

AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE LABORATORIES
IN KANSAS HIGH SCHOOLS

by

ERIC S. WESSELOWSKI
B. A., University of Kansas, 1964

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree


MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1966

Approved by:


Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to his advisor, Dr. Charles Peccolo, for his valuable guidance and assistance in planning and completing this report. Also the author expresses his gratitude to Mr. Charles E. Nicholson, Consultant of Modern Foreign Languages at the Division of Instructional Services of the Kansas State Department of Public Instruction, for his assistance in locating the information given in this report.

378.73
K160r
1966
W511
c.2

12
2662
154

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.	11
The Problem	3
Importance of the Study	3
Limitations of the Study.	4
Definition of Terms	4
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Limitations of Language Laboratory Use	6
Advantages of Language Laboratory Use....	9
Difficulties in Gaining Acceptance of Language Laboratories in the Schools	13
The Future of Language Laboratories	14
THE STUDY	15
Procedures	15
Analysis of Results	16
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	22
BIBLIOGRAPHY	25
APPENDIX	28

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
<p>I. Number and Percentage of Kansas High School Language Laboratories in Comprehensive (CP), Standard (ST), and Approved (AP) Schools as of the 1965-1966 School Year.</p>	17
<p>II. Number and Percentage of Permanent and Portable Kansas High School Language Laboratories in Comprehensive (CP), Standard (ST), and Approved (AP) Schools as of the 1965-1966 School Year.</p>	18
<p>III. Number of Student Positions in Each Language Laboratory of the Kansas Comprehensive (CP), Standard (ST), and Approved (AP) High Schools as of the 1965-1966 School Year.</p>	19
<p>IV. Percentage of Kansas Comprehensive (CP), Standard (ST), and Approved (AP) High Schools with the Categorized Number of Student Positions in the Language Laboratory as of the 1965-1966 School Year</p>	19
<p>V. Number and Percentage of Kansas High School Language Laboratories with no Student Recording Facilities, One or More Recording Devices (Partial), and with Recording Facilities at all Student Positions (100%) in Comprehensive (CP), Standard (ST), and Approved (AP) Schools as of the 1965-1966 School Year.</p>	20

TABLE

PAGE

VI. Distribution of Foreign Languages Taught in Kansas Comprehensive (CP), Standard (ST), and Approved (AP) High Schools during the 1965-1966 School Year.	21
---	----

INTRODUCTION

With Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, came a dramatic change in the teaching of modern foreign languages in the American high school. The Act authorized a program of financial assistance to state educational agencies for the acquisition of laboratory equipment to be used in the teaching of modern foreign languages. This movement was stimulated partly by the realization that the educational system was not keeping pace with national needs for persons competent in understanding and actually speaking modern foreign languages. In connection with this desire to help students become more "vocally" fluent in foreign languages came a gradual shift in the teaching methods from an emphasis on written translation and silent reading to an emphasis on the development of audio-lingual skills in foreign languages. Thus, to help meet the need of teaching modern foreign languages with an emphasis on the development of audio-lingual skills, the language laboratory was proving to be of valuable assistance.

Although Title III of the National Defense Act of 1958 provided the stimulus which caused a sudden growth and spread of language laboratories in the nation's schools, this by no means meant that 1958 was the beginning year of language laboratory use. The first record of an established language laboratory dates back to 1915 at Middlebury College in Vermont.

However, Locke¹ explained that it was not until 1929 at the Middlebury College French Summer School that this laboratory began to approach the modern conception of what a language laboratory should do. In 1929, it had ten student listening booths with a record player, earphones, and a mirror (for watching lip movements) at each booth. There was one recording machine in a nearby room which was used to record each student reading a selection in French once at the beginning and once again at the ending of the course.

It was not until World War II, however, that the audio-lingual method of foreign language teaching and the use of language laboratories gained significant acclaim. With World War II came a dire need to teach certain military personnel foreign languages. Not only was it essential to teach them a practical speaking and listening knowledge of the language, but it had to be learned during a relatively short period of time. Thus, military language training programs adopted new techniques and materials based on the latest knowledge of linguistic science. They implemented the audio-lingual approach with coordinated use of language laboratories and were able to produce a foreign language program boasting a high degree of success in meeting the immediate need at hand.

¹William N. Locke, "the Future of Language Laboratories," The Modern Language Journal, 49: 294, May, 1965

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact that Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 had made in regard to the number of language laboratory installations made in Kansas public high schools up to and including the 1965-1966 school year. More specifically, the purpose was (1) to determine which Kansas public high schools had a language laboratory as of the 1965-1966 school year that had been installed since the enactment of Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; (2) to determine which of those laboratories were of the listen type, listen-speak type, and listen-speak-record type; (3) to determine which laboratory equipment was of the permanently installed nature and which was of a portable nature; and (4) to determine which foreign languages were being taught during the 1965-1966 school year at those schools under study.

Importance of the Study

With the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, there had been a rather sudden upsurge of language laboratories all over the nation. Since the extent of this movement had not been studied in regard to how many Kansas public high schools were affected, the author of this paper wished to supply this information as a possible guideline for future research as to how effective language laboratories had been in improving foreign language teaching in Kansas public high schools.

