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The problem of this study was to determine legal, moral, and social responsibilities and practices of the Texas public school system in dealing with religion. The purposes of the study were (1) to determine the impact of state and federal judicial decisions on religious practices in schools, (2) to review the historical background for trends of religious practices in the public schools of Texas, (3) to determine the social and professional influence on religious practices in public schools, and (4) to survey current religious practices from a select sample of public schools in Texas to determine if schools were basically sectarian.

The review of the literature and supplemental data are presented in the following sequence: (1) the historical background of established religion and of early statutes, (2) the growing popularity of Church-State separation, (3) court decisions setting forth guidelines to maintain secularism, (4) current religious practices from a select sample of public schools in Texas, and (5) current views of lay and religious leaders on religious practices in schools.

To obtain appropriate data, these procedures were used: (1) a review of historical literature and of court decisions
was made, (2) some 214 school districts were selected at random to be surveyed, (3) an initial survey instrument was drafted, (4) a jury panel was selected, (5) the survey instrument was validated by the jury panel, (6) a final survey instrument was drafted, and (7) the survey instrument was returned and tabulated.

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter I presents the introduction to the study. Chapter II is a review of literature and court decisions. Chapter III contains the collection of data, and the presentation of the findings is in Chapter IV. Chapter V is composed of the summary, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

Findings

These findings are made from this study:

1. Public education does give recognition to the place of religion in the culture and respects personal religious convictions of the people within the community.

2. Few schools provide regular classes in objective religious instruction.

3. Many of the schools surveyed have some provision for devotional exercises.

4. The pupil benefit theory is not practiced in Texas.

5. Few written policies regarding religion in public schools are indicated.

6. Few plans and objectives are being implemented where the role of the study of religion complements the role of the church.
Conclusions

The following conclusions are inferred:

1. It is not the intention of the Supreme Court of the United States to deny the existence of a Supreme Being, but rather its intention is to assure each individual freedom from any form of an established religion.

2. School policies do not delineate the role of religion in public school.

3. Through careful planning, progress could be made in developing policies for a study of religion which will complement, not supplement, the religious teachings of the home and of the church.

4. There are many opportunities for public schools to provide religious materials and courses in religion which are within the legal scope of Amendment I of the Constitution of the United States.

Recommendations

These recommendations are made:

1. Policies regarding objective religious teaching should set forth adequate guidelines by which the faculty can function effectively.

2. Religious reference materials should be provided for a historical and literary study.

3. All professional school personnel should be trained to understand and to apply the test set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Secularism is a unique experiment in America for which there are no precedents or guide lines. The basic concept of a separation between Church and State is a creation formalized in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Its application, therefore, necessitates practices which are functional within the limits of various segments of society.

Throughout history, secular powers and religions have competed and struggled to dominate each other. Framers of the Constitution were fully aware of religious wars, of the persecutions, and of all other harm which inevitably accompanied unions of Church and State.

Colonists had participated in an exodus from the Old World to secure an opportunity to practice their religious beliefs. They did not seek freedom of religion for all faiths. Since man will create some form of ordered society to which he was accustomed, it was not unusual to expect a form of an established religion in each colony. This, in turn, resulted in persecutions, prejudices, and excommunications which had been suffered in Europe.
In this environment, the principles of religious liberty and secularism are preserved by the new nation in the First Amendment, which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This concept imposes a great moral obligation for a strict adherence on all future generations as it did on the existing generation.

Deviations from the concept do occur. Because of the imperfection of man, there are interferences with religious freedom, and there are sectarian practices in public schools. America's growth into a pluralistic society decreases these violations of the First Amendment due to jealousies created among numerous sects over any favoritism by government. The religious purpose for which schools were originated is also replaced by a secular education to enlighten society in areas other than a religious dogma.

Public schools are still challenged to develop students both morally and ethically. Schools are restricted by the First Amendment from using sectarian concepts. Yet, there are periods in our history where society demanded that some form of religion be included in the curriculum. Three patterns of practice in the schools which have resulted are avoidance of religion, planned religious activities, and a factual study of religion.
Planned religious activities cause the most controversies which result in litigation. Federal courts and many state courts adhere to the principle that separation between Church and State is absolute. The animosity and misunderstanding created by court decisions have been intense. Laymen fail to understand that the principle does not mean that God cannot be recognized. The Supreme Court of the United States held in *School District of Abington v. Schempp*, 374 U. S., 203 (1963), that the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer and that Bible reading are sectarian and unconstitutional. The opinion further explains that this does not mean that the Bible cannot be used for historical or literary purposes. Our government is founded on faith in God and protects religion, but no one under the color of governmental authority can favor any sect or foster sectarianism.

This mandate for complete neutralism brings into focus the question of governmental aid to nonpublic schools. Religious and educational groups now display a willingness to compromise the separation issue. To do so, they take advantage of environmental changes in American society. Poverty, metropolitanization, and the civil rights movement put the issue of federal aid in a new context with a political appeal for all groups, and temporarily resolve the Church-State dilemma. A
substantial expansion in the role of education by the federal government is now established.

In view of all these developments and restrictions within our society, the public schools maintain their directive to develop a citizenship which is founded on character. Due place to religious motives may be given in efforts to educate for character. One can teach that morality stems from the nature of God. In the process of teaching history, literature, or social science, religious faith can be given its normal and proper place. None of these activities violates the Free Exercise Clause or the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine legal, moral, and social responsibilities and practices of the Texas public school system in dealing with religion.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were

1. to determine the impact of state and federal judicial decisions on religious practices in schools,
2. to review the historical background for trends of religious practices in the public schools of Texas,
3. to determine the social and professional influence on religious practices in public schools,
4. to survey current religious practices from a
select sample of public schools in Texas to determine if schools were basically sectarian.

Questions this Study Sought to Answer

1. Does the size of the community and its socio-economic status influence a religious involvement of public schools?

2. Does public education give due recognition to the place of religion in the culture and in the personal convictions of the people within the community?

3. Does the school system provide regular classes in objective religious instruction?

4. Does the school system participate in a released-time program for religious instruction on or off campus?

5. Is there any provision made by the school system for devotional exercises?

6. Are tax monies used to provide materials, texts, or transportation for parochial schools?

7. What provisions are made to observe special religious holidays of all religions?

8. What plans and objectives in which the role of the study of religion complements the role of the church are being implemented in the school system?

Background and Significance of the Study

The First Amendment to the Constitution provides for the free exercise of religion and for an absolute separation
of Church and State. The underlying purpose of this amendment is to guarantee an individual the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience and to prevent any form of an established religion. This prohibition is made applicable to state governments by the Fourteenth Amendment. Since there was no precedent for this guaranteed freedom from governmental intervention, practices in applying the restriction developed a political philosophy of absolute separation between Church and State and of secular school systems.

A review of the literature and of early statutes reveals that at the time the Constitution was ratified, some form of an established religion existed in each colony. Establishment was varied and was not necessarily complete. There were penalties on dissenters, economic or political preferences to one or more churches, submission to a dominant creed, and tax payments to support churches (1, p. 21).

Religious dogma demanding that the individual read and interpret the Bible necessitated sectarian school systems. These early schools were designed for training followers and leaders and required a close correlation between education and religion. Laws were passed to reinforce the important role religion played in public education. Each church provided its own educational program which was narrow, moral, and limited.
Toward the last of the colonial period, a Church-State separation movement began. Puritans were no longer isolated. With the growth of business and commerce, villages changed into cities. Many workers moving into these cities converted the new nation into a pluralistic society of diverse religions. No common denominator for religious instruction which would not antagonize some groups could be found. The alternative was to eliminate sectarian instruction in public schools.

John Locke, James Madison, and Thomas Jefferson set the stage and created the influences which resulted in the First Amendment. Experience had taught them that an accommodation of conflicting religious enterprises was essential. The best way to assure individual liberty and fair treatment to each sect was to separate Church and State. The real problem throughout history stemmed from establishment rather than from free exercise. Their views and attempts were to prohibit all religious influence or control in schools.

Several forces gave impetus during the last half of the eighteenth century to the growing popularity of Church-State separation. The Great Awakening appealed directly to individuals and stressed the rights and duties of the individual conscience and its answerability to God. The movement produced ardent groups who were staunch partisans for separation of Church and State. Another
group of leaders were greatly influenced by Deism and Unitarianism (4, pp. 103-105). This created jealousies which produced sharp rivalries and dissensions.

A most important force was the Age of Enlightenment. Its doctrine in religion meant more than toleration of dissenters. There could be no equal rights of conscience in any form of an established religion.

An era of republican protestantism from 1820 to 1860 sought to make the United States Protestant Christian in substance and ran counter to the theory of separating political and religious life. The movement found its encouragement in the already existing progressive disestablishment of churches. Both the right and the left of the movement fought for Bible reading and for prayer (9, pp. 116-118).

A great crusade against sectarianism in public schools resulted. Horace Mann recognized the handicap which narrow sectarianism placed on the schools, and many have credited him as the person responsible for secular education. His solution, however, was a compromise which allowed the Bible to be read without comment. Had the United States remained a Protestant country, Mann's theory might have worked.

By 1840, Roman Catholics were challenging the Protestant influence in schools. A heated political fight ensued, and Protestants feared Catholic domination.
There were riots, murders, and burnings of property. Political parties became partisan in the dispute. Attitudes regarding religious exercises were no longer crystallized along denominational lines. Jews, liberal intellectuals, and Protestant clergymen who objected to any type of compulsory religious service were joining the Catholic dissent. Courts were also declaring that Bible reading in schools was illegal.

A period of transition and tension then developed in which some of the older paradigms of Church-State relations could not comprehend the legacy of the Constitutional epoch. Devotion to secular schools became so strong that Congress proposed the Blaine Amendment to prohibit teaching any religious creed. The amendment failed, but Congress did require all new states admitted after 1876 to guarantee religious freedom and to provide nonsectarian schools.

Traditionally, American schools have had the responsibility of developing character by teaching moral and spiritual values (7, p. 236). Many groups renewed an interest for some form of religious instruction to accomplish this goal, but agreement was not reached upon the form. The controversies over the issue of prayer and Bible reading continued to grow.

The same social pressures and conflicts which brought secularity to public schools are reflected in
the court decisions setting forth the judicial guidelines concerning religion in schools. The decisions are derived from an interpretation of the Establishment Clause. The view taken by the Supreme Court of the United States is significant because this position insists that establishment refers to any support or connection with religion and that the separation of Church and State is complete.

A counter view expressed by those who want religious practices in school is that establishment is preferential treatment for one religion and that state support of religious activities is permissible where all religions are treated equally or without discrimination. The fallacy would be in arriving at a conclusive definition for religion--who would not qualify as a religious sect?

The view espoused by the Supreme Court does not mean there can be no accommodations between Church and State. School lunch programs, transportation, and tuition for veterans in parochial schools are permissible. Nor does it mean that certain general welfare legislation providing for pupils' benefits breaches the wall of separation (3). It is the specific banning in state constitutions of state expenditures for religious purposes that has served as a check on expanding the pupil benefit theory to justify public aid to religious schools. The Supreme Court of the United States also upholds
released-time programs for religious instruction or devotion if public school buildings or public funds are not involved (10).

The purview of the First Amendment does prohibit recitation of a nondenominational prayer composed by school authorities, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and devotional Bible reading (2, 6). Court decisions on these practices in public schools ended a controversy of long standing but perhaps not a practice which developed with the school system.

Reaction to these court decisions was explosive. Few made any attempt to see the Court's sophisticated awareness of pluralism and its doctrinal differences or to recognize the Bible as a sectarian book. Criticism of the Court was sharp, and accusations were made that the Court took God out of the school and established a religion of secularism. But the decisions still stand as valid law and reject the argument that the concept of neutrality collided with the majority's right to free exercise of religion.

Presently, school officials feel somewhat hampered or simply ignore restrictions placed on them by the Establishment Clause. Many administrators and school boards are either indifferent to or ignorant of the fact that the Establishment Clause places a legal obligation on them to suspend by their own initiative any ongoing prayer programs (5, p. 70).
Definition of Terms

1. **Deism** is a belief in the existence of a God on purely rational grounds without reliance on revelation or authority. It is a belief that God created the world and its natural laws but takes no further part in its functioning.

2. **Dogma** is a doctrine formally and authoritatively affirmed.

3. **Established church** is a church officially recognized by the government and supported as a national institution.

4. **Religion** is any specific system of belief, worship, or conduct which often involves a code of ethics and a philosophy.

5. **Sectarian** is a membership of any religious sect.

6. **Secular** related to worldly things as distinguished from that which relates to church and religion.

Limitations

The scope of the survey and of the interviews was limited to public schools in Texas. Sample school systems were chosen by average daily attendance and geographic location. There was some reluctance on the part of school officials to reveal their practices accurately. Homogeneous groupings in large school systems encouraged some practices which were curtailed with diversity grouping.
Basic Assumptions

It was assumed by dividing the districts into categories and by using the random sample from each category that a valid representation of religious practices of public schools in Texas would be attained. It was also assumed that the administrators of these schools were knowledgeable of their legal responsibilities. A third assumption was that each questionnaire would be answered in an accurate and candid manner.

Procedure for Collection of Data

A review of the literature dealing with the historical background and with court decisions leading up to the *Engel* and the *Schempp* cases was made and is expanded in Chapter II. This developed a cross-sectional perspective of the evolution of religion in the public school philosophy of today.

The study of court cases and their direct or indirect influence on public schools aided in limiting the scope of this study. Current statutory and constitutional law for each of the fifty states was reviewed to give a national scope to the study. This information was secured from area law libraries.

The survey instrument was sent to 214 of the 1133 school districts which were listed in the *Public School Directory* (8). Selection of these schools was made at random with a consideration given to the
smaller number of larger systems. All of the larger school systems were surveyed, since a greater portion of student population was enrolled in those districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Daily Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Schools in Texas</th>
<th>Number Surveyed in Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,999</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 1,999</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 499</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey instrument was mailed to the superintendent of the school district who could delegate the answering of the instrument to the school official who was directly involved with the practices of the system. It was felt that a sample of 214 was necessary, because similar studies of this nature had been able to achieve approximately 50 per cent participation.

The Survey Instrument

The instrument was designed and was presented to a jury of six for analysis. The jury consisted of four college professors, one public school administrator, and one Regional Media Center administrator.
Each college professor was chosen because of his professional experience which lent to the various dimensions of this study. One is well versed in the historical background of this type study. Another teaches constitutional law. A third is involved in the training of teachers. The fourth has a background in extensive research. The school administrator is directly involved in the implementation of the school program. The Regional Media Center administrator was chosen because of his position to observe the general practices of many school districts within his region. The varied insight of this group was used to determine the final content of the research instrument and to clarify the wording and the interpretation.

Approval of at least four members of this panel was considered acceptable for an item to be included in the final questionnaire. It was felt that this procedure lent validity to the study. See Appendix A for sample questions subject to committee validation.

The Interviews

Religious leaders and laymen were interviewed to secure a cross-sectional opinion of various religions on the role public schools should fulfill in developing students' character by teaching moral and spiritual values. The questions sought to determine the current attitude among various religions toward keeping public schools secular;
to determine any desire or need for released-time programs for religious instruction; to determine if various religions would prefer religious practices in public schools; and to obtain the attitude of these various religions on the judicial guidelines set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States regarding religion in schools. See Appendix J for sample questions used in these interviews.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data from the survey instrument was compiled, tabulated, and reported. The response percentages were tabulated and reported categorically by the size of schools as indicated in the procedure for collection of data.

Conclusions were drawn categorically from the survey instrument and from the interviews. The final analysis includes an overall general conclusion. The recommendations include various comments made on the survey instrument as well as responses to specific questions, court cases, statutes, and historical background.
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CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

The American tradition of a free and disestablished religion is a by-product of two historical coincidences which resulted in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. One of the dominant motives in colonizing America was freedom to worship God according to the dictates of individual conscience (25, p. 552). Since this occurred during a period of religious revolutions and counter-revolutions, it might have been expected that provisions guaranteeing that right would have an important place in the Constitution. A second historical coincidence was that of the Constitution being adopted during a period of intellectual rationalism and skeptical enlightenment (24, p. 387). From these factors have emerged the political philosophy of separation of Church and State and the secular school system. This, in turn, attributed to the basic propositions of prohibiting public funds to sectarian schools and denying sectarian instruction in public schools.

Fleeing religious controversies in England, early settlers in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries sought refuge in the colonies. Actually, it was not the desire for a true religious freedom nor the
opposition to the theory of an established church which motivated the pilgrimage to America. Old World patterns of Church-State union and religious oppression were transplanted with all their rigor to the colonies. The attitude of early Colonists was summed up by Nathaniel Ward in *The Simple Cobler of Agawam*:

> I dare take upon me to be the Herald of New England so far as to proclaim to the world in the name of our colony that all Familists, Antinomians, Anabaptists and other Enthusiasts shall have free liberty to keep away from us and such as will come be gone as fast as they can, the sooner the better. . . . He that is willing to tolerate any religion. . . . either doubts his own, or is not sincere in it (19, pp. 78-79).

Colonists stubbornly clung to their convictions and preconceptions of their own version of Christianity, one of which was that the Church and State should have a correlative relationship. Civil and religious life remained distinguished in efforts to colonize, but the means and degrees of correlation between civil and religious life varied among colonies (40, pp. 1-2). Few colonies were tolerant of religious minorities. Maryland extended free exercise of religion to all Christian sects except Unitarians and to all others except Jews but eventually banned Roman Catholics and Episcopalians. Jews, Quakers, and Lutherans were persecuted in New York. Anglicans persecuted Puritans, and Puritans persecuted Quakers (12, pp. 19-20).
Establishment was not always complete and was in various forms: penalties on dissenters, economic or political preference to one or more churches, submission to a dominant creed, and tax payments to support churches (12, p. 21). Colonists understood establishment to mean that the state gave financial support by an allocation of tax money or by gifts of public lands and that the state enforced by law the public worship and doctrines of the established church by punishing offenders.

Maryland's church tax was forty pounds of tobacco per "poll." Most colonies gave glebe to the preferred church. Ministers and church repairs were paid by the state. Prior to 1787, there were religious qualifications required of legislators. As Sanford H. Cobb said:

"... in only two out of thirteen [states] was full and perfect freedom conceded by law. These were Rhode Island and Virginia. Six of these states, viz. New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, the two Carolinas, and Georgia insisted on Protestantism. Two were content with the Christian religion; Delaware and Maryland. Four, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and the Carolinas, required assent to the divine inspiration of the Bible. Two, Pennsylvania and South Carolina, demanded a belief in heaven and hell. Three, New York, Maryland, and South Carolina, excluded ministers from civil office. Two, Pennsylvania and South Carolina, emphasized belief in one eternal God. One, Delaware, required assent to the doctrine of the Trinity. And five, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, and South Carolina, adhered to a religious establishment (12, p. 27)."
The Calvinist theology of the Puritans demanded that each individual read, evaluate, and interpret the Bible and Calvin's works. This element necessitated the establishment of a sectarian school system in which no point of view could be taught without ecclesiastical sanction.

Early New England schools, as a result of this religious dogma, were designed for training both followers and leaders, and tradition in the development of colonial schools was obviously not one of separation but one of close cooperation between religion and education. Factors determining the pattern of education were compactness of community life, aggressive singularity of Puritanism, a well-educated leadership, and an alliance with commercial enterprise. Limited elementary training was provided for the moral discipline of the common man. A secondary program provided training for church leadership. Since there was generally little financial support by the people, the majority of women and a high percentage of men remained illiterate.

New England schools were first organized on a voluntary basis, but the Puritan struggle to maintain a unified obedience led to passing a series of laws. These laws and state constitutions emphasized the religious aspect of education and introduced the principle of public control of education. In 1642, Massachusetts empowered local school boards to "...take account from time to time of all parents and masters, and of their children's ability to
read and understand the principles of religion and the
capital lawes of this country" (30, p. 11).

Massachusetts law became more specific in the
Old Deluder Satan Act of 1647, which provided that townships
of fifty householders or more were to establish schools so
that the children might learn to read the Scripture. Parents
or inhabitants in general were to pay the schoolmaster.
Towns which had one hundred families or householders had
to provide a grammar school to prepare students for college.
The Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 reinforced the
important role religion played in public education. It stated:

As the happiness of a people, and the good
order and preservation of civil government,
essentially depend on piety, religion, and
morality; and as these cannot be generally
defused through a community but by the
institution of public worship of God, and
of public instructions in piety, their
happiness, and to secure the good order
and preservation of their government, the
people of this commonwealth have a right
to invest in their legislature with power
to authorize and require and the legislature
shall, from time to time, authorize and
require, the several towns, parishes,
precincts, and other bodies politic, or
religious societies, to make suitable
provision at their own expense, for the
institution of the public worship of God,
and for the support and maintainance of
public Protestant teachers of piety,
religion, and morality, in all cases where
such provision shall not be made voluntarily.

