

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
of  
LABORATORY SCHOOLS

JOURNAL

IN THIS ISSUE:

THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF  
PENNSYLVANIA: A HISTORY OF EXCELLENCE GETTING BETTER

JOHN R. JOHNSON

WARNER E. TOBIN

PROJECT OUTREACH: EXPANDING THE MISSION OF THE  
LABORATORY SCHOOL

TIMOTHY RUSNAK

KENNETH BURRETT

A COLLEAGIALITY MODEL FOR ART EDUCATION IN THE LAB  
SCHOOL/COLLEGE OF EDUCATION: A MODEL FOR CHANGE

CHARLOTTE BUCKNER

CHILDREN AND THEIR SELF-CONCEPT

WILLIAM R. HUMPHREY

NO PARENTS ALLOWED

GEORGIANNA CORNELIUS

THE UNC LABORATORY SCHOOL AND LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER  
IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

SONDRA HUGHES

F. X. ROBERTS

VOLUME XIV NO. 1

FALL 1989

### Acknowledgement

The National Association of Laboratory Schools gratefully acknowledges the provision of support for the NALS Journal for one year by the Alexander D. Henderson University School, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida. This grant is made possible because of the Alexander D. Henderson School's association with the Henderson Foundation, a part of the Florida Atlantic University Foundation. The NALS Journal appreciates this support very much.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
of  
LABORATORY SCHOOLS  
JOURNAL

The NALS Journal is supported financially by  
the Alexander D. Henderson University School  
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.

Dr. Robert C. Hymer, Editor  
NALS Journal  
Dean's Office  
College of Education  
Jacksonville State University  
Jacksonville, Alabama 36265

Dr. Mina Bayne  
Associate Editor  
University of Wyoming

Dr. Alvin Fabre, Jr.  
Past President and Associate Editor  
Louisiana State University

Dr. Barbara Bittner  
Associate Editor  
Florida Atlantic University

Dr. Katherine Knighten  
Associate Editor  
Ball State University

Dr. Leon Book  
Associate Editor  
Southeast Missouri State University

Dr. Gregory Ulm  
President and Associate Editor  
Indiana State University

VOLUME XIV NO. 1

FALL 1989

c August, 1989, National Association of Laboratory Schools

## CONTENTS

	Page
OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS . . . . .	iv
FEATURE	
The University School at Indiana University of Pennsylvania: A History of Excellence Getting Better John R. Johnson & Warner E. Tobin . . . . .	1
INNOVATION	
TEACHER EDUCATION	
Project Outreach: Expanding the Mission of the Laboratory School Timothy Rusnak & Kenneth Burrett . . . . .	10
FUNCTIONS, HISTORY & FUTURE OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS	
A Collegiality Model for Art Education in the Lab School/College of Education: A Model for Change Charlotte Buckner . . . . .	17
OPINION	
STUDENT GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT	
Children and Their Self-Concept William R. Humphrey . . . . .	24
PARENT RELATIONSHIPS	
No Parents Allowed Georgianna Cornelius . . . . .	33
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	
FUNCTIONS, HISTORY & FUTURE OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS	
The UNC Laboratory School and Library Media Center in Historical Perspective Sondra Hughes & F. X. Roberts . . . . .	40
INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS....Inside Back Cover	

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS

OFFICERS

President ..... Dr. Gregory Ulm  
Indiana State University  
President Elect ..... Dr. Mina Bayne  
University of Wyoming  
Past President ..... Dr. Alvin Fabre, Jr.  
Louisiana State University  
Executive Secretary ..... Dr. John Johnson  
Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
Recording Secretary ..... Dr. James Fox  
Louisiana State University  
Editor of NALS Journal ..... Dr. Robert C. Hymer  
Jacksonville State University, Alabama  
Editor of Newsletter ..... Dr. Judith Hechtman  
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS

One-year Term 1988-89 ..... Dr. Russell Ames  
University of Illinois, Urbana  
..... Dr. Loretta Krause  
University of Hawaii  
..... Dr. Sandra Tsurutome  
Florida Atlantic University  
Two-year Term 1988-90 ..... Dr. Roy Creek  
University of Pittsburgh  
..... Dr. Patricia McDonald  
Minot State University  
..... Dr. Kenneth Miller  
Ball State University  
Three-year Term 1988-91 ..... Dr. Barbara Bittner  
Florida Atlantic University  
..... Dr. Crayton Buck  
State University College at Buffalo  
..... Dr. Ann Baldwin Taylor  
Carnegie-Mellon University

\* \* \* \* \*

FEATURE ARTICLE

Editor's Note: The Executive Board of the National Association of Laboratory Schools has authorized the inclusion of a feature article in each edition of the National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal. This article, which will be written upon invitation, will highlight one of the member laboratory schools and give a description of the school and its functions. The following article is one in this series:

\* \* \* \* \*

THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

A HISTORY OF EXCELLENCE GETTING BETTER

John R. Johnson

Warner E. Tobin

University School

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Indiana, Pennsylvania

The Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) Laboratory School founded in 1875, has had a long and successful history as a model for higher education as well as basic education. Now operated as a laboratory of human resources with 160 children, it averages over 14,000 observations and participations by inservice and preservice education majors each year.

History

The Indiana University of Pennsylvania Laboratory School was created in 1875 as a "model school" to model new teaching methods and theories of instruction for normal school students studying to be teachers, and for

public school teachers in the community. The first building to house the Model School was John Sutton Hall, the first and only building for a long period of time on the campus of the then Indiana Normal School. John Sutton Hall housed all classrooms, the dining room, the dormitory, the library, the chapel, the sitting room, the President's apartment, the laundry, and the administrative offices along with the Model School. This building, with four floors above ground and a basement was the tallest building within a 50-mile radius. This building still stands on the campus and was completely restored to its original Victorian splendor with its 15-foot ceilings in 1981.

The model school, like many other early laboratory schools, served as the site for senior student teaching experiences. At that time, the student population of the normal school was approximately 250 and the student population of the model school was 80 pupils aged 8 to 18.

In 1883, the Model School was moved to a building of its own. Wilson Hall, which also still stands on the IUP campus, was reflective of the typical two-story academies or schools built in that era in western Pennsylvania. The classrooms were large with many windows to permit maximum natural lighting.

In 1939 the Model School was again relocated to a larger new facility bearing the name of Keith School in honor of John A. H. Keith, a former president of the then Indiana State Teacher's College. This structure, similar to many other high schools built in Pennsylvania from 1920 to 1940, contained the modern conveniences of metal lockers in the halls, coat presses in the back of each room, a large gym, and a large auditorium style demonstration room. It was from the demonstration room that "model" lessons were taught to a classroom of students for the benefit of those college students studying to be teachers. The class being taught was assembled on the lower

level of the room; and the observers, with pencil and paper in hand, sat in permanently mounted auditorium style seats around the outside edge of the room in two elevated rows. When possible, at the end of each lesson, the master teacher remained in the room to field questions and comments from the observers.

While the laboratory school was housed in Keith Hall, the scope of the school ran from K-10 with full offerings in every subject. The subjects taught in the Keith School provided a wide range of experiences needed to accommodate the increasing offerings of the expanding numbers of education majors attending the teacher's college.

In 1969 another new building was built to house the Departments of Elementary Education, Special Education, Communications Media, Educational Psychology, Counselor Education, the dean's offices, the radio and television studios and the newly renamed "University School." The motivation for this move was the enactment of legislation by the state legislature in 1965 changing Indiana State Teacher's College to Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Up to this point, all offerings on the campus were in the field of education. With the virtual overnight establishment of university status--budget, space, faculty, and money resources needed to be reallocated to accommodate the needs of the fledgling university. As a result, in addition to other re-aligning moves, it was deemed necessary to reduce the scope of the school from K-10 orientation to K-6. This allowed for resources to be reallocated to assist in strengthening and creating academic departments to expand offerings for students in areas other than education.

