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CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to make an analysis of certain factors as they are related to freedom of teaching in Texas. This study will include community relations as well as the conditions within the classroom, as for example, the freedom in discussing controversial ideas.

Need for the Study

The average prospective teacher in many cases knows little of what to expect in his relations with the community or the pressures that some groups would like to place upon him. Moreover, by a knowledge of these factors, they not only will know about what to expect but they can help to remove some of the restraints on the freedom of teaching.

Definition of Terms

Teachers.—As used in this study, teachers refer to superintendents, principals, and classroom teachers unless otherwise indicated.

Schools.—As used in this study, schools mean both elementary and secondary. No question was asked in the questionnaire as to its type, but it is assumed that only a few, if any, are parochial schools.
Freedom of Teaching.--Unless otherwise indicated, freedom of teaching in this study will be the description that is taken from the resolutions adopted by the National Education Association at its meeting in Washington in July, 1934:

Teachers should have the privilege of presenting all points of view, including their own, on controversial issues without danger of reprisal by the school administration or by pressure groups in the community. Teachers should also be guaranteed the constitutional rights of freedom of speech, press, and assembly and the right to support actively organized movements which they consider to be in their own and the public interest. The teacher's conduct outside the school should be subject only to such controls as those to which other responsible citizens are subjected. . . .

Other definitions will be given in their appropriate places.

Delimitations of Study

This study will not concern freedom of teaching on the university level, but it will discuss both elementary and secondary schools. The percentages that are quoted from the questionnaire are to be considered only as approximations, since no decimals are used. Moreover, such statements are, in most cases, opinions only and do not lend themselves to exact measurement. The teachers' opinions on their own limits of freedom are sometimes as useful as real restrictions since they tend to refrain from things that they think that the community mores would not approve. Although there was

---

no question as to the type of school taught, it would seem that most of the teachers, if not all, were from the public school systems. The problems of Negro teachers are not included in this study.

Source of Data

The primary source of data is from questionnaires. This procedure is essential since there are few related studies that are specific enough for this problem. Moreover, the nature of the study lends itself to the questionnaire type of analysis. Other sources are books that are of general value, some magazine articles, the school laws of Texas, a few newspaper articles, educational reports, and follow-up letters. Most of these supplemented the primary material.

For a copy of the questionnaire that was used in this study, see the appendix. There were eighty-eight usable replies to the somewhat lengthy questionnaire. Originally, 200 of these were sent to addresses that were obtained from the Placement Office at North Texas State College, Denton, Texas. The main reason why only fifty-eight teachers, or 29%, answered was that several of them had quit teaching or never had taught. A follow-up letter was answered by a dozen or so who said that they would like to cooperate but could not since they were no longer teaching. Because of the small percentage of replies from the first group, a second set of fifty questionnaires was mailed this spring. Thirty answers, or 60%, were received in return. Some of those who
didn't answer may have felt that they did not know the community well enough to reply, since this last group of addresses was taken from a list of first year teachers for the most part.

Related Studies

There are very few studies on the problem that apply to Texas specifically, but there are several general references. The most valuable reference was H. K. Beale's excellent study for the Commission on the Social Studies, Are American Teachers Free? This source has about a dozen references to Texas, but much of it is out of date since it was written in 1936. It still remains the best reference, however, on teacher freedom. Some parts of the present writer's questionnaire came from his exhaustive work. His conclusions are similar to those in this study except this study is concerned with the emphasis on Texas if possible. His main source of data were interviews, questionnaires, and primary materials, such as minutes of meetings, newspapers, and magazines. Some of his conclusions will be quoted wherever needed. Most of the writers on academic freedom write on the university level. A good book that deals with the nature of pressure groups is J. Flint Waller's Outside Demands and

---

Pressures on the Public Schools. By the interviewing of superintendent he tried to find out the nature of demands on the schools and how the superintendents handled them. He found that there are many pressures exerted on the school, depending on the size of the town and other factors. His study was not much on the freedom of teaching, but mainly as to how groups work through the schools and what they wanted. For a more complete list of organizations that work through the schools and what their motives are, one of the best references is Bessie Pierce's Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth. Her study was to determine the strongest groups that work through the schools, their motives, and their methods of supplying pressure. She analyzes the relations of dozens of the major groups in America and their relation to the education. If one is looking for a history of the freedom of teaching, another of H. K. Beale's books, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools, is very good. It brings the story up to the time of the Second World War. Most other books are older.

