the purpose of providing facilities
for laboratory experiences for prospective teachers.

The administrator of the laboratory school accepts responsibil-
ity for directing and coordinating the research in thirty-five of the
SCHOOLS SURVEYED. A COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF COLLEGE AND LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS DIRECTS AND COORDINATES THE RESEARCH IN NINETEEN, OR 16.5%, OF THE SCHOOLS. THE LACK OF DYNAMIC, CREATIVE LEADERSHIP IS EVIDENTLY A SERIOUS INHIBITING FACTOR TO ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BY LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS.

Sixteen and five-tenths percent of the respondents indicated that laboratory school faculty members were released from classroom teaching duties to carry on research. The vast majority of laboratory school teachers are not so released.

More than half of the respondents indicated that the help of graduate students was not available for help in educational research projects. Since more than one-fourth of the respondents did not complete this item, it would appear that graduate student assistance is available in less than one-fourth of the schools. Respondents did suggest, in comments relating to this item, that research can assume greater significance as a function in laboratory schools connected with colleges or universities offering graduate work.

Thirty six and five-tenths percent of the respondents indicated that no faculty time was deliberately budgeted for research activity. Forty three and five-tenths percent of the respondents stated that no funds were specifically budgeted for research. It is doubtful that much significant research is carried on in schools where neither time nor money is set aside for research purposes. Several pages of "An Inquiry Concerning Educational Research" were devoted to gathering data concerning types of research in which laboratory schools might be engaged. Numbers of respondents indicating engagement in specific
Types of research were reported. Since so few laboratory schools indicated research activity, it was felt that percentages would lack significance.

Seventy two and two-tenths percent of the respondents reported research of an experimental nature. Thirty seven of the experiments concerned the language arts or arithmetic areas of the curriculum. Other curricular areas within which experimentation was taking place were the social studies, foreign language, science, health, physical education, and music. Most of the experiments concerned the total elementary school. Those concentrated at specific grade levels concerned fifth or sixth grades.

Research techniques employed usually involved equated groups or using two methods with unselected groups or groups selected at random.

The classroom teacher or groups of teachers were given credit for the identification of areas needing study, with the administrative staff also identifying some areas.

Academic progress, physical development, and social development were areas of longitudinal research listed by respondents. The longitudinal research also concerned the entire elementary school, in most cases, with the third and fourth grades involved in most of the studies concerning specific grade levels. Most longitudinal studies involved more than 130 children, although it should be noted that only 21 of the respondents reporting completed this item. Few respondents completed items relating to planned length of time for continuing longitudinal research. Nearly every one of the longitudinal studies reported have been originated within the last ten years. The fact
THAT TEN, OR 8.7%, OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED PLANS TO COMPLETE THE
STUDIES WITHIN FROM TWO TO FOUR YEARS INDICATES SOME MISUNDERSTANDING
CONCERNING THE MEANING OF THE TERM "LONGITUDINAL."

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF, FACULTY COMMITTEES, AND INDIVIDUAL
CLASSROOM TEACHERS, IN THAT ORDER, WERE GIVEN CREDIT FOR IDENTIFYING
AREAS OF STUDY THROUGH LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH.

GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDIES WERE IDENTIFIED AS THE TYPE OF
SHORT-TERM RESEARCH IN WHICH LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS AND AD­
MINISTRATORS WERE MOST FREQUENTLY ENGAGED. THIRD AND FOURTH GRADES
WERE THE SPECIFIC GRADE LEVELS MOST OFTEN STUDIED, ALTHOUGH MOST STUDIES
CONCERNED THE WHOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THE SHORT­
TERM STUDIES WERE IDENTIFIED BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS OR GROUPS OF TEACH­
ERS.

RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT MOST OF THE DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES FOCUS­
ED ON SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, AND FOURTEEN OF THE DESCRIPTIVE
STUDIES WERE ORIGINATED BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS.

PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL BENEFIT FROM THE RESEARCH CARRIED ON IN
LABORATORY SCHOOLS THROUGH OBSERVATIONS IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS, AC­
CEPTING GUIDANCE AND DIRECTION FROM LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS, WHO
ACT AS CONSULTANTS TO SCHOOL SYSTEMS, THE PUBLICATION OF RESULTS OF
RESEARCH, AND ATTENDING CLASSES TAUGHT BY LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY
MEMBERS.

MORE THAN ONE-THIRD OF THE RESPONDENTS EXPRESSED THE OPINION
THAT RESEARCH SHOULD OCCUPY A MORE IMPORTANT POSITION IN THE LABORA­
TORY SCHOOL, AS CONTRASTED WITH ONLY SLIGHTLY MORE THAN ONE-TENTH OF
THE RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED SATISFACTION WITH THE RESEARCH ACTIVITY
IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WITH WHICH THEY WERE ASSOCIATED.
More than one-half the respondents indicated that the assumption of other "more important" functions constituted the primary block to educational research. More than one-fifth of the respondents indicated that research is not a stated or operational function.

Inadequate funds, insufficient clerical help, and lack of leadership were also suggested as important.

In response to the inquiry concerning significant contributions to educational research, twenty-nine respondents specified forty-two areas. Nineteen of these were classified as contributions to teacher education, both pre-service and in-service. Fourteen research studies concerned the curriculum of the elementary school. Three of these were studies of foreign language instruction in French or Spanish. Nine of the respondents considered their most significant contributions were studies of child growth and development.

Visits

Five laboratory schools were visited. These laboratory schools are associated with state-supported institutions of teacher education located in Ohio, Michigan, or Indiana. The purpose of the five visits and of the seven interviews was to gather data which would supplement and further clarify the data secured from the questionnaire.

Administrators made comments indicating a high level of interest in educational research. In the first school visited, the research was carried on almost entirely by administrators and a staff of psychologists, psychometrists, and a clerical staff whose energies were devoted to the collection and tabulation of research data and writing and publishing the results. Teachers are not involved in the research
in this laboratory school. In the other laboratory schools visited, research was limited to "action" research, studies carried on by individual teachers without concern for strict adherence to rules of research methodology.

Administrators stated that laboratory schools could serve more than one function, but that other functions may receive less time and attention in laboratory schools as research becomes a more important function. Teachers with whom the writer talked did not agree. Several expressed the opinion that they could not work with student teachers or participants, do demonstration teaching, carry on research, and do all of these jobs well.

Teachers and administrators agree that parents would not prove to be a serious block to participation in research. Parents want their children to have a good education, and are apparently convinced that the superior staff, wealth of teaching materials, and smaller classes usually found in a laboratory school contribute to a good education. The fact that so little research is done in laboratory schools may be responsible for the lack of parent concern that their children might be used as "guinea pigs".

The laboratory schools visited were usually housed in older buildings on their respective campuses. In one visit, much emphasis was placed upon the changes anticipated following the move to a new building, expected within the next three years.

Administrators and teachers expressed the opinion that the faculty of the school of education could be of greater service in giving impetus to research projects in the laboratory school.
Laboratory school classrooms are increasingly difficult to staff. The many demanding roles the laboratory school teacher is expected to fill, and the status problems (with members of the faculty of the college or department of education) make laboratory school teaching a less desirable and often a less financially rewarding job than public school teaching.

Interviews

Seven educators were interviewed. One was a director, one a principal of a laboratory school, at the time of the interview. The dean of a teachers college was interviewed because of the interest he has evidenced in the laboratory school. The other interviews were held with educators who had been laboratory school directors or principals but were now members of faculties of departments of education.

With only one exception, the educators interviewed favored increased activity in laboratory schools. The educator who did not favor more laboratory school research stated that he recognized that the role of the laboratory school was changing. He did not specify the direction this change should take.