Limitations of the Study

The information obtained in this study was limited to the period of time from the enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 to the conclusion of the 1965-1966 school year in Kansas public high schools. No record of language laboratories in Kansas public high schools prior to 1958 could be found at the State of Kansas Department of Public Instruction; however, there remained the slight possibility that a few public high schools might have had language laboratories prior to the enactment of the National Defense Education Act.

A further limitation was that only Kansas publicly supported high schools were studied with the exclusion of all other schools. The study was further limited to three and four year high schools.

Definition of Terms

Approved high school. The term approved high school was used to refer to any Kansas public high school that provides a minimum of eighteen units of resident instruction in at least six curricular areas.

Audio-lingual. The term audio-lingual was used to refer to the method of foreign language teaching which emphasizes the development of listening and speaking skills as opposed to the more traditional method of emphasizing the development of reading and writing skills.

Comprehensive high school. The term comprehensive high school was used to refer to any Kansas public high school that provides a minimum of fifty units of resident instruction in at

least nine curricular areas.

Language laboratory. A language laboratory was interpreted to be a room or portion of a room containing private or semi-private booths, each equipped with listen, listen-speak, or listen-speak-record facilities in connection with a master center or console from which the teacher can play tapes, records, or communicate personally with each student position.

Listen facilities. The term listen facilities was interpreted to be a series of earphones at student positions (in a language laboratory) providing one-way electronic communication from either a teacher or a recorded teaching model to the student.

Listen-speak facilities. The term listen-speak facilities was interpreted to be electronic equipment providing "listen" facilities with additional microphones at each student position with which the student can hear his own voice as he repeats after the model voice and with which the student can communicate with the teacher who is at the control center.

Listen-speak-record facilities. The term listen-speak-record facilities was interpreted to be electronic equipment providing "listen" facilities, "listen-speak" facilities, and with additional tape recorders at each student position with which the student can record the model voice and his own voice and play it back for comparison.

Kansas public high school. The term Kansas public high school was used to refer to any school which is supported with Kansas state revenue and which has either grades nine, ten,

eleven, and twelve or grades ten, eleven, and twelve.

Portable language laboratory. The term portable language laboratory was used to refer to a unit on wheels with a central tape recorder and record player which may be heard through a series of earphones also contained in the unit. There are no separate booths in this system, merely earphone positions around which students may position themselves.

Standard high school. The term standard high school was used to refer to any Kansas public high school that provides a minimum of thirty-two units of resident instruction in at least eight curricular areas.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Several articles had been written dealing with the controversy of the advantages and limitations of the language laboratory. The following discussion was meant to briefly present some of the issues involved in the two sides of the controversial issue and to present some of the possible reasons that the language laboratory innovation had been relatively slow in spreading.

Limitations of Language Laboratory Use

Even though language laboratories were being installed in many schools, there were certain recognized disadvantages of their use. Cassidy² suggested that language laboratory drills produce a parrot-like repetition and substitution habit in the student making it difficult to apply a conscious, discriminating

²Helene Monod-Cassidy, "The New Audio-visual Student," The Modern Language Journal, 50: 16, January, 1966.

use of the spoken and read language. She also believed that language laboratory use does not teach students to respect subject matter of the course, but merely emphasizes the mechanics of language. She continued by pointing out that a child is taught to live in a group and a child learns to get the approval of certain groups (family, schoolmates, close friends, and church groups). But a child is not taught the kind of self-discipline that language laboratory learning requires. Thus, when a student is placed in an insulated booth and told to listen to a disembodied voice through a pair of earphones, he is being put in a situation completely foreign to his experience and in fact it is a situation which his past training has tended to make him reject. She agreed that the language laboratory is a valuable tool for the dedicated and advanced student who clearly has a goal in mind. These students can adjust and accept the inevitability of the "hard work" involved in proper usage of the laboratory, but the average student quickly loses interest in the somewhat dehumanized drills of an isolation booth.

Mueller and Leutenegger³ investigated reasons why students dropped out of the elementary French courses at the University of Florida. The elementary French course was divided into two sections. One section was taught with little emphasis on audio-lingual skills while the other section was taught with development of audio-lingual skills being the prime objective.

³Theodore H. Mueller and Ralph R. Leutenegger, "Some Inferences About an Intensified Oral Approach to the Teaching of French Based on a Study of Course Drop-outs," The Modern Language Journal, 48: 91-94, February 1964.

The results were that more students dropped out of the class which emphasized reading skills. After interviews with each of the drop-outs, Mueller and Leutenegger concluded that most of the drop-outs of the audio-lingually orientated class complained that the course was too time consuming. Also, they expressed dissatisfaction with the audio-lingual approach. They were disturbed at having to speak the foreign language so soon and thus, thought their experiences in the language laboratory were unsatisfactory. However, Mueller and Leutenegger hesitated to place a value judgement on the language laboratory on the basis of this study alone. They pointed out that most of these students had had a first exposure to the language in high school classes with emphasis on reading skills. Thus, a complete change to speaking and listening emphasis would have understandably produced somewhat of a shock.