And the people of this commonwealth
have also a right to, and do, invest their
legislature with the authority to enjoin
upon all the subjects an attendance upon
the instructions of the public teachers
aforesaid, at stated time and seasons, if
there be any on whose instructions they can conscientiously attend (33, p. 71).

Schools in the Middle Colonies were private and parochial in character. Each church provided its own educational program. Parents paid for the instruction, but the very poor were admitted free if an education was desired. Education was not compulsory but was narrow, moral, limited, and elementary in character.

The educational program in the Southern Colonies was distinctly different because of plantation life. Schools in Virginia grew out of the generosity and endowments of interested individuals. Scattered farms and plantations made home-type education mandatory. Formal education, with its general tendency toward the tutorial method, was for aristocrats, leaving a great percentage of the population illiterate. Under a tutor, the son of a plantation owner was taught authority and command over slaves. He learned farming, curing and shipping of tobacco, carpentry, merchandising, courtesy, and hospitality. His political interests were cultivated. After tutorial training, he attended for part of a year a grammar school.

Southern tardiness in developing an educational system may be explained on social and economic grounds, but religion can also be assigned as an effective cause. The South was dominated by the Anglican Church, which required the least Bible reading by individuals of all Protestant sects. Hence, there was no compulsion for widespread literacy until the
Great Awakening in the eighteenth century displaced Anglicans with Baptists and Methodists for whom literacy was indispensable for individual communion with God (23, p. 322).

Early southern state laws stressed the important role of religion in education. A South Carolina statute in 1710 provided:

...It is necessary that a free school be erected for the instruction of youth of this province in Grammar, and other arts and sciences and useful learning and also in the principles of the Christian religion (21, p. 28).

North Carolina in 1766 stated in the preamble of its constitution:

Whereas a number of well-disposed persons, taking into consideration the great necessity of having a proper school of learning established whereby the rising generation may be brought up and instructed in the principles of the Christian religion (21, p. 28). ...  

Thus it may be observed that education throughout the colonies was narrowly conceived, socially divisive, and automatically administered. The policy was religious, and the atmosphere of the school was more like that of a church. Benches were backless, and teacher's desk was built high like a pulpit. The day commenced with the first half hour devoted to opening prayer and Bible reading and closed with a prayer and the repeating of a psalm or hymn. An additional hour was devoted to religious and moral instruction during which the Ten Commandments and the Catechism were repeated. The
Bible was used as a textbook both for reading exercises and for moral instruction even though Anglicans and Catholics placed less emphasis on individuals reading the Bible.

Even when the Bible was not used as a text in elementary schools, the student read from a handbook or manual closely paralleling Biblical teachings by using scripture for its moral lessons. The Hornbook had used the Lord's Prayer for half of its content. The New England Primer was a simple eighty-page manual with a religious overtone. Contents, which were memorized, began with the alphabet in capital and lower case letters. Each letter was illustrated by a well-known religious rhyme. Word lists were either religious or moral in character. Students then progressed in the New England Primer to other readings which were religious admonitions, lessons for youth, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, books of the Bible, and the Shorter Westminster Catechism. The Catechism, however, was the most important part of the New England Primer. It contained basic Christian dogma in a form of questions and answers such as, "Who was the first man?"

During the last years of the Colonial period and during the early period of Independence, a Church-State separation movement began. The thought-control so essential to Puritan theocracy can only flourish in isolation. Growth of business and commerce in New England changed villages into cities.
The many workers moving into the cities were of diverse religions. There arose a public outcry against the subjection of their children in school to the indoctrination of Puritan religious views. Finding no common denominator for a religious instruction which would not antagonize some group, the logical alternative was to eliminate sectarian instruction.

Even though such toleration developed slowly, when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 only four states still retained any form of an established church. The anguish against the enforcement of a rigid conformity of religious belief during the Colonial period reputed any attempt toward a multiple establishment of religion. Experience had taught that an accommodation of conflicting religious enterprises was essential and that the best way to assure individual liberty and fair treatment to each sect was to separate Church and State. The real problem seemed to stem from establishment rather than from free exercise.

Using public funds to finance churches and to provide legal support of teachers of the Christian religion, which in effect was an effort to make Christianity the established religion of Virginia, moved James Madison in 1785 to state in A Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments:

The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable; because the opinions of men, depending only on the
evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men; It is unalienable also; because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent both in order of time and degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society. We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the Institution of Civil Society, and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance (12, pp. 21-22).

Madison felt that freedom of religion "... arises from that multiplicity of sects... which is the best and only security for religious liberty in any society. For where there is such a variety of sects, there cannot be a majority of any one sect to oppress and persecute the rest" (12, p. 24).

Thomas Jefferson espoused the same view and attempted to prohibit all religious influence or control in schools. His "Statute of Religious Freedom" was enacted in Virginia in 1786. It stated:

That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose power he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal
conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind (15, p. 15); . . .

Both Madison and Jefferson were applying the social contract theory which had been popularized by John Locke and which was so widely accepted that it was deemed a self-evident truth to the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Locke defined church as a "voluntary society of men, joining themselves together of their own accord to engage in the public worship of God, in such a manner as they judge acceptable to Him, and effectual to the salvation of souls." But in applying Locke's idea, Madison and Jefferson had to make a logical extension, because Locke's religious toleration excluded Catholics and atheists and included an establishment of Protestant Christianity (23, pp. 101-102).

Madison's and Jefferson's fight for separation of Church and State in Virginia set the stage and created the influences which resulted in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . . ." Reference to congressional debates clarified that Congress was seeking to achieve the same absolute separation of Church and State and total exclusion of governmental aid to religion which Madison and Jefferson had earlier sought in Virginia. All motions to substitute any other language
were defeated, but the Senate did refuse to impose this restriction on the states. Consequently, the guaranty of religious freedom did not bind state governments until after the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution forbid depriving any person "of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Bishop Anson Phelps Stokes has written:

This action was significant in showing that Congress was not satisfied with a proposal which merely prevented an advantage to any one denomination over others as far as Church-State separation was concerned. It wished to go farther (15, p. 17).

Several forces contributed to the growing popularity of Church-State separation during the last half of the eighteenth century. An evangelical religious revival began in New England. The Great Awakening appealed directly to individuals, stressing the rights and duties of the individual conscience and its answerability exclusively to God. The movement resisted coercion by established churches and produced ardent revivalist groups who were staunch partisans for the separation of Church and State.

Many of the clergy of the established churches, especially in Virginia, had opposed the Revolutionary War. They not only were on the losing side, but they were amidst a group of leaders who accepted the social contract theory and who were also greatly influenced by Deism and Unitarianism (23, pp. 103-105).
Another force was the growing multiplicity of denominations and sects. This created jealousies from which there were sharp rivalries and numerous dissensions. Each sect wanted due consideration and feared another sect might be unduly favored.

Possibly the most important force was the Age of Enlightenment with its doctrine concerning "the natural rights of man" which, when applied to religion, meant more than toleration of dissenters. There could be no equal rights of conscience in any form of established religion. A person was to be judged on his morality, not religion (9, p. 8).

During the Jacksonian period, Democrats maintained the principles of Madison and Jefferson regarding separation of Church and State. It was also the period in which the franchise was broadened, and there was beginning the political development of creating a system of free public schools.

An era of republican protestantism ran counter to this theory of disengaging political and religious life and from 1820 to 1860 sought to make the United States protestant Christian in substance. It required evangelical groups to work together for common ends rather than as a check and balance to restrain each other's ambitions. American Protestantism found encouragement in the progressive disestablishment of churches which placed all sects on par
before the law. It was further nurtured by the general impact of the Enlightenment with its promotion of natural religion. Coupled with this era of good feelings was a rising tide of nationalism. The outcome of the united front in the Great Awakening was a strengthening rather than a threatening of American Protestantism. Both the right and the left of this united front fought for Bible reading, prayer, sobriety, Sabbath observance, and church attendance as the only respectable American ways of life and for Christian belief as the norm of American behavior (40, pp. 116-118).

Although this period from 1830 through the 1840's produced one of strife, it gave us the father of the public school system in America. Horace Mann emerged as the great crusader against sectarianism in public schools and has been credited by many as the person responsible for secular schools. Protestant sects and a large influx of Roman Catholic immigrants revealed to Mann the handicap which narrow sectarianism placed on public schools.

Mann, though holding a militant opposition to sectarian instruction, remained cognizant of the need for schools to have some form of moral instruction. His solution was for the schools to teach common elements of Christianity, some of which were honesty, fairness, and truth. To teach these, the Bible could be used as a reader, but no remarks or comments were to be made on the reading. Mann believed
that when the Bible spoke for itself, it was nonsectarian. He originated the theory which approved of Bible reading without comment. Had the United States remained a Protestant country, Mann's theory might have worked.

But in 1840, the Roman Catholics challenged the Protestant influence in public schools. A heated political fight ensued to establish the right of conscience of the Catholic student. New York Catholics requested that public funds be divided to support Roman Catholic schools separately from existing public schools (5, pp. 132-133). The controversy resulted in a statute prohibiting the teaching of sectarian religious doctrines in New York City schools. It read:

No school above mentioned, or which shall be organized under this act in which any religious, sectarian doctrine or tenet shall be taught, inculcated or practiced, shall receive any portion of the school moneys to be distributed by this act (16). . . .

In 1853 in line with this law, the State Superintendent of Schools of New York ruled that prayers could not be a required part of school activities and that where the King James Version of the Bible was read, Catholic pupils could not be required to attend (27, pp. 5-8). This compromise reflected the views on religious activities in public schools which were set forth by Horace Mann.
Prior to the Civil War, public support of sectarian education remained on a state level, but following the war, it gained national importance. Catholics became more vocal in their protest of Bible reading and Protestant exercises of faith. Protestants feared Catholic domination. The rumor that the Pope might move the papal see to the United States because of Garibaldi's encroachments on papal authority caused a national wave of anti-Catholicism (36, p. 4). There were riots, murders, and burnings of property. The feeling which these events generated was partially responsible for the Know-Nothing Party.

Other political parties became partisan in the dispute, and it was the Democratic Party which was associated with the Catholic cause. The Catholics and Jews were now being joined by liberal intellectuals and Protestant clergymen who objected to any type of compulsory religious service. Attitudes regarding religious exercises were no longer crystallized along denominational lines, and by the end of the nineteenth century, several courts had declared Bible reading in schools to be illegal.

The years between the Civil War and World War I represented a period of transition and tension between the religiously plural society and the older paradigms of Church-State relations which could not comprehend the legacy of the Constitutional epoch. This fostered an early and continuing issue in the development of public school
systems. The direct and immediate question before the American people became one of Bible reading and religious instruction rather than a general question of Church and State. There were many attempts to define independence between Church and State and to determine the relationship between religion and politics (40, p. 120).

Devotion to secular public schools became so strong that Congress sought an express constitutional provision. The Blaine Amendment which was proposed in 1876 would have prohibited teaching "the particular creed or tenets of any religion, or anti-religious sect, organization or denomination [other than] the reading of the Bible."

President Grant had expressed the national will earlier in 1875 in his famous remarks to the Grand Army of Tennessee, which were,

Let us all labor to add all needful guarantees for the security of free thought, free speech, a free press, pure morals, unfettered religious sentiments, and of equal rights and privileges to all men, irrespective of nationality, color, or religion. Encourage free schools, and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian schools. Resolve that neither the state nor the nation, nor both combined, shall support institutions of learning other than those sufficient to afford every child growing up in the land the opportunity of a good common-school education, unmixed with sectarian, pagan, or atheistical dogmas. Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and state forever separated (23, p. 337).
The Blaine Amendment failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate, but Congress did require that all new states admitted after 1876 must guarantee religious freedom and must provide for a system of public schools which was free from sectarian control. This reaffirmed the principle of separation of Church and State.

At the close of World War I, there was a renewed interest in religion with emphasis on the place religion should hold in public education. Americans have traditionally regarded the schools as transmitters of the American ethic or philosophy which undergirds society. Schools have a responsibility to develop character and to inculcate moral and spiritual values as found in the common Bible. It is also universally accepted that American democracy drew its strength from the general conviction that there is a Divine Power (32, p. 236).

The Fundamentalist Protestants now wanted irreligious influences removed from the school. Their efforts to make the teaching of evolution illegal resulted in the famous Scopes trial of 1925. The Neo-orthodox Protestants, however, believed that religious teaching must be included in public schools if children were to learn sound morals. Roman Catholics renewed their interests in how religion could be taught in school.

Areas of agreed upon beliefs shrank, and no religious group was happy. After 1923, the Fourteenth Amendment was
applied to cases involving freedom of religion in various states. Neutralism toward religion could not endure. New philosophies rejected the supernatural and limited reality to a purely natural order (32, p. 237).

These social pressures and conflicts which brought secularity to public schools are reflected in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States over the past twenty years. It is important to remember in reviewing the decisions that the Supreme Court is constantly under pressures imposed by a necessity of coexistence with the executive and legislative branches of government in a separation of powers system. Therefore, the Supreme Court has sought in numerous ways to restrict its performance. Standards which the Court developed to avoid passing on constitutional questions are,

1. The Court will not anticipate a question of constitutional law in advance of the necessity of deciding it, nor is it a habit of the Court to decide questions of a constitutional nature unless absolutely necessary to the decision of the case.

2. The Court will not formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by the precise facts to which it is to be applied.

3. The Court will not pass upon a constitutional question, although properly presented by the record, if there is also present some other ground upon which the case may be disposed.

4. . . . [I]t is a cardinal principle that the Court will first ascertain
whether a construction of the statute is fairly possible by which the [constitutional] question may be avoided (26, pp. 174-175).

As previously noted, Congress failed to pass the Blaine Amendment prohibiting the teaching of religion in public schools and forbidding school funds from being used directly or indirectly in aid of any religious sect. This has been effected, however, by the judicial decisions regarding freedom of religion in which the Supreme Court made the First Amendment applicable to the states by way of the "liberty" language in the Fourteenth Amendment. It was not until 1947 that the Supreme Court applied this principle to the Establishment Clause in the case of Everson v. Board of Education (14).

The Supreme Court did not give to free exercise of religion a literal interpretation which would include any practice a believer embraces. Religious beliefs may not be challenged in court, but a religious practice of human sacrifice or polygamy may. Regardless of the First Amendment, any religious practice inimical to peace, good order, and morals of a free society can be banned. This is in line with the interpretation that our freedom must be relative in an ordered society. The Free Exercise Clause would allow anyone to worship as he chooses or to embrace atheism or agnosticism. This is reinforced by Article VI of the Constitution which provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a
qualification to any office or public trust under the United States" (12, pp. 6-9).

There are two general views as to the intention of the Establishment Clause in the First Amendment. One view claims that only the type establishment of a publicly supported church experienced in the Old World is denied and that the evil in establishment is preferential treatment for one religion. This argument contends that state support of religious activities is permissible where all religions are treated equally and no discrimination is involved.

The second view, which the Supreme Court espouses, is that establishment refers to any support or connection with religion. This position insists on a complete separation of Church and State and forbids public financial support to religious institutions. Arguments used by the Supreme Court to support this position are: evidence of the restrictive language accepted by Congress in drafting the First Amendment, review of debates rejecting broad language forbidding an established church rather than an establishment of religion, giving the phrase the meaning it held in 1791, and adhering to the very strict positions on establishment of Jefferson and Madison as being a complete separation of Church and State (26, pp. 567-568).

At times in our judicial history, there appears to be a clash between the Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause, and issues in the national government
have usually been settled by practice. The building of chapels and the furnishing of chaplains in the armed services and in state and federal penal systems are justified on the ground that it would be a violation of religious freedom to take these members away from their homes and churches and fail to provide them with the opportunity to worship if they so choose. Under these conditions, government may provide facilities to fill a gap which otherwise would lead to a denial of constitutional rights. Also Thanksgiving Day proclamations, chaplains in Congress, and exempting certain Church property from taxes have long been established by practice.

There can be accommodations between Church and State which do not violate the First Amendment. Police direct traffic at churches and parochial schools, fire alarms are answered, and veterans receive government grants to complete their education in parochial schools. The school lunch program is available to both public and private schools, and transportation can be furnished to parochial students under the decision of *Everson v. Board of Education*. The Court has never decided the constitutionality of state or federal aid to parochial schools, but this would probably be precluded if the broad dictum of the *Everson* case were used (12, p. 15).

The majority opinion in *Everson v. Board of Education* (14) served as a springboard for some of the later decisions
which have caused considerable controversy regarding
religion in the public schools. The complainant challenged
the constitutionality of a New Jersey statute which
authorized school districts to provide transportation for
children to and from schools, whether public or private.
Under this statute, the school board reimbursed parents of
public and Catholic school pupils for the transportation
fares on the public transportation system. The complainant
alleged that this statute violated the Federal Constitution
on two counts. First, the statute violated the
Due Process Clause because the children are sent to church
schools to satisfy their parents' desires rather than for
the public interest in the general education of all
children. The Supreme Court held that the fact that the
state law, passed to satisfy a public need, coincided with
personal desires was an inadequate reason to declare the
law unconstitutional. This would unduly restrict a state's
power to legislate for public welfare.

Secondly, the complainant alleged that the New Jersey
statute was a "law respecting an establishment of religion."
This issue required an understanding of the meaning of the
language, and to construe the wording of the
Establishment Clause, the Supreme Court reviewed the
historical practices and customs prior to and surrounding
the writing of the First Amendment.

In the majority opinion written by Mr. Justice Black, the
Court held the New Jersey statute valid and thereby
endorsed the pupil benefit theory. The decision did not say such transportation had to be provided but merely that states may permit public transportation for parochial school children and that such general welfare legislation does not "breach the wall of separation between Church and State."
The Court concluded that the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment means,

Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the Clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between Church and State" (29, p. 9).

The Court considered two standards in reaching its decision. Under the First Amendment, New Jersey could not contribute tax funds to support an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church. On the other hand, the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment commands that New Jersey cannot hamper its citizens in their religious beliefs. Consequently, these citizens could not be excluded
because of their religious faith or lack of religious faith from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation. State power was not to be used to handicap religions anymore than it was to favor religions. The Court concluded that this legislation did no more than help parents get their children to and from accredited schools. The indirect benefits resulting to private religious schools from such bus transportation did not constitute support of such schools.

The *Emanuel* decision received overwhelming criticism in law reviews and education periodicals. It was argued that children in other than public schools had no more right to public school bus transportation than did wayfarer travelers. A counter argument was that a denial of transportation to private school students would increase the number of students in public schools and would incur an even greater expense for education. Some characterized the child benefit theory as legal fiction. Four out of five law reviews which took a stand were critical, and more than half the education journals which took a stand viewed the decision with disfavor. Some of these latter articles agreed with the philosophy but not as applied to transportation. Others objected to the Court's definition of the Establishment Clause (*4, pp. 11-14*).

State courts interpreted the decision as indicating that public transportation to parochial schools was a state
matter. This would mean that it would be up to the states
to determine if this practice were permitted by state
constitutions and statutes. Texas, however, has no statute
authorizing tax funds to defray expenses for transportation
to parochial schools.

Usually, state constitutional provisions are quite
specific in banning state expenditures for religious purposes.
This probably serves as a check on any extension of the pupil
benefit theory to justify additional forms of public aid to
religious schools. A good example of this is found in
Article I, Section 7 of the Texas Constitution which provides:

No Appropriation for Sectarian Purposes. No
money shall be appropriated or drawn from the
Treasury for the benefit of any sect, or
religious society, theological or religious
seminary, nor shall property belonging to the
State be appropriated for any such purposes.

Even though state courts usually refuse public money
to elementary and secondary parochial schools for general
operating expenses and tuition, they have been divided on
the issue of supplying textbooks (6, p. 15). The
Supreme Court of the United States upheld a New York law
requiring school districts to loan textbooks to students
enrolled in parochial schools. The Court reasoned that the
state has an interest in the proper education of all
students and is being completely neutral (3).

But a Pennsylvania statute which provided for state
reimbursement to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools
for costs of textbooks in specified secular subjects was held to be unconstitutional under the First Amendment (17). Also, a statute which authorized the state to provide nonpublic schools with educational materials for teaching secular subjects was held to violate the First Amendment in that it would bring about excessive involvement and entanglement between Church and State (1). The distinguishing factor is that a state may lend textbooks, but it cannot reimburse or buy textbooks for parochial schools.

The definition of the Establishment Clause in the Everson case was used a year later in McCollum v. Board of Education (20) to declare a "released-time program of religious education within public schools" as being unconstitutional. Classes, which were composed of pupils whose parents had given written requests, were held weekly for thirty to forty-five minutes. Religious teachers were employed, and they were subject to the approval and supervision of school authorities but were not paid by the public school system. Classes were conducted in the regular school rooms, and non-participating students moved to other rooms to continue their secular studies. The Supreme Court concluded that:

The foregoing facts, . . . show the use of tax-supported property for religious instruction and the close cooperation between the school authorities and the religious council in promoting religious education. The operation of state's compulsory education system thus assists and is integrated with the program
of religious instruction carried on by separate religious sects. Pupils compelled by law to go to school for secular education are released in part from their legal duty upon the condition that they attend the religious classes. This is beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith. And it falls squarely under the ban of the First Amendment... as we interpreted it in *Everson v. Board of Education* (20).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter emphasized the limitation of the decision to this particular set of facts and expressed that some forms of released-time programs might be unobjectionable.