Educators interviewed also favored involving faculty members in the research and acceptance by laboratory school teachers of a role of leadership in educational research. There was a feeling expressed that public as well as laboratory schools ought to be involved in educational research. Insufficient funds and inadequate clerical help were suggested as major blocks to educational research by several of the educators interviewed. One principal said any "block" was simply an excuse given by an administrator for evading inadequacies in leadership.
Caution in using and interpreting the term "research" was advocated. All the educators interviewed favored both "action" research and the more structured, formal experimentation.

There was agreement that many of the functions assumed by laboratory schools could be adequately performed by public schools. Almost every educator interviewed stated that the survival of the laboratory school as an institution depended in large part upon the assumption of a more significant role in educational research. Laboratory schools are expensive to maintain, and must justify their existence by making continuing and significant contributions to knowledge about children; how they grow, develop, and learn.

**Summary of Unpublished Materials Submitted by Respondents to Questionnaires**

If research is mentioned at all in the statements of function sent to the writer along with completed questionnaires, the statements are very general and research is placed in a most inferior position on the lists.

It is interesting to note that the bulletin prepared for distribution on the occasion of the dedication of one new laboratory school makes no mention of research as a function accepted by the faculty and administration of the laboratory school. Similar materials prepared for a new laboratory school in a different section of the country emphasized the role of the school as a center for educational research and the provisions for research which had been made in designing and equipping the buildings which comprised the new school.

Two respondents submitted comprehensive statements relating to research projects in the laboratory school for which they were reporting. Projects listed by one respondent included two major studies under the
DIRECTION OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY, AND SIXTEEN PROJECTS DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BY LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS AND FACULTY MEMBERS FROM VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY.

Summary of Correspondence

Letters were received from faculty members in three institutions where the laboratory school had been closed or its status changed.

The expense involved in maintaining the laboratory school was an important factor in each case of closing or changing the status of the school. The function of student teaching was evidently the most important function in the laboratory schools, and it was considered much less expensive to use the facilities of public schools for student teaching. In some cases the schools became part of the local public school system, and in others the building was converted to use as classrooms by the Department of Education.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The first section of the present chapter will be devoted to a
survey of trends in the functions of the laboratory school, as indi-
cated by a brief, historical analysis and survey of research and re-
lated literature.

In this chapter, the data basic to the study will be summarized,
and some implications of the findings suggested. The method of study
will be reviewed, briefly, and some limitations not specified in
Chapter One will be noted. Certain conclusions, based on the data and
their implications, will be stated.

The chapter will be concluded with several recommendations for
further study.
TRENDS IN LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS

The earliest laboratory schools were founded by religious orders and had as their major function the provision of facilities for "practice teaching" for prospective teachers.

Herbart, Pestalozzi, and their followers established schools in which prospective teachers might see demonstrated the teaching methods conceived and espoused by these educators.

There is nothing in the historical literature to suggest that experimentation or educational research of any type was carried on in European laboratory schools.

The first model or practice schools in the United States were privately owned. Cyrus Pierce's normal school, the first to have public support, was opened in 1839. This school apparently served both the practice and model functions.

David Page opened an experimental school in New York in 1845. The unique feature of Page's school was the use of one room as a model school and another for practice teaching. The controversy concerning the effectiveness with which the laboratory school can serve separate and often disparate functions is not new.

The Cook County Normal School was opened in Chicago in 1883 with the purpose of experimentation. In 1887, a "model" school, experimental in purpose, was opened concurrently with Teachers College in New York City, now part of Columbia University. Three laboratory schools, each with a slightly different function, were opened in connection with Teachers College, Columbia University, Lincoln School and Speyer School were experimental. Two of the schools were eventually
MERGED, AND IN 1947, AFTER A LONG LEGAL BATTLE, THE SCHOOLS WERE CLOSED.

John Dewey's experimental school was opened in 1896 in connection with the University of Chicago, and bore the title "University Laboratory School".

Several laboratory schools were opened during the first three decades of this century, among them Ohio State University's University School, opened in 1930.

Early studies of laboratory school functions revealed that the schools were used as model or practice schools, and that experimentation was considered inadvisable. Studies have indicated, however, that campus schools have been the setting for educational research more often than public schools. Where experimentation was recommended, the founding of a separate school for that purpose was usually recommended. More recent studies of laboratory school function summarize findings indicating that the laboratory school is primarily used for student teaching, and also for demonstration and observation. These studies usually include a recommendation for increased use of the laboratory school as a setting for experimentation and other types of research.

Contributors to recently published professional journals are almost unanimous in recommending more laboratory school research.

Method of Study

After consideration of several methods of gathering data relating to research in the laboratory school, it was determined to utilize the following:

1. Selective distribution of a questionnaire seemed to be the most practicable means of gathering data which would be representative.
2. Visits to selected laboratory schools would be an important method of supplementing and confirming data supplied through the questionnaire.

3. Interviews would be a means of gathering additional data and would be helpful in reaching conclusions concerning the role of the laboratory school administrator in the conduct of educational research in laboratory schools.

Development of an inquiry concerning educational research in the laboratory school. - The questionnaire was developed after a survey of the literature relating to the laboratory school.

The multiple-choice response form was selected because it was felt necessary to make completing the questionnaire a task which did not require an inordinate amount of time. An "open-end" was provided for each item, and the final page of the questionnaire was left almost blank in order to avoid undue structuring.

The proposed questionnaire was sent to five educators, and they were asked to suggest changes which would result in clarification or more meaningful data. The majority of the suggested changes were incorporated in the final form of the questionnaire.

The usual "follow-up" letters and second questionnaires were sent to administrators who delayed returning the completed questionnaires.

Selection of schools for visits and educators interviewed. - Five schools in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan were visited. All were laboratory schools associated with state-supported institutions of
TEACHER EDUCATION. Three colleges or universities in Indiana operate laboratory schools. The writer is a teacher in one of these, and the other two were visited. Schools were not selected because of outstanding contributions to educational research, but one of the schools visited has made such contributions. The practicability of making visits at a time not unduly inconvenient for the administrator and faculty of the school or for the writer, and within the time the writer was freed from teaching duties, were important considerations in selecting the schools to be visited.

Six of the seven educators interviewed had been laboratory school principals or directors, or were in such administrative positions at present. The dean of a teachers college was selected because of his apparent interest in the laboratory school on the campus where he was an administrator.

Additional data. - Correspondence with educators on campuses where laboratory schools had been abandoned or transferred to local public school systems was reviewed.

Materials submitted with completed questionnaires was surveyed and material relating to the research function of the laboratory school was summarized.

Additional Limitations of Method of Study

It seems clear to the writer that there are several limitations in the methods used to gather data for the present study. These will be discussed, briefly, at this point.

Questionnaire. - Although the questionnaire was submitted to five educators with past or present experience in laboratory school
administration in order to avoid omitting important areas of consideration, several such areas were omitted. The omissions became apparent when the writer discussed educational research in the laboratory school during visits and interviews.

Visits and interviews made obvious the importance of faculty rank for laboratory school teachers. The questionnaire should have included an item which would have yielded data in this area.

A question concerning laboratory school salary schedules should have been included in the questionnaire. Data relating to a comparison of laboratory school salary schedules with those in the associated teacher education institution and with the salary schedule for teachers in local public schools would have been quite interesting and pertinent. More than one respondent mentioned the non-competitive laboratory school salaries ("equal to the salary of the lowest paid teacher in ______ state") in discussing blocks to increased research activity.

Some attempt should have been made to collect data concerning the educational background of both the administrators and teachers in the laboratory schools surveyed. It is assumed that most laboratory school teachers have a master's degree, and that most administrators have a doctorate.