Other disadvantages of the language laboratory were agreed upon by various authors: (1) Movement from the classroom to the laboratory room disrupts the stream of learning making it difficult for students to get their minds back on the problem at hand after the disruption. (2) There is a lack of texts properly coordinated with tapes. (3) With the language laboratory there must be a slower presentation of material since printed words can be absorbed several times more quickly than spoken words. (4) It is more difficult to get a repeat of certain lesson material than with visually presented material (since the master tape recorder or the student tape recorder must be re-wound to get a repeat of the material).

Up to this point, the disadvantages listed were mainly based on the needs of the student. There were also certain disadvantages found that appeared to affect primarily the teacher. Zeldner⁴ stated that the complications involved in the mere mechanics of conducting laboratory sessions is driving away good, established foreign language teachers from the teaching field. He stated that many teachers who had good methods of teaching a foreign language and who were getting good results were trying to incorporate the use of a language laboratory into their methods with the results being confusing and frustrating for both the teacher and the student. Zeldner compared the use of microphones and earphones in the language laboratory to the giving up of one's legs merely for the purpose of being able to use prosthetic devices. If there is a live teacher and live students in the room, why communicate through electronic devices? Another known problem for the teacher in regard to conducting language laboratory sessions was that too often equipment was not dependable, causing much wasted laboratory time in trying to detect and remedy minor mechanical breakdowns. Even minor mistakes in trying to operate the equipment caused a great deal of wasted time and effort.

Advantages of Language Laboratory Use.

As a follow up of the Mueller-Leutenegger study

⁴Max Zeldner, "The Bewildered Modern Language Teacher," The Modern Language Journal, 47: 245-253, October, 1963.

(previously mentioned in this paper), Mueller and Harris⁵ conducted a similar experiment again at the University of Florida. The elementary French course was divided into two sections and as before, one section (the experimental group) was taught with an emphasis on audio-lingual skills while the other section (the control group) was taught with an emphasis on reading skills. However, a slightly different approach was taken that time. A two-week "conditioning" period was used for the experimental group to allow for a more gradual approach to the audio-lingual method. During the conditioning period, reading and writing skills were emphasized as well as audio-lingual skills. The results this time showed a higher degree of "control" students dropping the course than "experimental" students. Thus, Mueller and Harris concluded that with the right program of materials, the audio-lingual method incorporating the use of the language laboratory had significant possibilities in reducing language drop-outs.

Lorge⁶ conducted a rather thorough experiment to determine the effectiveness of high school foreign language classes which did not use a language laboratory as opposed to high school foreign language classes which did use a language laboratory. The study involved high school French I, II, III, and IV classes in New York City. Although she did not state which schools

⁵Theodore Mueller and Robert Harris, "The Effect of an Audio-lingual Program on Drop-out Rate," The Modern Language Journal, 50: 133-137, March, 1966.

⁶Sarah W. Lorge, "Language Laboratory Research Studies in the New York City High Schools: A Discussion of the Program and the Findings," The Modern Language Journal, 48: 409-419, November, 1964.

specifically were involved, she did point out that both the experimental and the control groups were randomly matched and that prescribed teaching methods were used to match the control group methods to each other and to match the experimental group methods to each other. Also, she pointed out that the same teaching material was used by both sets of groups. After a year, the experimental groups were compared to the control groups through tests of speech, aural comprehension, reading, and writing skills. In all of these tests of skills, the experimental groups (which used the language laboratory) did as well as or exceeded the control groups (which had not used the language laboratory).

Studies similar to Lorge's have been conducted with similar results. Why did the language laboratory appear to produce favorable results? Kilknor⁷ explained that one normally responds to an aural stimulus through the unconscious speech habit which interacts with the conscious mind, producing an oral response with relative ease. But when speech is not learned to be automatic (as when learned through the traditional means of memorizing conjugations and vocabulary from a printed page) the individual finds that his efforts to express himself are competing with the complexities of the language. Thus, the person has trouble communicating because both the mechanics of speech and the content to be expressed are on a conscious level. The language laboratory in

⁷James A. Kilknor, "Uses and Abuses of the Language Laboratory," Catholic School Journal, 64: 53-54, October, 1964

conjunction with the audio-lingual approach helps put the mechanics of grammar and pronunciation on an unconscious level.

Dodd⁸ stated that language is speech and that speech is a skill. Skills are not learned by intellectual processes. For instance, one does not learn to play golf or to play a musical instrument by merely sitting down and reading instructions and rules. Acts must be repeated until they can be performed automatically. He continued by pointing out that every music department has a practice room where a student can perfect his musical performance. Then why not have a similar room (the language laboratory) for practice in hearing and speaking a foreign language?