Since that simple beginning 114 years ago, the normal school at Indiana has evolved into a major state (Pennsylvania) university with 13,500 students, offering programs on three campuses at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral

levels. The University School itself has evolved into a laboratory of human resources, grades kindergarten through 6th grade, with a modified open concept school environment utilizing cooperative curriculum planning with University School faculty, University faculty, University students, graduate assistants, and teaching associates. The University School continues to provide the opportunity for University faculty and their students, and teachers in-service to observe and participate in exemplary teaching and learning experiences. Yearly numbers of individual observations and participations have averaged 14,000 each year since 1980. In addition, new and unique programs have been developed and introduced which are available to share with basic education. Some of these include programs for the handicapped--mental and physical--the hearing impaired; Chinese language and culture; thematic teaching of Chinese in the subject areas; multicultural education; art education; instrumental and vocal music; an avant garde, highly successful band program which has demonstrated the teaching techniques nationally; and a complete computer instruction curriculum for grades K-6.

#### Faculty

Faculty of the University School, a department in the College of Education, are considered full-time, tenured faculty members. Sixty-nine percent are full time with 31% of the faculty assigned from other departments of the University. For example, the teachers of Music, Art, and Physical Education are assigned to work half time teaching in their academic department on campus and half time teaching in the University School. This arrangement has served to strengthen the maximum use of the school as a laboratory for education majors while providing a realistic mix of theory with observable and interactive practice.

Since 1983, all new faculty hired must possess a doctorate. This same policy is true for all faculty in all departments on the campus. Salary and increases for the faculty are guaranteed by the collective bargaining unit contract. This contract is the same contract negotiated by the 14 Pennsylvania state-owned universities in the State System of Higher Education (SSHE). Specified in the contract, faculty of laboratory schools are required to work a minimum of 35 contact hours each week. This is in addition to time spent in planning, meetings, and consultation with university students and faculty.

#### Tuition

For the first 107 years of the school's existence no tuition was charged to students attending the school. All operating costs were covered in the regular University budget. However, in 1982, a voluntary yearly contribution of \$40.00 was requested from parents of students attending the school which was used to purchase materials and supplies used directly in the instruction of the students. In 1985, the Board of Trustees of the University initiated a mandatory yearly-increasing tuition which will be \$300.00 per student in 1989-90. In addition, each student is assessed a health services fee which covers the cost of a half-time school nurse which is provided by the health center on campus. The tuition fees collected are used by the school for the purchase of materials and equipment for the students and to underwrite field trips.

In addition, an account in the Foundation for IUP provides for parent and other benefactor tax-deductible contributions in the name of the University School. Some of the monies are restricted for particular donor projects or uses while other monies may be used at the mutually agreed upon discretion of the faculty for special unbudgeted purchases. Currently a special fund

has been established in the foundation to pay for the development of a school playground which has been nonexistent since 1969.

#### Current Mission of the School

The mission of the University School at Indiana University of Pennsylvania is to serve as an exemplary model of educational research, theory-based curriculum, and instruction in daily practice.

It is recognized, on the IUP Campus, that an expanded role of the laboratory school necessitates a research facility and staff to accomplish the formulated goals of the College of Education. To this end, support has been given to develop an experimental program which makes research possible.

The University School faculty members work together to combine their knowledge and specialized talents to create innovative educational programs which are piloted, refined, and disseminated. The University School provides a quality educational environment serving as a resource facility for:

1. a heterogeneous population of regular and special education students K-6;
2. graduate and undergraduate University students preparing for careers as professional educators;
3. other University faculty members conducting research and involved in pre-service clinical experiences;
4. elementary school teachers and administrators requesting assistance in staff and curriculum development; and
5. the professional education community at large through dissemination, including presentations and publications.

The IUP University School believes in a life long learning orientation for faculty members supporting active professional participation in roles as educators, mentors, coordinators, consultants, researchers, presenters, and

scholars. To this end, the University, through the Pennsylvania statewide Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties bargaining unit, created a Doctoral Teaching Associate Program to provide released time for faculty to engage in scholarly activity and research. For the IUP University School this has meant that since 1987 some of the faculty in the School have been awarded a Teaching Associate to work in the regular classroom to release the teacher half time. The Teaching Associate must be enrolled in advanced doctoral studies in the Department of Professional Studies and working on a terminal degree in Elementary Education. For their work as half-time instructors in the school, the teaching associates receive half of a beginning Instructor level salary and tuition remission. The Teaching Associate may be renewed for up to two additional years thus providing continuity and stability to the educational program of the school.

While being released, the master teacher must work on personally identified, but administratively approved, research and/or curriculum development projects. It is expected that the projects will result in publications and/or presentations at regional and national conferences. A semesterly accounting of productivity is reviewed to determine eligibility for continuance of release for scholarly work. This new and unique program has provided the faculty of the University School with the necessary time to more adequately do that which was always expected in addition to the full-time job of being personally responsible for a full classroom of students and coordinating thousands of college student observations and participations.

#### Examples of Educational Research at the School

The IUP University School works in concert with researchers through united cooperative planning for a research project and by providing the student population for a particular study. One recent example was a poster

presentation at the National Academy of Neuropsychologists regarding research conducted by Rattan and others at the IUP University School utilizing the "Older Children's Category" test as a measure of concept formation and prediction of cerebral integrity.

Other materials produced by University School faculty and graduate students include: (a) An Introduction to Chinese Language and Culture for Young American Students, (b) A Guide for Thematic Teaching about China in American Schools, and (c) A Kindergarten Through Grade Six Computer Instruction Curriculum.

The IUP University School envisions as its future role, a continuation of the curricular research, creation of lighthouse programs, and the demonstration of these programs to its interested publics. For the near future it is intended to strengthen ties with Shanghai Teacher's University and its Laboratory School. This will include utilization of computers, modems, and printers to experiment with common educational curricular units between classrooms of the two schools. It is also intended to exchange faculty and children for short term visits.

#### Students of the School

As is the case with most laboratory schools, the IUP University School provides an excellent education for the students attending in addition to all the other functions it performs. The students attending the school come from eight nearby school districts, with only 40% having parents with occupational affiliation at IUP. As has been tracked both formally and informally, graduates of the school consistently do very well in all they attempt. Repeatedly it is noted that students who attend the University School are better prepared to cope with change and are more flexible, self-reliant, independent, self-starting, and know how to maximize the use of their time. Among the

most famous of the University School attendees is Mr. Jimmy Stewart, world famous actor and hometown boy of Indiana, PA, who attended the then Model School in the 1920s.

#### Conclusions

The Laboratory School movement in the United States is still visible, strong and ever changing. On the IUP Campus the need for the laboratory school is an essential and vital part of the curricular development effort and continues to be extremely important. It is a place that weaves together the reality of school with the theory of the curriculum researcher. The IUP University School is a place where bold ventures in curriculum design can be conceptualized, worked on, developed, and disseminated.

PROJECT OUTREACH: EXPANDING THE MISSION  
OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL

Timothy Rusnak  
Falk Laboratory School  
Kenneth Burrett  
Duquesne University  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their thanks to the Northeast Regional Laboratory Schools Association whose initial grant made this project possible. Also to Dean Dorothy Frayer of Duquesne University, and Dr. Roy J. Creek, Director of Falk Laboratory School at University of Pittsburgh, for their support and encouragement.

Project Outreach was designed to address the mutual interests of the Falk Laboratory School of the University of Pittsburgh and the School of Education of Duquesne University. The goal was to link these institutions by making the Laboratory School and its resources available for observation and practicum purposes by Duquesne students.

Benefits have resulted from this involvement. Falk School became a "hub" for teacher education by demonstrating and modeling prototype teaching methods. Furthermore, by extending itself beyond the University of Pittsburgh, the school has gained recognition for its excellent programs through its contact with future teachers and reaffirmed its regional leadership as a teacher development center.

Also, by investing itself with another university and a broader base of future teachers, Falk School will increase its sphere of influence. As more education students from different institutions utilize the Laboratory School and assume teaching positions in the region, they will persuade others to view the laboratory school as a significant resource.