In reaction to the decision, the dissenters' argument evolved around the principle that our Founding Fathers “believed in freedom of religion, and not freedom from religion.” Moderates stressed that this was interference with state functions and chided the Court's assumption of the role of National School Board. Noted scholars argued that absolute separation damaged freedom of religion and parental rights.

Religious groups received the decision with the same mixed reaction. Roman Catholics were disturbed, Protestant Evangelicals were disappointed, but Unitarians, Baptists, and Jews agreed with the Court.

Education journals reviewed the decision with disfavor. Many felt that the public school was logically suited for religious instruction and that it would give an anti-religious slant by ignoring religion. Only religious teachings and interpretations should be left to the churches (4, pp. 44-47).
The whole issue of released-time instruction reached the Supreme Court in *Zorach v. Clauson* (42). New York City had a program which released public school students to go to religious centers for religious instruction or devotions. The released-time program did not involve public school buildings or public funds. Even the application blanks were financed by the religious organizations. These factors distinguish this case from *McCollum v. Board of Education* (20).

The Supreme Court upheld the program and declared:

> We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. . . . When the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. . . . [W]e find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for government to be hostile to religion. . . .

The government must be neutral when it comes to competition between sects (42).

This decision signalled to some a backing down by the Supreme Court from a trend of absolutism. A majority of educators received it favorably, but others opposed a dismissed-time plan as being harmful to an already short school day (4, p. 57).

The landmark case involving religion in public schools came in 1962--*Engel v. Vitale* (13). When the Supreme Court rendered its decision declaring that the recitation of a prayer composed by the New York State Board of Regents for public school classrooms was unconstitutional, a storm of
protests made reactions to the previous cases appear mild. Public agitation over this decision was far greater than that which followed the broader decision a year later in School District of Abington v. Schempp (31).

The New York State Board of Regents composed a twenty-two-word nonsectarian prayer which was recommended for daily recital in the public schools as part of a general program of moral and spiritual training. The prayer acknowledged dependence upon God and ask for His blessings in the following words:

Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country (4, p. 69).

Parents of ten pupils brought action in the New York State Court alleging that the prayer was contrary to their beliefs and religions and violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The New York Court of Appeals sustained the lower court in upholding the recitation of the prayer so long as the schools did not compel a pupil's participation over a parent's objection.

But the United States Supreme Court reversed the New York Courts and held that the Regent's prayer was a "religious activity" and that the prayer "was composed by governmental officials as part of a governmental program to further religious beliefs." The Court said that the
Establishment Clause "must at least mean that in this
country it is no part of the business of government to
compose official prayers for any group of the American
people to recite as part of a religious program carried
on by government."

The opinion reviewed the evils in our history which
resulted from establishment both in England and in the
Colonies. In response to the argument that the prayer was
not a form of establishment because it was nonsectarian
and because participation was not mandatory, the Court,
with reference to the Establishment Clause, stated,

Its first and most immediate purpose rested on
the belief that a union of government and
religion tends to destroy government and to
downgrade religion. . . . . . . Another
purpose of the Establishment Clause rested
upon an awareness of the historical fact
that governmentally established religions
and religious persecutions go hand in
hand (13).

Regarding the argument that to apply the Constitution
in such a way as to prohibit state laws respecting an
establishment of religious services in public schools
indicated hostility toward religion or toward prayer, the
opinion stated that all the Court was saying was that
"government in this country should stay out of the business
of writing and sanctioning official prayers and leave that
purely religious function to the people themselves and to
those the people choose to look to for religious guidance."
The Court cited the advice of James Madison that "it is
proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties," for the principle that can support a first experiment can later be used to support a broad establishment of religion. Justice Black in delivering this opinion of the Court did not invoke the Free Exercise Clause, because the prayer was neutral and participation was voluntary.

Reaction to the Engel case was extremely explosive. Only a small minority made any attempt to understand the Court's position. An Alabama Congressman cried out, "They put the Negroes in the schools and now they've [sic] driven God out (26, p. 576).

A number of bills were immediately introduced to provide a constitutional amendment to overcome the decision. Attacks were made on the Court's application of its historical test to determine what the Framers of the Constitution meant to prohibit because such test failed to consider modern changes in social institutions. Others charged that protection of minorities' rights discriminated against the majority.

The controversy of prayers in public schools had been one of long standing. This was a practice which developed with the school system. As pluralism grew, so did the demands to eliminate prayers. As early as 1908, an action was brought in Texas courts for a mandamus to command the trustees of the Corsicana schools to desist from conducting religious exercises. The complaint alleged that most teachers every morning were reading the Bible to their
classes, reciting the Lord's Prayer, and singing patriotic songs. The children had to be present during these exercises and were marked tardy if late in arriving. The pupils were required to behave in an orderly manner and to bow their heads during recitation of the Lord's Prayer. Reading of the Bible was done without comment, explanation, or interpretation. Purpose of the exercise was for moral instruction.

The Supreme Court of Texas upheld the exercise as not being violative of the Texas Constitution. The opinion stated:

However improper the exercises may have been, there is nothing in the evidence to show that they were in the interest of or forwarding the views of any one denomination of people. It was the purpose of the Constitution to forbid the use of public funds for the support of any particular denomination of religious people, whether they be Christians or of other religions. The school was not rendered sectarian within the meaning of the Constitution by the exercises shown to have been indulged in by the teachers.

...[W]e see that the provision in our Constitution was a protest against the policy of Mexico in establishing and maintaining a church of State and compelling conformity thereto, and was intended to guard against any such action in the future. The primary purpose of that provision of the Constitution was to prevent the Legislature from in any way compelling the attendance of any person upon the worship of a particular church, or in any manner, by taxation or otherwise, cause any citizen to contribute to the support of "any place of worship (8)."
The Texas Court defined place of worship as being one where people met to worship God continuously and said that the morning exercises held in school did not make the building a place of worship. To defend this definition, the opinion cited numerous exercises of a religious nature in governmental buildings which were accepted in practice. To recognize minority rights and deny these exercises "would be to starve the moral and spiritual natures of the many out of deference to the few." The Texas Court further held that:

... Christianity is so interwoven with the web and woof of the state government that to sustain the contention that the constitution prohibits reading the Bible, offering prayers, or singing songs of a religious character in any public building of the government would produce a condition bordering upon moral anarchy (8).

These justices in Texas are elected by the people and are not appointed for a term of good behavior with a salary which cannot be diminished. To retain their office, their opinions would have to reflect the social conditions and attitudes of their constituents. The impact of the Engel case in eliminating local religious exercises in Texas public schools, therefore, would not be of the same degree as it would be in states where the judges are appointed.

But the Engel decision did not settle the issue of prayer in public schools in any state. In 1965 in New York, parents of twenty-one children brought suit against the school principal who ordered his kindergarten teachers to
stop the children from repeating the prayer, "God is Great,
God is Good and We Thank Him for our Food, Amen!" The
principal acted pursuant to a resolution issued by the
board of education to ban all prayers, even when the
opportunity to pray was sought by the students.

The United States District Court in New York held that
under the Freedom of Speech Clause and Freedom of Religion Clause
school children are entitled to prayer. This prayer could be
distinguished from the one in the Engel case because it was
voluntary and not prepared by an agency of the state. There
was no compulsion involved.

The United States Court of Appeals reversed the lower
court's ruling on grounds that the constitutional rights to
the free exercise of religion do not require a state to
permit student initiated prayers in public schools. The
court also concluded that neither provision required a state
to permit persons to engage in public prayer in state-owned
facilities wherever and whenever they desire (35). The
Supreme Court refused certiorari.

A federal district court in Michigan ruled that public
school students who wished to pray or to read scriptures in
the morning prior to the commencement of school or in the
afternoon after school was dismissed may so do. The students
had to meet in some room other than homeroom, and there must
be a five-minute interval between the religious activities
and the school's secular program. The court insisted that a
bell should signal the beginning of the prayer exercises and that any prayer during the lunch period should be silent (28).

Generally, there have been three basic questions to be answered by litigation involving the constitutionality of Bible-reading exercises. The most important question to determine is whether the Bible is a sectarian book. If so, the second question is, can the Bible be used without comment as a textbook in public schools? The third question involves compulsory attendance during the Bible reading (4, p. 83).

The classic case declaring Bible reading to be illegal was in 1890, State ex rel. Weiss v. District Board (34). The Wisconsin court held that the practice whereby teachers selected scripture from the King James Version to read in class was contrary to the rights of conscience and constituted sectarian instruction. Bible reading was characterized as religious instruction. Parts of the Bible which were not sectarian could be used in secular education if from a book other than the Bible. Permissive attendance had no bearing on the court's decision, because the court felt that the absence of objecting students "from a stated school exercise, particularly when such cause is apparent hostility to the Bible which a majority of pupils have been taught to revere," caused the excluded pupils to lose caste with their peers, "and made them liable to be regarded with aversion, and
subjected to insult." The court concluded, however, that the teaching of the existence of a Supreme Being to whom all men had the duty to obey and to love is not sectarian, because all religions so believe and teach. To them, instruction became sectarian when the teaching inculcated doctrine or dogma.

_Doremus v. Board of Education_ (11) was the first federal Bible reading case. Appellants sought a declaratory judgment to determine whether the New Jersey Bible reading statute violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The state statute provided that each school day would begin by reading, without comment, five verses from the Old Testament. The Supreme Court of the United States dismissed the case on appeal, because the appellants lacked standing to sue in that they did not show the necessary interest to maintain a taxpayer's case or controversy which was necessary to give the federal court jurisdiction. The dismissal of the case on jurisdictional grounds left the controversial issue in limbo until 1963.

The Supreme Court did resolve the substantive issue of Bible reading in the joinder cases of _School District of Abington v. Schempp_ and _Murray v. Curlett_ (31). At issue were the practices in two Pennsylvania and Maryland schools of beginning the school day with a reading from the Bible or recitation of the Lord's Prayer. The Court held these to be unquestionably religious exercises
and unconstitutional and elaborated on the Engel reasoning in several ways. Only Justice Stewart dissented.

The Court reviewed the neutral position in which the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment placed the government. It reemphasized that it had consistently held that the Establishment Clause withdrew all legislative power respecting religious belief or expression and stated the test to use as, "What are the purpose and the primary effect of the enactment?" If either one of these advanced or inhibited religion, then legislative power exceeded its scope of power. To withstand the test, "there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion." Parallel with this test is the restraint placed on the legislature by the Free Exercise Clause to secure religious liberty. The Court pointed out that "the distinction between the two clauses was apparent--a violation of the Free Exercise Clause is predicated on coercion while the Establishment Clause violation need not be so attended." The Court relied on its precedents in this case rather than on history as it did in the Engel case.

The Court gave its conclusion in the following words:

"...in both cases the laws require religious exercises and such exercises are being conducted in direct violation of the rights of petitioners. Nor are these required exercises mitigated by the fact that individual students may
absent themselves upon parental request, for that fact furnishes no defense to a claim of unconstitutionality under the Establishment Clause. Further, it is no defense to urge that the religious practices here may be relatively minor encroachments on the First Amendment. The breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent (31). . . .

To the allegation that forbidding these religious exercises established a "religion of secularism" in the schools, the court disagreed. It stated:

... it might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the First Amendment (31).

Justices Goldberg and Harlan warned against any "untutored devotion to the concept of neutrality" or "pervasive devotion to the secular" which would lead to "hostility to the religious."

The Court rejected the argument that the concept of neutrality collided with the majority's right to free exercise of religion. The Free Exercise Clause in the Court's opinion had never meant "that a majority could use the machinery of the State to practice its beliefs." This is the point on which Justice Stewart disagreed. He
felt that if religious exercises were not permitted, religion was placed at a state-created disadvantage and that such exercises were necessary to render the school truly neutral in the matter of religion. His argument would impose an affirmative duty to provide religious education (25, p. 75).

The *Schempp* opinion explained more satisfactorily than the *Engel* opinion why religious exercises in schools are forbidden when some other public religious manifestations are not. Justice Black in the *Engel* decision had emphasized that there was a clear difference between religious exercises organized and sponsored by public schools and patriotic or ceremonial manifestations in public life of belief in God. Justice Brennan reduced the distinction to several categories. He explained that what the Establishment Clause forbid was:

> Those involvements of religious with secular institutions which (a) serve the essentially religious activities of religious institutions; (b) employ the organs of government for essentially religious purposes; or (c) use essentially religious means to serve government ends, where secular means would suffice (26, p. 578).

This would mean that every vestige of cooperation or accommodation between government and religion would not be declared unconstitutional.

The *Schempp* decision pointed out why the Court invoked the Establishment Clause rather than the Free Exercise Clause. If the Court had relied on the latter, it would mean that
religious exercises were constitutionally unobjectionable until challenged. The claimant in a free exercise violation must show the coercive effect of the religious exercise as it operated against him in the practice of his religion. Under the establishment violation, no coercion need be shown. It is also significant to note, as Louis Pollak pointed out, that if the Court had relied only on the Free Exercise Clause in _Engel_ and _Schempp_, this would have meant "that school boards would have been under no discernible legal obligation, as they are now, to suspend ongoing prayer programs on their own initiative (25, p. 70)."

Opposition to the _Schempp_ decision never reached the intensity of the reaction to the _Engel_ decision. Representative Frank J. Becker of New York proposed a constitutional amendment which would permit voluntary prayers and Bible reading in any governmental institution or public school. The amendment was never reported out of committee, and testimony revealed that a majority of religious leaders upheld the Court's decision. A second attempt to amend the Federal Constitution in 1966 by Senator Everett Dirksen met the same defeat.

Rejection and criticism of the decision came mostly from lay groups who failed to understand that the _Schempp_ decision prohibited the use of the Bible as a devotional tool but not for the study of history or literature. Laymen also failed to see that religious exercises, even though
voluntary, destroyed democracy in the classroom by stigmatizing non-participating students in the eyes of peers. The Court's sophisticated awareness of the increasing pluralism of the American society and the doctrinal differences among sects as to the true version of the Bible were not recognized.

In contrast to laymen, reactions in legal periodicals and education journals were subdued. An article in the National Educational Association Journal did not consider the decision to have driven the Bible out of schools and argued that the Bible could still be used for history and literature (37). Protestant and Jewish leaders also supported the decision, but Roman Catholics took the opposite stand and declared that this acceptance of secularism was a denial of religious freedom and the American tradition (4, pp. 112-113).

Dale Doak pointed out in his article that majority rule may not actually be desired by those who declare that atheists and deists are forcing their views (10, p. 22). He foresaw majority rule instituting the Catholic Prayer, Mormon Prayer, Buddhist Prayer, or any other prayer of the religious sect which held the majority. This would evolve into an established church, the very concept which Americans have rejected. Doak, as many other educators, viewed the Court as reaffirming that majority view is not in effect in matters of religion and that individuals are free to worship or to refrain from worship.
A slightly different issue of sectarianism faced by public schools is that of distributing Gideon Bibles. *Texas Jurisprudence Second* (38) refers to the New Jersey case *Tudor v. Board of Education* (39) for legal guidance. In that case, the New Jersey Supreme Court determined that the distribution of Gideon Bibles in public schools constituted an establishment of religion in violation of the Federal Constitution. This ruling evidenced that the court's interpretation of sectarianism would be controlled by those things of doctrinal significance which were unacceptable to specific religious groups.

Gideons International had asked the board of education for permission to distribute its Bible to public school children. During the consideration of this proposal by the board, opposition was voiced by a Catholic priest and a Jewish rabbi on grounds that this Bible was sectarian and forbidden to Catholic and Jewish children by their religions. The board allowed the distribution to children who requested the Bibles provided the parents gave written permission. It further stipulated that the Bibles were to be distributed after school with only the requesting students present and that no reference was to be made to the purpose for which these students assembled.

The school board was accused of showing preference for one religious sect by allowing the Bibles to be distributed. Such preference violated the neutral position required of
the government in competition between sects and was thus a form of establishment.

The court held that such favoritism could not be tolerated and was a clear violation of the Federal Constitution. In reviewing testimony of the witnesses, the court found that both the King James Version and the Gideon Bible were unacceptable to those of Jewish faith. Views expressed in these Bibles were those of one denomination and were therefore sectarian. The New Testament is directly opposite to the teachings of Judaism. The King James Version is unacceptable to Catholics, who use the Douay Version. The Douay Version is unacceptable to Protestants. The court concluded that this was not an accommodation of religion but a practice which could subject the excluded pupil to reproach and insult. It was a method used by Gideons International to further its missionary work by employing the public school system as a medium of distribution.

Debates over the legality of the distribution of Gideon Bibles to school children continue. A Florida court, like the New Jersey court, voided the distributions in Brown v. Orange County Board of Public Instruction (5), and its decision was affirmed by the Florida Supreme Court. This controversial practice remains unstable among states, however, since the United States Supreme Court has not ruled on this issue.
Recent state cases viewed any erection, maintenance, or display of religious structures or symbols on school property in which the governmental purpose advances or inhibits religion generally or any sect particularly as violating religious freedom (22). But in the absence of such purpose, then the erection, maintenance, or display of religious structures or symbols on school property violated the Establishment Clause only if its primary effect was the advancement or inhibition of religion (18). The courts have generally placed considerable emphasis on the fact that such structures involved no public expense and that such structures were temporary when the decisions are held that these structures did not violate the First Amendment.

In Chamberlin v. Dade County Board of Public Instruction (7), suit was brought against the school board for permitting the display of religious symbols which were works of art created by the children and which were displayed on a temporary basis. The court said that to forbid school children from expressing their natural artistic talents through art which had a religious theme or to exclude such efforts from public display because the subject was not secular would be a closer approach to restrain the free exercise of religion than did the practice of permitting such display.
The erection and display of a Nativity scene on a public school lawn during Christmas vacation was held to be free of federal and state constitutional violations in Baer v. Kolmorgen (2). The evidence established that no public funds nor public employees were involved. The court noted that the creche was not displayed while school was in session and that religious symbolism was inescapable during the Christmas season. The New York Court repeated dicta from the Schenck case (3) and said that neither government nor the court could or should ignore the significance of the fact that a vast portion of our people believe in and worship God, and that many of our legal, political, and personal values derive historically from religious teachings.

Any state salary supplements to parochial elementary school teachers is held unconstitutional even if these teachers only teach secular subjects. Again the Supreme Court of the United States reasons that the policing necessary to enforce a restriction of teaching only secular subjects would lead to excessive government entanglement in the affairs of religious schools (17).

The Supreme Court struck down a Wisconsin compulsory education law which required attendance in public or private schools until age sixteen. Members of Old Order Amish Religion and Conservative Amish Mennonite Church have a long-established, self-sufficient agrarian life style
which is essential to their religious faith. Exposure of their children to worldly influences by compelling them to attend high school threatened the life style of their religious faith. Such state statute, therefore, is barred by the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment (41).

The issue of secularism still remains unsettled. Before the Supreme Court cases decided in 1962, there was reflected the permissive attitude toward state accommodation of religious practices as sanctioned in *Zorach v. Clauson* (42), where the Court acknowledged the religious nature of the citizenry and said that it was consistent with the best national tradition to accommodate the public service to spiritual needs.

The view in recent decisions is contra to that expressed prior to 1962 and follows the ruling set down in the *Schempp* case (31). To determine whether a practice in public school is permissible, one must apply the following test: does the state's action in authorizing or permitting the practice have a secular purpose, and if so, then is the primary effect of the practice one that neither advances nor inhibits religion? If the answer is no to both parts of the test, the practice is permissible under both the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment. Our public schools today, however, have failed to perfect the application of this test, and as a result, religious practices of some form are still present.
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CHAPTER III
COLLECTION OF DATA

Since the purposes of this study were to review and to analyze the historical background of religious practices in the public schools of Texas and to survey current religious practices in the various schools in Texas, several procedures were designed to obtain the necessary data. An intensive research into the historical development of public schools and into state and federal court cases evolving from religious practices in schools was made initially to determine what approach, what method, and what type data should be compiled. The following procedures were then implemented to obtain the appropriate data:

1. selection of school districts by average daily attendance and by geographic location to provide a uniform survey,
2. drafting an initial survey instrument which would cover the most common practices involving religion in public schools,
3. selection of a jury panel,
4. validation of the survey instrument,
5. refining the final questionnaire, and
6. tabulating the returned questionnaire.
Selection of School Districts by Average Daily Attendance and by Geographic Location

To add validity to this study, it was necessary to survey schools at random with consideration being given to the smaller number of larger school systems. Therefore, questionnaires were sent to all 19 of the schools with an average daily attendance over 20,000 and to all 25 schools with an average daily attendance ranging between 10,000 and 19,999. An adequate sample was then surveyed from schools with lower average daily attendance. To determine the size of the schools and the geographic location, reference was made to the Public School Directory for 1973-1974 (1).