Hutchinson⁹ has compiled the following student advantages of the language laboratory: (1) It provides for active simultaneous participation of all students in a class. (2) It provides a variety of authentic native voices as models. (3) It allows students to individually progress or repeat material according to their own learning rates. (4) It provides a more intimate contact with the language through equal hearing conditions for all students. (5) It provides a sense of privacy for each student to help lower inhibitions in trying to speak, to help reduce outside distractions, and to provide for better concentration.

⁸Robert E. Dodd, "Why have a Language Laboratory?" High School Points, 48: 72, April, 1966.

⁹Joseph C. Hutchinson, Modern Foreign Languages in High School: The Language Laboratory, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, No. 23, 8, 1961.

King¹⁰ believed it to be an advantage that the language laboratory allows communication through a natural sense (hearing) rather than through an acquired skill (reading).

Again the focus turns to how the language laboratory affects the teacher. The following were some of the more pronounced benefits for the teacher: (1) It frees the teacher from the tedious, tiresome task of personally presenting repetitive drill material. (2) It offers the teacher an opportunity to evaluate and correct individual students (through their earphones) without interrupting other students' work. (3) It provides facilities for group testing of listening and speaking skills. (4) It even helps some teachers who are not adequately proficient in speaking the language to improve their own skills in the language.

Difficulties in Gaining Acceptance of Language Laboratories in the Schools

Even though the language laboratory had existed since the time of World War II, why had it taken so many years to gain acceptance in our schools? Haber¹¹ explained that the processes of innovation in the behavioral sciences are much different than those in the natural sciences. The adapter of behavioral science

¹⁰Paul E. King, "Audio Electronics in Education," Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide, 42: 264, May, 1963.

¹¹Ralph Norman Haber, "The Spread of an Innovation: High School Language Laboratories," The Journal of Experimental Education, 31: 359-369, Summer, 1963.

innovations is usually unsure before he had made the investment whether or not it will work. Yet the investor in a natural science innovation usually knows whether or not it will work. For example, the person buying hybrid corn seed clearly knows that it has a greater yield per acre than older seeds. But can the investor in a language laboratory have the same guarantee of improvement over older methods of teaching foreign languages? No. Also, he explained that natural science innovations are usually already established practices and can be accepted readily. However, behavioral science innovations often are the type which replace existing methods and usually meet more resistance because of this threat of replacement.

To find out who was helping spread the language laboratory innovation, Haber sent a questionnaire in 1958 to each of the seventy high schools in the United States which had language laboratories. He found that in most cases the initiator of the language laboratory idea was a language teacher who had studied a foreign language, himself, through the use of a language laboratory. Thus, he noted that the innovation was coming from within the teaching profession.

The Future of Language Laboratories

Bumpass¹² predicted that by 1975 almost all high schools in the United States will have language laboratories. He also predicted that the language laboratory will be used for shorthand,

¹²Donald E. Bumpass, "Language Laboratories: Bridge or Deterrent?" Journal of Secondary Education, 39: 317-320, November, 1964.

speech, literature, drama, music, and other classes. He even went so far as to predict that the term "language laboratory" will eventually be replaced by a more "suitable" term.

Locke¹³ predicted more use of visual equipment in conjunction with the audio equipment of the laboratory. Included in the visual equipment of the laboratory will be closed circuit television.

Another trend in the future appeared to be a decentralization of language laboratories, providing electronic distribution of laboratory materials into several different buildings. This was already a reality at Western Michigan University in 1965. Twelve residence halls were electronically linked to a broadcasting station which broadcasted language laboratory programs from self-automated rewind tape recorders. The ultimate goal of the university was to bring audio and even video language laboratory facilities into every student room. Although this system was not meant to replace the language laboratory, it was recognized as having great potential in serving effectively as an extension of the laboratory.

THE STUDY

Procedures

The number of Kansas public high schools having installed language laboratories since the enactment of Title III of the

¹³William N. Locke, "The Future of Language Laboratories," The Modern Language Journal, 49: 294-304, May, 1965

National Defense Act of 1958, information about those language laboratories, and which foreign languages were being taught at those schools during the 1965-1966 school year was obtained by record checks at the State of Kansas Department of Public Instruction at the Curriculum Section of the Division of Instructional Services in Topeka, Kansas. The information obtained was based on records of National Defense Education Act installations of language laboratories and the 1965-1966 annual school reports of each high school superintendent.

A list of the public high schools having language laboratories, the type of each laboratory, and the foreign languages offered at each school may be found in the appendix.

Analysis of Results

It was noted that there was a general decrease in the percentage of schools having language laboratories as the focus went from comprehensive to standard to approved high schools.

Table I shows that the comprehensive high schools had the highest percentage of language laboratories (79 per cent) while only 8 per cent of the approved high schools had language laboratories.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF KANSAS HIGH SCHOOL LANGUAGE LABORATORIES
IN COMPREHENSIVE (CP), STANDARD (ST), AND APPROVED (AP)
SCHOOLS AS OF THE 1965-1966 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION	Total number of schools	Number of schools with language laboratories	Per cent of schools with language laboratories
CP	77	61	79
ST	192	78	41
AP	306	24	8

Table II shows that the comprehensive high schools also had the highest percentage of permanent-type language laboratories (98 per cent), while the approved schools had the lowest percentage of permanent language laboratories (75 per cent). From this it can be said that regardless of school classification at least three-fourths or more of all the language laboratories were of the permanently-installed nature.

