1968

A Critical Survey of Selected Curriculum Practices of Social Science Programs in University Laboratory Schools in the State of Wisconsin

Joseph V. Strunka
Eastern Illinois University

PAPER CERTIFICATE #3

To: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

Subject: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements.

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

August 16, 1968
Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

_____

_____

_____
Date

_____
Author

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF SELECTED CURRICULUM PRACTICES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS IN UNIVERSITY LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

(TITLE)

BY

JOSEPH V. STRUNKA

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1968
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED

1/10/69
DATE

1/10/69
DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer desires to express his sincere thanks and appreciation to Dr. Dallas A. Price for his counsel and guidance; to Dr. Raymond F. McKenna for his constructive criticism in the preparation of this study; and to Mr. James W. Stewart for his suggestions in the development of the questionnaire, the use of his personal files, and encouragement in completing the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM, DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED AND PROCEDURE

I. INTRODUCTION

The university laboratory school is in a unique position to provide unlimited experiences and services for the pedagogically oriented university student and teachers in the public schools within the respective service area. The university laboratory school is, in the belief of the Council of Laboratory School Administrators, Wisconsin State Universities, ". . . a part of the unique, functional and accessible curriculum of the total university, and . . . an on-going integral part of the active and live dimension of the teacher education process."[1]

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study is to determine and critically evaluate, by means of a questionnaire, the services Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructors provide for pre-service and in-service teachers, as well as the extent of cooperation and coordination of social science programs existing at inter-departmental and inter-laboratory school levels in

---

[1]Statement by Council of Laboratory School Administrators, Wisconsin State Universities, to Council of Deans, Wisconsin State Universities, Stevens Point, September 29, 1967.

the eight Wisconsin State University laboratory schools.

Delimitations. The study is limited to (1) reviewing the historical background of the university laboratory school in the United States of America and Wisconsin; (2) the availability of Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science classrooms as observation-participation centers for pre-service and in-service teachers; (3) determining the effectiveness of the Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science program in the dissemination of pertinent information to the public school teachers; (4) ascertaining the amount of inter-departmental and inter-Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science cooperation and coordination; and (5) evaluate the results of the questionnaire and draw conclusions which seem justified upon the basis of the information available.

The Wisconsin State University laboratory schools included in the study were:

1. Eau Claire
2. La Crosse
3. Oshkosh
4. Platteville
5. River Falls
6. Stevens Point
7. Superior
8. Whitewater

Need for the study. Annually, literature relevant to area disciplines of the social sciences reflect nationwide findings detailing efforts to improve the methodology and content of the discipline structure.

The social science program in the university laboratory school is in a unique position to introduce and demonstrate the feasibility of these current concepts and innovations. To what extent have the university laboratory schools provided such services? How accessible are the university laboratory schools to the pre-service and in-service teachers to ensure the dissemination and utilization of improved pedagogical innovations?

A lack of previous research examining these aspects of curriculum practices of social science programs in Wisconsin State University laboratory schools prompted this study to bring the matter into perspective.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Accessibility. "The quality of being easy to approach or reach."[2]

Dissemination. "To spread or send out freely or widely . . ."[3]

In-service. Actively serving as a public school teacher.

Laboratory school. A school that is under the direct

---

[2]Carter V. Good (ed.), Dictionary of Education (second edition; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 5.

[3]Philip B. Gove (ed.), Webster's Third New International Dictionary (fourteenth edition; Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1961), p. 656.

> control or closely associated with a teacher-preparation institution, whose facilities may be used for demonstration, participation, experimentation, and practice teaching.[4]

Observation-participation experiences. A pre-service teacher's involvement in classroom activities under supervision of an instructor, e.g., assisting students with studies, preparation of displays, observing group inter-actions, or making case studies of specific individuals.

Pre-service. ". . . relating to, or taking place during a period of time preceding active service . . ."[5]

> Public school. A school, usually of elementary or secondary grade, organized under a school district of the state, supported by tax revenues, administered by public officials, and open to all.[6]

> Social science. The branch of knowledge that deals with human society or its characteristic elements, as family, state, or race, and with the relations and institutions involved in man's organized community.[7]

The social sciences being composed of the specific disciplines: anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, and sociology.

IV. PROCEDURE

Before studying the specific curriculum practices of the social

---

[4]Good, op. cit., p. 309.

[5]Dove, op. cit., p. 1,794.

[6]Good, op. cit., p. 431.

[7]Ibid., p. 486.

science programs in Wisconsin State University laboratory schools, it seems appropriate to first become familiar with the historical background of the university laboratory school in the United States of America and particularly Wisconsin. After the introduction to related curriculum practices on the national and state level, the results of the specific study should be more meaningful.

Development of the questionnaire. Constructive criticism by Mr. J. Shank, Head, Senior Division Language Arts, Wisconsin State University--River Falls, and Mr. J. W. Stewart, Director, Department of Educational Development, Wisconsin State University--River Falls, assisted the author in developing a questionnaire which would encourage a high percentage of responses.

Pre-testing and distribution. Questionnaires were pre-tested by Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructors at River Falls, Wisconsin, to determine the clarity and validity of questions.