#### Falk Laboratory School

Falk School performs the five major functions that are ascribed to laboratory schools (Goodlad, 1980). They include: (a) the education of the children enrolled according to the best established educational principles, (b) the development of new and innovative practices within a context of experimentation, (c) research, inquiry, and the development of theory pertaining to the conduct of education, (d) the preparation of new teachers, (e) the in-service education of experienced teachers through demonstration and discussion of the principles underlying the practice observed. Creek (1984) suggests that not only does Falk Laboratory School support these five functions, but it serves the educational community by acting as a bridge between research and practice.

The Personalized Progress Plan, a multi-aged, nongraded, research-based program in which instruction is adapted to meet children's needs, has been the centerpiece of the learning environment at Falk Laboratory School. An experienced, well-qualified faculty is committed to teacher education and research support programs and practices of the school (The Falk School Internal-Study, 1985).

-- The ability of Falk Laboratory School to develop exemplary programs is paralleled by the need for an institution like Duquesne University to use outstanding schools in their practicum program. Few schools have priority

commitments to teacher education, and many fall short in meeting the needs of developing teachers. Also, few public and private schools work to extrude practice from educational theory. This harbors the impression that would-be teachers leave theory in the University and learn to teach in a more practical way.

### The Duquesne Undergraduate Practicum

Not far from Falk Laboratory School is the campus of Duquesne University. This mid-sized institution operates the largest teacher education program in the Pittsburgh area. It is a practicum-based program, grounded in the belief that prospective teachers learn best by working in a variety of school environments. Starting in the freshman year, students are placed in a series of well-supervised teaching sites. Close care is given to the individual progress of every student. Each semester students are assigned to a different teaching environment. As the field sites change, so do the grade levels and types of schools. Therefore, students experience public, private, middle, elementary, inner-city, and suburban school classrooms before graduation. The orchestration of such an intricate program is supported by a committed faculty and well-designed program of studies.

### Implementation

Issues of scheduling, evaluation, and administrative policy were discussed in the fall of 1986 prior to the implementation of Project Outreach. It was decided that junior year education students would participate in a pilot project. These students would report to the Laboratory School two days a week for six weeks beginning in February of 1987.

Supervision of these students was left to the classroom teacher. However, initial visits and evaluations by a Supervisor from Duquesne University

would help ensure communication as the program emerged. Coordination and administration of the program was in the hands of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education at Duquesne with consent from the Director of Falk Laboratory School. Placement and on-site administration of students was the responsibility of the Supervisor of Student Teachers at Falk School.

During January of 1987, classroom teachers at the Laboratory school were briefed on the Duquesne Student Teaching System. Teachers were aware that each student had a background in classroom learning theory with limited classroom experience and observation. The task of the Falk School teacher was to ensure guided classroom practice and feedback. Students were briefed on their responsibility to complete three objectives: (a) complete observation reports on the implementation of the curriculum in a multi-aged classroom situation, including classroom structure, pupil-teacher interaction, and instructional technique; (b) assist teachers in instruction through administrative and support tasks, e.g., checking papers, erecting bulletin boards, etc.; (c) teach both individuals and small groups for specific skill development.

Project Outreach began early in February of 1987. Ten junior year undergraduate students reported, commencing the first formal relationship between the two largest Schools of Education in the Pittsburgh area. Students were oriented to the philosophy, policies, and practices of the school by the Supervisor of Student Teaching and assigned their room placements. Careful consideration was given to the policy of Duquesne University with respect to grade level experiences for each student. Eight students were placed in the Primary and Intermediate grades while two placements were assigned to the Middle School.

For six weeks beginning in February and extending through March of 1987, twice each week, Duquesne students worked in the classrooms of Falk Laboratory School. As planned, their active engagement with children was observed by both classroom teachers and supervisors. Feedback with both students and university personnel was maintained throughout the program. The Duquesne University pre-student teaching evaluation form was used for evaluation purposes. This instrument enables the student and supervising teacher to focus on three aspects of the practicum experience. The first part addresses professional skill development, i.e., the ability of the university student to work with and respond to the needs of children. The second element of the evaluation is described as personal development, which highlights the need for the student to work successfully with teachers and other professionals in the school to bring about a constructive classroom environment. The third part of the evaluation deals with the completion of university assignments in the classroom and with the implementation of pedagogical theory through practice with children.

Upon the conclusion of the six-week experiment, supervisory staff met with teachers to evaluate the initial phase of Project Outreach. By any measure--teachers, students, and program coordinators concluded that Project Outreach was a success. Noteworthy were the observations that the experience was not only beneficial for prospective teachers but also for the faculties of Falk and Duquesne as well. All strongly backed the plan of expanding the program to include more observation and practicum experiences.

In the Fall of 1987, the first contingent of student teachers from Duquesne University were assigned to Falk Laboratory School for their final practicum. Their successful completion of the program and their positive

feedback of the experience were testament to the benefits possible by integrating a laboratory school into the teacher education program at Duquesne University.

#### Discussion

Project Outreach was designed to explore the possibilities of developing better teachers through a complementary relationship between two teacher education institutions. Through the development of this relationship, the laboratory school will benefit from stronger ties with fellow teacher educators, increased visibility within the local school community, and the opportunity to expand its scope as a developer of teacher talent and as a teaching center. Duquesne University, through its comprehensive approach to teacher education, also benefits as it finds a well-trained cadre of teacher educators with whom to place its practicum students to validate the relationship between theory and practice.

The success of Project Outreach is another example of the effectiveness of a laboratory school. By developing strong shared relationships between major, but different teacher education institutions, Project Outreach serves as an example for everyone committed to teacher education. Moreover, it refocuses the attention of the academic community and the public schools on the laboratory school. Serving as a "hub" for teacher development, the laboratory school enhances its viability in the eyes of the public school community, while meeting its mission within the University.

## References

- Creek, R. J. (1984). The educational laboratory of the future. National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 9(2), 47-53.
- Falk Laboratory School faculty. (1985). Falk Laboratory School internal study. Unpublished manuscript, Falk Laboratory School, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Goodlad, J. (1980). How laboratory schools go awry. UCLA Educator, 21(2), 47.

A COLLEAGIALITY MODEL FOR ART EDUCATION  
IN THE LAB SCHOOL/COLLEGE OF EDUCATION:

A MODEL FOR CHANGE

Charlotte Buckner  
College of Education  
University School  
University of Wyoming  
Laramie, Wyoming

Many people avoid change and some even fear change. Change is a challenge. Change is an exciting opportunity to grow personally and professionally. We live in a changing world and especially a changing educational world. The complexities for implementing a model for change can be quite threatening. Who has the time?

The University School at the University of Wyoming is a laboratory school. Instructional innovations are not only encouraged, but also required.

Recently our laboratory school was on the verge of extinction. Reasons included operational expenses and the belief that teacher education, in general, needed vast improvement, as indicated in many national reports. University budget cuts seemed to be aimed toward programs that were characterized by high cost and questionable productivity. Our administrators, faculty, and staff rallied to support any changes that may assure our survival. One of the changes was a merger. The faculty voted to merge the Department of Curriculum and Instruction with the University School. This merger opened up many possibilities for closing the gap between theory and practice in the college. Most of the faculty jumped on this bandwagon of change. We agreed to work more closely together to improve teacher education and the education of children in our college. We were dedicated to changing the program for the better.

We had total support from the University School coordinator, Judy Minier; the Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, Wells Singleton; and the Dean of the College of Education, James Hook. These leaders granted release time and funding for the project. Johnson and Johnson (1986) states: "In many schools there is a lack of collegiality" (p. 107), and that "One of the most constructive contributions you can make to your schools is to encourage cooperation among teachers" (p. 87). The administrators believed in our collaborative endeavors and supported our integrated learning programs to strengthen the link between the University School teachers and the Curriculum and Instruction professors in order to improve the status of our graduating teachers and the quality of our laboratory school.