TABLE II
 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PERMANENT AND PORTABLE KANSAS HIGH SCHOOL
 LANGUAGE LABORATORIES IN COMPREHENSIVE (CP), STANDARD (ST),
 AND APPROVED (AP) SCHOOLS AS OF THE
 1965-1966 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION	Number of permanent language laboratories	Per cent of permanent language laboratories	Number of portable language laboratories	Per cent of portable language laboratories
CP	60	98	1	2
ST	66	85	12	15
AP	18	75	6	25

In Tables III and IV, it is shown that on the whole, the comprehensive schools had the laboratories with the greatest student capacity. There were 55 comprehensive laboratories with a seating capacity of 17 or more students. This represents about 90 per cent of the total number of comprehensive schools with laboratories. Yet in the approved high schools there were only 2 laboratories or about 8 per cent with that amount of seating capacity.

TABLE III

NUMBER OF STUDENT POSITIONS IN EACH LANGUAGE LABORATORY OF THE
KANSAS COMPREHENSIVE (CP), STANDARD (ST), AND
APPROVED (AP) HIGH SCHOOLS AS OF
THE 1965-1966 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION	0-7 student positions	8-16 student positions	17-25 student positions	26-34 student positions	35-43 student positions
CP	1	5	22	30	3
ST*	1	37	37	1	0
AP	1	21	1	1	0

*This information was unavailable for two schools.

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE OF KANSAS COMPREHENSIVE (CP), STANDARD (ST), AND
APPROVED (AP) HIGH SCHOOLS WITH THE CATEGORIZED NUMBER
OF STUDENT POSITIONS IN THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY
AS OF THE 1965-1966 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION	Per cent of schools with 0-7 student positions	Per cent of schools with 8-16 student positions	Per cent of schools with 17-25 student positions	Per cent of schools with 26-34 student positions	Per cent of schools with 35-43 student positions
CP	2	8	36	49	5
ST*	1	47	47	1	0
AP	4	88	4	4	0

*This information was unavailable for two schools.

Table V points out that very few of the language laboratories in Kansas had the recording facility at each student position. Yet at least one-half or more of all the laboratories had the student recording facility at one or more of the student positions.

All of the laboratories had both listen and listen-speak facilities at each student position.

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF KANSAS HIGH SCHOOL LANGUAGE LABORATORIES WITH NO STUDENT RECORDING FACILITIES, ONE OR MORE RECORDING DEVICES (PARTIAL), AND WITH RECORDING FACILITIES AT ALL STUDENT POSITIONS (100%) IN COMPREHENSIVE (CP), STANDARD (ST), AND APPROVED (AP) SCHOOLS AS OF THE 1965-1966 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION	Number and percentage of student positions with no recording facilities	Number and percentage of student positions with partial recording facilities	Number and percentage of student positions with 100% recording facilities
CP	7 (10%)	45 (74%)	9 (15%)
ST	25 (32%)	44 (56%)	7 (9%)
AP	10 (42%)	14 (58%)	0 (0%)

Table VI shows that Spanish was taught in more of the schools studied than any other foreign language, with French second, followed by Latin, and German fourth. Russian was being taught in three schools.

TABLE VI
DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES TAUGHT IN KANSAS COMPREHENSIVE (CP),
STANDARD (ST), AND APPROVED (AP) HIGH SCHOOLS
DURING THE 1965-1966 SCHOOL YEAR

SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION	Number of schools teaching Spanish	Number of schools teaching French	Number of schools teaching Latin	Number of schools teaching German	Number of schools teaching Russian
CP*	53	42	39	28	2
ST**	49	27	16	15	0
AP	7	8	0	5	1
Total	109	77	55	48	3

*This information was unavailable for two schools.

**This information was unavailable for one school.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was (1) to determine which Kansas public high schools had a language laboratory as of the 1965-1966 school year which had been installed since the enactment of Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; (2) to determine which of those laboratories were of the listen type, listen-speak type, and listen-speak-record type; ((3) to determine which laboratory equipment was of the permanently installed nature and which was of a portable nature; and (4) to determine which foreign languages were being taught during the 1965-1966 school year at these schools under study.

The review of the literature mentioned some of the historical background of the language laboratory (which began in about 1915); some of the advantages of laboratory use (such as providing mass simultaneous participation of students, providing a variety of native voices, and providing the students with a sense of privacy to lower inhibitions); and some of the disadvantages (such as equipment break-down, lack of texts coordinated with the laboratory, and the possibility of producing merely "parrot-like" responses in the students). Also some of the future possibilities for the language laboratory were pointed out such as laboratory use in many other subject areas and a possible decentralization of the laboratory.

A list of 163 Kansas public high schools was compiled with information about each school in regard to how many student positions each laboratory had, how many listen-speak-record facilities each had, whether or not the laboratory was permanently

installed or portable, and which foreign languages had been taught at each school during the 1965-1966 school year.