A list of all schools to which a questionnaire was mailed was compiled (Appendix G). From this list, it could be determined which schools were answering. This, in turn, would reflect whether an adequate sample from each size school as measured by the average daily attendance and from the various geographic locations in Texas was obtained.

Drafting an Initial Survey Instrument

To determine the contents of the initial questionnaire, an intensive research was made into the historical development of public schools. All the leading cases involving religious issues in public schools which were determined by the Supreme Court of the United States were read
and briefed. State court decisions regarding religious practices in public schools were also briefed. These cases were then checked in Shepard's Citator (2) to verify that the case law was still effective and had not been reversed or distinguished. These procedures provided a base from which questions could be drafted for the tentative questionnaire to survey the public schools in Texas (Appendix A).

Selection of the Jury Panel

The jury panel was selected from a varied level of educators whose professional experience would lend to the dimensions of the study. The six members (Appendix B) selected were four college professors, one public school administrator, and one Regional Media Center administrator.

Each juror was personally contacted. An explanation of the purposes of the study was given. This was followed by a letter to each juror explaining in detail how to validate each question. The jurors then approved or rejected each question and based their decisions on clarity and appropriateness. Comments for improving or clarifying the question were given.

Validation of the Survey Instrument

The initial survey instrument which included thirty-four questions (Appendix D) was attached to a letter of instruction (Appendix C) and mailed to each juror. The juror was asked
to consider whether each question would provide the necessary data. The juror was also to determine if the question were clearly stated.

A validity response was provided in the left margin of the questionnaire. The response was numbered "1," "2," and "3" and was placed prior to the number of each question. If the question were clear and appropriate, the juror circled the "1." If undecided, the juror circled "2." If the question were not clear or were not appropriate, the juror circled "3." Ample space was provided for the juror to make corrections, deletions, or suggestions. Whenever four jurors accepted an item, such item was valid and was included in the final questionnaire.

Validation of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire for validation (Appendix F) was drafted from the responses of the jury panel. As suggested by one juror, one question was added to the original survey instrument. Twelve questions were changed to clarify the desired response. On five questions, the wording of the selected responses was changed for consistency and to achieve a full range of responses.

After incorporating and adding the suggested changes to the original survey instrument, the revised questionnaire (Appendix F) and a letter of instruction (Appendix E) were mailed to each juror. The juror was again asked to consider
whether each item was clearly stated and whether it would provide the appropriate information. The same validity response rating system was used. At the end of each question and at the end of the questionnaire, space was provided for the juror to make any additional comments or corrections which he deemed necessary. The juror also was requested to certify his acceptance of the instrument as being complete or with noted exceptions. An additional form was provided for this certification. To constitute validity and to justify inclusion in the final questionnaire, each question had to receive the approval of four of the six jurors.

Construction of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire (Appendix I) was drafted from the jurors' responses to the second validation questionnaire. Twenty-five questions were accepted as submitted. The question which was added was accepted unanimously. Ten questions were acceptable if minor changes in wording were made.

After incorporating the suggested changes, the survey instrument (Appendix I) was typed on eight pages of pastel green paper.

A cover letter (Appendix H) accompanied the questionnaire. This letter explained the purpose of the survey and assured the participant that any response or identification would be treated with complete anonymity. The participant was
instructed that responses should reflect the policy or philosophy of the school district.

Administration of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire was mailed to the superintendents of 214 school districts in Texas. The superintendent could respond, or he could designate a representative of his school district to answer the questionnaire. The accompanying cover letter (Appendix H) explained the purpose of the study, advised the number of schools which were being surveyed, and requested any material or revelation of any policy related to the subject of this study which his school district might share. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was also included.

The respondent was requested to check, to respond, or to comment to thirty-five questions. He was to identify his questionnaire by school district and by county. Any unidentified return could be properly tabulated in the appropriate categories, since question one of the survey instrument had to be answered by designating the appropriate average daily attendance category.

Responses were returned by 153 of the 214 schools which were surveyed. This resulted in a 71 per cent return.

Eight data sheets were designed—one for each of the categories included in question number one of the survey instrument. As a completed survey instrument was received,
the responses were recorded on the correct data sheet. The number of responses were then totaled, and the percentages for each group were computed. These responses and percentages are reported in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The survey questionnaire, "Survey of the Responsibilities and Practices of Public Schools in Dealing with Religion," was composed of thirty-five questions. These queries sought data to answer the eight questions in the section, "Questions this Study Seeks to Answer," which were:

I. Does the size of the community and its socio-economic status influence a religious involvement of public schools?

II. Does public education give due recognition to the place of religion in the culture and in the personal convictions of the people within the community?

III. Does the school system provide regular classes in objective religious instruction?

IV. Does the school system participate in a released-time program for religious instruction on or off campus?

V. Is there any provision made by the school system for devotional exercises?

VI. Are tax monies used to provide materials, texts, or transportation for parochial schools?

VII. What provisions are made to observe special religious holidays of all religions?
VIII. What plans and objectives in which the role of the study of religion complements the role of the church are being implemented in the school system?

The answer to Question I regarding whether the size of the community and the socio-economic status of the community influence a religious involvement of public schools will be determined from Items 1, 2, 14, 33, and 34 of the questionnaire. Whether public education gives due recognition to the place of religion in the culture and in the personal convictions of those within the community can be concluded from data in Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 15, 24, and 32 of the questionnaire. The answer to whether the school system provides regular classes in objective religious instruction can be shown by Item 9 of the questionnaire. Question IV can be answered by Items 21, 22, and 23, which record any released-time religious instruction on or off campus. Question V, which involves provisions for devotional exercises, can be answered from the data for Items 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29. Question VI, inquiring if tax monies are being spent for materials, texts, or transportation for parochial schools, can be answered from data supplied by Items 30 and 31. The answer to Question VII, which involves religious holiday observance, can be concluded from answers to Items 16, 17, and 18 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question VIII, about plans and objectives being implemented whereby the study of religion complements the role of the church, will be
produced by data from Items 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 35.

Data from each item in the survey questionnaire are shown in separate tables. Percentages are given for each possible answer of the item. The additional comments made on any item are reported in the results.

Summary of the Response to the Survey Questionnaire

A total of 214 public schools in Texas was surveyed. The sample included all schools with an average daily attendance of 10,000, and schools with a smaller enrollment were selected at random according to their average daily attendance and by their geographic location. Some 153 schools responded. This 71 per cent response exceeded the 50 per cent response that was considered acceptable to provide sufficient data from which to draw the necessary conclusions to the questions proposed in this study.

The tabulated data reported in this section represent the responses of the superintendent or that of a designated representative of the school district which should reflect the policy or philosophy of the school district which is related to responsibilities and practices in dealing with religion. The results are reported in eight categories according to size of schools based on average daily attendance. The per cent of responses in each category was tabulated and shown. The percentages are shown on each question.
Data from the Questionnaire Related to the Size of the Community and Socio-Economic Status as Influencing Religious Involvement in Public Schools (Question I)

The data in this section represent the size of the community and the socio-economic status of the patrons. Table I indicates the size of the school district as shown by the average daily attendance of schools.

**TABLE I**

DETERMINATION OF SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT* (SURVEY ITEM 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The size of this school district as measured by average daily attendance is: (a) over 20,000, (b) 10,000-19,999, (c) 4,000-9,999, (d) 2,000-3,999, (e) 1,000-1,999, (f) 500-999, (g) 200-499, (h) under 200

n = number of schools surveyed
Item 1 was included to check the cross section of the responses and to provide a categorical identification for each survey instrument that was not identified by district or county. Only 6 of the 153 responses chose to remain anonymous for a surprising 96 per cent identification by name and location.

The number of responses in each category by size was well distributed and gave a balanced return for the total survey. The range from 63 to 88 per cent placed each category well above the 50 per cent usually considered to be a valid return for a study of this nature.

Table II shows the family's median income per year in the community of the school district which was surveyed.

TABLE II

DETERMINATION OF MEDIAN INCOME IN COMMUNITY* (SURVEY ITEM 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE II--Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The household or family median income per year for the community of this school district is approximately:
(a) $15,000 and over, (b) $10,000-$14,999, (c) $5,000-$9,999,
(d) under $5,000, (e) unable to estimate.

Table II presents the approximate median household or family income for the total community of the responding school district. The highest percentage of responses was in the $5,000 to $9,999 income range. This 54 per cent placed the median income a little below the national average. Thirty per cent showed an income median above this figure as compared to only 16 per cent below this range. This fact indicated several very wealthy districts and only a few very poor school districts. The percentages showed an increase in median income as the size of school district increased.

Table III reports data of the respondents who answered Survey Item 14. This question asked if the school districts agreed that social and economic influences of various religions should be taught.
### TABLE III
TEACHING RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES*
(SURVEY ITEM 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district agree that the social and economic influences of various religious sects should be taught in the curricula? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

That religion in public schools is highly controversial was clearly reflected in the responses to this question. Some 50 per cent of the schools surveyed agreed, but 42 per cent disagreed. As expected, the metropolitan areas agreed that such religious social and economic influences should be taught. The smaller schools disagreed. Since the diversity of religions in smaller communities would be less,
the variety of influences could also be less.

This response also indicated there is no clear-cut and generally approved policy to guide public schools in dealing with religion as a basic institution and influence in life. Instead, schools are tying social and economic influences to national origins, thereby avoiding the controversial issue of religion in public schools.

Table IV shows data from Survey Item 33, which reports the percentage of districts which agree that school districts should leave religious training to the home and to religious organizations.

**TABLE IV**

**NONINVOLVEMENT IN RELIGIOUS TRAINING**

* (SURVEY ITEM 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Does your school district agree that school systems should leave religious training to the home and to religious organizations? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

As expected from responses to other questions, 81 percent of the school districts, both large and small, believed in separation of Church and State if any recognition or involvement with religion will add to the curriculum and to the duties and liabilities of the faculty. A lack of expertise in the field of religion restricted all but the large districts in Texas from offering any instruction in religion as an elective course.

Table V seeks to determine from data supplied by Survey Item 34 whether the school districts understand the intent of Amendment I of the United States Constitution.

**TABLE V**

**SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE***  
(SURVEY ITEM 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district feel that Amendment I of the United States Constitution requires a complete separation between Church and State? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

Seventy-six per cent of the schools surveyed understood and agreed that Amendment I of the United States Constitution requires a complete separation of Church and State. More of the smaller schools disagreed. The theory of complete separation still does not exist in practice, as other tables will show, and the substitution of Horace Mann's theory of religious exercises without comment prevailed in many of the schools surveyed.

In summary, Table I gave the percentage of responses to the questionnaire which indicated that a uniform cross section of the survey was returned as well as designating the size of the school. Table II categorized this cross section according to the socio-economic status of the community. These statistics were necessary to determine
if size and median income were factors which influence the responsibilities and practices of public schools in dealing with religion.

The larger school districts agreed that religious social and economic influences should be taught, but the smaller districts disagreed. The larger districts also felt that Amendment I of the United States Constitution required a complete separation of Church and State.

From this data, size and socio-economic level of the community appeared to have an influence on religious involvement of schools. The larger districts were aware that religion is personal and that a religious involvement of public schools will be controversial in a city where there is a diversity of religions and a higher socio-economic scale. Smaller districts showed a tendency to become more involved with religious influences within the school.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Public Education Giving Due Recognition to the Place of Religion in the Culture and Convictions of People within the Community (Question II)

Data presented in Table VI determine the predominant nationality in the school district. These responses were taken from Survey Item 3.
TABLE VI
PREDOMINANT NATIONALITY IN DISTRICT*
(SURVEY ITEM 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What nationality is predominant in your district? (a) German, (b) Czechoslovakian, (c) English, (d) Mexican-American, (e) Afro-American, (f) other (list)

The response of the surveyed districts showed that the predominant nationality was English. The majority represented a diversity of religious backgrounds and beliefs. This should indicate a stronger adherence to an absolute separation between Church and State. However, the contrary was reported in Texas.

In the larger districts, the responses showed a greater tendency for the clustering of English, Mexican-American,
and Afro-American. Where Germans and Czechoslovakians were predominant, they had remained in the smaller towns and communities. This reflected a cultural trend which originally centered around the rich agricultural belt of central and south central Texas.

The data presented in Table VII report the predominant religions in the various school districts.

TABLE VII
PREDOMINANT RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS IN DISTRICT*
(SURVEY ITEM 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Are there predominant religious denominations in your district, and if so, please give estimated percentages: (a) _____ % Protestant, (b) _____ % Catholic, (c) _____ % Jewish, (d) _____ % other (list)
As expected, the larger school districts showed a greater diversity of religious denominations. These percentages for various denominations were closely balanced between Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions. The percentage of Protestants became larger in the smaller school districts. The Catholic religion was stronger in middle-size school districts, and there was a greater percentage of Judaism in the metropolitan areas. There was also an indication that as the district decreased in size, there was a tendency for Protestantism or for Catholicism to dominate. This, in turn, reflected the cultural background of the community as well as the nationality.

Table VIII reports data showing the extent that the school system teaches basic qualities which have a moral value.

TABLE VIII

TEACHING OF MORAL VALUES*
(SURVEY ITEM 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>a 54  b 38  c 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>a 43  b 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>a 58  b 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District ADA</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In your school system, do the aims and objectives include the teaching of moral values which refer to such basic qualities as honesty, courage, loyalty, etc.? (a) extensively, (b) moderately, (c) limited, (d) none*

This question was designed to determine the emphasis placed by school districts on honesty, courage, and loyalty which are basic qualities of any religion. Results indicated a balance between a moderate and an extensive involvement in the aims and objectives of the philosophy of the schools in teaching these moral values. The very small per cent which indicated limited involvement showed the freedom of choice in Texas as to the degree that the aims and objectives will include teaching of moral values.

Table IX reports data which reflect the teaching of neutral spiritual values. These responses are shown by Survey Item 6.
TABLE IX
TEACHING OF SPIRITUAL VALUES*
(SURVEY ITEM 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school system include in its aims and objectives the teaching of spiritual values which refer to such qualities as love, faith, reverence for a Supreme Being? (a) extensively, (b) moderately, (c) limited, (d) none

In contrast to moral values, the responses to including spiritual values in aims and objectives in teaching showed only a limited per cent participated extensively as compared to an almost 55 per cent response to Item 5 in Table VIII. There was a strong response in districts with over 20,000, indicating a limited involvement in teaching spiritual values. This validated the theory that diversified religious backgrounds restrict a religious involvement by public schools.
Data from Survey Item 13 are shown in Table X. This concerns keeping religious beliefs purely personal to continue the level of tolerance and good will which has characterized public education.

**TABLE X**

**KEEPING RELIGIOUS BELIEFS PERSONAL**

*(SURVEY ITEM 13)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district agree that keeping religious beliefs a purely personal affair continues the level of tolerance and good will which has characterized public education? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree*

This question was designed to show the need for a review of the philosophy of public schools in dealing with religion. The 14 schools which disagreed that keeping
religious beliefs a purely personal affair would continue the level of tolerance and good will which has characterized public education emphasized the premise that, in Texas, questions concerning religion should be referred to the home or church and are not the concern of public schools. It also indicated that the great majority of schools surveyed reflected the attitude of their communities which felt there was no need for any review of public schools in dealing with religion.

Table XI presents data to determine if school districts agree that teaching respect for others' religious beliefs should also include non believers, including atheists.

**TABLE XI**

**TEACHING RESPECT FOR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS* (SURVEY ITEM 15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district agree that schools, in teaching respect for the religious beliefs of others, should also include respect for any non-believers, including atheists? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

Twenty-three per cent of the responses disagreed that respect for non-believers including atheists should be taught. This would not mean that these schools would not teach respect for an individual. But it did reveal a misunderstanding that Amendment I of the United States Constitution with reference to freedom of religion guarantees a right to believe or not to believe and a limited or relative right to practice this belief as long as such practice does not interfere with the public morals and welfare.

Only 8 per cent of the schools surveyed strongly agreed. There was a tendency for the 58 per cent who agreed to lump respect for all religions into the teaching of respect for mankind and for a relative freedom to be an individual in an ordered society.
Data reflecting the hiring of ordained or designated representatives of religious orders to teach in public schools are shown in Table XII. An effort was made to determine if such teachers were full-time or part-time employees.

**TABLE XII**

**HIRING OF RELIGIOUS REPRESENTATIVES***
(SURVEY ITEM 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Are ordained or designated representatives of religious orders teaching in the public schools of your district? (a) yes; if yes, then check whether ___ part-time or ___ full-time, (b) no, (c) occasionally

Few schools employed as teachers ordained or designated representatives of religious orders. This practice was
consistent in the smaller systems as well as in the larger ones. It would not indicate a separation of Church and State rule because many religious leaders would not have the time to devote to teaching school. But the fact that schools would employ such religious leaders showed a recognition of the religious factor in the community without dealing directly with religion.

Table XIII provides data from Survey Item 32. This item seeks the opinion on whether the school district should supplement religious training.

| TABLE XIII |
| SUPPLEMENTAL RELIGIOUS TRAINING* |
| (SURVEY ITEM 32) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Should your school district supplement religious training which is provided by the home and religious organizations? (a) extensively, (b) limited, (c) no, (d) undecided

Only 15 per cent of the schools surveyed indicated that supplemental religious training on a limited basis should be provided by public schools. Two major factors underlie this small positive response. There is already an overcrowded school curriculum, and the other factor is the lack of interest by school systems to become involved in any program that would necessarily have to be broad enough to satisfy and to nurture the great diversity of religions in the community.

In summary, English was the predominant nationality in Texas. A greater diversity of religion occurred in larger cities, but a safe assumption was that Protestantism was predominant. The larger cities, however, showed a close balance between Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism. Schools engaged in a moderate to extensive involvement of teaching moral values, but there was a somewhat limited involvement in teaching spiritual values.

The majority of Texas schools agreed that religious beliefs should be kept a purely personal affair to continue the level of tolerance and good will which characterizes public education. A striking 23 per cent refused to teach respect for non-believers.

Few ordained religious leaders were employed as teachers. These factors indicated a recognition by the schools of
religion and its personal nature. There was a tendency to support religion by teaching moral values and to respect personal convictions by limiting involvement in teaching spiritual values. Only 15 per cent of the schools surveyed indicated that supplemental religious training on a limited basis should be provided by schools.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Providing Regular Religious Instruction (Question III)

Table XIV shows data from Survey Item 9. This data report the schools which participate in regular religious instruction. This instruction was outside that given as historical and literary enrichment.

**TABLE XIV**

REGULAR RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION*
(SURVEY ITEM 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only the larger districts provided regular courses in objective religious instruction outside historical and literary enrichment. None of these identified any particular religion but indicated that a course was taught in Bible history. An overwhelming 94 per cent of the schools provided no religious instruction per se. One district was willing to release students for religious instruction.

In summary, no districts with an average daily attendance below 4,000 provided regular courses in objective religious instruction. A small 4 per cent of the larger districts provided such a course, but 94 per cent of all schools surveyed did not provide regular courses in objective religious instruction.

TABLE XIV--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district provide regular courses in objective religious instruction outside the historical and literary enrichment instruction? (a) yes, (b) no*  
If the answer is yes, in what religion or religions?
Data from Questionnaire Related to Participation in Released-Time Program for Religious Instruction (Question IV)

The data presented in Table XV report the percentage of schools surveyed which cooperate in a program of released-time religious instruction. This data was recorded by Survey Item 21.

### Table XV

#### RELEASED TIME INSTRUCTION* (SURVEY ITEM 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To meet the need for teaching moral values, does your school system cooperate in a program of released-time religious instruction? (a) regularly, (b) seldom, (c) never

Only thirteen schools utilized a released-time program which can give recognition to the place of religion in the
culture and in the convictions of people and at the same
time guard safely the separation of Church and State. This
usually occurred in the metropolitan areas which have
extensive curricula as well as a greater diversity of
religions among its patrons.

Of the vast majority of schools which did not provide
released-time programs, many felt the school day was already
too demanding and too crowded with activities. There was a
general consensus among this majority that the school day
was already too short to add to the number of electives.

Table XVI reports data from Survey Item 22 which asked
the location of released-time instruction.

TABLE XVI
LOCATION OF RELEASED-TIME INSTRUCTION*  
(SURVEY ITEM 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If there is a released-time instruction, where are the classes held? (a) school, (b) church, (c) home, (d) other (list)

Twelve schools provided for released-time study in the school itself. There was no qualification to this answer that such classes were held before and after regular classes with a bell to signal the beginning or the end of the scholastic school day. The majority indicated an adherence to a complete separation between Church and State by having such programs off campus.

Data showing the opinion of the school district of released-time instruction are shown in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII

VALUE OF RELEASED-TIME INSTRUCTION* (SURVEY ITEM 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVII—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the opinion of your school district of released-time religious instruction? (a) great value, (b) some value, (c) no value

Over 46 per cent felt there was value in released-time programs. The validity of those 19 per cent who said no value must be viewed in the light that such a released-time program is not supervised by school personnel. Therefore, valid evaluations of released-time programs are difficult to make. Many returned this item unanswered or qualified it as being not applicable. Others qualified on grounds that with such a few in a minority religion a valid opinion could not be given.