While it is not claimed that any of these factors relates directly to laboratory school research, the inclusion of data relating to rank, salary, and educational background of faculty members and administrators would have added significantly to the present study.

Interviews. - Interviews should have been held with laboratory school teachers. Since the writer is a teacher in a laboratory school,
AND HAS MANY PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL CONTACTS WITH OTHER LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS, IT WAS FELT THAT THE ENTIRE STUDY WOULD REFLECT THE POINT OF VIEW OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHER. THE EMPHASIS IN THIS STUDY ON THE ADMINISTRATORS' OPINIONS, BELIEFS, AND CONCEPTS OF FUNCTIONS, WAS IN A DELIBERATE EFFORT TO COUNTERACT PERSONAL BIAS. HOWEVER, BRIEF CONTACTS WITH LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS MADE DURING VISITS SUGGEST THAT MORE EMPHASIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN TO THEIR CONCEPT OF THE FUNCTION OR FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WHERE THEY TEACH. THE WRITER APPARENTLY NEGLECTED TO CONSIDER THAT ALL LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS DO NOT SHARE THE SAME BELIEFS, OPINIONS, OR BIASES.

VISITS. - THE WRITER HAD LITTLE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS RESEARCH IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WITH GROUPS OF TEACHERS OR ADMINISTRATORS. CONVERSATIONS WITH INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS WERE OF INTEREST, AND PROVIDED MUCH PERTINENT DATA. HOWEVER, A BRIEF MEETING WITH THE TOTAL ELEMENTARY FACULTY IN WHICH RESEARCH IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WAS DISCUSSED WOULD HAVE GIVEN THE PRESENT STUDY AN IMPORTANT ADDITIONAL DIMENSION.

SUMMARY. - LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY WERE DETAILED IN CHAPTER ONE. THIS SECTION OF THE FINAL CHAPTER WAS DEVOTED TO A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF AREAS WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN EXPLORED IN ORDER TO GATHER ADDITIONAL PERTINENT DATA. MORE EMPHASIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN TO THE ROLE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHER, AND DATA SHOULD HAVE BEEN COLLECTED RELATIVE TO FACULTY RANK, EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, AND SALARY SCHEDULES OF LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS. MEETINGS WITH GROUPS
OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS WOULD HAVE SUPPLEMENTED DATA GATHERED THROUGH INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES AND INTERVIEWS.

DATA GATHERED THROUGH THE ADDITIONAL SOURCES SUGGESTED IN THIS SECTION MIGHT NOT HAVE GREATLY ALTERED THE CONCLUSIONS REACHED. THEY WOULD HAVE ADDED SIGNIFICANCE AND FURTHER CLARIFICATION TO DATA COLLECTED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY.
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF DATA GATHERED THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES, VISITS, AND INTERVIEWS

In the following sections of this chapter, the writer will briefly summarize and suggest the implications of the findings of the present study.

Summary and Implications of Data Relating to the Size of the Teacher Education Institution, Size of the Laboratory School, and Positions of the Respondents

More than half of the respondents indicated that the enrollment of the elementary grades in the laboratory school was between 100 and 300 pupils. Only nine of the respondents reported laboratory school enrollments of over 500. Visits to laboratory schools and data supplied through the questionnaires suggest that the laboratory school is typically composed of not more than two sections at each grade level.

Forty percent of the respondents did not complete the item relating to graduate school enrollments. The tabulated responses suggest that more than one-fourth of the institutions from which data were collected enroll fewer than 100 graduate students in elementary education.

Tabulated responses to the request for data concerning undergraduate enrollment indicate that more than half of the institutions enroll fewer than 1000 undergraduate students majoring in elementary education.

There is no evidence to support the contention that more educational research is conducted in larger teacher education institutions than in smaller teacher education institutions, or in colleges or
universities which have graduate programs as contrasted with those which do not have graduate programs. Neither is there evidence that there is more research activity in larger laboratory schools as contrasted with that in smaller ones. There was some indication that educators felt that the addition of a graduate program would give needed impetus to educational research in the laboratory school for which they were reporting.

Data reported concerning teacher stations in the laboratory school, supplied through the questionnaires and visits, suggest that elementary laboratory schools seldom have more than two sections at each grade level. Certain experimental methods are better suited to large samplings. The number of sections at each grade level also has implications in view of the suggestion made by several educators that one group of children might be involved in a research project, while others worked under the supervised guidance of student teachers.

The majority of the principals or directors to whom the questionnaires were sent were involved in completing them. Two spaces were provided for the names and positions of respondents. Eighty-nine principals or directors helped complete the one hundred and fifteen returned questionnaires. Only thirty-nine of the respondents held positions other than principal or director of the laboratory school. Administrators were also involved in the data gathered through the visits and interviews. It can be said that the data supplied are probably representative of the judgment, opinions, and evaluation, relative to educational research, of the laboratory school administrators surveyed. It was assumed that administrators would be in the best position to report on educational research.
Data concerning the availability of laboratory school staff to work in special areas are inconclusive due to the large number of respondents who failed to complete this item on the questionnaire. Twenty-three respondents listed librarians, twenty-six listed art teachers, thirty-four listed music teachers, and twenty-eight listed physical education teachers as members of the elementary faculty. Each of the five schools visited had music teachers, librarians, and art teachers. One of the schools visited provided no physical education for children in the elementary school because of the extremely crowded conditions in the school. There is no evidence that more educational research is being conducted in schools where specialized assistance is provided for laboratory school classroom teachers.

Summary and Implications of Data Relating to Functions of the Laboratory School

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to list the functions of the laboratory school with which they were associated. It was thought that the functions actually being emphasized in laboratory schools might differ from those listed on statements of functions. Therefore, respondents were asked to list functions as officially stated, and as they operated in laboratory schools. In the visits and interviews, the emphasis was placed on the functions actually being performed in laboratory schools. Most administrators did not claim to be doing research, despite the current emphasis on this function in current literature. There was a very little difference between the officially stated functions and those actually in operation. Only seven respondents listed research as the most important function, as listed on statements of function.
Functions were ranked by assigning a numerical value of four to each function listed first, three to each function in second place, two to each third place function, and one to each function listed in fourth position on each list. The rank value was multiplied by the number of respondents listing the function in each position. The sum of the products was termed the weighted total computed for each function. The purpose of this procedure was to determine the relative importance of the various functions, in the view of the respondents, in the laboratory schools for which data were reported. The rank order of the six most important functions is as follows:

1. Student Teaching
2. Demonstration
3. Observation
4. Participation
5. Research, Experimentation
6. Education of Children

Research received the primary emphasis in but one of the five schools visited. Only one of the educators interviewed indicated much emphasis on the research function in the school with which they were associated.

Student teaching appeared to be an important function in four of the five laboratory schools visited. Educators interviewed suggested recognition of the important role of student teaching in most laboratory schools. Transferrance of this function to public schools was suggested, both in questionnaires and during interviews and visits. Some administrators were of the opinion that research and other functions were not
INCOMPATIBLE, ALTHOUGH THEY INDICATED THAT RESEARCH SHOULD BE GIVEN MORE EMPHASIS THAN AT PRESENT.

Statements concerning blocks to educational research and comments made during interviews suggest that fulfilling other functions leaves little time, money, or energy for carrying on educational research and publishing the results. Of particular significance here is the disagreement between laboratory school teachers and administrators with whom the writer talked concerning the feasibility of carrying on educational research along with student teaching, demonstration, observation, or any other function. The implications of the data are relatively clear. At present, the laboratory school is not an active agency in educational research. If it is to become actively engaged in educational research, will research take the place of functions presently occupying major portions of administrative and faculty time and energy, or will educational research simply occupy a more prominent position than it does at present, one of a number of laboratory school functions? Data collected for the present study do not provide a clear answer to this question. At present, in schools where research is an important function, little time and energy is devoted to other functions. This is particularly true in laboratory schools where faculty members are involved in the research. Comments made during visits and interviews, such as "WE'RE TRYING TO MOVE STUDENT TEACHING INTO PUBLIC SCHOOLS SO WE'LL BE FREE TO DO MORE RESEARCH," suggest that administrators recognize that research must occupy a more prominent role, if not the most prominent position, in a hierarchy of functions, if necessary time and funds are to be available.