Faculty members interested in art education reviewed several models before instigating our own model for change. One was "Differentiated Staffing." Scobey and Florino (1973), editors of an Association of Curriculum and Development publication, define differentiated staffing as "a planned operational model for staff utilization. It takes advantage of the differences in teaching specialties, experiences, talents, and ambitions, compensating for them in differentiated levels of assigned instructional responsibility, time, and salary" (p. 6). This concept has developed beyond the limitations of teacher utilization and benefits but is an acceptable springboard for our purpose. Other models were "FIO: flexible instructional organization" (Scobey, 1973), integrated learning, job sharing, and cooperative learning.

Capitalizing on the strengths of the individual teacher was the basic premise for our art education model for change in the College of Education. Team members were Thomas Smucker, Associate Professor of Curriculum and

Instruction, Art Education; Sherry Anderson, certified art teacher and substitute teacher in the lab school; and Charlotte Buckner, University School Art Educator. Because we are in the business of educating both college students and young people together, and sometimes in the same classroom, we needed to develop a different model to suit our particular goals and objectives. We established three basic goals.

Our main goal was to offer a more in-depth study program for college students and for students in seventh, eighth and ninth grades, based upon our individual strengths as teachers. The second goal was to establish a precedent for camaraderie among the faculty, and the third was to grow personally and professionally.

By establishing cooperative goals that we all planned to accomplish, by instigating a network of trust, by planning together, and by providing feedback about each other's teaching, as colleagues, we began to develop cooperative interaction in this coordination of efforts. We seemed to constantly be in need of communication with each other and met frequently, mostly informally. Johnson and Johnson (1986) claim that "there is a deep human need to collaborate and build personal relationships with supportive peers, and to learn how to structure relationships among teachers cooperatively" (p. 107). We tried to focus on the belief that the students would learn more from us collectively rather than individually, although we maintained our individuality. Allen (1975) states that "more flexible methods of teaching mean that teachers begin to question the traditional methods . . . and often feel the need to cooperate with other teachers or take advantage of a colleague's particular skills" (p. 9).

We then discussed our strengths. Tom Smucker, associate professor of art education, teaches college students how to teach art in the elementary

and secondary schools. He is also an accomplished potter. Charlotte Buckner teaches art to students in grades nursery through ninth at the lab school and has taught art methods courses in the summer. Buckner is an accomplished painter. Buckner has about 15 years experience in teaching art and Smucker has 25 years of experience. Sherry Anderson has a strong background in crafts and photography and has taught in the lab school for six years. Buckner (1983) states that the concept of sharing job responsibilities includes "utilizing teachers' individual talents for maximum educational benefit to students." We felt that the use of our individual talents would strengthen the program.

We first needed to establish a trust for each other's abilities and expertise before relinquishing our treasured territories to each other. We needed to take the risk. Timpson (1982) claims that risks are important in building confidence and stretching capacities, and he states that "developing potential requires the taking of risks" (p. 5). Another goal, then, was to grow professionally and personally from this experience.

Our weaknesses, as well as our strengths, centered around the diversity of our backgrounds and our methods of instruction. Smucker taught art methods to college students and felt the need to also teach younger students in order to improve his instructional skills and to bridge the gap of theory and practice. Buckner taught art to younger students and supervised students from Smucker's art methods classes during their practicum assignments. Buckner felt a need to teach art methods to the practicum students to improve the transition of theory and practice. Anderson was needed to distribute evenly the teaching load and to offer her expertise in crafts and photography.

Using our combined backgrounds and instructional methods, we decided on how we could strengthen the program and accomplish our goals. Buckner taught

an art methods course called the "Professional Semester: Teaching Art in the Elementary School." The professional semester students were in a program that required an extensive art practicum experience. Buckner taught art methods to students and then supervised their elementary school practical teaching experience to create a comprehensive and cohesive flow of theory and practice. Smucker taught the pottery art elective course to seventh, eighth, and ninth graders and supervised his secondary art methods students in their art practicum assignments. Anderson taught a course in photography and taught the art electives, alternating with Buckner. Lessons were planned and taught both by us individually or as a team. All of us also shared rooms and offices.

The University School students benefitted from our collaboration. They seemed to appreciate the relationships that they developed with the three teachers, and they liked the variety we offered as a team. They realized how much more they could learn through a cooperative effort on their behalf. We, as instructors, realized that the results were positive and that our goals were being accomplished.

Our goal to offer a more in-depth study program for students was achieved in the ceramics class, the photography class, and the art methods professional semester class. Because of our separate and individual strengths, combined with our collaborative efforts, we were able to realize our potential and reached our goal of professional and personal growth. Our belief that the students would learn more from us collectively gained momentum, and we felt that this focus was worthwhile and successful. The program was a success in many ways, even though we had some problems to solve during the semester.

Most of the problems involved the acceptance of change by the students and teachers. For example, the professional semester students questioned

Buckner's ability to teach art methods; and Buckner did not have total confidence in that realm of instruction, either. By the same token, the college students realized some of the pitfalls that they may encounter their first year of teaching. This problem was soon solved with the help of Smucker's advice and the gained experience in on-the-job training. The secondary ceramics students attempted to test Smucker's classroom management skills, but they soon realized the potential of learning a great deal from an accomplished potter and settled down to learn. The art electives students, at first, rebelled against not having their "regular" art teacher all the time but quickly realized that both Anderson and Buckner were seriously and wholeheartedly trying to provide an interesting and meaningful art experience for them. They began to like the variety of lessons and the fact that two teachers were devoting all that attention to them at once.

These difficulties could not have been addressed and corrected without constantly meeting and discussing the program with each other. These meetings made us realize a common need for teacher professional support groups. Johnson and Johnson (1986) state that "there is no doubt that teachers teach better when they experience support from their peers" (p. 73). They further state that "structuring teachers into professional support groups can have important effects on teacher morale as well as on their competence, and structuring a clear cooperative interdependence among teachers has numerous advantages over encouraging competitive or individualistic relationships" (p. 107). Of course, the group must allow time for discussion. We discovered that the enthusiasm generated for the program was paramount to the extra time involved. We felt that this experience provided camaraderie and shared success and improved our competence. We all worked toward a common goal to improve teacher education and the education of children at the University of Wyoming, College of Education.

## References

- Allen, I. (1975). Working an integrated day. London, UK: Ward Lock Educational.
- Brandt, R. S. (Ed). (1979). Partners: Parents and schools. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Buckner, A. L. (1983). Job sharing study report. Laramie, WY: Albany County School District 1.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. (1986). Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.
- Scobey, M., & Fiorino, A. J. (Eds.) (1973). Differentiated staffing. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Timpson, W. M., & Tobin, D. N. (1982). Teaching as performing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

## CHILDREN AND THEIR SELF-CONCEPT

William R. Humphrey

Laboratory School  
Southeastern Louisiana University  
Hammond, Louisiana

John Quincy Adams held more important government offices than anyone else in the history of the United States. He served with distinction as President, Senator, Congressman, minister to major European powers, and participated in various capacities in the American Revolution, the War of 1812, and events leading to the Civil War. Yet at age 70 with much of this behind him, he would write . . . "My whole life has been a succession of disappointments. I can scarcely recollect a single instance of success in anything that I ever undertook" (Kennedy, 1956).

What explains the difference in how persons such as Adams look at themselves and feel about themselves when compared to how others evaluate them? Differences are hard to explain, but experience testifies to the fact that they are there--for teachers, for administrators, and for children.

Self-concept is the sum total of the view we, as individuals, have of ourselves. The individual's self-concept is a unique set of perceptions, ideas, and attitudes a person senses pertaining to himself or herself.

Perception is the sensory data we receive from our surroundings. Much of these data are about ourselves. Close your eyes and quickly visualize a picture of yourself. Think about the picture. Did you see yourself as heavier than you are? . . . More slender? Did you see yourself as you are, or as you used to be, or as you would like to be? Every individual sees himself or herself differently.

The self also contains a set of unique ideas, and ideas are the central factor in the term "self-concept." The set of ideas which people have about themselves defines who and what they are. It is only as they absorb the sensory data and attach meaning to them that they can be said to have self-concept. The meanings attached to sensory data are the conclusions the people come to about themselves from perceptions of their environment. As meanings become definite ideas, they operate to define and, in turn, give meaning to new data which are received; and the whole process becomes circular.