To summarize, only 8 per cent of the surveyed schools provided a released-time program for religious instruction.
Seven per cent of these schools held the classes in the school building but did not indicate a time when such classes were held. The majority of schools which did not provide for released-time instruction indicated that time was not available for such a program.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Devotional Exercises in School (Question V)

This data include many forms of devotional exercise held during the school day. Seven activities are covered by various survey items.

Table XVIII shows the percentage of schools which observe baccalaureate services at graduation. The data were recorded by Survey Item 19.

TABLE XVIII

OBSERVANCE OF BACCALAUREATE SERVICES* (SURVEY ITEM 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVIII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Are baccalaureate services conducted in connection with high school graduation? (a) always, (b) sometimes, (c) never

Sixty-nine per cent of the schools surveyed always conducted baccalaureate services. Only 17 per cent of the schools never conducted these services, and 3 per cent of the schools occasionally conducted such services. It is a safe assumption that 72 per cent of the schools do provide for a form of devotional service at least one time during the year. The larger schools indicated that the baccalaureate services were optional with the students and were not compulsory.

The data in Table XIX report the value that school districts place on baccalaureate services in providing a meaningful learning experience.
TABLE XIX
VALUE OF BACCALAUREATE SERVICES*
(SURVEY ITEM 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district feel baccalaureate services provide a meaningful learning experience for high school graduates? (a) great value, (b) some value, (c) no value, (d) undecided

The returned questionnaires indicated that only 16 per cent of the schools felt that the devotional exercise embodied in baccalaureate services provided a meaningful experience. Fifty-five per cent felt there was some value. Surprisingly, the larger school districts experienced a similar reaction as did smaller school districts. This could indicate that public schools feel that they are not doing all that needs to be done about religion, and this
one particular effort is simply an alternative to a factual study of religion as well as an accepted social practice.

Table XX records data from Survey Item 25. This item asked in what manner can Bibles be read, if at all.

**TABLE XX**

**READING OF BIBLES***
*(SURVEY ITEM 25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In your school district, can Bibles be read: (a) by teachers aloud without comment during class, (b) by students aloud during class, (c) not at all, (d) silently on an individual basis.

Some 53 per cent of the schools allowed Bible reading during class. This shows the continuing impact of
Horace Mann's theory that the Bible could be read without comment and still be within the legal limits of a separation between Church and State. It further shows a prevalent belief among educators that Christianity is the accepted religion in the United States.

Several schools indicated that Bibles were always available to students in the school library, and some indicated that Bibles were used only as a literary reference and for a comparison of various religions in a specific course on comparative religions. It is significant that only 4 per cent of the schools surveyed prohibited any Bible reading and would specifically forbid such a practice over the public address system.

Table XXI reports data from Survey Item 26 which seeks to determine if chapel exercises are held regularly.

**TABLE XXI**

**REGULAR CHAPEL EXERCISE* (SURVEY ITEM 26)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district provide for any regular chapel exercise? (a) monthly, (b) weekly, (c) daily, (d) seldom, (e) never

Responses showed a sharp decline in Texas schools in providing regular chapel exercises. Comments and qualifications of answers contributed the decline in this practice to urbanization, growth of student bodies, and inadequate plant facilities as much as to recent court decisions which have held such exercises were in violation of Amendment I of the United States Constitution.

Other schools which still have chapel exercises have eliminated any religious activity and have substituted awards programs, programs for special recognition of students and teachers, and assemblies with guest speakers. The 58 per cent of the schools which answered that never were any religious exercises held obviates the identification of this question as being the regular religious exercise.
which has violated the theory of a separation between Church and State.

Data provided in Table XXII report the responses to Survey Item 28. This item seeks to determine what regular provisions are made for homeroom devotional exercises.

**TABLE XXII**

**HOMEROOM DEVOTIONAL EXERCISE**

(SURVEY ITEM 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Is there any provision for homeroom devotional exercises? (a) daily, (b) weekly, (c) monthly, (d) other

Sixty per cent of all schools which responded had some provision for homeroom devotional exercises. These
were supervised by the teachers and principals. One school commented that the desires of the parents were also given consideration.

Most schools indicated there was no policy. This fact was shown by the large number which acknowledged homeroom devotional exercises, including prayer, and which admitted this practice was left to the discretion of the principal and the teacher.

Table XXIII shows data from Survey Item 28. This question seeks to determine if prayer and scripture reading are included in opening exercises in schools and the method used.

**TABLE XXIII**

**PRAYER AND SCRIPTURE READING IN OPENING EXERCISE* (SURVEY ITEM 28)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXIII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your school district, are prayers and/or reading of Bible verses included in the morning opening exercise? (a) yes, at the option of the principal, (b) yes, at the option of the teacher, (c) yes, by students, (d) undecided, (e) no, (f) no, violates school policy.

Only one school surveyed indicated that it had a written policy which forbids prayers and/or Bible verses in the morning opening exercise. It is a popular practice in Texas to allow the principal, the teacher, or the students to have discretion to determine this program. In reference to this practice, there was a strikingly even distribution of schools which grant this freedom of choice to the principal, the teacher, or the students.

Only 30 per cent of the schools forbid religious practices in the morning exercise. If this table is compared to Table XXI, one can see a discontinuance of the larger group practices of religion in public schools in favor of the smaller or grass root groups whereby students are reluctant to complain for fear of losing their acceptance among peers. This will also disseminate a small minority among the various classrooms and further
weaken any opposition to this religious practice.

Table XXIV reports data on how prayer is given before meals. Survey Item 29 also shows data for those schools which do not have prayer before meals.

**TABLE XXIV**

PRAYER BEFORE MEALS*
(SURVEY ITEM 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Which one of the following provisions is made by your school district for prayer before meals? (a) homeroom, (b) public address system, (c) lunchroom, (d) none

A large majority of Texas schools answered that no provision is made for prayer before meals. Some 10 per cent of the schools admitted prayers were offered in the homeroom. A few responses indicated such a practice was by teacher option.
The validity of the negative answer by 75 per cent indicated a lack of awareness by administrators of practices. Too, it showed the de-emphasis placed by society on prayer before meals.

In summary, it is safe to assume that 72 per cent of the schools surveyed provided some form of devotional service at least once a year by having baccalaureate service. Only the small per cent of 16 felt that baccalaureate services provided great value as a meaningful learning experience. A significant finding was that a mere 4 per cent of the schools surveyed prohibited Bible reading, but 53 per cent of the schools allowed Bible reading. The practice of having chapel exercises declined, and 58 per cent of the schools which held such exercises explained that religion was not a part of this exercise.

A large majority of 60 per cent had some provision for homeroom devotional exercises. Most respondents indicated that their school district had no policy regarding homeroom devotionals. Only one respondent had a written policy which forbid prayer and/or Bible reading. The majority left such practices to the principal who, in turn, delegated the discretion to the homeroom teacher. Seventy-five per cent indicated that their system made no provision for prayers before meals. No respondent denied that some provision is made by the
school system for some type of devotional exercise.

Data from Questionnaire Related to the Use of Tax Monies to Aid Parochial Schools (Question VI)

The data presented in this section represent the actions taken by the various school systems to provide materials, texts, or transportation for parochial schools. Table XXV records data which show whether the school district favors a policy by which tax monies can buy texts and materials for parochial school students.

**TABLE XXV**

**TEXTS AND MATERIALS FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS**

*(SURVEY ITEM 30)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district favor a policy by which public monies are used to buy texts and materials for
parochial school children? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

Aid to parochial schools was strongly opposed in Texas. This opposition is not only reflected by practice and by preference as revealed in this table, but the Texas Constitution forbids any aid to parochial schools. The pupil benefit theory as espoused by the United States Supreme Court is not practiced, and by the large majority of schools strongly disagreeing with such a policy, there seems to be no likelihood of this policy being practiced by any school district.

Table XXVI records data from Survey Item 31. This data show the number of school districts which provide bus transportation for students in parochial schools.

**TABLE XXVI**

**BUS TRANSPORTATION FOR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS**
*(SURVEY ITEM 31)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district provide bus transportation for children attending parochial schools? (a) always, (b) sometimes, (c) never

Only one school reported that it transported parochial school students by bus. Both statutory and constitutional law in Texas hold that pupils of a parochial school may not be transported to their school on a public school bus. Even a plan whereby students of parochial schools would be enrolled in the public schools merely for the limited purpose of riding public school buses to their parochial schools is plainly a subterfuge which is illegal and contrary to the Texas Constitution.

In summary, the school districts of Texas do not practice the pupil benefit theory as espoused by the United States Supreme Court. Only one school transported parochial school students by bus. Aid to parochial schools was strongly opposed by the surveyed schools, and these schools are abiding by the Texas Constitution and by statutory laws which forbid any aid to parochial schools.
Data from the Questionnaire Related to the
Observance by Schools of Special
Holidays of All Religions
(Question VII)

This data deal with dismissing classes to observe
religious holidays and religiously oriented activities
which precede these holidays. Table XXVII reports
responses to Survey Item 16 which questions whether
specific religious holidays were observed by dismissing
classes.

TABLE XXVII

OBSERVANCE OF RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS*
(SURVEY ITEM 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What religious holidays does your school district
observe by dismissing classes? (a) Christmas, (b) Easter,
(c) Thanksgiving, (d) Rosh Hashana, (e) Yom Kippur,
(f) other (list)
The very small 2 per cent which answered affirmatively for the Jewish holidays were qualified in that only students, not classes, were dismissed. This 2 per cent was found in school districts with an average daily attendance of 4,000 or above and indicated that the Jewish population was concentrated in our larger towns and cities. Some qualified Thanksgiving as being a national, not a religious, holiday. All schools observed Christmas holidays, and a few who observed Easter questioned whether this could be considered a religious holiday observed by schools since Sunday was the actual day for recognition.

The practice of dismissing classes during a period of special significance and observance for the Christian religion has become so traditional that it is no longer associated with religious practices. It simply indicates that social and economic influences are factors which caused the schools to utilize this season for winter and spring breaks.

Table XXVIII shows responses to Survey Item 17. This survey item determines if religiously oriented activities are held in the school district to observe religious holidays.
TABLE XXVIII
RELIGIOUSLY ORIENTED SCHOOL ACTIVITIES*
(SURVEY ITEM 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In your school district, are there any religiously oriented activities in observance of religious holidays? (a) usually, (b) seasonally, (c) seldom, (d) never

Sixty-seven per cent acknowledged that religiously oriented activities were utilized to observe religious holidays. This contradicts the theory that classes are dismissed simply on a basis of tradition.

These activities are generally accepted by the community. Schools are merely reflecting an attitude of the community which has been formed by commercial influences and personal preferences as well as religious influences.
Table XXIX represents the opinions of school districts on whether celebrating religious holidays by school activities strengthens moral education.

**TABLE XXIX**

**STRENGTHENING MORAL EDUCATION***
(SURVEY ITEM 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the opinion of your school district, should religious holidays be celebrated by school activities to strengthen moral education? (a) always, (b) sometimes, (c) never

Only 6 per cent of the school districts felt that religious holidays should not be celebrated by school activities to strengthen moral education. The vast majority which felt that holidays should be celebrated
sometimes reflected a positive attitude which underlies the utilization of religiously oriented activities to observe religious holidays. This implies an acceptable middle ground has been found whereby schools can strengthen moral education in a manner which is less controversial than teaching religion objectively.

To summarize the various survey items for Question VII, all schools observed Christmas holidays. Some districts qualified their answers about Thanksgiving and Easter by pointing out that these were national holidays. Jewish students were dismissed to observe special religious holidays for Judaism, but classes were not dismissed. Sixty-seven per cent affirmed that religiously oriented activities were utilized to observe religious holidays, and a small six per cent felt that such activities did not strengthen moral education.

Data from Questionnaire Related to Plans and Objectives of the School District in which the Role of the Study of Religion Complements the Role of the Church (Question VIII)

The data in this section reflect the plans and objectives of the school district to implement a study of religion which complements the role of the church. Table XXX records the views of the school districts on supplementing religious training.
TABLE XXX
PROVISION TO PROVIDE TEACHING MATERIALS*
(SURVEY ITEM 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Are provisions made in your school system for materials such as Bibles of various religious orders or cults and/or factual and historical literature which help in teaching religious values? (a) yes, (b) no
If the answer is yes, list the materials used:

School districts seemed reluctant to provide Bibles and materials of various religious orders which would aid in teaching religious values. In school districts where average daily attendance was 10,000 and over, there appeared to be a greater degree of objectivity as an equal number indicated that they provided Bibles and materials. Below this size school, there was a general
consistency of not providing Bibles and other religious literature. The one exception to this general consistency was schools which had an average daily attendance of 2,000 to 3,999.

Among the school districts which qualified their answers, there appeared to be a greater emphasis placed upon historical literature with very few indicating the inclusion of Bibles as part of their reference materials in their libraries. An even smaller percentage indicated an inclusion of Bibles other than the King James Version.

Table XXXI reports data which reflect school policy for providing the freedom to teach objectively about religion. The data are qualified in that in so teaching about religion, a minority religion should not be offended.

TABLE XXXI

FREEDOM TO TEACH RELIGION OBJECTIVELY*
(SURVEY ITEM 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does the policy of your school district provide the freedom to teach objectively about religion without offending a minority religion? (a) yes, (b) yes with these restrictions, (c) undecided, (d) no

Half the school systems in this sample had a policy providing freedom to teach religion objectively. But 13 per cent of these indicated restrictions on this freedom.

The qualified answers reported that most teaching was done in an elective course in the high school curriculum. An emphasis was placed on the importance in being objective by making presentations in the form of historical literature. Teachers were cautioned not to advocate any one religion. The 18 per cent which were undecided tends to indicate a lack of in-service communication rather than the lack of school policy.

Table XXXII presents data from Survey Item 10 regarding materials furnished to aid in teaching about
Only 1 per cent of the schools quite adequately provided their teachers with materials to teach about religions. Some 27 per cent felt that they provided adequate materials. Over 56 per cent indicated that their materials were inadequate in this area. Those who qualified their answers stated that the King James Version of the Bible was placed in the library.
Table XXXIII reports data from Survey Item 11 which inquired if there could be a combination of pre-service and in-service education to qualify teachers to teach objectively about religion.

TABLE XXXIII
PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS* (SURVEY ITEM 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district agree that there can be a combination of pre-service and in-service education which will qualify teachers to be sufficiently objective in teaching about religion to protect the religious liberty of learners? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

Sixty per cent of the schools agreed that there can be a combination of pre-service and in-service education which
will qualify teachers to teach objectively about religion. Only 3 per cent of these strongly agreed, and this indicates a reluctance on the part of public schools to become involved in teaching religion. Twenty-nine per cent disagreed entirely.

Table XXXIV reports data from Survey Item 12 questioning the desirability to give teachers greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching about religions.

TABLE XXXIV

FREEDOM TO DEVELOP OBJECTIVES*
(SURVEY ITEM 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does your school district agree that it is desirable that teachers in public elementary and secondary schools be given greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching about religion and religious institutions? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree
Schools were equally divided on whether teachers should be given greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching religion. In districts with an average daily attendance over 20,000, some 54 per cent disagreed. This should be expected in the larger cities which have a greater number of varied religions. With a diversity of religions, it is far more difficult to protect religious liberty.

Table XXXV reports data from Survey Item 35 which explored the necessity of further amendments to clarify the roll of public schools in religious education.

**TABLE XXXV**

NEED FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS*  
(SURVEY ITEM 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>Answers in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-9,999</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-3,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXV--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ADA</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since the American people support and control public schools within limitations of federal and state provisions, should constitutional amendments be made to clarify the roll of public schools relative to religious education? (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, (d) strongly disagree

A higher percentage of the smaller districts indicated a desire for constitutional amendments to clarify the role of public schools relative to religious education. This stems from a lack of legal counsel which is available to the larger districts and a lack of time for school administrators to research existing law as it applies to schools. The larger districts thought that the existing amendment is clear and in theory adhered to a total separation of Church and State.

In summary, few plans and objectives are being implemented where the role of the study of religion compliments the role of the church. The larger districts had a higher percentage of schools which provided Bibles and religious materials to teach religious values. It was significant, however, that only 1 per cent of these schools responded that the materials were quite adequate.
The policy of granting freedom to teach religion objectively was restricted by not furnishing the necessary materials and training and by emphasizing the historical literature of religions. Schools were equally divided on whether teachers should be given greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching religion.

Reluctance by most schools to provide materials, training, and separate courses on religion emphasized that schools are not willing to become involved in teaching a subject which is so controversial. No answers were qualified to show any future plans for religious instruction in the school districts.

That religious practices and courses in public schools remain a controversial issue was reflected again in the interviews of laymen and religious leaders. An interesting observation was that these people favored objective religious instruction if care were exercised to eliminate the teaching of religious dogma. These findings were made from the interviews:

1. Moral values which refer to such basic qualities of character as honesty, courage, and loyalty should be taught. It was felt that such characteristics were inherent and vital for a basically religious society. Great care, however, must be exercised if any spiritual values which refer to love, faith, and reverence for a Supreme Being were taught. Even though most religions believe in a
Supreme Being, the teaching of reverence should not offend any sect or the non-believer.

2. Bibles and religious literature should be provided to teach religious values. These answers were qualified in that those who were interviewed felt that these materials must represent all religions.

3. School systems can set policies which give the freedom to teach objectively about religion without offense to any group. The difficulty would stem from finding qualified instructors who would not be influenced by their personal convictions.

4. Courses in objective religious instruction other than for a religious historical and literary enrichment should be provided. Two methods for instruction could be utilized. Various religious leaders can teach the course, but the question was raised whether these people could be objective in their teaching, personal influence, and their appearance. Another method would be to have a teacher who is versed in various religions to teach fundamentals which are basic to each faith.

5. All agreed that religion should be kept a purely personal affair and that no sect should be propogated by instruction or exercises which would include Christmas and Easter programs.

6. The social and economic influences of various religions should be taught as part of our historical
heritage. Dogma can be recognized only to show the reason for the social and economic influence.

7. All religions and non-believers should be respected. To deny this respect would be to weaken our safeguards for religious freedom which is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

8. There was some doubt as to the value of released-time instruction. Time for transporting students could not be justified.

9. Ordained or designated representatives of religious orders can be allowed to teach in public schools provided these people are qualified. Care should be exercised in hiring these representatives to determine that they are not so entrenched in their religious dogma that they would convey it to the students.

10. Chapel exercises, oral reading of scriptures, and oral prayers should not be allowed in public schools.

11. No public monies should be expended for transportation, books, or materials for parochial schools. Some respondents felt that public monies could be used to assist parochial colleges and universities since compulsory attendance is not involved and since older students are not as impressionable.

12. Religious training should be the responsibility of the home and the church. Schools should compliment but not supplement religious training and can do so by
offering elective courses in religion or by teaching the history of religion. Respect for the individual student is so vitally important, and it should be safeguarded against any religious sect or cult as espoused by the Supreme Court of the United States.

This chapter has presented a summary at the end of each section which details the findings on specific questions. The concluding summary has included the answers and suggestions from the interviews. Additional summary is presented in Chapter V in support of the answers to specific questions.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine legal, moral, and social responsibilities and practices of the Texas public school system in dealing with religion. The purposes of the study were (1) to determine the impact of state and federal judicial decisions on religious practices in schools, (2) to review the historical background for trends of religious practices in the public schools of Texas, (3) to determine the social and professional influence on religious practices in public schools, and (4) to survey current religious practices from a select sample of public schools in Texas to determine if schools were basically sectarian.

A review of the literature and supplemental data has been presented in the following sequence: (1) the historical background of established religion and of early statutes, (2) the growing popularity of Church-State separation, (3) court decisions setting forth guidelines to maintain secularism, (4) current religious practices from a select sample of public schools in Texas, and (5) current views of lay and religious leaders on religious practices in schools.
A selection of 214 school districts from the Public School Directory for survey was made at random, but consideration in making this selection was given to the smaller schools. All the larger systems were surveyed. Consideration was also given to the geographic location of the school system. Interviews were made with an attorney, educators, and religious leaders of various faiths.

The survey questionnaire mailed to each school selected had 35 items. This questionnaire was validated by 6 jurors and was mailed to the superintendent who could then delegate the answering to the school official who was directly involved with practices in the system. The survey questionnaire was developed to show current religious practices in Texas public schools. Some 153 schools responded which gave a return of 71 per cent.

The interviews were conducted personally. The questions were designed to determine attitudes of different professions and religions toward keeping public schools secular.

Tables in Chapter IV were used to report data from the survey questionnaire. This data was presented in percentages for each possible answer.

Findings

Eight questions were drafted to fulfill the purpose of this study. These questions are answered here and incorporate the findings in Chapter IV and in the interviews.
I. Does the size of the community and its socio-economic status influence a religious involvement of public schools?