Fifty-one of the respondents reported that they were presently
ENGAGED IN A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WITH WHICH THEY ARE ASSOCIATED, OR THAT SUCH EXAMINATION OF FUNCTIONS IS A CONTINUOUS PROCESS. PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH ONE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS SUPPOSEDLY ENGAGED IN A CONTINUOUS EXAMINATION OF FUNCTIONS CAUSES THE WRITER TO QUESTION THE EXTENT AND QUALITY OF THIS EXAMINATION, AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FACULTY IS INVOLVED. THE CONTINUOUS RE-EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION OF FUNCTIONS MAY BE AT A MUCH DIFFERENT LEVEL IN THE OTHER FOUR LABORATORY SCHOOLS. THE WRITER WOULD EXPRESS A HOPE THAT THIS IS SO. HOWEVER, IF RE-EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION OF FUNCTIONS ARE AS WIDESPREAD AS THE DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES SUGGEST, IT IS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND WHY SO LITTLE CHANGE HAS TAKEN PLACE IN LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS SINCE THE FOUNDING OF THE FIRST SUCH SCHOOLS. THEY WERE FOUND FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROVIDING SITUATIONS IN WHICH THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER MIGHT OBSERVE EXCELLENT TEACHING OR WORK WITH GROUPS OF CHILDREN UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF AN EXPERIENCED TEACHER. DATA COLLECTED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY INDICATE THAT THESE FUNCTIONS STILL OCCUPY POSITIONS OF IMPORTANCE IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. IT WOULD SEEM THAT SERIOUS EFFORTS TO EXAMINE AND EVALUATE THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WOULD RESULT IN MORE CHANGE THAN IS EVIDENT.

OFFICIALS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION WERE EVIDENTLY INSTRUMENTAL IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE FUNCTIONS FOR TEN OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS FROM WHICH DATA WERE REQUESTED. COOPERATIVE STATE-ADMINISTRATIVE-FACULTY STUDY RESULTED IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE FUNCTIONS OF TWENTY-THREE LABORATORY SCHOOLS. OFFICIALS CONCERNED WITH THE LEVEL OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN A STATE HAVE APPARENTLY GIVEN RATHER CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO THE ROLE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IN TEACHER EDUCATION.
It is of particular interest to note that respondents from two states reported that they expected more widespread research activity in the laboratory school with which they were associated because of recent encouragement given by officials in state departments of education. It has been noted previously that correspondence with faculty members connected with institutions where laboratory schools had recently been closed disclosed that state education officials were instrumental in transferring pre-service laboratory experiences to public schools and using former laboratory school buildings for additional education department classrooms.

The faculty and administrative officials of a teacher education institution probably constitute the group most responsible for the original determination of the functions of the laboratory school. Forty-two, or thirty-six and five-tenths of the respondents, reported that the functions of the laboratory school were established by some combination of administrative-faculty action. Therefore, it may be assumed that college and laboratory school faculty members and administrative officials constitute the group from which a major change in laboratory school function must emanate.

Substantiation for the preceding statement is furnished by the data collected concerning the direction and coordination of the research. Although more than one-fifth of the respondents did not complete this item, the tabulated responses indicate that research leadership comes from the director or principal of the laboratory school. Data gathered during interviews and visits suggest that administrators accept responsibility for research leadership, but express some feelings of
INADEQUACY IN PROVIDING DIRECTION AND COORDINATION TO MEMBERS OF THEIR FACULTIES. In-service programs were suggested as a means of helping faculty members achieve more competence in carrying on educational research. Such programs might also serve the purpose of helping administrators provide more adequate leadership. Specialized assistance from educators whose background includes a great deal of experience with educational research is apparently not available to administrators and faculty members in laboratory schools. Only eight, or seven percent, of the respondents indicated such a position on the staff. Most coordination and direction is provided by the laboratory school administrators. The limited research activity in laboratory schools tends to support the contention of several administrators that such coordination and direction as they can provide is inadequate and insufficient. The comment of one administrator that lack of leadership is merely an excuse for inactivity in educational research should not be ignored, however.

Since there are so few directors or coordinators of research, sufficient data are lacking to indicate the impetus to research the presence of such a person can give. One respondent, with the title "Director of Research", listed as his school's most significant contribution to educational research a project completed some years before his position was created.

Undoubtedly, the quality of leadership given to faculty members interested in educational research is a significant factor in determining the level and extent of a laboratory school's contributions in this area. Twenty-two respondents stated that inadequate leadership provided a major deterrent to research activity. Whether leadership should be provided by a principal or director, or by a person with
Specific training and experience in educational research is not one of the questions answered through reference to the data gathered for the present study.

Although some educators would expect the laboratory school administrator to provide necessary leadership and coordination of research activities, data gathered through interviews, visits, and comments made on questionnaires suggest that very few expect the laboratory school teacher to become actively engaged in educational research while still performing full-time teaching duties. Nearly every educator with whom the writer discussed this problem expressed the opinion that the laboratory school teacher must be released from routine classroom duties in order to carry on research. Data gathered for the present study lead to the conclusion that this is merely opinion, however. Only nineteen of the respondents reported that faculty members were released from teaching duties, either on a full or part-time basis, in order to work in educational research. Seventy-four respondents reported that no faculty members were released. It would seem unrealistic to expect laboratory school teachers to work with a group of children, supervise student teachers or several participants, prepare and present demonstration lessons for college classes, and still evidence much enthusiasm and vigor for educational research. This is a factor in consideration of multiple laboratory school functions, also. How much can an individual teacher, or group of teachers, even conscientious and dedicated teachers, be expected to do?

It is not surprising, in view of the data presented in the preceding paragraphs, that forty two respondents report that no time
IS SPECIFICALLY BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITY, AND TWO OTHERS CLASSIFY THE TIME BUDGETED AS "VERY LITTLE" OR "NEGLIGIBLE". ONLY FIFTEEN RESPONDENTS REPORT A SPECIFIC AMOUNT OF TIME ALLOTTED FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. DATA REPORTED IN THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPHS INDICATING THAT LITTLE FACULTY TIME IS DELIBERATELY BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH AND THAT ONLY RARELY ARE LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS RELEASED FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITY SEEM TO REPRESENT BOTH EVIDENCE OF LACK OF INTEREST IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE RESULTS OF THIS LACK OF INTEREST. SIMPLY RELEASING TEACHERS TO CARRY ON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH OR DELIBERATELY BUDGETING TIME FOR RESEARCH WILL NOT ENSURE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION. IF TEACHERS GIVE EVIDENCE OF STRONG INTEREST IN RESEARCH ACTIVITY, THE RELEASED TIME AND FREEDOM FROM OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES MIGHT WELL BE PROVIDED. HOWEVER, IT WOULD SEEM THAT FREEING TEACHERS FROM ROUTINE CLASSROOM DUTIES MIGHT GIVE TEACHERS AN INDICATION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR'S CONCEPT OF THE ROLE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN THE HIERARCHY OF LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS.