From the results, it was concluded that: (1) 163 Kansas public high schools had a language laboratory as of the 1965-1966 school year which had been installed since the enactment of Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; (2) all of the language laboratories had complete listen-speak facilities, at least one-half of all the laboratories had recording facilities at one or more of the student positions, and about 10 per cent of all the laboratories had recording facilities at all of the student positions; (3) about 88 per cent of the laboratories were permanently installed and the remaining 12 per cent were portable units; and that (4) Spanish, French, Latin, German, and Russian were being taught with Spanish being taught in the greatest number of schools and Russian being taught in the least number of schools.

The author suggests that valuable future studies might be ones that determine who initiated the language laboratories in the schools, the degree that the language laboratories are being used, the laboratory-training background of the foreign language teachers, the laboratory methods being used, and teacher and student opinions of the value of the language laboratories.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blackstead, J. H. "Improving the Foreign Language Program at Johnson High School: Installing a Modern Language Laboratory," Curriculum Bulletin, 43: 1-13, September, 1962.
- Blank, Gordon. "Language Laboratories: A Status Report," Audio-visual Instruction, 8: 405, June, 1963.
- Bumpass, Donald E. "Language Laboratories: Bridge or Deterrent?" Journal of Secondary Education, 39: 317-20, November, 1964.
- Cables, Virginia. "The Language Laboratory, Boon or Bane?" The French Review, 39: 618-22, February, 1966.
- Cassidy, Helene Monod. "The New Audio-visual Student," The Modern Language Journal, 50: 15-18, January, 1966
- Cole, Roger L. "Foreign Language in the Residence Hall," The Modern Language Journal, 49: 362-363, October, 1965.
- Dodd, Robert E. "Why have a Language Laboratory?" High Points, 48: 71-74, April, 1966.
- Haber, Ralph Norman. "The Spread of an Innovation: High School Language Laboratories," The Journal of Experimental Education, 31: 359-369, Summer, 1963.
- Holton, James S, and others. Sound Language Teaching. New York: University Publishers, 1961. 249 pp.
- Hutchinson, Joseph C. Modern Foreign Languages in High School: The Language Laboratory. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Hutchinson, Joseph C. "The Language Laboratory. How Effective is It?" School Life, 46: 14-17, 39-41, January-February, 1964.
- King, Paul E. "Audio Electronics in Education," Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide, 42:264-265, May, 1963.
- Kilkner, James A. "Uses and Abuses of the Language Laboratory," Catholic School Journal, 64: 53-54, October, 1964.
- Kirch, Max S. "The Role of the Language Laboratory," The Modern Language Journal, 47: 256-260, October, 1963.

- Locke, William N. "The Future of Language Laboratories," The Modern Language Journal, 49: 294-304, May, 1965.
- Lorge, Sarah W. "Language Laboratory Research Studies in New York City High Schools: A discussion of the Program and the Findings," The Modern Language Journal, 48: 409-419, November, 1964.
- Mueller, Theodore H. and Ralph R. Leutenegger. "Some Inferences About an Intensified Oral Approach to the Teaching of French Based on a Study of Course Drop-outs," The Modern Language Journal, 48: 91-94, February, 1964.
- Stack, Edward M. The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960, 149 pp.
- Zeldner, Max. "The Bewildered Modern Language Teacher," The Modern Language Journal, 47: 245-253, October, 1963.

APPENDIX

The following two lists contain the name of every Kansas public high school that had installed language laboratories since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 up to and including the 1965-1966 school year. With the name of each school is the school classification in parenthesis and student positions in each laboratory with the number of those student positions (in parentheses) which had the individual tape-record facility. Also included is a list of the foreign languages being taught at each school during the 1965-1966 school year. The languages were abbreviated as such: Spanish (S), French (F), Latin (L), German (G), and Russian (R).

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Abilene High School (CP)	5 (5)	L,S
Andale Rural High School (ST)	16 (3)	L,S
Anthony Rural High School (ST)	20 (2)	F,S
Argonia High School (ST)	27 (6)	F,S
Arkansas City High School (CP)	30 (2)	L,S
Ashland High School (ST)	Unavailable	F,S
Atchison High School (CP)	15 (15)	L,F,S
Attica Rural High School (ST)	15 (1)	S
Rawlins County Community High School, Atwood (ST)	20 (10)	S
Augusta High School (CP)	20 (5)	S,G
Basehor Rural High School (AP)	13 (7)	S
Baxter Springs High School (ST)	24 (4)	F,S
Belle Plaine Rural High School (ST)	20 (4)	S