The third aspect of self-concept is self-attitude. In addition to receiving perceptions and developing them into ideas of what kind of individual we are, we develop a set of attitudes about ourselves. Perceptions are received and come to individuals from the environment. Ideas are developed from perceptions and become internal thoughts about the self. Ideas and internal thoughts develop into attitudes which are aimed at the self. Attitudes occupy the dual role of both having and receiving. People have attitudes and they aim them at themselves. Because self-attitudes are directed inward, the emotions aroused by these attitudes are powerful. We cannot walk away from an attitude that both comes from and is directed inward--further, they are not easily controlled.

The self-concept is a dynamic circular force in human lives. Every person is influenced by those around him or her. The people who are important to a person influence what one thinks of oneself. The experiences which an individual has every day indicate to oneself that he or she is competent, incompetent, good, bad, worthy or unworthy. As though he or she were an individual in the center of an arena, the individual receives information and attitudes from all sides at once.

Further, it is believed that the conceptions people have of themselves are learned through social interaction, how other people respond to them. The self-concept is acquired, not inherited--it is based on relationships we all have with our immediate families and significant persons in our lives. Infants are born without a self-concept but through social interaction acquire one.

The self-concept's active role in shaping behavior gives it primary importance for those who attempt to understand the behavior of children. The child will act in ways which he or she thinks are consistent with the ways the individual child perceives oneself. If the child feels unable to perform a certain task--that he or she is dumb, the child is likely to behave in such a way as to come out looking dumb.

A child's inner feelings about himself or herself are often the root cause of many difficulties. The child's inner self may rebel against loved ones, school rules, and routines, all because the child feels inadequate, unloved, stupid, or ugly. This negativeness usually manifests itself in two ways: a feeling of being unable to cope with the world or the feeling of being unlovable.

When encountering a child with negative self-concept, the teacher faces an enormous task: to wade through every experience that has come before--to get to basic child--and teach him or her.

The manner in which children speak about themselves and the behavior they display provides us with information about how they view themselves. A typical kindergarten child with a positive self-image is not afraid of new situations. This child makes friends easily, experiments with new materials, and trusts one's teachers. The child is cooperative, able to follow reasonable rules, and assumes responsibility for his or her behavior. This child

is creative, imaginative, talks freely, listens well, and generally enjoys life. The child with low self-concept, on the other hand, reflects the opposite characteristics of relying on others for directions, asking permission to do anything. This child seldom shows spontaneity or initiative, rarely enters new activities, and isolates himself or herself from others. The child rarely talks, is possessive of objects, and makes excessive demands.

There are many ways children get these undesirable feelings about themselves. Four common causes are through overprotection, domination, neglect, and abuse (Yawkey, 1980).

Overprotection by parents, particularly the mother, during the child's beginning years often leads to instability. Domination is a more direct form of overprotection. Making decisions for a child and directing the child's every move is telling the child he or she is not trusted and is not capable of directing his or her own life. Neglecting and abusing tells a child he or she is unworthy in the eyes of the parents. When parents are constantly too busy for a child, the child often reverts to negative behavior to seek attention.

Children with positive self-concepts feel capable, likeable, and valued. They realize their own human worth and potential. Children with negative self-concepts often are in trouble at home or at school or in other relationships. They react by displaying negative behavior. The purpose behind the behavior is to get revenge for the destruction of the positive self--or to obtain a substitute for love--such as attention. Buried resentments impair learning.

When we watch children in their pre-school years, we see that they do things at which they are successful. If they fail at an activity, they will either work to master it or choose not to engage in it. When the child comes

to school, the situation is fundamentally changed. For many students the activities at school are not rewarding. They experience difficulty gaining competence, but they are still required to engage in the activity. The child who says, "I don't want to work on math, because I'm not good at it," is simply following the natural desire to do that which is satisfying. The rules the child meets at schools are just the opposite. If the child is not good at something, he or she must spend more time on that activity. If the child can see step-by-step success, the activity can be satisfying; but if the child experiences no satisfaction, asking him or her to deal with this failure is like asking the child to bang his or her head against the wall.

One of the major tasks of self-concept development is the acquisition of a system for dealing with incompetencies and failures. The system for dealing with failure or the development of such a system takes on prime importance when the child goes to school. The concept of learning involves the idea of moving on to greater competencies but it also involves the idea of being incompetent at any point along the way. The role of the school in self-concept development is crucial. There is evidence, however, that the schools do not meet the problems of enhancing self-concept. School by its very nature has a detrimental effect on the self image of the child. Students who enter school with a positive self-concept and have mechanisms for maintaining this self-concept are able to adjust to school even though they may have some difficulty. But for the children who do not have these mechanisms, the school situation only compounds their problems and increases the negative load which they must handle. Consequently, the pressures of school are likely to adversely affect those pupils who are already most hindered.

It is well established that a relationship between self-concept and academic achievement exists. It is consistently found that positive self-concept

is related to good academic achievement. This relationship is found in early and middle elementary grades and high school.

The individual with low ability who meets failure would be expected to develop a negative self-concept. But the relationship between self-concept and achievement seems to be based on more than inadequate ability. It has been found that self-concept adds significantly to the prediction of performance even when ability measures are taken into account. It has been found that low self-concept is characterized by significant underachievement; that is, the individual with a low self-concept does less well than expected when only one's ability measures are taken into account (Shaw & Alves, 1963). One explanation which can be given is that achievement and self-concept interact. The low self-concept could produce low performance, which, in turn, would produce lower performance (Felker, 1972).

Another possible explanation for the relationship is that low self-concept inhibits the individual's participation in learning tasks. It has been found that high-curiosity boys have higher self-concepts than a counter group of low-curiosity boys (Maw & Maw, 1970). Various aspects of creativity have also been found to be related to self-concept (Felker & Treffinger, 1971). If the curious and creative person is more able to seek out information and tasks, a low or negative self-concept could inhibit this behavior and produce lower performance.

There are two other findings of particular interest to teachers. One is that the positive relationship between academic achievement and self-concept appears to be more definite in boys than girls.

Another important concept is that students learn according to the way they see themselves. In a study by Dr. Suzanne Faust, it was found that students achieve at certain levels not out of ability alone but in keeping with

the picture they have of themselves as learners. She discovered that a significant number of students failed even when they could have succeeded at an almost perfect level of performance.

In other words, students are likely to behave or achieve in accordance with their self-picture rather than according to ability. They fail when they could succeed if they see themselves as a failure-sort of person.

Dr. Faust administered a reading comprehension test in which it was possible for 6th graders to obtain a nearly perfect score. When she administered the test to a control group of 6th graders, nine out of every ten scored 80% or higher. But something different happened when she gave the same test to an equal number of similar 6th graders who were given the following additional information:

Before I read the story, you might like to know that excellent students in their classrooms seldom miss any of the questions about the story. If they miss any at all, they only miss one.

Students who are average in their schoolwork--they're not excellent and they're not poor students, just average--usually miss two.

Students who are poor students in their schoolwork, who make low grades, usually miss three questions at least, sometimes four, or even all of them.

Dr. Faust found that students who had earlier identified themselves on a secret ballot as average or poor students proceeded to achieve on the test in average or poor ways, even though they could have scored at an excellent or A level. Students who had previously identified themselves as A students did, in fact, score at an A level.

There are guidelines teachers may follow to help in self-concept development:

1. Arrange a high ratio of successes to failures in academic tasks.  
"The Peanuts cartoon character is often pictured as the epitome of failure. In a cartoon strip he talks about the problem of scraped knees and says something like: 'the sidewalk is the undefeated champ.' In over 2,000 years of recorded history, the sidewalk has never lost a contest with a child's knee!" Many children must look at school the same way. In all their time at school they have never won. The school is still the reigning champ. It's the job of the teacher who wants to develop self-respect to change the situation so that the successes outnumber the failures.
2. Teach the child to avoid the conclusion that failure is typical of him or her. Failure experiences are often translated into a concept of self. When they are, failure becomes an identifying characteristic of self. Children need techniques to handle failure.
3. Recognize, respect, and encourage individual differences.
4. Teach children to be pleased about the good fortune of others.
5. Capitalize on strengths--too often we focus only on what the child lacks.
6. Provide as comprehensive a range of activities as possible.
7. Separate a child's behavior from who he or she is. Praise or punish the behavior--not the child.
8. Provide the child with appropriate models.
9. Keep promises.
10. Be consistent.