ALTHOUGH RESPONDENTS FROM APPROXIMATELY HALF OF THE INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED (51.4) REPORT THAT THE SERVICES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR HELP IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, COMMENTS ON QUESTIONNAIRES SUGGEST THAT ADMINISTRATORS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS ON CAMPUSES WHERE GRADUATE WORK IS BEGINNING ANTICIPATE MORE RESEARCH ACTIVITY AS AN OUTGROWTH OF THE WORK OF GRADUATE STUDENTS. MANY RESPONDENTS DID NOT COMPLETE THE ITEM REQUESTING DATA ON GRADUATE ENROLLMENT. Thus, while it is the opinion of administrators that there is a relationship between laboratory school contributions in educational research and the availability of graduate students to work in this area, data are insufficient to support this opinion. GRADUATE STUDENTS SEEMED TO BE
ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN FOUR OF THE FIVE LABORATORY SCHOOLS VISITED. BECAUSE NO MENTION WAS MADE OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION IN THE FIFTH SCHOOL, AND VISIBLE EVIDENCE OF THEIR WORK WAS LACKING, NO CONCLUSIONS CAN BE DRAWN.

ADMINISTRATORS ARE BUDGET-CONSCIOUS INDIVIDUALS. USUALLY, THEY MAY BE EXPECTED TO WORK HARD FOR MONEY FOR CAUSES THEY CONSIDER SUFFICIENTLY WORTHY. DATA INDICATE THAT FIFTY RESPONDENTS, 43.5%, HAD NOT REQUESTED FUNDS FOR RESEARCH. SEVENTEEN RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT PART OF THE REGULAR APPROPRIATION WAS BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITY. IT WOULD APPEAR THAT ADMINISTRATORS DO NOT CONSIDER RESEARCH A FUNCTION SUFFICIENTLY IMPORTANT TO WARRANT A SPECIFIC ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS. FUNDS FOR RESEARCH COULD BE USED TO HIRE REPLACEMENT PERSONNEL, MAKING POSSIBLE RELEASED TIME FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS. ADDITIONAL CLERICAL HELP COULD BE HIRED. IN THE SCHOOL VISITED WHICH EXHIBITED THE MOST INTEREST IN AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, A VERY LARGE CLERICAL STAFF WAS EMPLOYED TO ASSIST THE DOCTORS, NURSES, AND PSYCHOMETRISTS. FUNDS MIGHT ALSO BE USED TO PAY FOR SPECIAL EQUIPMENT NEEDED FOR EXPERIMENTATION AND/OR THE STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF RESULTS.

THE SAME COMMENT COULD BE MADE REGARDING MONEY AS WAS MADE REGARDING TIME. PERHAPS THE MONEY WILL BE BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH WHEN RESEARCH ASSUMES PROPORTIONS SUFFICIENTLY LARGE TO JUSTIFY SUCH A CHANGE. IT MAY BE DIFFICULT TO JUSTIFY BUDGETING FUNDS FOR RESEARCH BEFORE MUCH SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH IS DONE. HOWEVER, THE KNOWLEDGE THAT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE MIGHT ACT AS A STIMULANT TO INCREASED RESEARCH ACTIVITY. FORTY THREE RESPONDENTS LISTED INSUFFICIENT FUNDS AS A "BLOCK" TO INCREASED RESEARCH ACTIVITY, SUGGESTING THAT THE APPROPRIATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS WOULD AT LEAST REMOVE AN EXCUSE FOR
INACTIVITY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. A COMPARISON OF THE FORTY-THREE RESPONDENTS WHO STATE THAT FUNDS ARE INSUFFICIENT WITH THE FIFTY WHO REPORT THAT NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS HAVE BEEN REQUESTED MAKE CONCLUSIONS DIFFICULT, UNLESS ONE CONCLUDES THAT DIFFERENT RESPONDENTS ARE REPRESENTED IN THE TWO GROUPS.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF DATA RELATING TO AREAS AND TYPES OF RESEARCH IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL

FOUR TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH WERE IDENTIFIED IN "AN INQUIRY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH." THESE WERE LABELED EXPERIMENTAL, LONGITUDINAL, SHORT-TERM, AND DESCRIPTIVE. EACH OF THESE TYPES WAS DESCRIBED BRIEFLY, AND POSSIBLE AREAS OF RESEARCH WERE INCLUDED WITHIN EACH TYPE CLASSIFICATION.

CLASSIFICATIONS, DESCRIPTIONS OR DEFINITIONS PROVIDED, AND THE STRUCTURING OF THIS PORTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WERE INADEQUATE, OR PROVIDED INSUFFICIENT GUIDANCE TO THE RESPONDENT. SEVERAL RESPONDENTS UTILIZED THE LAST PAGE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR MADE MARGINAL NOTES TO THIS EFFECT. OTHER RESPONDENTS LEFT INCOMPLETE ITEMS WITHIN CLASSIFICATIONS OR DID NOT CLASSIFY RESEARCH PROJECTS ACCORDING TO GENERALLY ACCEPTED PROCEDURES.

THE PROBLEMS DETAILED IN THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPH INDICATE SUPPORT FOR THE POSITION OF THE EDUCATORS WHO, DURING VISITS AND INTERVIEWS, SUGGESTED THAT THE RELATIVELY UNSTRUCTURED, SO-CALLED "ACTION" RESEARCH WAS THE TYPE BEST ADAPTED TO THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. MOST EDUCATORS, HOWEVER, EXPRESSED THE HOPE THAT LABORATORY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY WOULD BECOME INVOLVED IN BOTH "ACTION" RESEARCH AND MORE HIGHLY STRUCTURED TYPES.
There was wide variation in the number of studies reported within each classification. Eighty-three studies were classified as experimental, forty-four as longitudinal studies; thirty-two were short-term studies and twenty studies were classified as descriptive. In view of the numerous comments made by administrators concerning the inadvisability of attempting highly structured studies and the supposed dearth of such studies, it is rather surprising to find that 46.4% of the studies reported were of an experimental nature.

The majority of the problems studied in laboratory schools were identified by a classroom teacher or group of teachers as being significant and worthy of exploration. Administrators also identified many of the problems. Members of the college or department of education faculty identified very few, as did parents, school physicians, psychologists or psychiatrists. Even within the experimental classification, which would involve the selection and application of relatively sophisticated research techniques, thirty-seven of the sixty respondents to this item indicate identification by a classroom teacher or teachers. Two-thirds of the problems selected for study and classified as longitudinal were identified by a classroom teacher or group of teachers were involved in the identification of fourteen of the twenty-six descriptive studies listed.

There are no data, collected for the present study, to substantiate the opinion expressed by several respondents that laboratory school teachers are not competent to carry on educational research. Such an opinion was not held by the educators interviewed or by many of the administrators in schools visited. Teachers were not involved in educational research in one school visited, and it is thought that the
MAJOR REASON WAS A RATHER LOW REGARD FOR THE ABILITY OF THE TEACHERS IN THAT SCHOOL TO CARRY ON SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH. THE POSITION TAKEN BY MOST ADMINISTRATORS WITH WHOM THE WRITER CONFERRED WAS THAT TEACHERS IN THEIR SCHOOLS WERE FREE TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH TO WARRANT STUDY, TO DETERMINE, WITH ADMINISTRATIVE HELP, IF DESIRED, THE METHODS OF STUDY MOST SUITABLE, AND CARRY THE STUDY TO A CONCLUSION. THE FREQUENTLY RECOMMENDED "IN-SERVICE" WORK IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH WOULD BENEFIT BOTH TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS ARE EVIDENTLY NOT AS UNAWARE OF POSSIBLE AREAS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AS IT IS FREQUENTLY SUPPOSED.

EIGHTY-THREE EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES WERE REPORTED. FIFTY-SIX OF THESE STUDIES DEAL RATHER DIRECTLY WITH THE CURRICULUM OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OR WITH SPECIFIC AREAS OF THE CURRICULUM.