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Belleville High School (ST)	18 (1)	L, S
Beloit High School (ST)	8 (2)	L, F
Bird City High School (AP)	28 (5)	S
Bison Rural High School (AP)	12 (2)	S
Blue Rapids High School (AP)	10 (5)	F
Bonner Springs Rural High School (CP)	27 (6)	L, F, S
Brewster High School (AP)	7 (1)	S
Bucklin High School (ST)	24 (6)	F
Buhler Rural High School (CP)	14 (1)	L, S, G
Bushton Rural High School (ST)	10 (10)	F
Caldwell High School (ST)	20 (2)	F, S
Canton High School (AP)	12 (2)	G
Dickinson County Community High School, Chapman (CP)	24 (6)	L, F, S
Chase Rural High School (ST)	15 (3)	S, G
Southeast Rural High School Cherokee (CP)	12 (0)	F, S
Cherryvale High School (ST)	Unavailable	F
Claflin Rural High School (ST)	15 (5)	F, S
Clearwater High School	20 (0)	F, S
Clifton Rural High School (ST)	10 (5)	L, G
Coffeyville High School (CP)	30 (0)	F, S
Thomas County Community High School, Colby (CP)	28 (7)	S, G
Coldwater High School (ST)	18 (2)	S

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Concordia High School (CP)	30 (15)	L, F, S
Conway Springs High School (ST)	15 (1)	L, S
Derby High School (CP)	30 (5)	F, S, G
Dodge City High School (CP)	30 (6)	L, S, G
El Dorado High School (CP)	24 (6)	L, S
Elk City High School (ST)	6 (1)	F, S
Elkhart High School (ST)	16 (4)	L, F, S
Ellis High School (ST)	10 (10)	L, S
Emporia High School (CP)	32 (32)	L, F, S
Erie High School (ST)	18 (2)	L, S
Eudora Rural High School (ST)	20 (1)	G
Eureka High School (ST)	24 (0)	F, G
Garden City High School (CP)	24 (6)	L, F, S
Garden Plain High School	15 (5)	G
Genesco High School (AP)	10 (1)	G
Glasco Rural High School (AP)	10 (0)	S
Goddard High School (ST)	24 (3)	S
Goodland High School (CP)	24 (14)	L, S, G
Great Bend High School (CP)	28 (17)	L, F, S
Greensburg High School (ST)	18 (2)	S
Harper High School (ST)	10 (0)	L, S
Hays High School (CP)	20 (5)	L, F, S, G
Herrington High School (ST)	25 (5)	L, F, S
Hodgeman County Community High School, Jetmore (AP)	13 (2)	F

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Hiawatha High School (ST)	20 (0)	F
Hoisington High School(CP)	20 (10)	F,S
Sheridan County Community High School, Hoxie (ST)	15 (15)	S,G
Hutchinson High School (CP)	30 (6)	L,F,S,G
Hugoton Rural High School (CP)	20 (6)	F,G
Independence High School (CP)	21 (7)	F
Iola High School (CP)	30 (3)	S,G
Jennings Rural High School (AP)	15 (5)	F,G
Kingman Rural High School (CP)	24 (2)	L,S
Kinsley High School (ST)	20 (0)	L,S
Kiowa High School (ST)	18 (4)	F,S
Kismet High School (ST)	15 (15)	F,S
Lakin Rural High School (CP)	10 (2)	F,S
Fairfield Rural High School Langdon (ST)	18 (2)	L,F,G
Lansing Rural High School (ST)	20 (2)	S
Larned Rural High School (ST)	24 (0)	S,G
Lawrence High School (CP)	30 (30)	L,F,S,G
Liberal High School (CP)	27 (3)	S,G
Logan High School (ST)	10 (2)	S
Lyons High School (CP)	30 (2)	F,S
Madison Rural High School (ST)	12 (3)	F,S
Manhattan High School (CP)	30 (6)	L,F,S
Marion High School (ST)	15 (5)	S,G

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
McPherson High School (CP)	28 (5)	S,G
Meade High School (ST)	18 (6)	L,S
Medicine Lodge Rural High School (ST)	14 (2)	S,G
Minneapolis Rural High School (ST)	20 (6)	L,F
Montezuma High School (AP)	10 (3)	S
Moscow High School (ST)	10 (0)	G
Moundridge High School (ST)	24 (4)	L,G
Neodesha High School (CP)	25 (5)	F,S
Nickerson Rural High School (ST)	20 (2)	F
Norton Community High School (ST)	24 (15)	F,S
Decatur Community High School Oberlin (ST)	24 (15)	S
Olathe High School (CP)	22 (0)	L,F,S
Otis Rural High School (AP)	16 (2)	S
Oxford Rural High School (ST)	10 (10)	S
Parsons High School (CP)	30 (4)	L,S
Pittsburg High School (CP)	24 (0)	L,F,S
Frederick Remington Rural High School, Whitewater (ST)	18 (4)	F,S
Pratt High School (CP)	20 (0)	L,F,S
Preston High School (ST)	12 (0)	L,S
Protection High School (AP)	16 (2)	S
Ransom High School (AP)	24 (0)	S
Republic High School (AP)	15 (0)	F
Rolla High School (AP)	15 (2)	S
Russell Rural High School (CP)	16 (8)	L,S