On May 1, 1968, seventy-five questionnaires were delivered, in respective quantities, to each Wisconsin State University laboratory school director by Mr. J. W. Stewart, Director, Wisconsin State University Laboratory School--River Falls, for further distribution to respective staff members in each school. Of the seventy-five questionnaires distributed, sixty were returned. This represented a total of 80.8 per cent which was considered, by the author, to be a highly

satisfactory response to the questionnaire.

Source of additional data. Additional sources of data relating to the historic development of the laboratory school were secured primarily from an examination of professional writings in the field of education. The information was taken from books, bulletins, publications, periodical publications, and research studies, available in the Eastern Illinois University Library, Charleston, Illinois; University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota; University of Wisconsin Library, Madison, Wisconsin; Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin; Wisconsin State Univerasity Library, River Falls, Wisconsin, and from personal and friends' files.

The letter of transmittal and the questionnaire distributed to the Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructors are included in the appendix of this study.[8]

---

[8]Appendix, pp. 37-44.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Before proceeding to the problem itself, it is appropriate to review the laboratory schools' past and present role. This review is to bring into perspective the laboratory schools' development in the pre-service and in-service education of teachers in the United States of America and Wisconsin.

The exact date and location of the first established laboratory school in the United States is disputed among historical scholars. Earliest credit for application of teaching techniques is given to the Franciscan Friars who provided teaching experiences for prospective teachers as early as the 1600's in the territory which is now New Mexico.

In the early 1800's, the "model school" initially was an important segment of the first teacher-education institutions in the United States which were privately owned and operated. The introduction of the model school from Europe found the role of providing an opportunity for student-teaching and demonstration well established functions. European schools, as founded by Pestalozzi (1805), and Herbart (1809), where student-teachers observed and instructed children, may be credited with establishing the basic principles.[9]

---

[9]P. M. Lamb, "The Laboratory School: An Historical Perspective," The Journal of Educational Research, 56:107-108, October, 1962.

On July 3, 1839, the first publically supported normal school opened in Lexington, Massachusetts. The undertaking was in the hands of Cyrus Peirce, the first principal. From the beginning, the first class of twenty-five young ladies was not given just theory, but was expected to give examples of "how to illustrate, express and explain to effectively teach others."[10]

The "model" or "annexed" school at Lexington was under the direct supervision of the principal of the normal school. The enrollment in 1839 consisted of thirty students of both sexes, ranging from six to ten years of age and taken at random from the town.

In 1841, correspondence from Cyrus Peirce to Henry Barnard, an advocate of educational reform as well, illustrates the mechanics and purpose of the model school:

> After it (the model school) was arranged, the general course of instruction and discipline being settled, it (the model school) was committed to the immediate care of the pupils of the Normal School, one acting as Superintendent, and two as assistants, for one month in rotation, for all who are thought prepared to take part in its instruction.[11]

Peirce further stated, ". . . the teachers are expected to apply the principles and methods they have been taught in the Normal School, with liberty to suggest any improvements, which may occur to them."[12]

---

[10] M. L. Borrowman (ed.), Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), p. 61.

[11] Ibid., p. 61.

[12] Ibid., p. 64.

The student preparing for the dual role as a one-room school administrator-teacher was obviously gaining valuable pre-service experience in the model school. Peirce later related to Barnard (1851), the value of experience gained in the model school so that, ". . . teachers may be prepared to enter on their work, not only with the hope, but almost with the assurance of success."[13]

As the number of normal schools increased in the United States, model schools were included in the initial plan or were soon opened thereafter. In many instances, the "model school" consisted of only one or two rooms, housed within the building(s) of the normal school: one room being used for practice teaching and the other for demonstration purposes. Each room was under the direction of a supervisor.

By the 1860's, there were twelve state normal schools in the United States. For several years after the Civil War, "approximately twenty-five new teacher training institutions were established each year."[14] In 1873, "71.4 per cent of the publically supported normal schools had campus laboratory schools."[15]

The closing of the Nineteenth Century ushered in the beginning of the most progressive era in education in the United States. Of great significance was the opening of the "Laboratory School" (1896) by John

---

[13] Ibid., p. 67.

[14] Lamb, op. cit., p. 108.

[15] R. C. Bryan, "The Vital Role of the Campus School," The Journal of Teacher Education, 12:278, September, 1961.

Dewey at the University of Chicago. The school began with sixteen pupils and two teachers, but by 1902, had grown to one hundred-forty pupils, twenty-three teachers and ten assistants. The purpose of the school was

> . . . to discover in administration, selection of subject matter, methods of learning, teaching, and discipline, how a school should become a cooperative community while developing in individuals their own capabilities and satisfying their own needs.[16]

The establishment of a program for educational research to apply scientific concepts and methods to teacher education was a unique innovation.

Even after the far reaching innovations were introduced by Dewey, the primary functions of many laboratory schools in the United States continued to center on student-teaching, observation, and demonstration experiences for pre-service teachers. Gradually the initial resistance to the so called "scientific movement" in education lessened and several laboratory schools became leaders in educational research. The Lincoln School, established in 1917 by Teachers College in New York, was an excellent example of this leadership. The school's prime objective was "to discover new and better materials of instruction and improved methods of organization and teaching."[17]

Prior to the 1940's, normal schools contributed immensely to new

---

[16]L. A. Cremin, Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), pp. 135, 136.