---

3J. Flint Waller, Outside Demands and Pressures on the Public Schools, New York, 1932.


It traces the background for the other book that is described above, *Are American Teachers Free?* Their approach is the same, except that one is the historical approach; the other is a more complete analysis of the same problem since the First World War. For a general treatment of the problem of teacher freedom, a good source is the Second Yearbook of the John Dewey Society entitled *Educational Freedom and Democracy.* 6

There are several other references on the general subject of teacher freedom but practically none of them mention Texas. This study will summarize some of their findings in the appropriate sections. At the end of each chapter will be found an analysis of the situation in Texas as determined by the questionnaires that were sent out to the Texas teachers.

CHAPTER II

FACTORs IN EMPLOYMENT AND TENURE

Introduction

This chapter is a consideration of the related questions of employment practices and tenure of teachers. The first part will take into consideration the practices that often exclude certain groups from employment, due to the race, religion, or sex of a teacher who is seeking a teaching position. In the second part the question of tenure will be related to the over-all problem of the freedom of teaching.

Before considering these two questions, however, a description will be given of the teachers who cooperated in the study by answering the questionnaires.

General Information as to Those Who Answered the Questionnaire

A check on the first part of their questionnaires seems to indicate that it was a very typical group of teachers.

In order possibly to receive more replies, it was stated in the questionnaire that no names or towns would be quoted; hence, in the quotations that are used from the questionnaires, only the number assigned to that address will be given, as (No. 2). There is no need for anyone who participated in this study to be worried about someone checking up
on his statements; only the writer has a list of the ones who cooperated in this study.

Although not a part of the main study, it might be of interest to note that 85% of those replying placed their names in the blank provided, even though it was optional. As to designation of town, which also was optional, 94% listed their town. Even with this precaution for their protection, however, some individuals gave instances of restraint and then asked that they not be quoted.

As to the classification of sex, 34% were men and the remaining two-thirds were women teachers.

One of the things to take into consideration in this matter of teacher freedom certainly would be that of the size of the community, since in smaller communities there is sometimes less freedom than there would be in a larger city with less personal contact with the community. Of those who replied to the questionnaires, we find that the size of the community is as follows: Under 500 population, 9% of the total; 500 to 2500, 33%; 2500 to 10,000, 20%; 10,000 to 50,000, 24%; over 50,000 population accounted for 14% of those replying.

As to the level of educational work the teachers were in, more than one-third were in elementary work, or 36%. In the junior high classification we find 18% of the total; the senior high group was 25%; and a combination of the two secondary divisions accounted for 21% of the total. These figures probably show a larger per cent in the secondary schools
than actually exist in Texas, but it will prove more useful to this study, inasmuch as many elementary teachers do not encounter some controversial ideas that high school teachers discuss in their classes. Several elementary teachers commented that the controversial ideas listed did not affect them.

As to the amount of educational work done, we find that one-third, or 36%, have taught less than five years; a similar group, or 32%, from five to fifteen years; and another one-third with over fifteen years teaching experience. On the surface it would appear that the average teacher in the study has had around ten years teaching experience.

On the other hand, however, we might compare the number of years the teachers have taught in their present position, keeping in mind that these were answered during the 1948-49 school year. In this latter grouping we find that 9% had taught over fifteen years in their present school system; 22% of the total had taught five to fifteen years; and 69% of the group had taught less than five years in their present school.