There is evidence in the data from the several items in the survey questionnaire that both size and socio-economic status influence religious involvement of public schools. The larger areas which also had a higher socio-economic status felt that religious social and economic influences could be taught but that religious training should be left to the home and to the church. More of the smaller schools which had a lower socio-economic status disagreed that Amendment I of the United States Constitution required a complete separation of Church and State. Smaller districts showed a tendency to become more involved with religious influences within the school. Larger districts were aware that involvement with religious influences would be too controversial where there is a greater diversity of religions.

II. Does public education give due recognition to the place of religion in the culture and in the personal convictions of the people within the community?

Several factors indicated a recognition by the schools of religion and its personal nature. A majority of schools agreed that religious beliefs should be kept a purely personal affair. Few ordained religious leaders were employed as teachers. There was a tendency to recognize religion in the culture by teaching moral values and to
support personal convictions of people by limiting any involvement in teaching spiritual values. But some 23 per cent of the schools surveyed refused to teach respect for non-believers.

III. Does the school system provide regular classes in objective religious instruction?

None of the school districts with an average daily attendance below 4,000 provided regular classes in objective religious instruction. Only 4 per cent of the larger districts provided such classes, and these indicated that the classes were Bible history. A large 94 per cent of all schools surveyed did not provide such classes.

IV. Does the school system participate in a released-time program for religious instruction on or off campus?

Only thirteen of the schools surveyed had a released-time program for religious instruction. Most of these thirteen schools were in metropolitan areas. Many schools which did not have such programs commented that the school day was too demanding and too crowded with activities.

V. Is there a provision made by the school system for devotional exercises?

A safe assumption is that 72 per cent of the schools surveyed provided some form of devotional exercise. A significant finding is that only 4 per cent of the schools surveyed prohibited Bible reading, and 53 per cent allowed
Bible reading. A large majority of 60 per cent had provisions for homeroom devotional exercises. One respondent had a written school policy which forbids prayer and/or Bible reading. No respondent, however, denied that some provision is made by the school system for some type of devotional exercise.

VI. Are tax monies used to provide materials, texts, or transportation for parochial schools?

Aid to parochial schools was strongly opposed in Texas. The pupil benefit theory that was espoused by the Supreme Court of the United States was not practiced. Only one school transported parochial school students by bus.

VII. What provisions are made to observe special religious holidays of all religions?

All schools observed Christmas, Thanksgiving, and Easter. Some districts qualified their answers about Thanksgiving and Easter by designating them as national, not religious, holidays. No school dismissed classes for any Jewish holidays, but students would be excused. Religiously oriented activities were used to observe these religious holidays by 67 per cent of the respondents.

VIII. What plans and objectives in which the role of the study of religion complements the role of the church are being implemented in the school system?

Few plans and objectives were being implemented where the role of the study of religion complements the role of
the church. A higher percentage of larger districts provided Bibles and religious materials to teach religious values. Only 1 per cent of these reported that their materials were quite adequate. There was a reluctance by most schools to provide materials, training, and separate religious courses. Schools were equally divided on whether teachers should be given greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching religion. No answers were qualified to show any future plans for the study of religion.

Specific Findings

Based on the survey instrument, the following findings are factors which influence the policies and are the policies, expressed or implied, of the school districts which were surveyed:

1. The median income increased as the size of the school district increased.

2. The larger districts favored the teaching of religious social and economic influences of various sects.

3. Most schools tied social and economic influences to national origin to avoid the controversial issue of religion in public schools.

4. Only the larger school districts offered any instruction in religion as an elective course.

5. Schools were reluctant to add a course in religion because there is a lack of expertise in this subject and
because the curriculum is already putting a great demand on school time.

6. The larger districts indicated a greater diversity of religions than the smaller districts which had one or two predominant religions.

7. Catholics seemed to be more concentrated in the middle-sized school districts, and Jews usually clustered in the larger metropolitan areas.

8. There was a balance of agreement among all school districts that their aims and objectives included the teaching of the moral values of honesty, courage, and loyalty.

9. The response to including spiritual values in aims and objectives in teaching showed only a limited per cent of the schools participated extensively.

10. Texas schools emphasized the premise that questions concerning religion should be referred to the home or church.

11. There was a misunderstanding in a few schools that freedom of religion guarantees a right to believe or not to believe and thereby protects the non-believer.

12. School districts were cognizant that any program for religious training must be broad to satisfy and to nurture the great diversity of religions in the community.

13. Instruction in religious courses was provided only by the larger districts.

14. Released-time programs for religious courses were utilized by just a few districts.
15. Sixty-nine per cent of the schools always had baccalaureate services.

16. Those schools which held baccalaureate services indicated that such services were a social practice.

17. Four per cent of the schools surveyed prohibited any Bible reading.

18. Most schools replaced the religious-oriented chapel exercise with programs for awards, special speakers, and development of student talent.

19. Sixty per cent of the schools had some provision for homeroom devotionals.

20. Few written policies regarding religion in public schools were indicated.

21. A popular practice in Texas was to allow the principal, the teacher, or the student the discretion to determine whether prayers and/or Bible verses are used in morning opening exercises.

22. Schools strongly opposed the use of tax monies to aid parochial schools.

23. The pupil benefit theory was not practiced in Texas.

24. All schools observed Christian holidays, but some qualified Thanksgiving and Easter as national holidays.

25. Jews were released by personal request to observe Jewish holidays, but classes were not dismissed.

26. Schools seemed reluctant to provide Bibles and materials of various religious orders which would aid in teaching religions.
27. Few schools indicated that Bibles were included in their libraries as reference materials.

28. Schools were reluctant to become involved in teaching religion.

29. Few plans and objectives were being implemented where the role of the study of religion complemented the role of the church.

30. The smaller districts expressed a desire for constitutional amendments to clarify the role of public schools relative to religious education.

From a review of the literature and supplemental data, the findings are,

1. A review of the literature and of early statutes revealed that some form of an established religion existed in each colony at the time the Constitution was ratified.

2. Early schools were designed for training religious leaders and followers and required a close correlation between education and religion.

3. Colonial laws were passed to reinforce the role of religion in public education.

4. Each church provided its own narrow, moral, and limited educational program.

5. Toward the end of the Colonial period, the desire for freedom to worship God according to personal dictates coinciding with a period of intellectual rationalism and
skeptical enlightenment generated our political philosophy of separation of Church and State and the secular school system.

6. The growth of business and commerce which changed villages into cities and which concentrated workers converted our new nation into a pluralistic society of diverse religions.

7. To accommodate conflicting religions, sectarian instruction in public schools was eliminated.

8. Church and State were separated by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

9. Views on religious activities in public schools continued to be varied and controversial.

10. Between the Civil War and World War I, there was a period of transition and tension between the religiously plural society and the older paradigms of Church-State relations which could not comprehend the legacy of the Constitutional epoch.

11. The issue narrowed after World War I to Bible reading and religious instruction, and there was a renewed interest in the place religion should hold in public education.

12. The controversies over religious practices and instruction were carried to the courts.

13. The Supreme Court of the United States reflected in its decisions the same social pressures and conflicts which brought secularity to public schools.
14. The First Amendment was made applicable to each state by the "liberty" language in the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and no state can pass any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

15. Establishment as used in the First Amendment refers to any support or connection with religion and completes the separation of Church and State.

These findings are from the review of court decisions which interpret the Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause of Amendment I to the Constitution of the United States:

1. Religious beliefs may not be challenged in court under the Free Exercise Clause, but a religious practice inimical to peace, good order, and morals of a free society can be banned.

2. The Free Exercise Clause protects the right of an individual to practice atheism or agnosticism.

3. The Supreme Court of the United States held that establishment referred to any support or connection with religion and that the separation of Church and State is complete (6).

4. The Supreme Court of the United States recognized accommodations between Church and State in its decision in *Everson v. Board of Education* (6) and allowed states to provide public transportation for parochial school children as general welfare legislation.
5. The armed services and state penal institutions could provide chaplains and build chapels since members are taken from their homes and cannot exercise their religious freedom.

6. Police could direct traffic at parochial schools and at churches, fire alarms could be answered at parochial schools, and government grants could be given to veterans for education without violating the separation of Church and State.

7. School lunch programs could be given to both public and parochial schools without breaching the separation of Church and State.

8. Tax monies could not be used to support an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church (6).

9. State governments may loan textbooks to students enrolled in parochial schools (2), but a reimbursement to parochial schools for costs of textbooks or a purchase of textbooks for parochial schools in secular subjects would be unconstitutional (7).

10. Released-time programs for religious instruction which were held off campus were constitutional (13).

11. The recitation of any prayer in public school was unconstitutional (5, 10).

12. A student could have his private silent prayer during his lunch period.
13. Morning devotionals by students could be held before or after the school day, if students hold such exercises outside homeroom (9).

14. Bible verses could not be read aloud in public schools even without comment (10).

15. The Bible can be used as a reference material for literary and historical instruction (10).

16. On their own initiative, school boards had a legal obligation to suspend ongoing prayer programs (10).

17. Distributing Gideon Bibles in public schools constituted an establishment of religion which violated the Constitution of the United States (3, 11).

18. Any erection, maintenance, or display of religious structures or symbols on school property in which the purpose advances or inhibits religion generally or any sect particularly violated religious freedom (8).

19. A display of students' natural artistic talents through art which had a religious theme was constitutional (4).

20. A nativity scene without the creche which was placed on a school lawn during the Christmas vacation period was held permissible (1).

21. Salary supplements to parochial school teachers of even secular subjects were held unconstitutional (7).

22. Compulsory education laws which thwart a lifestyle essential to a religious faith were unconstitutional (12).

23. The test to determine whether a practice in public school was unconstitutional became: (1) Does the state's
action in authorizing or permitting the practice have a secular purpose? (2) If so, is the primary effect of the practice one that neither advances nor inhibits religion (10)?

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions are inferred:

1. It is not the intention of the Supreme Court of the United States to deny the existence of a Supreme Being, but rather its intention is to assure each individual freedom from any form of an established religion.

2. Both educators and laymen need a full understanding of the inherent limitations under which public schools must operate with respect to religion.

3. Some form of planned religious practice remains in many public schools in Texas even though the separation of Church and State is absolute.

4. School policies do not delineate the role of religion in public school.

5. Through careful planning, progress could be made in developing policies for a study of religion which will compliment, not supplement, the religious teachings of the home and of the church.

6. There are many opportunities for public schools to provide religious materials and courses in religion which are within the legal scope of Amendment I of the Constitution of the United States.
Implications

These implications have been drawn:

1. Public schools should complement the role of the church through an objective study of religion.
2. Programs in which moral values are enhanced can be enriched and expanded.
3. When teaching respect for the rights of an individual, the school should treat equally respect for the rights of the believer and for the non-believer.
4. More courses in objective religious instruction can be implemented.
5. Adequate religious reference materials should be provided by each school district for a historical and literary study.
6. Policies regarding objective religious teaching should be defined in each school district and should give adequate guidelines by which the faculty can function effectively.
7. Administrators should provide an opportunity to study religions as part of the curriculum.
8. There is a lack of in-service education at all levels on the interpretation of the concept of a separation of Church and State.
9. Prayers and Bible reading should be excluded from morning exercises.
10. There needs to be thorough training of all professional school personnel in the understanding and
application of the test which is used to determine whether a practice in public school is unconstitutional. This test, both parts of which require a no answer to be a constitutional practice is:

(1) Does the state's action in authorizing or permitting the practice have a secular purpose?

(2) If so, is the primary effect of the practice one that neither advances nor inhibits religion?

Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon this study, these recommendations for future research are made:

1. A study of laymen might be made to determine attitudes on teaching an objective course in religion in public schools.

2. A similar study of religious administrators and pastors could be made to determine their views on the role of public schools in complimenting religious training.

3. A study of faculty attitudes and knowledge of problems in dealing with religion in public schools could be made to use for teaching prospective teachers.

4. A study could be made of classroom teachers to determine attitudes of competency, materials needed, and in-service education which is necessary to teach religion objectively.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX A

Survey Questionnaire
(Sample)

1. The size of this school district as measured by average daily attendance is:
   ______ a) Over 20,000
   ______ b) 10,000 – 19,999
   ______ c) 4,000 – 9,999
   ______ d) 2,000 – 3,999
   ______ e) 1,000 – 1,999
   ______ f) 500 – 999
   ______ g) 200 – 499
   ______ h) Under 200

2. The approximate average yearly income for the community of this school district is:
   ______ a) $13,000 and over
   ______ b) $8,000 – $12,999
   ______ c) $5,000 – $7,999
   ______ d) Under $5,000
   ______ e) Unable to estimate

3. What nationality is predominant in your district?
   ______ a) German
   ______ b) Czechoslovakian
   ______ c) English
   ______ d) Mexican-American
   ______ e) Other (list)
4. Is there a predominant religion in your district, and if so, please check:
   ___ a) Protestant  ___ c) Jewish
   ___ b) Catholic   ___ d) Others (list)

5. In your school system, do the aims and objectives include the teaching of moral values which refer to such basic qualities as honesty, courage, loyalty, etc.?
   ___ a) Extensively
   ___ b) Moderately
   ___ c) Limited
   ___ d) None
Comment__________________________________________________________

6. Does your school system include in its aims and objectives the teaching of spiritual values which refer to such qualities as love, faith, reverence for a Supreme Being?
   ___ a) Extensively
   ___ b) Moderately
   ___ c) Limited
   ___ d) None
Comment__________________________________________________________
7. Are provisions made in your school system for materials to help in teaching spiritual values?
   ___ a) Sufficiently
   ___ b) Insufficiently
   ___ c) None
   Comment

8. Do you feel that teachers in your school district are capable of experimenting objectively in teaching about religion?
   ___ a) Very adequate
   ___ b) Fairly adequate
   ___ c) Undecided
   ___ d) Other
   Comment

9. Does your school system provide regular classes in objective religious instruction?
   ___ a) Protestant
   ___ b) Catholic
   ___ c) Jewish
   ___ d) Other (list)
   Comment
10. Are classroom teachers provided materials to help in teaching about religions?

____ a) Quite adequately
____ b) Adequately
____ c) Inadequately

Comment

__________________________________________________________________________

11. Can there be a combination of pre-service and in-service education which will qualify teachers to be sufficiently objective in teaching about religion to protect the religious liberty of learners?

____ a) Strongly agree
____ b) Agree
____ c) Disagree
____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment

__________________________________________________________________________

12. Do you agree that it is desirable that teachers in public elementary and secondary schools be given greater freedom to experiment with objective approaches to teaching about religion and religious institutions?

____ a) Strongly agree
____ b) Agree
____ c) Disagree
____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment
13. Does keeping religion a purely personal affair continue the tolerance and good will which has characterized public education?
   ___ a) Strongly agree
   ___ b) Agree
   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment

14. Should the social and economic influences of various religious sects be taught in the history curricula?
   ___ a) Strongly agree
   ___ b) Agree
   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment

15. Should the schools in teaching respect for the beliefs of others also include respect for any non-believers up to and including atheism?
   ___ a) Strongly agree
   ___ b) Agree
   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment
16. Does your school system excuse students to observe any special religious holidays other than Christmas, Easter, Thanksgiving, Rosh Hashana, and Yom Kippur?
   _____ a) Always
   _____ b) Sometimes
   _____ c) Seldom
   _____ d) Never
   Comment

17. In your school system, is there any recognition or activity in observance of religious holidays?
   _____ a) Usually
   _____ b) Seasonally
   _____ c) Seldom
   _____ d) Never
   Comment

18. In your opinion, should religious holidays be celebrated by school activities to strengthen moral education?
   _____ a) Always
   _____ b) Sometimes
   _____ c) Never
   Comment
19. Are baccalaureate services conducted in connection with high school graduation?
   _____ a) Always
   _____ b) Sometimes
   _____ c) Never
   Comment

20. Do you feel baccalaureate services provide a meaningful learning experience for high school graduates?
   _____ a) Great value
   _____ b) Some value
   _____ c) No value
   _____ d) Undecided
   Comment

21. To meet the need for teaching moral values, does your school system cooperate in a program of released-time religious instruction?
   _____ a) Regularly
   _____ b) Seldom
   _____ c) Never
   Comment
22. If there is a released-time instruction, where are the classes held?
   ___ a) School
   ___ b) Church
   ___ c) Home
   ___ d) Other (list)
   Comment

23. What is your opinion of released-time religious instruction?
   ___ a) Great value
   ___ b) Some value
   ___ c) No value
   Comment

24. Are members of religious orders teaching in the public schools of your system?
   ___ a) Yes
   ___ b) No
   ___ c) Occasionally
   Comment
25. In your school system, can the Bible be read:
   ____ a) by teachers without comment during class
   ____ b) by students during class
   ____ c) not at all
   ____ d) only on an individual basis

   Comment

26. Does your school system provide for any regular chapel exercise?
   ____ a) Monthly
   ____ b) Weekly
   ____ c) Seldom
   ____ d) Never

   Comment

27. Is there any provision for homeroom devotional exercises?
   ____ a) Daily
   ____ b) Weekly
   ____ c) Monthly
   ____ d) Other

   Comment
28. Which one of the following provisions is made by your school system for prayer before meals?
   ___ a) Homeroom
   ___ b) Public address system
   ___ c) Lunchroom
   ___ d) None

Comment__________________________

29. Do you favor the use of tax monies to provide texts and materials for parochial school children?
   ___ a) Strongly agree
   ___ b) Agree
   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ d) Strongly disagree

Comment__________________________

30. Does your school system provide bus transportation for parochial school children?
   ___ a) Always
   ___ b) Sometimes
   ___ c) Never

Comment__________________________
31. Do you believe your school system is dealing in an adequate way with religion?
   a) Very adequately
   b) Adequately
   c) Inadequately
   d) Undecided
Comment

32. Should the school systems leave religious training to the home and to organizations of religion?
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
Comment

33. In your opinion, do you feel that Amendment I of the United States Constitution requires a complete separation between Church and State?
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
Comment
34. Since the American people support and control the public schools within the limitations of federal and state provisions, should constitutional amendments be made to define teaching of religion?

____ a) Strongly agree
____ b) Agree
____ c) Disagree
____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment

Further comments related to the subject matter of religion in the public schools:
VALIDATION COMMITTEE FOR THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Dr. Gerald Ward
Deputy Superintendent
Fort Worth Public Schools
3210 West Lancaster
Fort Worth, Texas

Dr. Frank Buell
Assistant Director
Region XI Education Service Center
2821 Cullen
Fort Worth, Texas

Dr. John Perkins
Professor of Economics
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

Dr. Luther Hagard
Professor of Government
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas

Dr. Mary Lynn Crow
Associate Professor of Education
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas

Dr. Sam Hamlett
Professor and Chairman of the Department of Government
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas
Dear Dr. 

Your assistance is requested in establishing the validity of a survey questionnaire to be used as a part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. The dissertation is being done under the direction of Dr. Paul Smith, Professor, Division of Educational Leadership.

The study involves the problem of determining the legal, moral, and social responsibilities of the Texas public school system in dealing with religion and includes a survey of current religious practices from a select sample of public schools. A validated questionnaire will be mailed to 214 administrators of school districts in Texas. These school districts shall be selected at random. A higher percentage of the larger systems will be surveyed, since a greater portion of student population is enrolled in these districts.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether each of the 34 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2." If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3." At the end of the questionnaire, please make any comments, suggestions, or corrections needed. Any significant changes made by members of this validating committee will be submitted for final approval.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

VALIDITY RESPONSE

1 2 3 1. The size of this school district as measured by average daily attendance is:

   ____ a) Over 20,000   ____ e) 1,000 - 1,999
   ____ b) 10,000 - 19,999  ____ f) 500 - 999
   ____ c) 4,000 - 9,999    ____ g) 200 - 499
   ____ d) 2,000 - 3,999    ____ h) Under 200

1 2 3 2. The approximate average yearly income for the community of this school district is:

   ____ a) $13,000 and over  ____ d) Under $5,000
   ____ b) $8,000 - $12,999  ____ e) Unable to estimate
   ____ c) $5,000 - $7,999

1 2 3 3. What nationality is predominant in your district?

   ____ a) German    ____ d) Mexican-American
   ____ b) Czechoslovakian    ____ e) Other (list)
   ____ c) English

1 2 3 4. Are there predominant religious denominations in your district, and if so, please give estimated percentages:

   a) ____ % Protestant    c) ____ % Jewish
   b) ____ % Catholic    d) ____ % Other (list)
5. In your school system, do the aims and objectives include the teaching of moral values which refer to such basic qualities as honesty, courage, loyalty, etc.?

____ a) Extensively  ______ c) Limited
____ b) Moderately  ______ d) None

Comment__________________________________________

6. Does your school system include in its aims and objectives the teaching of spiritual values which refer to such qualities as love, faith, reverence for a Supreme Being?