[17]Lamb, op. cit., p. 108.

educational theory and practice. However, there continued to be a growing need for expanded facilities and a re-evaluation of the primary functions of the school as a laboratory. With increasing enrollments placing greater demands on the laboratory school, the need was evident for "a coordination of the work (in the laboratory school) with the work in the other departments of the college,"[18] and a like need for a closer "affiliation with public school systems."[19]

In the 1950's, the laboratory schools began a definite period of re-evaluation and re-definition of their prime role and function. Two major events attributed to the metamorphosis, and the relegation of the laboratory school to a secondary status, were (1) the increased enrollment in teacher education programs for the mid-1950's to mid-1960's, and (2) the Sputnik era.[20] The greater demand for more realistic pre-service experiences led to the utilization of public schools in student-teacher placement. The arrangement was believed to acquaint the student-teacher more fully with the "whole-school situation and often of community situations as well."[21]

---

[18] C. H. Judd and S. C. Parker, Problems Involved in Standardizing State Normal Schools, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 12 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1916), p. 14.

[19] L. M. Wilson, Training Departments in the State Normal Schools in the United States (Illinois: Eastern Illinois State Normal School, 1926), p. 15.

[20] J. F. Ohles, "Is the Laboratory School Worth Saving?" The Journal of Teacher Education, 18:304, Fall, 1967.

[21] M. L. Borrowman, op. cit., p. 249.

The problems of the laboratory school were further compounded when experienced laboratory school teachers moved into fulltime teaching positions in college classrooms thus escaping an unrealistic workload. With increased demands placed on the already overtaxed facilities and teachers, the situation often became impossible which was best described by Ohles, as a

> . . . perpetual farce in demanding that the laboratory school teacher be a fulltime classroom teacher; perform the functions of a college professor; seek advanced degrees; and plan, organize, conduct, and evaluate research, while providing demonstrations, observations, and supervision of student-teachers.[22]

To resolve one of the problems, a definite decline in the use of laboratory schools for student-teaching and a greater reliance on area schools for this purpose has occurred since 1958. The change in the traditional role was fully supported by laboratory school teachers questioned in a study (Venable, 1960) with a majority indicating the primary function should be as an observation and participation center.[23]

II. LABORATORY SCHOOL TODAY

The basic functions of the laboratory schools have shifted from the original role, earlier identified, to meet the current needs of pre-service and in-service teachers. A new conception of the laboratory

---

[22]Ohles, op. cit., p. 306.

[23]R. E. Reynard, "Pre-service and In-service Education of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, 33:377, October, 1963.

experience for future teachers, which means greater cooperation and coordination between the academic departments, the laboratory school, and the community is needed to meet the unique demands within the total framework of teacher education.[24]

Innovations such as the use of television and video-taping of demonstrations have provided a breathing spell and increased the capabilities of the laboratory school to meet the demands of increased teacher education enrollment, as well as provide further services to the in-service teacher.[25] The freeing of the laboratory facilities primarily for observation, participation, and demonstration purposes has allowed greater flexibility to fulfill the wider range of experiences needed by today's pre-service teachers. A greater utilization of the laboratory school for underclassmen is being advocated by educators so the students may gain insight into the needs and demands which will face them upon graduation.[26]

The need for the laboratory school's existence and services continues to grow although greater emphasis must be placed on the inter-departmental coordination and cooperation, as well as with the area schools. The opportunity for pre-service and in-service involvement in

---

[24]L. Rzepka, "The Campus School: Its Search for Identity," The Journal of Teacher Education, 13:29, March, 1962.

[25]Reynard, op. cit., p. 377.

[26]Bryan, op. cit., p. 275.

an excellent laboratory school can be of greatest benefit in bridging the gap between theory and practice.[27]

III. LABORATORY SCHOOL IN WISCONSIN

The historical background of the Wisconsin laboratory schools in association with state normal schools closely parallels the national development and purpose. The establishment and funding of the Wisconsin normal schools was made possible through the Federal Government Arkansas Act of 1850 which supported state colleges, universities, and academies that maintained departments for training teachers.[28] In Wisconsin, the Board of Regents appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate, was responsible for the operation of the normal schools. The purpose of the normal schools as stated in Section 37.09 of the Wisconsin Statutes was:

> . . . the instruction and training of persons, both male and female, in the theory and art of teaching . . . [29]

To fulfill the purpose of the State of Wisconsin normal schools, the importance of the laboratory or model schools has been recognized from the beginning. In the establishment of each state normal school, the

---

[27] L. E. Bradfield, "A Survey of Twenty-four Campus Elementary Schools," The Journal of Teacher Education, 6:118, June, 1955.

[28] C. E. Patzer, Public Education in Wisconsin (Madison: State Department, 1924), pp. 137-138.

[29] Wisconsin State Planning Board, Survey-Report: State Buildings, Institutions and Plants (Madison: State Department, 1942), Part V, p. 2.

laboratory school was included in the teacher education program.[30] A description of the course of study for the first normal school in Wisconsin at Platteville (established in 1866) was submitted by the Board of Regents which stated, "All students will be taught how to teach, by being required to do in the experimental school, what they must afterwards do in the public school."[31]

The initial role of the laboratory schools in Wisconsin was the observation by pre-service and in-service teachers of master teachers using superior techniques of instruction and the pre-service classroom involvement for student-teachers. The accessibility to the laboratory school for observation and participation purposes by pre-service teachers was considered a primary asset to the teacher education program.[32]

The early laboratory schools were generally housed in the main building of the normal schools and usually consisted of one or more rooms. As the enrollment of the normal and laboratory schools increased in the late 1800's the need for future separate facilities became evident.[33] Crowded conditions in the laboratory schools not only

---

[30]J. W. Stearns (ed.), The Columbian History of Education in Wisconsin (Milwaukee: Press of the Evening Wisconsin Company, 1893), p. 282.