## References

- Faust, V. (1980). Self esteem in the classroom. San Diego: Thomas Paine.
- Felker, D. (1974). Helping children to like themselves. Minneapolis: Burgess.
- Felker, D. W. (1972). Prediction of specific self-evaluation from performance & personality measures. Psychological Reports, 31, 823-826.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1956). Profiles in courage. New York: Harper.
- LaBenne, W. W. & Greene, B. I. (1969). Educational implications of self-concept theory. CA: Goodyear.
- Maw, W. H., & Maw, E. W. (1970). Self-concepts of high- and low-curiosity boys. Child Development, 41, 123-129.
- Shaw, M. C., & Alves, G. J. (1963). The self-concept of bright academic underachievers, II. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 42, 401-403.
- Yawkey, T. D. (1980). The self-concept of the young child. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Zink, J. (1981). Champions in the making. Manhattan Beach, CA: Zink.

## NO PARENTS ALLOWED

Georgianna Cornelius

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico

### Introduction

"No parents allowed past this door." "Teachers Room Only." "No Parents Permitted." These sharp statements excluding parents from the classroom were typical signs in many schools during the early 1900s (Tizard, Mortimore, & Burchelle, 1981). Parents and schools were frequently viewed as separate worlds. Separate worlds of values, ideals, and aspirations existed for the same child. For many parents, an invitation to the school was rare. Historically, open doors with welcome signs were not evident (Lyons, Robbins, & Smith, 1983). Signs separating and clearly polarizing home and school were very obvious in many school hallways. Frequently, mutual respect and understanding were absent. Parents gave their child up to the public institution called school with severe reservations and feelings of inadequacy. Understandably, these reservations stemmed from a lack of understanding of "what goes on behind those walls?" to "what does my child do all day?"

This lack of understanding existed for many complex reasons between home and school. A primary reason can be found in how parents were perceived and in the extensive pressure of how to be a "good parent." Equally important was the confusing role of the teacher. Parents felt inadequate because they did not believe they were in control of their children's lives and education. They no longer believed they were the primary influence in their children's lives.

## Historical Background

Major perspectives on family-school relations are uniquely different. Epstein (1986) clearly delineated three distinct perspectives based on principal assumptions. As she points out, separate responsibilities of families seemed to predominate much of the thinking during the early 30s as well as into the 40s. The home and school were considered as separate entities with varying authority and responsibility to the children. Current thinking views the home and school as having shared responsibility. Epstein (1986) described this as a shared responsibility perspective. Specifically, the family and school share responsibilities in educating and socializing the children. Epstein (1986) postulates a third perspective, a more specific differentiated view. She asserts that as children and families change, so do the needs of the home/school relationship change. This perspective emphasizes parents' responsibility for the education of the infant and young child and the schools' responsibilities for education thereafter. The sequential changing role of school and family focuses on the critically important early years, 0-6 years. The thrust of the following paper stems from this differentiated perspective. Obviously, the emphasis of parent involvement is of greater need during the early elementary years for positive home/school relations.

### Parent Cooperation Versus Parent Involvement

Tizard, Mortimore, and Burchelle (1981) in their extensive work in London, England, clearly point out the vagueness of the term parent involvement. Parent involvement may represent to some teachers the notion of a field trip mother or P.T.A. chairperson. For others, the term parent involvement may include parents as teaching aides only. Unfortunately, many school practices cling tightly to the notion of a specific kind of involvement.

Frequently, a school will adopt an unidimensional view of parent involvement and conceptualize parents as simple custodial aides. Educators frequently refer to the value of parents, but frequently most parents are never utilized as important resources. Clearly, a pizza sale fund raiser or the traditional room mother who bakes cookies each birthday involves parents. One important question is, "Do these activities represent involvement?" One new question may be, "Does this level of involvement strengthen the relationship between home and school?" Are the tasks we ask of parents meaningful ones that will generalize to the home environment?

The important question is, "Do we want simple cooperation of parents or do we want parents contributing their ideas and talents?" As educators, we must utilize parents as valuable resources in our schools. For parent involvement to be meaningful, parents need to be respected and consulted regarding decisions that ultimately involve them. All parents need to be asked about their interests and skills. Parents need to be asked if they have time to be involved and specifically in what way. What is implicit in parent involvement is the need for communication and exchange between parent and teacher.

Equally important is the contact between the teacher and parent. One or two conferences per school year frequently does not clear issues of concern or build an understanding between the family and the school. Often, lack of communication fosters negative attitudes from both the school and the home (Hepworth-Berger, 1986). Likewise, prior attitudes of the parents and how they perceive school may influence interactions. Finally, teachers, too, hold a certain set of attitudes regarding parents (Lyons, Robbins, and Smith, 1983). Attitudes for parent-teacher cooperation may range from the teachers feeling threatened by a parent in the class. Similarly, teachers may not want to consult parents regarding instruction and content. They may operate

on the belief that parents have little to offer in the classroom setting. Unfortunately, extensive research has shown that many teachers, in fact, prefer parental cooperation over parent involvement (Croft, 1979; Epstein, 1986).

Specifically, in effective parent involvement practices, parents are demonstrating an active, informed role in decision making (Epstein, 1986; Honig, 1981). This involvement may range from a cohesive teacher/parent association to an extensive number of parents integrated in the classroom. It may be parents functioning as teacher aides, resource speakers, and material makers. Whereas, cooperation is based on the idea that parents and teachers have the same values and attitudes when, in fact, they may not. For obvious communication needs, specific teaching strategies need to be utilized in developing a foundation of trust and mutual understanding between home and school.

#### Strategies for the Classroom Teacher

In spite of the tremendous changes in home/school relations implemented in many educational settings, parent cooperation seems to be the most prevalent practice; for it seems comfortable to the majority of teachers. With this professional position, teachers feel their decisions are seldom questioned, and they can feel secure in their room. Are the parents comfortable with custodial tasks or cut and paper assignments in the class? Are cutting turkeys, making brownies, and monitoring a fund raiser meaningful tasks? Is being a room mother a realistic experience? The relationship between home and school must represent a relationship of meaningful communication and mutual respect. A relationship where the parent is an active decision maker in the process of educating the child is critical. Strategies to strengthen

the home-school relationship are necessary and important for the children, parents, and teachers!

### Laying the Foundation

Building the foundations for positive home-school relations requires extensive planning. Positive home-school relations involve a careful analysis of home and school needs. Teachers need to be cognizant of parent needs, beliefs, and skills. Of equal importance, parents need to be aware of school policies, procedures, and the teachers' instructional goals. This process does not begin on the first day of school but during the summer months prior to school. Tizard, Mortimore, and Burchelle (1981) argue for very early visits by the parents prior to the first day of school. Early contacts with the school are important for many reasons (Lyons, Robbins, & Smith, 1983; Tizzard, Mortimore, & Burchelle, 1981). Early contacts to the school should include: (a) opportunities for parent-teacher exchange of ideas, needs, and concerns; (b) opportunities for the teacher to share school philosophy and classroom practices; and (c) opportunities for staff to learn from parents about their child through School Visitation. Home visits are equally important. They provide: (a) opportunities for the teacher to better understand the home life of the child; (b) time for parent, teacher, and child to constructively focus on important issues; and (c) opportunities for teachers, parents, and child to better understand each other's needs, abilities, and interests.

### Planning the Issues of Organization

In planning a comprehensive and appropriate parent involvement program, teachers need to identify several organizational elements for success. Listed are several guidelines to help build a meaningful home-school relationship.