FIFTEEN OF THE FORTY-FOUR LONGITUDINAL STUDIES WERE IN THE AREA OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS. TWELVE LONGITUDINAL STUDIES DEALT WITH ASPECTS OF PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT, TEN WITH SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

TWENTY-ONE OF THE THIRTY-TWO SHORT-TERM STUDIES REPORTED WERE CLASSIFIED BY RESPONDENTS AS GROUP OR INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDIES.

TWENTY DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES WERE REPORTED. ONE-HALF OF THESE DEALT WITH THE GENERAL AREA OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS.

STUDIES DEALING WITH CURRICULUM OCCUPIED A MAJOR PORTION OF THE TIME AND ENERGY DEVOTED TO RESEARCH IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. IN EACH CLASSIFICATION, AT LEAST ONE STUDY WAS MENTIONED WHICH CONCERNED CURRICULUM IN GENERAL, ("CORE PROGRAM IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL") OR SPECIFIC CURRICULAR AREAS. (INDIVIDUALIZED READING IN THE PRIMARY GRADES"). ACADEMIC PROGRESS AND METHODS OF COMMUNICATING EVIDENCE
OF THIS PROGRESS TO PARENTS WERE ALSO FREQUENTLY MENTIONED AREAS OF
STUDY.

THE AREAS OF CURRICULUM, PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT, AND REPORTING TO
PARENTS HAVE MUCH SIGNIFICANCE FOR TEACHERS. IT IS PROBABLE THAT SOME
RELATIONSHIP EXISTS BETWEEN THE AREAS SELECTED FOR STUDY AND THE FACT
THAT CLASSROOM TEACHERS WERE INSTRUMENTAL IN DETERMINING AREAS WHICH
NEEDED TO BE STUDIED. STUDIES IN CURRICULUM AND PARENT RELATIONS
WERE PROMINENTLY LISTED BY EDUCATORS IN RESPONDING TO A REQUEST TO
LIST AREAS OF RESEARCH IN WHICH THE LABORATORY SCHOOL HAS MADE THE MOST
SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION. FOURTEEN SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS DEALT DIRECTLY
WITH CURRICULUM, AND ELEVEN OF THE STUDIES LISTED IN THE TEACHER EDU-
CATION CLASSIFICATION DEALT WITH PARENT RELATIONS, OR METHODS, MATER-
IALS, OR TECHNIQUES APPROPRIATE FOR SPECIFIC CURRICULAR AREAS OR CUR-
RICULUM OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

THE ENTIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HAS BEEN THE SETTING FOR MORE OF
THE STUDIES REPORTED THAN WERE ANY SPECIFIC GRADE LEVELS. WHERE GRADE
LEVELS WERE REPORTED, THEY TENDED TO BE MIDDLE OR UPPER GRADES, RATHER
 THAN PRIMARY GRADES. PERHAPS THIS IS DUE TO THE SOMEWHAT STRONGER EM-
PHASIS ON SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT TYPICAL IN THE
MIDDLE AND UPPER GRADES.

IT IS DIFFICULT TO DETAIL THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS SUM-
MARIZED IN THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPHS. PERHAPS MORE EMPHASIS NEEDS TO BE
PLACED ON RESEARCH IN ON-ACADEMIC AREAS, YET IT IS CERTAINLY TRUE THAT
WE HAVE MUCH TO LEARN ABOUT TEACHING AND LEARNING THE SO-CALLED TOOL
SUBJECTS.

IT IS HOPED THAT THE LONGITUDINAL STUDIES IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT
WILL MAKE AVAILABLE TO EDUCATORS MORE RECENTLY GATHERED DATA. MUCH
OF THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT DATA ON WHICH SCHOOL PRACTICES AND PROGRAMS
ARE BASED WERE COLLECTED MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS AGO. ONE OF THE
SCHOOLS VISITED BY THE WRITER HAS BEEN THE SETTING FOR A MAJOR CHILD
DEVELOPMENT STUDY. IT WAS ADMITTED THAT THE DATA COLLECTED AT PRESENT
IS BEING COMPARED WITH DATA GATHERED FROM CHILDREN THIRTY YEARS AGO.
SURELY OUR UNDERSTANDINGS OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT NEED TO BE BASED ON
MORE RECENT DATA.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF DATA RELATING
to Dissemination of Findings, Appropriateness of the Role of Research, and
Blocks to Educational Research in the
Laboratory School

Nearly one-half (47.8%) of the respondents did not complete the
item requesting an answer to the question: "Are Research Findings made
Available to Public School Personnel?" Seventeen and three-tenths of
the respondents indicated that findings were not made available. The
reason given by most respondents was that research was still a new
function, and there were, as yet, no definite findings.

The writer questions the effectiveness of disseminating the
results of educational research through observations in the laboratory
school. Teachers can almost certainly profit through observing another
teacher at work with children, but it is doubtful that much more than
methods, materials, and/or techniques are noted. If these have been
selected on the basis of staff study, perhaps involving the comparison
of one method with another, and the selection of the method producing
superior results, this may not be immediately apparent to the observer.

Other means of making available to interested educators the
results of educational research seem to be more effective. Several
EDUCATORS WITH WHOM THE WRITER DISCUSSED THIS PROBLEM MENTIONED INCREASING PRESSURE ON THE FACULTY TO WRITE. WHERE LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS HAVE FACULTY RANK, AND SUCH IS THE CASE IN EACH LABORATORY SCHOOL VISITED, THEY ARE SUBJECT TO THE APPLICATION OF THE SAME CRITERIA WHEN SALARY INCREMENTS OR PROMOTIONS ARE CONSIDERED AS ARE APPLIED TO THE TEACHERS OF COLLEGE CLASSES. WRITING IS OFTEN ONE OF THE CRITERIA. ONE EDUCATOR MENTIONED THE APPOINTMENT OF A STAFF MEMBER, IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WHERE HE WAS PRINCIPAL, WHOSE DUTIES WOULD BE ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY WRITING FOR PUBLICATION THE RESULTS OF STUDIES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH WHOM THE WRITER IS ACQUAINTED AND THOSE WITH WHOM SHE CONFERRED DURING VISITS EXHIBIT EXTREME RELUCTANCE TO WRITE, AND CONSIDER IT AN UNFAIR BURDEN ADDED TO A TEACHING LOAD WHICH IS ALREADY HEAVY.

IF LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS DISCUSS THE RESEARCH IN WHICH THEY ARE INVOLVED WHILE ACTING AS CONSULTANTS TO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS OR WHILE TEACHING COLLEGE CLASSES THE RESULT SHOULD BE AN INCREASED INTEREST IN RESEARCH IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. SEVERAL OF THE EDUCATORS INTERVIEWED MENTIONED THE IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC AS WELL AS LABORATORY SCHOOLS BECOMING CENTERS FOR RESEARCH. A LEADERSHIP ROLE FOR LABORATORY SCHOOL PERSONNEL WAS RECOMMENDED.

ONLY ONE OF THE ADMINISTRATORS OF A SCHOOL VISITED EXPRESSED SATISFACTION WITH THE CONTRIBUTION TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BEING MADE BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL. THERE WAS AGREEMENT AMONG THE EDUCATORS INTERVIEWED THAT THE LABORATORY SCHOOL SHOULD BE A MORE ACTIVE PARTICIPANT IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. IN RespondING TO "AN INQUIRY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH", FORTY-FIVE
RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT RESEARCH WAS ASSUMING AN APPROPRIATE ROLE IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS WITH WHICH THEY ARE ASSOCIATED. FORTY RESPONDENTS CHECKED THE ITEM INDICATING THE OPINION THAT MORE RESEARCH SHOULD BE DONE. RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE SEEMED TO SUGGEST A HIGHER DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH THE RESEARCH ROLE THAN EDUCATORS WHO WERE INTERVIEWED. HOWEVER, A SURVEY OF THE COMMENTS ADDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE REVEALS THAT MANY RESPONDENTS ARE SATISFIED THAT A BEGINNING HAS BEEN MADE, BUT REALIZE THAT MUCH MORE MUST BE ACCOMPLISHED BEFORE THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WILL BE MAKING SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.