[31]R. D. Gamble, From Academy to University 1866-1966: A History of Wisconsin State University, Platteville, Wisconsin (Platteville: Wisconsin State University, 1966), p. 105.

[32]A. Reynolds, The Training of Teachers for the Country Schools of Wisconsin (Madison: State Department, 1917), p. 44.

[33]Patner, op. cit., p. 185.

limited the implementation of innovations but created unrealistic situations for the instructors and student teachers which were "far removed from the actual conditions of regular public school teaching."[34]

Throughout the early 1900's continual examination and assessment of the laboratory school's role led to the providing of additional services for the changing needs of the pre-service and in-service teachers. The use of the laboratory school as an observation and demonstration center early in the orientation period of pre-service teachers was encouraged to acquaint them with the classroom situations they would face at a later date as student-teachers and eventually in-service teachers.[35] These added responsibilities of the Wisconsin laboratory school instructors, compounded by the futile efforts of the Board of Regents "to coordinate the work of the so-called normal departments with that of the model school and vice versa . . ."[36] hampered the effectiveness of the laboratory schools as late as the mid-1950's. To alleviate the burden on the laboratory schools and instructors with hope of improving the teacher training program, the Board of Regents in 1946 implemented a program to build new laboratory facilities.[37]

---

[34] Ibid., p. 186.

[35] Wisconsin Commission on Improvement of the Educational System, The Problem of Teacher Training in Wisconsin (Madison: State Department, 1948), p. 183.

[36] Patzer, op. cit., p. 183.

[37] The Council of the Deans of Education and Directors of Laboratory Schools, Roles and Functions of Laboratory Schools: A Report to the Council of Presidents (Wisconsin State University System, 1967), Appendix C, p. 2.

Expanding enrollments in the teacher education programs in Wisconsin as in the nation in the mid-1950's raised the need for increased cooperation with the public schools to provide for student-teaching experiences. During this time of change the role and function of the Wisconsin laboratory schools in the teacher education program was questioned. In 1959, Governor Nelson directed the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education (CCHE) to review the laboratory school's role.[38] The CCHE reported later the same year the Wisconsin laboratory schools "are absolutely essential for an effective teacher training program,"[39] i.e., for the performing of educational research, experimentation and demonstration of successful practices.[40]

At present a number of Wisconsin laboratory schools have reduced or eliminated the opportunity for pre-service teachers to student teach in the laboratory school classrooms. Instead, Wisconsin laboratory schools have placed greater emphasis, prior to the pre-service teacher's final year, on observation and participation in the laboratory school classrooms. Very little basic research is conducted in most Wisconsin laboratory schools, however instructors have increased experimentation with methods or techniques of instruction based on innovations researched elsewhere which are disseminated to pre-service and in-service teachers.[41]

---

[38] Ibid., Section II, p. 8.

[39] Ibid., Appendix I, p. 1.

[40] Ibid., Appendix I, p. 1.

[41] Ibid., Section III, p. 15.

With continued effort to identify the changing needs of pre-service and in-service teachers, the position of the Wisconsin laboratory school in the total teacher education program should remain paramount.

CHAPTER III

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF SELECTED CURRICULUM PRACTICES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS IN UNIVERSITY LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Laboratory school social science instructors are an integral part, as are other laboratory school personnel, of the total teacher education program. The opportunities provided for pre-service and in-service teachers to observe and participate freely in the laboratory school social science activities, enhance their perspective in the application of theoretical hypotheses to practical situations.

Knowledge of the functions performed by university laboratory school social science instructors is important in evaluating the services provided for the parent institution, and particularly, the pre-service and in-service teachers. A continual appraisal of the functions of the laboratory school social science program is necessary to meet the changing needs of today's public social science teacher.

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

This study was made to report the findings of a survey of the selected curriculum practices of social science programs in the eight Wisconsin State University laboratory schools in order to: (1) critically evaluate the kinds of experiences and services laboratory schools' social science instructors provide for the pre-service and in-service teachers; and to (2) ascertain the amount of inter-departmental and inter-laboratory

schools cooperation and coordination.

Information for this study was obtained from the questionnaire. On May 1, 1968, seventy-five questionnaires were distributed to Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructors, and on June 1, 1968, sixty questionnaires were returned which represented a sum total of 80.8 per cent response. The eight Wisconsin State University laboratory schools which participated and responded to the questionnaire are located in the following communities: Eau Claire; La Crosse; Oshkosh; Platteville; River Falls; Stevens Point; Superior; and Whitewater.

Pre-service responsibilities. The instruction of social science methods appears to be of minor significance in the responsibilities of the social science laboratory school instructors. The study shows that 20 per cent of those reporting are charged with this duty. Of those indicating the teaching of social science methods courses, 75 per cent taught only one course per year. There was an average enrollment of thirty-seven students in these classes. In but one case did an instructor teach three social science methods courses per year. Of those responding, 55 per cent did not attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the laboratory schools' social science methods program, although 17 per cent thought it "satisfactory," 7 per cent "highly effective," but significantly, 21 per cent considered it "ineffective."