## The Value of Communication

It is not rare or even uncommon to have breaks in what seems to be a very stable relationship. Miscommunication between home and school is not uncommon. However, teachers need to recognize the signs of needed repair in the home/school relationship. A few signs may include: (a) a once cooperative parent no longer volunteers in the room or is extremely short and terse in conversations, and (b) notes go home and are never answered.

Positive home/school relations are important for the child, for the parent, and for the teacher. Here are a few suggested guidelines for teachers:

1. Recognize and accept the observed problem.
2. Take responsibility for the "repair" of the breakdown in positive exchange.
3. Call the parent. Be direct and honest in their concerns.
4. Offer constructive solutions that involve the parents as part of the solution.
5. Follow through on a consistent ongoing basis.

### Commitment and Concerns

An effective, satisfying parent involvement program requires extensive and careful planning by classroom teachers. Typically, parents usually do not expect to help in class or be consulted on any educational issues. They need to be invited and sincerely welcomed in the school setting. Parents need to be surveyed for their interests, strengths, and skills. It is the commitment and concern of the classroom teacher that characterizes the success of parents being involved. Yes, parents should and must be allowed in the classroom. Obviously, the strategies to involve parents are endless. The most critical consideration for teachers is the continuing challenge of maintaining open communication channels and building the important respectful link between home and school.

## References

- Croft, D. (1979). Parents & teachers: A resource book for home, school, and community relations. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Epstein, J. (1986). School and family connections. Paper presented at American Education Research Association.
- Hepworth-Berger, E. (1987). Parents as partners in education. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Lyons, P., Robbins, A., & Smith, A. (1983). Involving parents: A handbook for participation in schools. Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope.
- Tizard, B., Mortimore, J., & Burchelle, B. (1981). Involving parents in nursery and infant schools. Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope.

THE UNC LABORATORY SCHOOL AND LIBRARY  
MEDIA CENTER IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Sondra Hughes

F. X. Roberts

UNC Laboratory School

University of Northern Colorado

Greeley, Colorado

Introduction

The year 1989 marks the centenary celebration of the University of Northern Colorado. The University began as a normal school and grew and developed over the last 100 years through various stages. It went from a normal school in 1889 to a State Teachers College in 1911, and became the University of Northern Colorado in 1970.

The emphasis on teacher education during these years has been supported by the existence of a model school or laboratory school on campus since 1892, giving practical exposure to the classroom environment to teachers in training. Also, during most of this period there has existed a juvenile library or media center in the laboratory school. Currently, the UNC Laboratory School has an enrollment of 600 students in grades K-12.

In conjunction with UNC's College of Education, the Laboratory School and its Media Center still provide a setting for undergraduate university students to participate in a clinical teaching experience or educational research study. However, their primary objective is to provide an excellent educational program for the students in grades K-12.

It is the purpose of the following essay to describe the growth and development of both of these entities in their broad historical context and in the context of the 100-year history of the University of Northern Colorado.

### Growth of Laboratory Schools

The idea of laboratory or training schools for teachers came to America from Europe when training schools, organized by the Franciscan Fathers, first appeared in the Indian pueblo schools of the Southwest in the 1600s. By the early 1800s, training schools also existed in private normal schools, but they did not become established in a public context until after 1838 when the first state-supported normal school in America was founded in Massachusetts (Benson, 1968).

Training schools were designed to allow beginning teachers to observe "master teachers" and to practice the art of teaching under supervision. They evolved into places where methods and ideas could be exchanged and developed to enlighten prospective teachers. Many of today's laboratory schools began as training schools or "model schools" and were incorporated into the program of the normal schools of the time. By the early 1900s there were approximately 300 laboratory schools associated with teacher training institutions in the United States. Among his numerous contributions to educational reform, John Dewey gave new direction to the laboratory school by reorganizing it to use new applications to educate children through the latest educational research methods (Benson, 1968).

### Growth of School Libraries

While laboratory schools have existed for more than 300 years, the school library concept is of a relatively recent origin. Though the state of New York pioneered the idea of school district libraries as early as 1838, these libraries were not established exclusively for the schools but for the people in the school districts, and might be located anywhere in the district. Because of inadequate and erratic funding, school district libraries generally were unsuccessful. Metropolitan areas developed public libraries

during the latter half of the 19th century, and these public libraries did provide a certain degree of material for school children, often housed in a special room or area. The general view was that the public library was the appropriate source for library materials for schools. Indeed, many schools developed a special relationship with public libraries which permitted teachers to borrow selected titles for use in the classroom (McClenahan, 1932). However, this arrangement often proved unsuitable for both parties. At the same time, many schools did not have access to a public library at all.

The first real growth of school libraries came during the period 1892 to 1913 owing to the introduction of state legislative policies which provided a continuing financial basis for school library support (McClenahan, 1932). Secondary schools were the first to establish libraries located within school buildings; and with the growing impetus for change and improvement of education in the 1950s, libraries became part of the elementary school as well. After 1957, following the launching of Sputnik, there was an increased emphasis on the quality of public education in the United States. Funds suddenly were available for expansion and improvement. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided funding for school libraries under Title II, and later the National Defense Education Act provided funding under Title IV programs (Minor, 1988).

Today, a library is an integral part of the school, though it may be known variously as a media center, resource center, or school library. While the name may vary, the function and purpose of a school library remains the same--to provide materials in print and nonprint media that support the school curriculum and philosophy, and to provide instruction in accessing the information contained in the collection.

## Development of the Laboratory School at UNC

The Training School at Colorado State Normal School in Greeley, CO, began in 1891 when Dr. Z. X. Snyder, President, convinced the Board of Trustees of the necessity of establishing a model school in which student teachers at the State Normal School would have the opportunity to develop the most current, modern concepts of education with the freedom to expand on their own ideas without the restrictions of conventional thought and practices of the educators of the period. Dr. Snyder hired Sarah Alice Glisan, of the Normal School at Fredonia, New York, to organize the first "model school," which enrolled 42 students in 1892 (Carter, 1930). The model school was housed in two basement rooms of Cranford Hall, the College's administration building. The model school suffered from many handicaps because it began without proper planning and preparation. It had poor lighting and ventilation; there was a scarcity of equipment and books; there was no space for demonstration classes to be held (Carter, 1930).

During the first ten years in its history, the growth of the Greeley Training School was rapid, and the consequent demand for practice teachers was so great that elementary classes were held wherever space permitted--even in the basement (Carter, 1930). Teachers developed small classroom libraries or had collections of books, recognizing the importance of exposing children to good literature in the elementary grades. These classroom collections became the foundation for the first Children's Library in the Training School. Since 1892, the Training School (renamed the Laboratory School about 1940) has developed into a well-equipped, modern facility with an extensive collection of print and nonprint materials in its library media center.

## The Library in the Laboratory School at UNC

The University of Northern Colorado Laboratory School Library Media Center evolved from humble beginnings in much the same way that other school libraries began prior to the 1950s. A collection of books from the school's classrooms was integrated into one area and thereby became the first library. It was during the administration of David Douglas Hugh, superintendent of the Training School at the Colorado State Normal School from 1904-1914, that the Children's Library was started after the Training School moved to its new building (now Kepner Hall) in 1911 (Carter, 1930). Therefore, as of 1989 the Laboratory School Library Media Center has been in existence approximately 78 years.

However, the first mention of a separate "Model school-room or juvenile library" for the teacher training program at Colorado State Normal School appeared in the School's student newspaper in 1896 ("The Library," p. 29). By 1899 the growing juvenile collection was extended by the addition of a "Pedagogical Museum Library" in which teachers could examine "pictures, casts, and all schoolroom decorations . . . so lately become a matter of interest" (Daniels, J. F., p. 278). The Pedagogical Museum also contained textbooks, illustrations for class work, apparatus (i.e., charts, thermometers, anemometers, etc.), games, toys, and kindergarten materials. It was an early example of a curriculum resources collection.