____ a) Extensively  ______ c) Limited
____ b) Moderately  ______ d) None

Comment__________________________________________

7. Are provisions made in your school system for materials to help in teaching spiritual values?

____ a) Sufficiently  ______ c) None
____ b) Insufficiently

Comment__________________________________________

8. Can teachers in your school district objectively teach about religion without offending secularism?

____ a) Very adequately ______ c) Undecided
____ b) Fairly adequately

Comment__________________________________________
9. Does your school system provide regular courses in objective religious instruction outside the historical and literary enrichment instruction?
   ___ a) Protestant   ___ c) Jewish
   ___ b) Catholic    ___ d) Other (list)

Comment ____________________________________________________________

10. Are classroom teachers provided materials to help in teaching about religions?
    ___ a) Quite adequately   ___ c) Inadequately
    ___ b) Adequately

Comment ____________________________________________________________

11. In your district, can there be a combination of pre-service and in-service education which will qualify teachers to be sufficiently objective in teaching about religion to protect the religious liberty of learners?
    ___ a) Strongly agree   ___ c) Disagree
    ___ b) Agree            ___ d) Strongly disagree

Comment ____________________________________________________________

12. Does your district agree that it is desirable that teachers in public elementary and secondary schools be given greater freedom to develop objectives
in teaching about religion and religious institutions?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment

123 13. Would keeping religion a purely personal affair continue the high level of tolerance and good will which has characterized public education?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment

123 14. Should the social and economic influences of various religious sects be taught in the history curricula?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment

123 15. Should the schools in teaching respect for the beliefs of others also include respect for any non-believers up to and including atheism?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment
1 2 3 16. What religious holidays does your school district observe?
   ____ a) Christmas       ____ d) Rosh Hashana
   ____ b) Easter          ____ e) Yom Kippur
   ____ c) Thanksgiving    ____ f) Other (list)
Comment

1 2 3 17. In your school district, is there any recognition or activity in observance of religious holidays?
   ____ a) Usually         ____ c) Seldom
   ____ b) Seasonally      ____ d) Never
Comment

1 2 3 18. In your opinion, should religious holidays be celebrated by school activities to strengthen moral education?
   ____ a) Always          ____ b) Sometimes
   ____ c) Never
Comment

1 2 3 19. Are baccalaureate services conducted in connection with high school graduation?
   ____ a) Always          ____ c) Never
   ____ b) Sometimes
Comment
20. Does your school district feel baccalaureate services provide a meaningful learning experience for high school graduates?

___ a) Great value ___ c) No value

___ b) Some value ___ d) Undecided

Comment

21. To meet the need for teaching moral values, does your school system cooperate in a program of released-time religious instruction?

___ a) Regularly ___ b) Seldom

___ c) Never

Comment

22. If there is a released-time instruction, where are the classes held?

___ a) School ___ c) Home

___ b) Church ___ d) Other (list)

Comment

23. What is your opinion of released-time religious instruction?

___ a) Great value ___ b) Some value

___ c) No value

Comment
24. Are ordained or designated representatives of religious orders teaching in the public schools of your district?
   __ a) Yes ___ b) No ___ c) Occasionally

Comment ___________________________________________

25. In your school district, can the Bible be read:
   ___ a) by teachers without comment during class
   ___ b) by students during class
   ___ c) not at all
   ___ d) only on an individual basis

Comment ___________________________________________

26. Does your school district provide for any regular chapel exercise?
   ___ a) Monthly ___ c) Seldom
   ___ b) Weekly ___ d) Never

Comment ___________________________________________

27. Is there any provision for homeroom devotional exercises?
   ___ a) Daily ___ c) Monthly
   ___ b) Weekly ___ d) Other

Comment ___________________________________________
28. Which one of the following provisions is made by your school district for prayer before meals?
   _____ a) Homeroom _____ c) Lunchroom
   _____ b) Public address _____ d) None

Comment

29. Does your school district favor the use of tax monies to provide texts and materials for parochial school children?
   _____ a) Strongly agree _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree _____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment

30. Does your school district provide bus transportation for parochial school children?
   _____ a) Always _____ c) Never
   _____ b) Sometimes

Comment

31. Does your school district feel that it is adequately dealing with religion in public schools?
   _____ a) Very adequately _____ c) Inadequately
   _____ b) Adequately _____ d) Undecided

Comment
Should school systems leave religious training to the home and to organizations of religion?

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Agree
- c) Disagree
- d) Strongly disagree

Comment

Does your school district feel that Amendment I of the United States Constitution requires a complete separation between Church and State?

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Agree
- c) Disagree
- d) Strongly disagree

Comment

Since the American people support and control the public schools within the limitations of federal and state provisions, should constitutional amendments be made to define teaching of religion?

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Agree
- c) Disagree
- d) Strongly disagree

Comment

Further comments related to the subject matter of religion in the public schools:
Dear Dr.

Your assistance is again requested in establishing the validity of my survey questionnaire. I would like to thank you for your promptness and helpful suggestions on the first mailing. The suggestions have been incorporated into this second writing of the questionnaire, and one additional question has been added. I am seeking your final approval of all items prior to sending the questionnaire to the public school administrators.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether each of the 35 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2." If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3." At the close of the instrument, there is a place for your comments, corrections, and deletions. It is the researcher's intent that the final questionnaire be an efficient and effective instrument.

Your assistance in returning the questionnaire within five days will enable me to mail the questionnaire by early August. Again, thank you for your time and expertise in this research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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APPENDIX F

SAMPLE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

VALIDITY RESPONSE

1 2 3 1. The size of this school district as measured by average daily attendance is:
   
   ___ a) Over 20,000  
   ___ b) 10,000 - 19,999  
   ___ c) 4,000 - 9,999  
   ___ d) 2,000 - 3,999  
   ___ e) 1,000 - 1,999  
   ___ f) 500 - 999  
   ___ g) 200 - 499  
   ___ h) Under 200

1 2 3 2. The household or family median income per year for the community of this school district is approximately:
   
   ___ a) $15,000 and over  
   ___ b) $10,000 - $14,999  
   ___ c) $5,000 - $9,999  
   ___ d) Under $5,000  
   ___ e) Unable to estimate

1 2 3 3. What nationality is predominant in your district?
   
   ___ a) German  
   ___ b) Czechoslovakian  
   ___ c) English  
   ___ d) Mexican-American  
   ___ e) Afro-American  
   ___ f) Other (List)

1 2 3 4. Are there predominant religious denominations in your district, and if so, please give estimated percentages:
   
   a) ____ % Protestant  
   b) ____ % Catholic  
   c) ____ % Jewish  
   d) ____ % Other (List)

176
5. In your school system, do the aims and objectives include the teaching of moral values which refer to such basic qualities as honesty, courage, loyalty, etc.?

   ____ a) Extensively   ____ c) Limited
   ____ b) Moderately   ____ d) None

Comment: ____________________________________________

6. Does your school system include in its aims and objectives the teaching of spiritual values which refer to such qualities as love, faith, reverence for a Supreme Being?

   ____ a) Extensively   ____ c) Limited
   ____ b) Moderately   ____ d) None

Comment: ____________________________________________

7. Are provisions made in your school system for materials such as Bibles of various religious orders or cults and/or factual and historical literature which help in teaching religious values?

   ____ a) Yes
   ____ b) No

If the answer is yes, list the materials used:

____________________________________________________
8. Does the policy of your school district provide the freedom to teach objectively about religion without offending a minority religion?

   _____ a) Yes       _____ c) Undecided
   _____ b) Yes with   _____ d) No
   restrictions

Comment_________________________________________________________________

9. Does your school district provide regular courses in objective religious instruction outside the historical and literary enrichment instruction?

   _____ a) Yes
   _____ b) No

If the answer is yes, in what religion or religions?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

10. Are classroom teachers provided materials to help in teaching about religions?

   _____ a) Quite adequately       _____ c) Inadequately
   _____ b) Adequately

Comment_________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
123

11. Does your school district agree that there can be a combination of pre-service and in-service education which will qualify teachers to be sufficiently objective in teaching about religion to protect the religious liberty of learners?

   ___ a) Strongly agree   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ b) Agree           ___ d) Strongly disagree

Comment

123

12. Does your school district agree that it is desirable that teachers in public elementary and secondary schools be given greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching about religion and religious institutions?

   ___ a) Strongly agree   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ b) Agree           ___ d) Strongly disagree

Comment

123

13. Does your school district agree that keeping religious beliefs a purely personal affair continues the high level of tolerance and good will which has characterized public education?

   ___ a) Strongly agree   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ b) Agree           ___ d) Strongly disagree

Comment
123 14. Does your school district agree that the social and economic influences of various religious sects should be taught in the curricula?
   ___ a) Strongly agree   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ b) Agree          ___ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment______________________________

123 15. Does your school district agree that schools, in teaching respect for the religious beliefs of others, should also include respect for any non-believers up to and including atheism?
   ___ a) Strongly agree   ___ c) Disagree
   ___ b) Agree          ___ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment______________________________

123 16. What religious holidays does your school district observe by dismissing classes?
   ___ a) Christmas       ___ d) Rosh Hashana
   ___ b) Easter          ___ e) Yom Kippur
   ___ c) Thanksgiving    ___ f) Other (List)
   Comment______________________________

   _________________________________
   _________________________________
   _________________________________
1 2 3 17. In your school district, are there any religious oriented activities in observance of religious holidays?

___ a) Usually ___ c) Seldom

___ b) Seasonally ___ d) Never

Comment

1 2 3 18. In the opinion of your school district, should religious holidays be celebrated by school activities to strengthen moral education?

___ a) Always ___ c) Never

___ b) Sometimes

Comment

1 2 3 19. Are baccalaureate services conducted in connection with high school graduation?

___ a) Always ___ c) Never

___ b) Sometimes

Comment

1 2 3 20. Does your school district feel baccalaureate services provide a meaningful learning experience for high school graduates?

___ a) Great value ___ c) No value

___ b) Some value ___ d) Undecided

Comment
21. To meet the need for teaching moral values, does your school system cooperate in a program of released-time religious instruction?
   ____ a) Regularly  ____ c) Never
   ____ b) Seldom
   Comment

22. If there is a released-time instruction, where are the classes held?
   ____ a) School  ____ c) Home
   ____ b) Church  ____ d) Other (List)
   Comment

23. What is the opinion of your school district of released-time religious instruction?
   ____ a) Great value  ____ c) No value
   ____ b) Some value
   Comment

24. Are ordained or designated representatives of religious orders teaching in the public schools of your district?
   ____ a) Yes  ____ b) No  ____ c) Occasionally
   Comment
25. In your school district, can Bibles be read:
   ___ a) by teachers aloud without comment during class
   ___ b) by students aloud during class
   ___ c) not at all
   ___ d) silently on an individual basis
   Comment

26. Does your school district provide for any regular chapel exercise?
   ___ a) Monthly
   ___ b) Weekly
   ___ c) Daily
   ___ d) Seldom
   ___ e) Never
   Comment

27. Is there any provision for homeroom devotional exercises?
   ___ a) Daily
   ___ b) Weekly
   ___ c) Monthly
   ___ d) Other
   Comment

28. In your school district, are prayers and/or reading of Bible verses included in the morning opening exercise?
   ___ a) Yes, at the option of the principal
   ___ b) Yes, at the option of the teacher
   ___ c) Yes by students
   ___ d) Undecided
   ___ e) No, violates school policy
29. Which one of the following provisions is made by your school district for prayer before meals?

   a) Homeroom  c) Lunchroom
   b) Public address system  d) None

Comment

30. Does your school district favor a policy by which it provides for the use of tax monies to buy texts and materials for parochial school children?

   a) Strongly agree  c) Disagree
   b) Agree  d) Strongly disagree

Comment

31. Does your school district provide bus transportation for parochial school children?

   a) Always  c) Never
   b) Sometimes

Comment

32. Should your school district engage in religious training beyond that which is provided by the home and religious organizations?

   a) Extensive engagement  c) None
   b) Limited engagement  d) Undecided

Comment
33. Does your school district agree that school systems should leave religious training to the home and to organizations of religion?
   _____ a) Strongly agree
   _____ b) Agree
   _____ c) Disagree
   _____ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment

34. Does your school district feel that Amendment I of the United States Constitution requires a complete separation between Church and State?
   _____ a) Strongly agree
   _____ b) Agree
   _____ c) Disagree
   _____ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment

35. Since the American people support and control the public schools within the limitations of federal and state provisions, should constitutional amendments be made to define teaching of religion?
   _____ a) Strongly agree
   _____ b) Agree
   _____ c) Disagree
   _____ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment

Further comments related to the subject matter of religion in the public schools:
APPENDIX G

LIST OF SCHOOLS SURVEYED
1973 - 1974

Name of School District and Address

Abilene Independent School District
842 North Mockingbird
Abilene, Texas

Aldine Independent School District
Ald West Field Road
Houston, Texas

Alice Independent School District
200 North Reynolds
Alice, Texas

Alief Independent School District
Box 68
Alief, Texas

Amarillo Independent School District
910 West 8
Amarillo, Texas

Amherst Independent School District
Box 248
Amhurst, Texas

Anahuac Independent School District
Box 369
Anahuac, Texas

Aransas County Independent School District
Box 907
Rockport, Texas

Arlington Independent School District
1203 Pioneer Parkway
Arlington, Texas

Superintendent
Mr. A. E. Wells

Mr. M. O. Campbell

Mr. Dewey G. Smith

Dr. John D. Bowser

Mr. Robert R. Ashworth

Mr. Lamar B. Kelley

Mr. Henry Wheeler

Mr. E. J. Randow

Dr. Charles Greer
Director of Personnel
Austin Independent School District
6100 North Guadalupe
Austin, Texas

Avinger Independent School District
Box 188
Avinger, Texas

Barbers Hill Independent School District
Box B
Mount Belvieu, Texas

Beaumont Independent School District
820 Neches
Beaumont, Texas

Beckville Independent School District
Box 37
Beckville, Texas

Benavides Independent School District
Drawer P
Benavides, Texas

Benjamin Rural High School District
Box 166
Benjamin, Texas

Big Spring Independent School District
Eleventh and Owens
Big Spring, Texas

Birdville Independent School District
6125 East Belknap
Fort Worth, Texas

Bonham Independent School District
Box 490
Bonham, Texas

Bosqueville Independent School District
Route 3, Box 470
Waco, Texas

Brady Independent School District
Box 471
Brady, Texas

Brazosport Independent School District
Drawer Z
Freeport, Texas

Dr. Jack L. Davidson
Mr. Edmund Aycock
Mr. Bill L. Farmer
Mr. A. W. Shannon
Mr. Harold Pool
Mr. Gordon G. Ross
Mr. W. Kenneth Roberts
Mr. S. M. Anderson
Mr. W. G. Thomas, Jr.
Mr. Joe C. Campbell
Mr. J. R. Grissom
Mr. C. A. Reynolds
Mr. H. K. Wilson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge Independent School District</td>
<td>500 West Lindsey</td>
<td>Mr. Jim W. Wilkerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breckenridge, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge City Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 874</td>
<td>Mr. Glenn Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge City, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 589</td>
<td>Mr. Alberto Byington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falfurrias, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville Independent School District</td>
<td>1102 Madison</td>
<td>Mr. James T. Ogg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brownsville, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Independent School District</td>
<td>2200 Villa Maria Road</td>
<td>Dr. W. K. Summers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bryan, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullard Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 105</td>
<td>Mr. James R. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullard, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 289</td>
<td>Mr. W. M. Stribling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burleson, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnet Consolidated Independent School District</td>
<td>308 East Brier</td>
<td>Mr. Robert F. Wilkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnet, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo Mills Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 160</td>
<td>Mr. W. P. Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caddo Mills, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrizo Springs Independent School District</td>
<td>Armory Building</td>
<td>Mr. Harold D. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrizo Springs, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleberry Independent School District</td>
<td>315 Churchill Road</td>
<td>Dr. Clarence L. Winn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celina Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 188</td>
<td>Mr. Perry E. Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celina, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill Independent School District</td>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>Mr. Charles G. Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyler, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christoval Independent School District  
Box 162  
Christoval, Texas

Claude Independent School District  
Box 209  
Claude, Texas

Clear Creek Independent School District  
2301 Main  
League City, Texas

Cleveland Independent School District  
Box 758  
Cleveland, Texas

Comstock Independent School District  
Box 905  
Comstock, Texas

Conroe Independent School District  
Box 449  
Conroe, Texas

Copperas Cove Independent School District  
Box 580  
Copperas Cove, Texas

Corpus Christi Independent School District  
Box 110  
Corpus Christi, Texas

Cotulla Independent School District  
Box 699  
Cotulla, Texas

Crane Independent School District  
Box 997  
Crane, Texas

Cranfills Gap Independent School District  
Box 67  
Cranfills Gap, Texas

Crosby Independent School District  
Drawer C  
Crosby, Texas

Crosbyton Independent School District  
Box 259  
Crosbyton, Texas

Mr. Thilman Erickson  
Mr. Glen Lowrance  
Dr. Lloyd R. Ferguson  
Mr. Bobby G. Wood  
Mr. Warren McCarson  
Mr. J. L. McCullough  
Mr. J. L. Williams  
Dr. Dana Williams  
Mr. H. A. Halvorson  
Mr. M. D. Ford  
Mr. C. L. Mitchell  
Mr. Kenton L. Page  
Mr. S. T. Hawkes
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas

Carlton C. Moffett
Assistant Superintendent

Deer Park Independent School District
203 Ivy
Deer Park, Texas

Mr. Sebron Williams

Denton Independent School District
1205 University Drive West
Denton, Texas

Dr. James Benjamin

Divide Rural High School District
Box 110
Nolan, Texas

Mr. Leonard Pruden

Dripping Springs Independent School District
Box 104
Dripping Springs, Texas

Mr. Calvin Knauth

Dumas Independent School District
Box 852
Dumas, Texas

Mr. Frank J. Vollert

Duncanville Independent School District
802 South Main
Duncanville, Texas

Mr. W. H. Byrd, Jr.

Eanes Independent School District
601 Camp Craft Road
Austin, Texas

Mr. Thomas D. Carter

Eastland Independent School District
Box 31
Eastland, Texas

Mr. Wendell T. Siebert

Ector County Independent School District
Box 3912
Odessa, Texas

Mr. William M. Holm

Edcouch-Elsa Independent School District
Box 127
Edcouch, Texas

Mr. A. W. Bell, Jr.

Edgewood Independent School District
5358 West Commerce
San Antonio, Texas

Mr. Ruben Lopez

Edinburg Independent School District
Box 990
Edinburg, Texas

Mr. Richard Evins
Edna Independent School District  
Drawer D  
Edna, Texas

Mr. Carlos Baker

Electra Independent School District  
400 East Roosevelt  
Electra, Texas

Mr. Weldon Snodgrass

Elgin Independent School District  
Box 351  
Elgin, Texas

Dr. C. W. Thompson

El Paso Independent School District  
Box 1710  
El Paso, Texas

Mr. J. M. Whitaker

Flatonia Independent School District  
Box 189  
Flatonia, Texas

Mr. R. B. Freehner

Fort Stockton Independent School District  
Box 1628  
Fort Stockton, Texas

Mr. James Huckaby

Fort Worth Independent School District  
Box 1628  
Fort Worth, Texas

Dr. Gerald Ward  
Deputy Superintendent

Fredericksburg Independent School District  
Box 673  
Fredericksburg, Texas

Mr. Hans E. Bergner

Frenship Independent School District  
Box 100  
Wolfforth, Texas

Mr. J. Weldon Bennett

Friendswood Independent School District  
302 Laurel Drive  
Friendswood, Texas

Dr. John F. Ward

Frost Independent School District  
Drawer K  
Frost, Texas

Mr. R. Dale Coxby

Gainesville Independent School District  
Box 801  
Gainesville, Texas

Mr. Wilburn O. Echols

Galena Park Independent School District  
Box 565  
Galena Park, Texas

Mr. Gerald D. Cobb
Galveston Independent School District
Box 660
Galveston, Texas

Mr. Eli Douglas

Garland Independent School District
720 Stadium Drive
Garland, Texas

Mr. Glen B. Couch

Glen Rose Independent School District
Box 996
Glen Rose, Texas

Mr. J. M. McCroskey

Goose Creek Independent School District
Box 30
Baytown, Texas

Mr. Johnny Clark, Jr.