The high involvement in observation and participation supervision by social science laboratory school instructors tends to follow the

pattern reported by campus schools nationally (see Chapter II, page 13, paragraph 2). Sixty-one per cent of the social science instructors reported supervising pre-service teachers in observation and participation experiences. The average of twenty-eight observation-participation students per term, with a minimum required involvement of nineteen hours per term, seems unrealistically high. However, 7 per cent of the instructors reporting indicated that in the sum totals reported, many pre-service teachers, especially freshmen and sophomores, had no minimum hour requirement. In the latter case, observation and participation experiences occurred as a partial fulfillment of university class requirements. Forty-two per cent of the respondents rated the social science observation and participation portion of their program as "satisfactory," 17 per cent "highly effective," and only 8 per cent felt their program to be "ineffective." One-third of the instructors did not respond to this evaluation.

Fifty per cent of the laboratory school social science instructors indicated that they supervised student-teachers. Of the total reporting, 93 per cent supervised the student-teachers in the laboratory school classroom, while 7 per cent supervised student-teachers in off-campus situations. The high percentage of responses to student-teacher supervision, whether on-campus or off-campus, is surprising. The trend nationally (see Chapter II, page 12, paragraph 2) and supposedly in Wisconsin (see Chapter II, page 17, paragraph 2) has been for greater "utilization of public schools in student-teacher placement," with a

shifting in role toward increased use of the laboratory school for observation, participation and demonstration purposes.

The average supervision of seven student-teachers per year (maximum) was reported by the laboratory school social science instructors, which is in the author's opinion, a considerable workload. Only one social science instructor involved in off-campus supervision exceeded this average. The instructor supervised an average of thirty student-teachers per year but the fact must be taken into consideration that this was the individual's major contribution to the laboratory school's social science program. In either case, on-campus or off-campus, the duration of student-teacher supervision averaged nine weeks. In evaluation of the social science student-teacher program in which university laboratory school instructors were involved, 37 per cent indicated that their program was "satisfactory," 12 per cent "highly effective," 8 per cent "ineffective," and 43 per cent gave "no response."

In-service responsibilities. The opportunity to coordinate the universities' laboratory school social science programs with those of the area public schools programs to provide maximum services for in-service teachers, does not seem to be hampered by the lack of consultation time available to laboratory school social science instructors. Sixty-four per cent of the respondents were available to meet and discuss relevant matters with area in-service teachers. However, only 13 per cent of the laboratory school social science instructors had the opportunity to visit social science classrooms in the public schools

within the service area of the institution. The fact that 80 per cent of the laboratory school social science instructors were unable to visit area schools, yet indicated their willingness and availability for consultation seem contradictory. This paradox may be explained by the need of the laboratory school social science instructor to be present as a supervisor or in the capacity of a resource person for students engaged in academic pursuits and still be available to confer within the laboratory school. This supposition is given support in that 47 per cent of the respondents consulted with area in-service teachers who visited the laboratory school. The larger number of area in-service teachers visiting the laboratory school are perhaps attributed to the granting by local school districts of a "visitation day" to their personnel. A reciprocal visit could serve to open wider channels of communication and eventual coordination of social science programs. It should be noted that only 36 per cent of the visits by in-service teachers resulted from a formal invitation extended by the laboratory school directors. This suggests an obvious need for increased public relations, not only on the director's part, but the social science laboratory school instructors as well. In several instances, individual respondents indicated taking the initiative to perform beneficial services for the in-service teachers, e.g., off-campus demonstrations, concept interpretation, and workshop participation. Further evidence of the laboratory school social science instructors' awareness of the need for increased cooperation with area in-service teachers is their

willingness to evaluate the in-service portion of the program as relatively "ineffective" (27 per cent), and only 30 per cent considered it "satisfactory." None of the respondents believed the in-service program to be "highly effective" and 43 per cent made no judgment at all.

There was a definite lack of participation by laboratory school social science instructors in social science institutes or workshops for in-service teachers. The expected leadership of the laboratory school social science instructors did not materialize and is questionable when only 15 per cent of the respondents indicated involvement in in-service programs. Although only a limited number of workshops or institutes are available annually, in 1967-1968, the public schools hosted 67 per cent of the sum total reported. There is reason to believe that the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction and related public service organizations contributed to the success of the institutes and workshops hosted by public schools. Coordination of similar undertakings between the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction and service organizations with the university laboratory school social science program could provide the in-service teacher and laboratory school social science instructor valuable assistance and further open the doors of communication. The effectiveness of the laboratory school's social science program to participate in or host workshops and institutes for the in-service teachers gained "no response" from 54 per cent of the respondents. Twenty-six per cent considered the program "ineffective," while 10 per cent thought the program to be "satisfactory," and the remaining 10 per cent state "highly effective."

A meager 3 per cent of the respondents indicated that area in-service teachers requested need for a social science institute or workshop. There were no requests by in-service teachers for assistance from the laboratory school social science instructors to aid in the implementation of institutes or workshops hosted in area public schools. Only one in-service teacher informally requested the laboratory school to host a social science institute or workshop and no inquiries were in response to formal inquiries by the laboratory school directors. These figures further substantiate the need to mend the communication breakdown, at both ends.