As already noted, in the 1890s and up to 1910, the Training School of the College was located in Cranford Hall, until in 1911 a separate building for the Training School was constructed. The first juvenile library in the new Training School comprised "a collection of books and bookcases contributed by the training teachers from their individual rooms" (Carter, 1930, p. 190). This collection was located "in [a] little dressing room back of

the stage in the Training School auditorium, and [was] presided over by one of the training teachers and whatever student help could be obtained" (Carter, 1930, p. 190). However, the Training School's library continued to grow and by 1917 its collection totaled over 2,000 volumes of books and periodicals selected to support learning and to supplement regular studies at the various grade levels. The educational philosophy of the Training School regarding library use was that grade level libraries were "a significant factor in the education of children," and that every effort should be made to obtain "the best literature available for the children in the different grades" (State Teachers College, 1912, p. 92).

A method used in this approach to learning, and one which underlines our forebears' faith in the power of the printed word, is described in an early discussion of the Training School's book collection. The discussion indicates that the books were placed in the classrooms of the different grades so that children would be led "to read such literature as will form correct notions of life, and cultivate in them a taste for what is good and wholesome in the formation of character" (Library of the State Normal School, 1902, p. 5).

By the mid-1920s the Training School Library (called the Children's Library in 1924) had grown so rapidly that it was in need of much larger accommodations. When new wings were added to the Training School Building in 1924, the Children's Library was moved into "a large well-lighted room in the western wing of the Training School basement" (Many New Books Added," 1924, p. 1). This site was fitted out with tables and chairs of a height to accommodate both primary grade children and older children.

In the middle of the 1920s decade, the Children's Library was "an epitome of the larger [College Library]" ("Training School Library," 1926, p. 1).

The collection was classified and arranged in the same manner (using the Dewey Decimal System) as the collection in the College's main library. To differentiate the Children's Library collection from the main library, a lower-case j preceded all call numbers; the j indicated it was part of the "juvenile" collection. Pupils attending the Training School were served in the same way as the larger college library served its clientele, and they were encouraged in every way to learn the intricacies of the catalog in the Children's Library and to make full use of it in finding the books they required for study.

During these years, the Children's Library was developed through the efforts of many groups in "a program of cooperation between college, training school, teacher, pupil and parent" ("Training School Library," 1926, p. 1). The librarian helped teachers make selections which would increase the value of the collection for students and also considered for purchase the many recommendations made by parents of the students and by faculty of the Training School and other college departments. The library grew and developed, and by the 1940s it had on its shelves a book collection exceeding 6,000 volumes.

The Library's growth continued in the Kepner Hall location until 1961 when the Laboratory School with its library moved into Bishop-Lehr Hall. The new \$2,000,000 building honored Ralph Bishop, from the college's department of printing, who worked with students in his print shop, and Elizabeth Lehr, a highly respected elementary teacher who taught fifth grade in the 1930s (Larson, 1989).

During the early 1970s, the role of the Laboratory School librarian changed. With the arrival of Marie Moinat, the school librarian became more than one who simply selected, organized, and circulated books. Her role now

grew to include the organizing of a library skills program, the expanding of the collection through the purchase of audiovisual materials and equipment, and the provision of special services to the College of Education. A \$12,000 federally funded grant was awarded during this period and was used to purchase a large collection of media materials, and another library assistant was hired to provide personnel support to the rapidly expanding library (Moniat, 1988). In addition, the Special Education Department was located in the south wing of Bishop-Lehr Hall. It had created special classrooms for visually impaired, hearing impaired, and mentally impaired children. The visually and mentally impaired programs no longer exist, but the hearing impaired program, now a Weld County Colorado School District 6 program, continues to be an integral part of the Laboratory School. With the addition of these programs, the library media specialist was asked to provide special materials and support for the children and faculty in the program.

On the college level, the librarian, now certified as a library media specialist, worked closely with the UNC College of Education faculty teaching children's and adolescent literature courses, and supervised Master's degree students from the Educational Media Department who completed their field experience at the Laboratory School. She also became a frequent guest speaker in the College of Education, a practice which continues today.

In 1977, the Gifted and Talented Education Department offered a special summer program in which a number of students in groups of 200 to 300 would attend a two-week special enrichment program on campus. Originally, three separate sessions were offered; currently there are two Summer Enrichment Program sessions each summer. The S.E.P. program, as it became known, relies on the personnel and resources of the Laboratory School's Library Media Center for the materials needed by faculty and students in pursuing their varied

interests. Additional summer programs using the resources of the Library Media Center are the Frontiers of Science Institute (FSI) and the reading tutorial classes offered by the College of Education during the summer session.

The Laboratory School Library Media Center is a multifunctional learning, teaching, and resource center. It expanded to a collection of approximately 26,000 print and 17,000 nonprint items, with an increasing emphasis on the nonprint format and technology. As a branch of the University of Northern Colorado's University Libraries, it extends its resources to the University community; faculty in District 6 and other local school districts have access to the collection, a factor which will be of increasing importance in the future.

#### The Future Role of the UNC Laboratory School

Currently, the Laboratory School's faculty, students and their parents, and other interested participants are examining the future role of the Laboratory School at the University of Northern Colorado. Still in the initial stages, the process will result in a change, a change as yet undefined, but one in which the Laboratory School and its Library Media Center will be prepared to accept the challenge of education in the year 2000 and beyond.

## References

- Benson, C. H. (1968). The role of the laboratory school in teacher education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 1030A. (University Microfilms No. 68-14, 715)
- Carter, A. F., & Kendell, E. H. (1930). Forty years of Colorado State Teachers College, formerly the State Normal School of Colorado, 1890-1930. Greeley, CO: Tribune-Republican Publishing.
- Daniels, J. F. (1899, June). The library. The Crucible, p. 278.
- Larson, R. W. (1989). Shaping educational change, the first century of the University of Northern Colorado at Greeley. Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press.
- The library. (1896, June). The Crucible, p. 29.
- The library of the State Normal School of Colorado. (1902). History and scope of the library. State Normal School Bulletin, 1(4), 4-5.
- Many new books added to school library of late. (1924, July 3). Colorado State Teachers College Mirror, p. 1.
- McClenahan, S. (1932). Growth of school libraries in America. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, CO.
- Minor, R. O. (1988). It's 1988--Do you know where your libraries are? (or where they should be?). Tech Trends for Leaders in Education & Training, 33(3), 12-14.
- Moniat, M. (1988, October). [Interview with Sondra Hughes, Supervisor, UNC Laboratory School Library], Greeley, CO.
- The State Teachers College of Colorado. (1912). Training department. Bulletin of the State Teachers College of Colorado, 13(1), 88-124.
- Training school library has 3000 volumes for children. (1926, August 12). Teachers College Mirror, p. 1.

## INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, a refereed journal, publishes articles that contribute to the knowledge and understanding of laboratory schools, as well as other significant educational issues. Most articles fall into one of these types: Research, Innovation, and Opinion. The subjects most often addressed are: Teaching Techniques; Administrative Concerns; Functions, History and Future of Lab Schools; Innovations in Curriculum & Program; Teacher Education; Student Growth and Development; and Philosophically Oriented Topics. Rebuttals, responses and reviews are also of interest. Although available space and a thematic approach limit the number of unsolicited manuscripts that can be used, submission of unsolicited manuscripts is encouraged.

### SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Length: All text--including title, headings, references, quotations, and tables--must be typed double spaced. Manuscripts should be typed on 8½" x 11" white bond, one side only, with references at the end of the article. The maximum acceptable length is ten pages including all references and supplementary material. The NALS Journal uses the latest edition of American Psychological Association (APA) format.

Submission: Send the original and six clear copies with a stamped, self-addressed 9½" x 12½" envelope with sufficient postage for manuscript return to: Dr. Robert C. Hymer, Editor, NALS Journal, Dean's Office, College of Education, Jacksonville State University, Jacksonville, Alabama 36265.

Manuscripts are accepted at any time. Articles which are accepted and cannot be used immediately are held for a future issue.

Editing: The NALS Journal reserves the right to make editorial changes in all manuscripts to improve clarity, to conform to style, to correct grammar, and to fit available space. Authors should send information concerning their titles, positions, laboratory school, and university names, locations, etc. However, titles and positions will not be printed with the article.

The Editors welcome suggestions from NALS members concerning ways in which the Journal can be improved.