Gordon Independent School District
112-116 Rusk
Gordon, Texas

Mr. Travis Hilliard

Grand Prairie Independent School District
Box 1170
Grand Prairie, Texas

Dr. Leo Bradley

Grand Saline Independent School District
Stadium Drive
Grand Saline, Texas

Mr. Failen Stewart

Grapeland Independent School District
Box 248
Grapeland, Texas

Mr. Monte K. McBride

Gruver Independent School District
Box 709
Gruver, Texas

Mr. Jack H. Weldon

Hall Elementary School
102 West Austin
Jefferson, Texas

Ms. Grace Hood
Teacher

Harlandale Independent School District
102 Genevieve
San Antonio, Texas

Mr. C. N. Boggess

Harlingen Independent School District
1409 East Harrison
Harlingen, Texas

Mr. James Thigpen

Hemphill Independent School District
Box 550
Hemphill, Texas

Mr. Douglas Butler
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Island Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 1012</td>
<td>High Island, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park Independent School District</td>
<td>7015 Westchester Drive</td>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooks Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 36</td>
<td>Hooks, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yokum, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Independent School District</td>
<td>3800 Richmond</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull-Daisetta Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 477</td>
<td>Daisetta, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble Independent School District</td>
<td>219 Main</td>
<td>Humble, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 791</td>
<td>Huntsville, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District</td>
<td>Highway 121A and Central Drive</td>
<td>Bedford, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iola Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 756</td>
<td>Iola, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 2067</td>
<td>Vanderbilt, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 248</td>
<td>Ira, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 2637</td>
<td>Irving, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Italy Independent School District
Drawer 909
Italy, Texas

Jacksonville Independent School District
Box 631
Jacksonville, Texas

Kaufman Independent School District
1000 South Houston
Kaufman, Texas

Killeen Independent School District
Box 967
Killeen, Texas

Krum Independent School District
Box 158
Krum, Texas

LaMarque Independent School District
Box 7
LaMarque, Texas

LaPorte Independent School District
LaPorte, Texas

LaPryor Independent School District
Box 688
LaPryor, Texas

Laredo Independent School District
1702 Houston
Laredo, Texas

LaVernia Independent School District
Box 108
LaVernia, Texas

Leakey Independent School District
Box 609
Leakey, Texas

Lewisville Independent School District
Box 217
Lewisville, Texas

Lubbock Independent School District
1628 19 Street
Lubbock, Texas

Mr. George E. Scott
Mr. W. D. Mauldin
Mr. James R. Phillips
Mr. C. E. Ellison
Mr. Mac W. Vincent
Dr. R. Eugene Tenney
Mr. Ralph Pearce
Mr. Lloyd Smith
Mr. Vidal Trevino
Mr. Victor Krejci
Mr. Gerald Boyer
Mr. Ben Harmon
Principal
Mr. Edwin Irons
Mabank Independent School District
Box 245
Mabank, Texas

Mansfield Independent School District
Box 338
Mansfield, Texas

Marathon Independent School District
Box 516
Marathon, Texas

Marfa Independent School District
Box T
Marfa, Texas

Marshall Independent School District
Box 879
Marshall, Texas

Mart Independent School District
Box 120
Mart, Texas

Mathis Independent School District
Box 1177
Mathis, Texas

Maydelle Independent School District
Box 13
Maydelle, Texas

Maypearl Independent School District
Box 40
Maypearl, Texas

McAllen Independent School District
110 South 10
McAllen, Texas

Megargel Independent School District
Box 38
Megargel, Texas

Melissa Elementary School
Box 127
Melissa, Texas

Merkel Independent School District
Box 430
Merkel, Texas

Mr. Marcellus Parrish

Mr. Willie Pigg

Mr. John Trantham

Mr. Carl Robinson

Mr. Truitt Ingram

Mr. Leslie Bryan

Mr. Olan McGraw, Jr.

Mr. Granvil Hobson

Mr. John Mays

Dr. Rodney Cathey

Mr. James Williams

James Samuel Carter
Teacher

Mr. Jack Fisher
Mesquite Independent School District
405 East Davis
Mesquite, Texas

Midland Independent School District
702 North N
Midland, Texas

Milford Independent School District
Box 545
Milford, Texas

Mobeetie Independent School District
Box 197
Mobeetie, Texas

Montague Independent School District
Box 13
Montague, Texas

Moody Independent School District
Box 448
Moody, Texas

Mount Calm Independent School District
Box 105
Mount Calm, Texas

Mount Enterprise Independent School District
Box 130
Mount Enterprise, Texas

Mount Pleasant Independent School District
Box 1117
Mount Pleasant, Texas

Navarro Independent School District
Route 1, Box 72
Seguin, Texas

Navasota Independent School District
Box 511
Navasota, Texas

Nederland Independent School District
Box 908
Nederland, Texas

Needville Independent School District
Route 2, Box 125
Needville, Texas

Dr. Ralph Peteet

Dr. James H. Mailey

Mr. Robert L. Beer

Mr. Robert Mickey

Mr. Melvin E. Fenoglio

Mr. Grady Brewster

Mr. J. B. Trussell

Mr. Robert I. Boyd, Jr.

Mr. J. B. Etheredge

Mr. John C. Webb

Dr. J. B. Morris

Mr. Louis E. Ludwig
Newcastle Independent School District  
Box 128  
Newcastle, Texas  

Mr. C. M. Hanson

Nixon Independent School District  
Box 400  
Nixon, Texas  

Mr. James Talley

North East Independent School District  
10333 Broadway  
San Antonio, Texas  

Dr. Ivan W. Fitzwater

North Forest Independent School District  
Box 23278  
Houston, Texas  

Mr. L. B. Lohn

Northside Independent School District  
5900 Evers Road  
San Antonio, Texas  

Mr. Edmund D. Cody

Odem Independent School District  
Drawer A C  
Odem, Texas  

Mr. C. L. West

Olney Independent School District  
Box 67  
Olney, Texas  

Mr. Charles Mitchell

Olton Independent School District  
Box 388  
Olton, Texas  

Mr. Joe L. Turner

Onalaska Independent School District  
Onalaska, Texas  

Mr. Jackie R. Havard

Paint Creek Rural High School District  
Route 2, Box 86  
Haskell, Texas  

Mr. Winifred Dodds

Paint Rock Rural High School District  
Box 277  
Paint Rock, Texas  

Mr. Harroll Watkins

Palestine Independent School District  
Box 440  
Palestine, Texas  

Dr. Evans C. Hodd

Pampa Independent School District  
321 West Albert  
Pampa, Texas  

Dr. James F. Malone
Paris Independent School District  
Drawer 1159  
Paris, Texas  

Mr. Tom P. Linam

Pasadena Independent School District  
Box 1799  
Pasadena, Texas  

Dr. Forrest Watson

Pewitt Independent School District  
Box 1106  
Omaha, Texas  

Mr. H. R. Hamilton

Pharr-San Juan-Alamo Independent School District  
Drawer Y  
Pharr, Texas  

Mr. Dean Skiles

Point Isabel Independent School District  
Drawer AH  
Port Isabel, Texas  

Mr. Ruben M. Torres

Port Arthur Independent School District  
Box 1388  
Port Arthur, Texas  

Dr. Clyde M. Gott

Poteet Independent School District  
Box 138  
Poteet, Texas  

Mr. Glenn R. Ellison

Premont Independent School District  
Box 530  
Premont, Texas  

Mr. G. R. Schneider

Princeton Independent School District  
Box 38  
Princeton, Texas  

Mr. George D. Clark

Progreso Independent School District  
Box 613  
Progreso, Texas  

Mr. Thomas M. Spell

Richardson Independent School District  
400 South Greenville  
Richardson, Texas  

Mr. J. J. Pearce

Robinson Independent School District  
500 West Lyndale  
Waco, Texas  

Mr. William Bradley, Jr.

Rockdale Independent School District  
Box 632  
Rockdale, Texas  

Mr. J. M. Moorman
Rogers Independent School District
Drawer A
Rogers, Texas

Mr. Wayne Cornelius

Royse City Independent School District
Box 479
Royse City, Texas

Mr. James F. Holt

Sabine Pass Independent School District
Box 98
Sabine Pass, Texas

Mr. A. C. Scott, Jr.

Saint Jo Independent School District
Drawer L
Saint Jo, Texas

Mr. John Henderson

Salado Independent School District
Box 98
Salado, Texas

Mr. Charles Larrison

San Antonio Independent School District
141 Lavaca
San Antonio, Texas

Dr. Harold H. Hitt

San Benito Consolidated Independent School District
195 West Adele
San Benito, Texas

Mr. John F. Barron

Sanger Independent School District
Box 188
Sanger, Texas

Mr. Herbert Arledge

Schleicher Independent School District
Box W
Eldorado, Texas

Mr. Guy Whitaker

Schulenburg Independent School District
517 North Street
Schulenburg, Texas

Mr. Ben J. Sustr

Scurry-Rosser Independent School District
Route 1, Box 14
Scurry, Texas

Mr. Harold R. Nichols

Seguin Independent School District
Drawer 31
Seguin, Texas

Mr. Jim Barnes

Shallowater Independent School District
Box 220
Shallowater, Texas

Mr. Weldon McCready
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharyland Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 753 Mission, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. B. L. Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 1156 Sherman, Texas</td>
<td>Dr. Wendell Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiley Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 158 Smiley, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. Billy Galbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyer Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 192 Smyer, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. Warren Morton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snook Independent School District</td>
<td>Snook, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. W. E. Dalchau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro Independent School District</td>
<td>10150 Alameda El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. H. W. Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Independent School District</td>
<td>1025 Woodrow Beaumont, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. Darrell Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Antonio Independent School District</td>
<td>2515 Sioux San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. Joe Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Independent School District</td>
<td>Route 7, Box 267 San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. Darrell Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman Independent School District</td>
<td>403 East 11 Avenue Spearman, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. James Cunningham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splendora Independent School District</td>
<td>Box 168 Splendora, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. Elliott Lansford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Branch Independent School District</td>
<td>955 Campbell Road Houston, Texas</td>
<td>Dr. H. M. Landrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek Independent School District</td>
<td>Route 1 Skellytown, Texas</td>
<td>Mr. L. E. Dyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring Hill Independent School District
Route 2, Box 33
Longview, Texas

Mr. Louie Williamson

Springtown Independent School District
Box 248
Springtown, Texas

Mr. Maurice English

Sulphur Bluff Independent School District
Sulphur Bluff, Texas

Mr. Roy Herman

Sulphur Springs Independent School District
Box 276
Sulphur Springs, Texas

Mr. Norris Starkey

Temple Independent School District
Box 788
Temple, Texas

Mr. Ace Alsup

Texarkana Independent School District
4241 Summerhill Road
Texarkana, Texas

Mr. James Covert

Texline Independent School District
Box 68
Texline, Texas

Mr. James Lanier

Trent Independent School District
Box 105
Trent, Texas

Mr. R. Dean King

Trinity Independent School District
Box 752
Trinity, Texas

Mr. R. L. Burton

Tucker Independent School District
Route 5
Palestine, Texas

Mr. Edward B. Alford

Tuleso-Midway Independent School District
9760 LaBranch
Corpus Christi, Texas

Dr. H. Doyle Little

Tyler Independent School District
Box 2035
Tyler, Texas

Mr. Jim Plyler

Union Hill Independent School District
Box 370
Gilmer, Texas

Mr. G. B. Clark
Venus Independent School District
Box 364
Venus, Texas

Mr. Grady Vaughn

Victoria Independent School District
Box 1759
Victoria, Texas

Mr. C. O. Chandler

Waco Independent School District
Box 27
Waco, Texas

Mr. Avery R. Downing

Wellman Independent School District
Box 68
Wellman, Texas

Mr. Frank L. Odom

Westhoff Rural High School District
Box 38
Westhoff, Texas

Ms. Irene Hahn

Wheeler Independent School District
Box 38
Wheeler, Texas

Mr. Dorman Thomas

Wichita Falls Independent School District
1105 Holliday
Wichita Falls, Texas

Mr. G. H. Kirby

Wills Point Independent School District
Box 258
Wills Point, Texas

Mr. Victor H. Jordan

Windom Rural High School District
Box 938
Windom, Texas

Mr. Johnnie Kay

Wylie Independent School District
Box 490
Wylie, Texas

Mr. Don E. Whitt

Ysleta Independent School District
8445 Valdespino
El Paso, Texas

Dr. J. M. Hanks

Zephyr Reverted Independent School District
Box 708
Zephyr, Texas

Mr. Tom H. Howard
Dear Fellow Administrator:

A request for your help or that of a designated representative of your school district is made in an effort to complete a study on "The Responsibilities and Practices of Public Schools in Texas in Dealing with Religion." This research is being done as part of a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Paul F. Smith, Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University. The questionnaire is being sent to two hundred and fourteen schools of all sizes throughout the state in an effort to get a valid cross sectional study.

The request for identification on the questionnaire will enable me to maintain a check on all questionnaires as they are received. No school will be identified by fact, number, or implication due to the controversial nature of this subject. Responses will be recorded categorically according to size of student population.

Any material or any policy related to the subject would be appreciated. This will be treated with the same anonymity as the questionnaire.

Response from each school administrator is a very important contribution to the validity of this study. The completion of the questionnaire should take no more than twenty minutes. Responses should reflect your school district policy or philosophy. Your consideration in returning the questionnaire as soon as possible will help me to meet a September 15 schedule. Thank you for your time and your contribution to the study.

Sincerely,

C. E. Andrews, Principal
Wimbish Elementary School
APPENDIX I

SURVEY OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND PRACTICES OF
PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN TEXAS IN DEALING WITH RELIGION

District Name

County

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions. Space is provided for you to make comments and remarks.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school will be identified by name, number, or implication.

1. The size of this school district as measured by average daily attendance is:
   _____ a) Over 20,000
   _____ b) 10,000 - 19,999
   _____ c) 4,000 - 9,999
   _____ d) 2,000 - 3,999
   _____ e) 1,000 - 1,999
   _____ f) 500 - 999
   _____ g) 200 - 499
   _____ h) Under 200

2. The household or family median income per year for the community of this school district is approximately:
   _____ a) $15,000 and over
   _____ b) $10,000 - $14,999
   _____ c) $5,000 - $9,999
   _____ d) Under $5,000
   _____ e) Unable to estimate

3. What nationality is predominant in your district?
   _____ a) German
   _____ b) Czechoslovakian
   _____ c) English
   _____ d) Mexican-American
   _____ e) Afro-American
   _____ f) Other (List)

4. Are there predominant religious denominations in your district, and if so, please give estimated percentages:
   a) _____ % Protestant
   b) _____ % Catholic
   c) _____ % Jewish
   d) _____ % Other (List)
5. In your school system, do the aims and objectives include the teaching of moral values which refer to such basic qualities as honesty, courage, loyalty, etc.?

   _____ a) Extensively _____ c) Limited
   _____ b) Moderately _____ d) None

Comment

6. Does your school system include in its aims and objectives the teaching of spiritual values which refer to such qualities as love, faith, reverence for a Supreme Being?

   _____ a) Extensively _____ c) Limited
   _____ b) Moderately _____ d) None

Comment

7. Are provisions made in your school system for materials such as Bibles of various religious orders or cults and/or factual and historical literature which help in teaching religious values?

   _____ a) Yes _____ b) No

If the answer is yes, list the materials used:

Comment

8. Does the policy of your school district provide the freedom to teach objectively about religion without offending a minority religion?

   _____ a) Yes _____ c) Undecided
   _____ b) Yes with _____ d) No

these restrictions:

Comment

9. Does your school district provide regular courses in objective religious instruction outside the historical and literary enrichment instruction?

   _____ a) Yes _____ b) No

If the answer is yes, in what religion or religions?
10. Are classroom teachers provided materials to help in teaching about religions?
   _____ a) Quite adequately  _____ c) Inadequately
   _____ b) Adequately
Comment

11. Does your school district agree that there can be a combination of pre-service and in-service education which will qualify teachers to be sufficiently objective in teaching about religion to protect the religious liberty of learners?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment

12. Does your school district agree that it is desirable that teachers in public elementary and secondary schools be given greater freedom to develop objectives in teaching about religion and religious institutions?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment

13. Does your school district agree that keeping religious beliefs a purely personal affair continues the level of tolerance and good will which has characterized public education?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment

14. Does your school district agree that the social and economic influences of various religious sects should be taught in the curricula?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree
Comment
15. Does your school district agree that schools, in teaching respect for the religious beliefs of others, should also include respect for any non-believers, including atheists?
   ____ a) Strongly agree   ____ c) Disagree
   ____ b) Agree            ____ d) Strongly disagree
   Comment

16. What religious holidays does your school district observe by dismissing classes?
   ____ a) Christmas        ____ d) Rosh Hashana
   ____ b) Easter           ____ e) Yom Kippur
   ____ c) Thanksgiving     ____ f) Other (List)
   Comment

17. In your school district, are there any religiously oriented activities in observance of religious holidays?
   ____ a) Usually          ____ c) Seldom
   ____ b) Seasonally       ____ d) Never
   Comment

18. In the opinion of your school district, should religious holidays be celebrated by school activities to strengthen moral education?
   ____ a) Always           ____ c) Never
   ____ b) Sometimes        ____ e) ________
   Comment

19. Are baccalaureate services conducted in connection with high school graduation?
   ____ a) Always           ____ c) Never
   ____ b) Sometimes        ____ e) ________
   Comment
20. Does your school district feel baccalaureate services provide a meaningful learning experience for high school graduates?
   ____ a) Great value   ____ c) No value
   ____ b) Some value   ____ d) Undecided
Comment________________________________________

21. To meet the need for teaching moral values, does your school system cooperate in a program of released-time religious instruction?
   ____ a) Regularly   ____ c) Never
   ____ b) Seldom
Comment________________________________________

22. If there is a released-time instruction, where are the classes held?
   ____ a) School   ____ c) Home
   ____ b) Church   ____ d) Other (List)
Comment________________________________________

23. What is the opinion of your school district of released-time religious instruction?
   ____ a) Great value   ____ c) No value
   ____ b) Some value
Comment________________________________________

24. Are ordained or designated representatives of religious orders teaching in the public schools of your district?
   ____ a) Yes   ____ c) Occasionally
   If yes, then check whether ____ part-time or ____ full time.
   ____ b) No
Comment________________________________________
25. In your school district, can Bibles be read:
   ____ a) by teachers aloud without comment during class
   ____ b) by students aloud during class
   ____ c) not at all
   ____ d) silently on an individual basis
Comment

26. Does your school district provide for any regular chapel exercise?
   ____ a) Monthly
   ____ b) Weekly
   ____ c) Daily
   ____ d) Seldom
   ____ e) Never
Comment

27. Is there any provision for homeroom devotional exercises?
   ____ a) Daily
   ____ b) Weekly
   ____ c) Monthly
   ____ d) Other
Comment

28. In your school district, are prayers and/or reading of Bible verses included in the morning opening exercise?
   ____ a) Yes, at the option of the principal.
   ____ b) Yes, at the option of the teacher.
   ____ c) Yes, by students.
   ____ d) Undecided.
   ____ e) No.
   ____ f) No, violates school policy.
Comment

29. Which one of the following provisions is made by your school district for prayer before meals?
   ____ a) Homeroom
   ____ b) Public address system
   ____ c) Lunchroom
   ____ d) None
Comment
30. Does your school district favor a policy by which public monies are used to buy texts and materials for parochial school children?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment__________________________________________

31. Does your school district provide bus transportation for children attending parochial schools?
   _____ a) Always  _____ c) Never
   _____ b) Sometimes

Comment__________________________________________

32. Should your school district supplement religious training which is provided by the home and religious organizations?
   _____ a) Extensively  _____ c) No
   _____ b) Limited  _____ d) Undecided

Comment__________________________________________

33. Does your school district agree that school systems should leave religious training to the home and to religious organizations?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment__________________________________________

34. Does your school district feel that Amendment I of the United States Constitution requires a complete separation between Church and State?
   _____ a) Strongly agree  _____ c) Disagree
   _____ b) Agree  _____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment__________________________________________
35. Since the American people support and control public schools within limitations of federal and state provisions, should constitutional amendments be made to clarify the roll of public schools relative to religious education?

____ a) Strongly agree   ____ c) Disagree
____ b) Agree   ____ d) Strongly disagree

Comment_________________________________________________________

Additional comments concerning religion and the public schools:
APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DISSERTATION
ON
THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND PRACTICES OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN TEXAS
IN DEALING WITH RELIGION

1. Should school systems include in their aims and objectives:
   (a) the teaching of moral values which refer to such basic qualities as honesty, courage, and loyalty?
   (b) the teaching of spiritual values which refer to such qualities as love, faith, reverence for a Supreme Being?

2. Should school systems provide Bibles and factual and historical literature of various religious orders or cults to aid in teaching about religious values?

3. Do you feel that a school system can set a policy which gives the freedom to teach objectively about religion without offending any minority religion?

4. Should school systems provide regular courses in objective religious instruction outside religious historical and literary enrichment instruction?

5. Should religious beliefs be kept a purely personal affair?

6. Should school systems teach the social and economic influences of various religious sects?

7. Should respect for all religions and for non-believers, including atheists, be taught?

8. What is your opinion of released-time instruction?
   (a) Where should such classes be held?
   (b) When should the classes be held?

9. Should ordained or designated representatives of religious orders be allowed to teach in public schools either full or part time?
10. Should Bibles be read, and, if in your opinion this is allowable, what procedure should be used?

11. Should chapel exercises be held in public schools?

12. Should morning opening exercises be held where prayers and/or reading of Bible verses are included?

13. Should prayers be given before meals?

14. Should public school systems provide bus transportation, texts, or materials for parochial schools?

15. Should public school systems supplement religious training which is provided by the home and by religious organizations?
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