The data showed 23 per cent of the respondents used various devices for dissemination of social science information to in-service teachers. These devices, 35mm filmstrips, 16mm films, pamphlets, and brochures, were used sparingly. One-third of the respondents indicating use of devices for dissemination, primarily used video tapes, 35mm slides, curriculum guides, and newsletters. With greater demands placed on the laboratory school social science instructors, the increased reliance on audio-visual media may facilitate in their need to disseminate pertinent literature to the in-service teachers.

Inter-departmental coordination. The effectiveness of any academic institution or program depends on the dedication and cooperation of the membership. To ascertain the extent of cooperation and coordination existing between laboratory school social science instructors, on an inter-departmental basis, the respondents were asked to indicate the

regularity of their inter-departmental meetings. Of the 97 per cent responding to the question, 30 per cent said inter-departmental planning did take place and an alarming 67 per cent indicated no inter-departmental planning occurred on a regular basis. Whenever inter-departmental planning took place, less than half of the meetings (41 per cent) were regularly scheduled on a weekly or monthly basis. The remaining meetings occurred, "as needed," "when necessary or need shown," "sporadically," "infrequently," "no set time," and when "new innovations are suggested." Certainly regularly scheduling of meetings, even on an annual basis, would help to give positive direction to the laboratory school social science curriculum and staff. Numerous meetings does not necessarily mean that positive results are the norm, but "regularity" does suggest communication and coordination of effort. The inter-department planning program for 1967-1968 was considered "ineffective" by 37 per cent of the respondents and "satisfactory" by 25 per cent. Only 3 per cent expressed "highly effective," and 35 per cent gave "no response."

Although a high percentage of the respondents indicated there was little inter-department planning, the use of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction Curriculum Guide by 74 per cent of the laboratory school social science instructors indicates that a degree of uniformity in the laboratory schools' social science curriculums may exist. The remaining 23 per cent who reacted negatively specified, "other" guides were in use. Some of the guides used included, Science

Research Associates, Inc. (SRA) materials, laboratory school curriculum guides developed by inter-department social science instructors, and guides established by university committees in cooperation with SRA.

Inter-laboratory school coordination. The lack of coordination in the Wisconsin State laboratory school social science programs is greatest at the inter-laboratory school level. The duplication of effort, without even the advantage of comparative analysis, and the loss of time, energy and money are probable negative results occurring because of poor lines of communication. Correspondence regarding exchange of ideas, research (on-going or proposed), and coordination of programs, in essence, is non-existent.

Ninety-one per cent of the laboratory school social science instructors in the Wisconsin State University system DO NOT correspond regularly with colleagues in like positions. Only 5 per cent of the respondents reported corresponding or receiving correspondence relative to existing or proposed social science projects or programs, and only 5 per cent indicated attending meetings whereby the exchange of information concerning their projects or programs were discussed. Even though 48 per cent of the respondents did not evaluate the 1967-1968 inter-laboratory school social science planning program, a sense of dissatisfaction is indicated in that 47 per cent of those who responded believe the program to be "ineffective." Only 5 per cent were satisfied with the program.

A possible solution to this communication gap at this level could

be the development and design of a newsletter for Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science departments. Eighty per cent of the respondents recommended the circulation of the suggested publication and only 7 per cent dissented.

Bi-annual publication of the newsletter received 45 per cent approval; quarterly, 37 per cent; and annually, 17 per cent. Several individuals suggested the publication of a newsletter by each laboratory school and to include, "curriculum innovations, experiments and research" . . . at . . . "all levels, elementary to university." One Wisconsin State laboratory school is already publishing a newsletter. Publication is planned to continue because of favorable reactions from in-service teachers. Minor adverse reaction to the proposal was received as well, based on the justification, ". . . there is enough to do for the classroom teacher already . . ." The suggestion to secure the services of "necessary clerical help" to perform the perfunctory tasks would eliminate additional burden to the instructor.

It is agreed by the majority that a social science publication, to inform periodically all participants in the pursuit of excellence in social science instruction, could be a catalyst for the needed cooperation and coordination at all levels of instruction in the State of Wisconsin laboratory and public schools.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine and critically evaluate the services Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructors provide for pre-service and in-service teachers, as well as the extent of cooperation and coordination of social science programs existing at the inter-departmental and inter-laboratory school levels in the eight Wisconsin State University laboratory schools.

I. SUMMARY

A questionnaire was used to obtain information which would be relevant to the laboratory schools' social science instructors' pre-service and in-service responsibilities, and the ways in which cooperation and coordination of the social science programs at the inter-departmental and inter-laboratory school levels are conducted.

The findings of the study indicated that the Wisconsin State University laboratory school instructors provide a wide variety of experiences for the pre-service teachers but very few services for area in-service teachers. The Wisconsin laboratory school instructors, in general, stated that the inter-departmental cooperation and coordination in the planning of laboratory school social science programs was primarily spontaneous in nature and almost non-existent at the inter-

laboratory school level. However, there was general agreement among the respondents for the need to have increased cooperation and coordination with respective colleagues, and pre-service and in-service teachers to enhance the effectiveness of the State of Wisconsin's social science programs.