From the definition already given, all of those who responded were called teachers. In this group, however, we might note that 80% were classroom teachers; 14% were principals; and, as would be expected, a much smaller proportion, 6%, were superintendents.

Finally, as to the subjects they taught, one might note
that they are in similar proportions to the total number of teachers of these subjects. One-third, 33%, listed themselves as teachers of elementary grades, from which fact we might conclude that the other 3% of the elementary teachers had secondary combinations or were principals. In the junior high and senior school classifications we note that 10% taught social science (a field that has several explosive controversial ideas for narrow-minded communities); English, 12%; commercial subjects, 6%; homemaking, 5%; and 20% among other subjects. The remaining 14% were listed as administrators, and, since this is a smaller per cent that the foregoing paragraph indicates, we can conclude that about one-half of the principals also taught some classes.

No effort will be made to list the main occupations in the communities, but from a perusal of this item we note that the size of the community has much to do with types of occupations. The small towns usually are agricultural communities, whereas, as the population increases, we find a trend toward industrialization. In a latter chapter, an attempt will be made to show the relations between the size of the town and the freedom that the teachers have.

Factors That Affect Employment

Even in times of teacher shortage, such as Texas has been facing for several years, there are still several factors that handicap or affect the employment of teachers other than ability. A list of factors that prevent the hiring of
teachers is not as long as it was during the depression period, but it is still serious enough to warrant attention in our democracy.

The reasons for not hiring a teacher will vary from one community to another. In some of the larger towns, several of the following factors would have little to do with his application, unless it would be communism or atheism. In some of the smaller towns many of them might be taken into consideration.

In his exhaustive study of the freedom of teaching, H.K. Beals found that:

Prejudice frequently strong enough to disqualify prospective teachers affects: (1) "foreign" origin groups; (2) non-residents such as inhabitants of other towns or states, natives of other sections of the country such as Northerners in the South or Westerners in the East, and country folk in urban centers or city-bred applicants in rural communities; (3) racial groups such as Negroes in white schools, and Jews; (4) groups handicapped by sex or marriage such as men in certain schools, women in others, feminists, married women, and divorced persons; (5) members of unpopular political parties; (6) religious groups such as Catholics in some localities, Protestants in others, liberals, fundamentalists, Unitarians, agnostics, and atheists; and (7) other objectionable persons such as pacifists.1

By checking over the above list it will be noted that the particular person who would be handicapped in one community might not be in another, depending on the type of community and people who lived there, the control of the school board, and dozens of other factors.

Usually the matter of who teaches in the public schools is not a question for the community to talk about, but at the present time a great deal of discussion on a national level is going on as to whether communists should teach. This is only a sidelight, however, of the total communist inquiry that is going on all over the country. It has led to cries of "witch hunting" on the part of the educators, not because they favor communists as teachers, but because they fear that the whole question of teacher loyalty might lead to reactionary movements similar to those that followed the First World War. In this connection it might be pointed out that the un-American Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives is now checking for subversive materials in textbooks used by the colleges.\(^2\) Another sidelight to the question of who shall teach was the announcement by the Educational Policies Commission, led by such a well-known figure as Dwight Eisenhower, that no communist should be allowed to teach in the schools, regardless of whether or not he tried to propagandize in the classroom. Their charge was that communist membership "renders an individual unfit to discharge the duties of a teacher in this country."\(^3\) This is not the universal opinion, however, and in regard to this

---


\(^3\) "Educators Ask Reds Be Barred From Teaching," Denton Record-Chronicle, June 8, 1949, p. 1.
one of the strongest defenders of civil rights spoke as follows:

The American Civil Liberties Union opposed the dismissal of teachers in New York City on the ground of opinion or mere membership, holding that activities alone should constitute 'Conduct unbecoming a teacher,' the ground for dismissal specified in the tenure law. 4

Now that some idea has been given as to the national situation, a consideration will be given as to the handicaps that hinder a teacher's employment in Texas. The question that was asked was as follows: "Which of the following would in your school or school system be disqualified or seriously handicapped: In getting a position--In keeping it if fact becomes known without previous misrepresentation." 5

After a tabulation of the results several interesting facts were revealed. In this particular question only the answer to the first part—that part of getting a position—will be used since the second part—keeping it—revealed almost the same results. The table below illustrates the results of the replies in the questionnaires, beginning with the group that would be least handicapped in Texas, as shown by this representative group.