THE MAJOR BLOCK TO INCREASED RESEARCH ACTIVITY APPEARS TO BE THE ACCEPTANCE OF STUDENT TEACHING, PARTICIPATION, AND OBSERVATION AS FUNCTIONS, LEAVING NO PLACE FOR RESEARCH. SIXTY-FIVE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THAT THE ASSUMPTION OF OTHER FUNCTIONS PROVIDED THE MAJOR DETERRENT TO RESEARCH ACTIVITY, AND TWENTY-SIX RESPONDENTS STATED THAT RESEARCH WAS NOT A FUNCTION OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL WITH WHICH THEY WERE ASSOCIATED.

INADEQUATE FUNDS WERE LISTED AS A "BLOCK" BY FORTY-THREE RESPONDENTS, AND INSUFFICIENT CLERICAL HELP WAS LISTED BY THIRTY-FOUR RESPONDENTS.

INADEQUATE (OR NON-EXISTENT) LEADERSHIP IN RESEARCH WAS LISTED BY TWENTY-TWO RESPONDENTS AS A "BLOCK" TO RESEARCH ACTIVITY.

IT HAS BEEN NOTED PREVIOUSLY THAT LIMITATIONS OF TIME, MONEY, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, AND LACK OF LEADERSHIP SEEM TO REPRESENT BOTH CAUSES AND RESULTS OF LIMITED RESEARCH ACTIVITY. THE WRITER WOULD HESITATE TO MAKE THE CLAIM THAT INCREASED RESEARCH ACTIVITY WOULD
FOLLOW PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR RESEARCH, ADDITIONAL CLERICAL HELP, OR
THE REMOVAL OF ANY OF THE BLOCKS LISTED BY ADMINISTRATORS. THERE IS
NO DATA TO SUPPORT SUCH A CLAIM. HOWEVER, IT COULD BE NOTED THAT THE
ADMINISTRATORS WHO STATED THAT TIME AND MONEY WERE USUALLY AVAILABLE
TO DO JOBS OF SUFFICIENT IMPORTANCE HAVE SOME BASIS FOR SUCH BELIEFS.
CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data collected for the present study and the analysis, interpretation and implications suggested by the writer, certain conclusions can be made regarding educational research in laboratory schools connected with state-supported institutions of teacher education:

1. The laboratory school is presently devoting major portions of time and energy to fulfilling the functions of student teaching, observation, demonstration, and participation.

2. Many faculty members and administrators see a need for a redefinition of the role of the laboratory school. Maintenance of the laboratory school will be difficult to justify if it continues to fulfill functions which can be served equally as well and at considerably less expense by public schools.

3. The laboratory school is presently making contributions to research in the areas of curriculum and aspects of school-community relations.

4. There is some agreement that laboratory school teachers should be active participants in educational research and should be released from some routine classroom duties in order to carry on research.

5. Laboratory school teachers are more competent contributors to educational research than has
been assumed. Both teachers and their principals expressed a need for specific help in research methodology. It was suggested that in-service workshop activities would be of more benefit than academic courses in educational research.  

6. There is a frequently expressed opinion that research methods designed for the biological and physical sciences were not necessarily those best adapted for use in laboratory school classrooms. However, the term "action research" was used almost apologetically as though it were research of a lower order.
SUPPORT FOR HYPOTHESES

The hypothesis is stated in Chapter One as follows: "The major hypothesis to be tested is that the great majority of personnel connected with laboratory schools associated with state-supported institutions of teacher education do not consider a major function that of conducting educational research, including experimentation with new and as yet untried or inadequately tried techniques, methods, or procedures, as well as sharing the results of such research with interested educators.

Implied in the hypothesis stated in the preceding paragraph is a second hypothesis which must also be tested. That is, that the limited research being conducted in laboratory schools meets generally accepted criteria for educational research."

Support for the first hypothesis is claimed, in view of the data indicating that only fifteen of 13.0% of the respondents listed research in first or second place on lists of officially stated functions and only eighteen listed research on the lists of operational functions.

The rank order of functions listed by respondents suggests that research and experimentation occupy fifth place in the hierarchy of functions, well behind student teaching, demonstration, observation, and participation. Student teaching, participation, observation, and demonstration constitute the major functions of most laboratory schools. Very limited support is claimed for the second hypothesis. Much of the research carried on in laboratory schools was termed
"Experimental" by respondents, and questions were raised relating to the application of commonly accepted criteria for this type of research. There was also evidence of some misunderstanding of the term "longitudinal." However, many respondents reported descriptive studies, and/or short-term studies, or refused to categorize the research in which they were engaged, preferring to term it "action research."

These respondents seemed to give evidence of some understanding of methodology of educational research. The writer would concur with the educators who suggested that we should stop attempting to adapt to the social sciences research methods designed and more appropriate for use in biological and physical sciences.

Data collected for the present study contribute little to the solution of the persistent and recurring problem of the laboratory school. Can and should the laboratory school attempt to perform multiple functions?
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Areas of investigation were suggested in the sections in which limitations of the present study were discussed. The following recommendations include three important areas of consideration which might well be investigated by an educator who is interested in experimentation and other types of research in the laboratory school.

Leadership. - A study focusing on the role of the laboratory school administrator would yield interesting and pertinent data. The principal or director of a laboratory school is most influential in determining which of the functions typically fulfilled by laboratory schools will receive the most emphasis in the school where he is the administrator.

Laboratory school teachers. - Of great interest would be a study which would help to determine the type of teacher needed to participate actively in educational research in the laboratory school. It has been suggested that successful public school teaching should not be the sole criterion in the selection of laboratory school teachers. It is suggested that the laboratory school teacher should be more than a "keeper of guinea pigs" for the research done by others.

Blocks to educational research. - Although blocks to educational research were investigated as part of the present study, it will be recalled that one educator considered these imaginary rather than real inhibiting factors or conditions. A thorough study of a few laboratory schools which would include prolonged visits, several interviews with administrators, faculty members, and parents, would be the source of much meaningful and pertinent data.
APPENDIX

FIGURES AND QUESTIONNAIRE
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FIGURE 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (STATED) AND ENROLLMENT OF LABORATORY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Stated)</th>
<th>Enrollment of Laboratory School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 or Under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11111 11111 1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (OPERATIONAL) AND ENROLLMENT OF LABORATORY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Operational)</th>
<th>Enrollment of Laboratory School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 or Under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11111 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11111 11111 11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11111 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (STATED) AND FUNDS BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Stated)</th>
<th>Funds Budgeted for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL
(OPERATIONAL) AND FUNDS BUDGETED FOR RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Operational)</th>
<th>Funds Budgeted for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (STATED) AND ENROLLMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS (GRADUATE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Stated)</th>
<th>Number of Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 or Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>111111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (OPERATIONAL) AND ENROLLMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION (GRADUATE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Operational)</th>
<th>Number of Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 or Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>111111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 7

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH (STATED) AND ENROLLMENT OF TEACHER
EDUCATION INSTITUTION (UNDERGRADUATE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Stated)</th>
<th>Number of Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 8

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH (OPERATIONAL) AND ENROLLMENT OF TEACHER
EDUCATION INSTITUTION (UNDERGRADUATE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Order of Importance (Operational)</th>
<th>Number of Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN INQUIRY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. NAME OF LABORATORY SCHOOL: ____________________________