The author believes it would be difficult to evaluate the Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructor's contribution to the total teacher education program based only on the findings of this study. It is hoped, however, this investigation will assist in the further assessment of the Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science program's effectiveness, or the lack thereof.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions, relative to the social science instructors at the eight Wisconsin State University laboratory schools during 1967-1968, can be drawn from this study:

1. Instruction of social science methods is a minor function of the laboratory school social science instructors.
2. Providing social science observation and participation experiences for pre-service teachers is a primary function of laboratory school social science instructors.
3. Supervision of social science student-teachers in the laboratory school is a primary responsibility of the laboratory school social science instructors.

4. Lack of coordination and cooperation with in-service teachers can be attributed to little "free time" beyond the laboratory school social science classroom, i.e., "free time" is to be interpreted as the release from duties enabling the social science instructor an opportunity for off-campus visitation of in-service teachers to discuss, plan and coordinate academic programs, and to participate in off-campus demonstrations, institutes or workshops.
5. In-service teachers' requests for assistance in the implementation of, or for the laboratory school to host, social science workshops or institutes are very limited in number.
6. Greater effort is needed on the part of the laboratory school director and social science instructors to disseminate pertinent information to the in-service teacher gained through laboratory school research, experimentation and application of innovations.
7. Audio-visual media are used sparingly for dissemination of social science research data and literature.
8. Inter-department planning of social science programs are not regularly scheduled. Meetings are primarily spontaneous results of day to day demands.
9. Use of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction Curriculum Guide, "A Conceptual Framework for the Social Studies," is the principle guide used in laboratory school social science programs.

10. Communication, coordination and cooperation of inter-laboratory school social science program planning is essentially non-existant.
11. Development of a laboratory school Social Science Newsletter is recommended for inter-exchange of information and more effective utilization or coordination of social science programs.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this questionnaire study, the following recommendations seem justified.

The Wisconsin State University laboratory school social science instructors and administrators should:

1. Define the role and function of the social science program in the total education of pre-service teachers.
2. Define the role and function of the social science program in the total education of in-service teachers.
3. Develop a framework for the implementation of the recommended role and function of the social science programs.
4. Regularly schedule inter-departmental meetings to open channels of communication, coordination and cooperation for establishing continuity in the social science program.
5. Establish an inter-laboratory school organization to coordinate the social science programs.

6. Annually publish a laboratory school Social Science Newsletter for the inter-exchange of information for more effective utilization and coordination with State of Wisconsin Public School social science programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

Borrowman, M. L. (ed.). Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Cremin, L. A. Transformation of the School. First edition. Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Gamble, R. E. From Academy to University, 1866-1966: A History of Wisconsin State University, Platteville, Wisconsin. Platteville: Wisconsin State University, 1966.

Good, Carter V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Gove, Philip B. (ed.). Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Fourteenth edition. Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1961.

Patzer, C. E. Public Education in Wisconsin. Madison: State Department, 1924.

Stearns, J. W. The Columbian History of Education in Wisconsin. Milwaukee: Press of the Evening Wisconsin Company, 1893.

Wilson, L. M. Training Departments in the State Normal Schools in the United States. Illinois: Eastern Illinois State Normal School, 1920.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Judd, Charles H. and Chester S. Parker. Problems Involved in Standardizing State Normal Schools. United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1916.

Reynolds, A. The Training of Teachers for the Country Schools of Wisconsin. Madison: State Department, 1917.

C. PERIODICALS

Bradfield, Luther E. "A Survey of Twenty-four Campus Elementary Schools," The Journal of Teacher Education, 6:118-21, June, 1955.

Bryan, R. C. "The Vital Role of the Campus School," The Journal of Teacher Education, 12:275-81, September, 1961.

Lamb, Rose M. "The Laboratory School: An Historical Perspective," The Journal of Educational Research, 56:107-9, October, 1962.

Ohles, John F. "Is the Laboratory School Worth Saving," The Journal of Teacher Education, 18:304-7, Fall, 1967.

Reynard, Harold E. "Pre-Service and In-Service E ucation of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, 33:377, October, 1963.

Rzepka, Louis. "The Campus School: Its Search for Identity," Journal of Teacher Education, 13:24-9, March, 1962.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Council of Deans of Education and Directors of Laboratory Schools, Roles and Functions of Laboratory Schools: A Report to the Council of Presidents. Wisconsin State University System, 1967.

Council of Laboratory School Administrators, Statement to Council of Deans of Wisconsin State Universities. Stevens Point, Wisconsin, 1967.

Wisconsin Commission on Improvement of Educational System, The Problem of Teacher Training in Wisconsin. Madison: State Department, 1948.

Wisconsin State Planning Board, Survey-Report: State Buildings, Institutions and Plants. Madison: State Department, 1942.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE

The enclosed questionnaire is a vital part of a survey of curriculum practices of social science programs in Wisconsin State University laboratory schools. I would greatly appreciate your taking a few minutes from your already busy schedule to help with this project.

In responding to the items on the questionnaire, please report only what occurred during the academic year 1967-1968. If you taught in a self-contained classroom, please relate answers specifically to the social science program.

No attempt will be made to evaluate individual practices and your replies will be treated as confidential information.

Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE TO WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY

LABORATORY SCHOOL SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTRUCTORS

I. Availability of Wisconsin State University Laboratory Schools as Social Science Observation-Participation* Centers in Academic Year 1967-1968.