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Sabetha Rural High School (ST)	24 (0)	F, S
Cheyenne Community High School, St. Francis (ST)	18 (6)	G
St. John High School (ST)	24 (24)	F, S
Salina High School (CP)	30 (15)	L, F, S, G, R
Satanta Rural High School (ST)	15 (5)	S
Scott City High School (CP)	24 (24)	L, S
Sedan High School (ST)	10 (0)	S
Sedgwick High School (ST)	20 (0)	G
Seaman High School, Topeka (CP)	24 (6)	F, S
Shawnee Mission East High School (CP)	30 (30)	L, F, S, G
Shawnee Mission North High School (CP)	30 (30)	L, F, S, G
Shawnee Mission West High School (CP)	30 (30)	L, F, S, G
Stafford High School (ST)	24 (2)	F, S
Stanton Community High School, Johnson (ST)	16 (4)	S, G
Sublette Rural High School (ST)	15 (0)	S
Shawnee Heights High School, Tecumseh (CP)	20 (2)	L, F, S
Highland Park High School, Topeka (CP)	25 (0)	L, F, S
Topeka West High School (CP)	30 (7)	L, F, S, G
Topeka High School (CP)	30 (9)	L, F, S, G
Circle Rural High School, Towanda (ST)	18 (3)	F, S
Tribune High School (ST)	20 (10)	S
Ulysses Rural High School (CP)	20 (20)	Unavailable
Victoria Rural High School (ST)	15 (5)	Unavailable
Washington High School (ST)	12 (12)	Unavailable

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Weskan High School (AP)	8 (0)	G
Wichita Southeast High School (CP)	30 (6)	L, F, S, G
Wichita West High School (CP)	32 (7)	L, F, S, G
Wichita North High School (CP)	36 (9)	L, F, S, G
Wichita North High School (CP)	36 (7)	L, F, S, G
Wichita South High School (CP)	36 (9)	L, F, S, G
Wichita East High School (CP)	25 (7)	L, F, S, G
Wichita East High School (CP)	25 (7)	L, F, S, G
Wichita East High School (CP)	25 (7)	L, F, S, G
Campus High School, Wichita (CP)	30 (5)	F, S, G
Campus High School, Wichita (CP)	24 (6)	F, S, G
Wichita Heights High School (CP)	30 (6)	L, F, S, G
Winfield High School (CP)	24 (8)	L, S, R
Yates Center High School (ST)	12 (0)	L, F

PORTABLE LABORATORIES

Ellsworth High School (ST)	12 (0)	L, F
Elwood High School (AP)	12 (0)	F
Fredonia High School (CP)	24 (0)	F, S
Gorham Rural High School (AP)	12 (0)	F, G
Holcomb High School (ST)	10 (0)	S
Kendall High School (AP)	12 (0)	F, R
Leon Unified School (ST)	10 (0)	L, F, S
Leroy Rural High School (ST)	10 (0)	S
Lincoln Rural High School (ST)	12 (0)	L, G

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>STUDENT POSITIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGES</u>
Little River Rural High School (AP)	10 (0)	F
Macksville High School (ST)	12 (0)	S
Mullinville High School (ST)	12 (0)	G
Mulvane High School (ST)	12 (0)	F, S
Natoma Rural High School (AP)	10 (0)	F
Peabody High School (ST)	24 (0)	F, S
Riley County Community High School, Riley (ST)	10 (0)	F, G
St. Marys High School (ST)	10 (0)	F, S
South Haven Rural High School (ST)	10 (0)	F, S
Windom Rural High School (AP)	10 (0)	None

AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE LABORATORIES
IN KANSAS

by

ERIC S. WESSELOWSKI
B. A. , University of Kansas, 1964

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1966

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact that Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 had made in regard to the number of language laboratory installations made in Kansas public high schools up to and including the 1965-1966 school year. More specifically, the purpose was (1) to determine which Kansas public high schools had a language laboratory as of the 1965-1966 school year which had been installed since the enactment of Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; (2) to determine which of those laboratories were of the listen type, listen-speak type, and listen-speak-record type; (3) to determine which laboratory equipment was of the permanently installed nature and which was of a portable nature; and (4) to determine which foreign languages were being taught during the 1965-1966 school year at these schools under study.

The number of Kansas public high schools having installed language laboratories since the enactment of Title III of the National Defense Act of 1958, information about those language laboratories, and which foreign languages were being taught at those schools during the 1965-1966 school year was obtained by record checks at the State of Kansas Department of Public Instruction at the Curriculum Section of the Division of Instructional Services in Topeka, Kansas. The information obtained was based on records of National Defense Education Act installments of language laboratories and the 1965-1966 annual school reports of each high school superintendent.

It was found that (1) 163 Kansas public high schools had a language laboratory as of the 1965-1966 school year which had been installed since the enactment of Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; (2) all of the language laboratories had complete listen-speak facilities, at least one-half of all the laboratories had recording facilities at one or more of the student positions, and about 10 per cent of all the laboratories had recording facilities at all of the student positions; (3) about 88 per cent of the laboratories were permanently installed and the remaining 12 per cent were portable units; and that (4) Spanish, French, Latin, German, and Russian were being taught with Spanish being taught in the greatest number of schools and Russian being taught in the least number of schools.