2. NAME OF TEACHER-EDUCATION INSTITUTION WITH WHICH LABORATORY IS CONNECTED: ____________________________

3. NUMBER OF COLLEGE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAM: Graduates: ________ (Number) Undergraduates: ________ (Number)

4. NAME OF PERSON OR PERSONS COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE: ____________________________ Position: ____________________________ Position: ____________________________

4. ENROLLMENT OF LABORATORY SCHOOL (ELEMENTARY): ________ (Number)

5. TEACHER STATIONS IN LABORATORY SCHOOL (ELEMENTARY): ________ (Number)

6. OTHERS: (PLEASE SPECIFY) ____________________________

B. FUNCTION OF LABORATORY SCHOOL: DEMONSTRATION TEACHING, PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING, PARTICIPATION, OBSERVATION, AND RESEARCH ARE COMMONLY ACCEPTED FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. PLEASE LIST THOSE FUNCTIONS WHICH YOU ACCEPT, FIRST AS THEY ARE OFFICIALLY STATED, AND SECOND, AS YOU SEE THEM OPERATING IN YOUR SCHOOL.

FUNCTIONS: OFFICIALLY STATED (IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE) FUNCTIONS: OPERATIONAL (IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE)

1. ____________________________ 1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________ 2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________ 3. ____________________________
HAS THE FACULTY OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL ENGAGED IN A STUDY AND RE-EXAMINATION OF THE FUNCTION OR FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL?

**YES:**

____ We are involved in such a study now.

____ Not recently. Approximate date: __________________

____ Recently completed such a study. Date: __________

**NO:** ______

How were the functions of your laboratory school originally determined? ____________________________________________

C. IF YOU HAVE LISTED RESEARCH AS A FUNCTION, PLEASE RESPOND TO

THE FOLLOWING:

1. Who directs and coordinates the research?
   
   ____ A faculty committee: Members from laboratory school -- college -- both. (Please underline)
   
   ____ The principal or director of the laboratory school.
   
   ____ A "Coordinator" or "Director" of research.
   
   ____ A consultative expert or team not directly connected with the school.

   Others: (Please specify) ______________________________________

2. Are any laboratory school staff or faculty members released from teaching assignments in order to carry on research?

   **YES:** Full-time____ (Number Released) Part-time____ (Number Released)

   None released: ______

   Are the services of graduate students made available for help in research?
Yes: Number of students involved: ______

No: Services not available: ______

Please indicate the approximate percentage of faculty
time deliberately budgeted for research activity. ______

3. Are any funds specifically budgeted for research?
Yes: ______ Special grant or foundation money.
______ Part of regular appropriation.
No: ______ We have not requested additional funds for research.
______ Requests made have not been granted.

D. Type or types of research in which you are engaged:

1. Experimental (involving the critical testing of
hypotheses under controlled conditions)

Area of experimentation: Grade level or levels concerned:
____ Language arts K 1 2 3 4 5 6 (please circle)
____ Social studies
____ Arithmetic Research technique used:
____ Science ______ Equated groups
____ Art ______ Paired subjects
____ Health, physical education ______ Rotation of groups
____ Music ______ Random groups, two methods
Others: (please specify) ______ Others: (please specify) ______

How did the problem or problems specified in 1, above,
originate?
____ Identified by classroom teacher or teachers.
____ Identified by faculty committee: Members from laboratory
   school -- college -- both. (please underline)
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IDENTIFIED BY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF.

Others: (please specify) ________________________________________________

2. Longitudinal (involving the regular, relatively frequent, and repeated measurement of observation of the same individual or group of individuals, conducted over a considerable period of time).

Area of Research: Grade level or levels concerned:

physical development K 1 2 3 4 5 6 (please circle)

social development number of children involved: ___

academic progress when did the research begin? ___

Others: (please specify) how long do you expect it to continue? ______________________________

How did the problem or problems specified in 2, preceding page, originate?

IDENTIFIED BY CLASSROOM TEACHER OR TEACHERS.

IDENTIFIED BY FACULTY COMMITTEE: Members from laboratory school -- college -- both. (please underline)

IDENTIFIED BY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF.

Others: (please specify) __________________

3. Short-term studies of group and individual adjustment.

(Similar to longitudinal, but covering shorter period of time; more than ordinary record keeping).

Techniques employed: Grade level or levels concerned:

sociometric K 1 2 3 4 5 6 (please circle)

case study; group or individual

Others: (please specify) ____________________________
How did the problem or problems specified in 3, above, originate?

___ Identified by classroom teacher or group of teachers.

___ Identified by school psychologist, psychiatrist, and/or physician.

___ Identified by administrative staff.

Others: (Please specify) __________________________

4. Descriptive studies. (Involving the collection of data and their interpretation).

Area of Research:

___ Pupil personnel (class size, pupil-teacher ratio, etc.)

___ School-community relations (Parent conferences, use of teacher aides, etc.)

Others: (Please specify)

How did the problem or problems identified in 4, above, originate?

___ Identified by classroom teacher or group of teachers.

___ Identified by a parent group.

___ Identified by administrative staff.

Others: (Please specify) __________________________

F. Are the results of your research made available to public personnel?

Yes:

___ Results are published.

___ Teachers (laboratory school) teach college classes, discuss work at this time.

___ Laboratory school teachers act as consultants to school systems throughout the state.
Public school teachers observe in the laboratory school.

Others: (please specify) ________________________________

Yes:

Research is a new function; we have no definite findings as yet.

Results would not be applicable anywhere else; concern only our own situation.

Teachers are reluctant to write about or discuss what is being done.

Others: (please specify) ________________________________

G. Is research assuming an appropriate role in your school?

Yes:

We are pleased with results, thus far.

Within the limits imposed by budget and size of staff.

So far as we have gone. Research is a new function for us.

Uncertain; opinion is divided on this point.

No:

It is taking too much time.

It is usurping functions more properly ours.

We should be doing much more research.

Other opinions: (please specific) ________________________________

H. Please check, on the following list, those items which represent "blocks" to educational research in your institution:

Research is not one of our functions, stated or operational.

Other functions assume greater importance in our school, leaving little time for research.
There is no strong, clear interest in educational research; no one has assumed leadership in this area.

The faculty indicates little interest in or enthusiasm for educational research.

Funds are inadequate.

We lack sufficient clerical help.

Others: (please specify)

1. Please describe, briefly, the areas of research in which you feel your school has made the greatest contribution.

J. Please discuss, in the space remaining, any areas of research not covered.

(It is probable that some types of research in which you are engaged have not been included, or that some important background information has been omitted).
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I, Pose Maxine Lamb, was born on October 31, 1927, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. My family moved to Columbus, Ohio, prior to my school entrance. In Columbus, I have attended Ninth Avenue Elementary School, Everett Junior High School, and North High School.

I entered the Ohio State University as a freshman in the Autumn Quarter of 1945, and graduated in June of 1948.

My first teaching position was as a third-grade teacher in a county school system in Michigan (School year 1948-49).

From September, 1949, until June of 1955, I was a primary teacher in the Bexley Public Schools.

I began graduate work in the Spring Quarter of 1949 and received the Master of Arts Degree from Ohio State University in 1952.

In May of 1955, I accepted a position in the laboratory school at Ball State Teachers College, in Muncie, Indiana, and in order to be better equipped for work with college students, I enrolled for courses in supervision at Ohio State University.

While completing the residence requirement, I was graduate assistant to Dr. Loren Tomlinson. I have also assisted Dr. Lowry Harding, my major adviser, Dr. Martha Norman, and Dr. Irvin Ramsey.