A. Pre-Service Responsibilities.

1. Did you teach a social science methods course(s) to university students? Yes__ No__

a. Number of university students you taught in social science methods course(s)? __

b. Number of social science methods courses you taught? __

c. The 1967-1968 social science methods course(s) appear to be: Please indicate "X".

ineffective__ satisfactory__ highly effective__

2. Did you supervise observation-participation experiences for teacher education students in your classroom? Yes__ No__

a. Average number of observation-participation students per term? __

b. Minimum total observation-participation hours required of each student? __

c. The 1967-1968 observation-participation program appears to have been: Please indicate "X".

ineffective__ satisfactory__ highly effective__

*A university teacher education students' involvement in classroom activities under supervision of respective instructor. Involvement may include assisting of K-9 students with studies, preparation of displays, observing group interactions or case studies of specific individuals, etc.

3. Did you supervise social science student teachers? Yes__ No__

   a. Did you supervise social science student teachers in the university laboratory school? Yes__ No__

   b. Did you supervise social science student teachers in surrounding community schools? Yes__ No__

   c. Maximum number of social science student teachers you supervised? ___

   d. Minimum number of social science student teachers you supervised? ___

   e. Duration of social science student teacher experience required? Weeks__

   f. The 1967-1968 social science student teacher program appeared to be: Please indicate "X".

      ineffective__ satisfactory__ highly effective__

B. In-Service Responsibilities.

1. Were you available to discuss or meet with social science teachers in the surrounding communities? Yes__ No__

2. Did you visit social science classrooms in the surrounding communities? Yes__ No__

3. Did social science teachers from surrounding communities visit the university laboratory school to observe and discuss your social science program? Yes__ No__

   a. Visitation was response to formal invitation extended by university laboratory school director? Yes__ No__

   b. Visitation was spontaneous and informal? Yes__ No__

   c. Specify other: _____

   d. The 1967-1968 community assistance social science program appears to be: Please indicate "X".

      ineffective__ satisfactory__ highly effective__

4. Did you participate in a social science institute or workshop provided for teachers in surrounding communities? Yes__ No__

   a. Social science institute or workshop was hosted by university laboratory school? Yes__ No__

   b. Social science institute or workshop was hosted by surrounding community school? Yes__ No__

   c. Specify other: _____

   d. The 1967-1968 social science institute or workshop program appears to be: Please indicate "X".

      ineffective__ satisfactory__ highly effective__

5. Have you received inquiries from social science teachers in surrounding communities requesting institutes or workshops? Yes__ No__

   a. Inquiries requested university laboratory school to host institutes or workshops? Yes__ No__

   b. Inquiries requested services of university laboratory school personnel to aid in implementation of institutes or workshops in surrounding community school? Yes__ No__

   c. Specify other: _____

   d. Inquiries were response to formal inquiry conducted by university laboratory school director? Yes__ No__

   e. Inquiries were spontaneous and informal? Yes__ No__

   f. Specify other: _____

   g. The 1967-1968 social science public relations progras appeared to be: Please indicate "X".

      ineffective__ satisfactory__ highly effective__

6. Did you use the following devices for dissemination of social science information to teachers in the surrounding communities? Please indicate "X". Yes___No___

Video tape___ 35mm slides___ 35mm filmstrips ___

16mm films___ Pamphlets ___ Curriculum guides___

Newsletter___ Brochures ___ Specify other: ___

II. Inter-Department and Inter-Wisconsin State University Laboratory School Social Science Coordination and Cooperation.

A. Inter-Department Planning.

1. Did you meet with other social science teachers to discuss or plan the university laboratory school social science program, i.e., current innovations, scope and sequence, student teacher policy, etc.? Please indicate "X". Yes___No___

Weekly_____ Bi-weekly_____ Monthly_____

Specify other: _____

a. The 1967-1969 inter-department planning program appears to have been: Please indicate "X".

ineffective___ satisfactory___ highly effective___

2. Did you use the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction Curriculum Guide in your social science program? Yes___No___

Specify other: _____

If available, please forward a syllabus of your scope and sequence for your grade level with return of the questionnaire.

B. Inter-Laboratory Planning.

1. Did you correspond with social science instructors at other Wisconsin State University laboratory schools concerning existing or proposed social science research projects or programs? Yes___ No___

2. Did you receive information concerning existing or proposed social science research projects or programs at other Wisconsin State University laboratory schools? Yes___ No___

3. Did you attend meetings at which social science instructors from Wisconsin State University laboratory schools exchanged information concerning existing or proposed social science research projects or programs? Please explain: Yes___ No___

   Date: _____

   Location: _____

   Subjects discussed: _____

   _____

   _____

   a. The 1967-1968 inter-laboratory school planning program appeared to have been: Please indicate "X".

      ineffective___ satisfactory___ highly effective___

   Would you recommend the development of a social science newsletter for the exchange of information concerning existing or proposed research projects, classroom innovations, etc. at Wisconsin State University laboratory schools? Yes___ No___

   Quarterly___ Bi-annually___ Annually___

   Specify other: _____

I would like a summary of the results of this study. Yes___ No___

Name: _____

Institution: _____

Comments: (Observations relevant to this questionnaire and social science pre-service or in-service programs at university laboratory schools would be appreciated.)