By looking at Table 1 it will be seen that some groups would not be barred, as such, from teaching in Texas. It

4American Civil Liberties Union, Liberty's National Emergency: The Story of Civil Liberty in the Crisis Year 1940-1941, June, 1941, p. 38.
5See the appendix for a copy of the questionnaire.
might be worthy of our attention, however, to consider some of these a little more in detail.

In Table 1 there are two columns; the first giving the names of the group and the second giving the approximate per cent of schools in which they would be handicapped in getting a position.

**TABLE 1**

**FACTORs THAT HANDICAP EMPLOYMENT OF TEACHERS IN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Group</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of other states</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized citizens</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced persons</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious liberals</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialists</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheists</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protestants**—Since Texas is predominantly Protestant in religion, it would be expected that there would be little discrimination in hiring Protestant teachers. None of those answering the questionnaires checked this as a handicap, but this questionnaire may have never been answered by a teacher in a private school. In applying for a position in a parochial school, the situation might be entirely different.

**Married women**—The present teacher shortage has removed this from factors to be considered in the employment of teachers. There was a time, though, when they were discriminated
against because it was thought best to let the men take the few available jobs. If another depression comes this factor might be an important consideration; in other words, it depends on the "times," as one teacher replied.

Naturalized citizens—There is no law against the hiring of naturalized citizens, but about one-sixth of the communities discriminate against their employment.

Divorced persons—It would depend partly on what the cause for divorce was, but, generally speaking, one-fourth of the schools do not want to trust the examples of divorced persons as teachers and models for their students.

Catholics—The small communities were the ones that most often checked that Catholics would be discriminated against.

Socialists—Perhaps the biggest reason why Socialists are discriminated against is the conservatism of school boards and the current distrust of anything that might be considered as "foreign."

Atheists—It is not surprising to find that almost all of the schools refuse to hire atheists, since teachers often have a great deal of influence on their students. As to the topic of religion, the laws of Texas forbid the questioning of one's religion in his application for a job, but school boards have a right to question his belief in the existence of a Supreme Being. Article 2899a, Sec.1.

Communists—Perhaps one of the most reassuring things in this study to many is that in Texas a communist would find it
practically impossible to get a teaching position. The present legislature has passed a resolution that would call on the state supported colleges to remove all communist students. The question of teacher loyalty oaths will be taken up in a later chapter.

Some of the typical comments on this part of the questionnaire, and the number of the cooperating teacher, are as follows:

As far as I know, none of the above would affect any teacher applying for a position, or holding one, unless it would be proven that the teacher was a Communist or an Atheist. (No. 80).

Anyone who has any of the qualifications of a teacher can hardly keep from being pressed into service at this present time. Before the war the situation was entirely different. (No. 11).

As far as I have ever heard we have a very broad-minded board who hires teachers on qualifications and personality and not on "isms." (No. 22).

We are merely asked to sign a statement that we are not members of any political or religious groups that desire to overthrow the U. S. government. (No. 126).

At one time married women were not hired. However, about one-half of the women teachers today are married. (No. 16).

Analysis of Tenure Practices

About half of the states have some form of tenure laws for the school teachers, but Texas has only the continuing contract type. Some of the cities in Texas have tenure regulations that are liberal but so tenure has not become a reality in most of our schools. Because there is a lot of
misunderstanding about tenure, it is deemed advisable to quote the following principles and purposes of tenure:

1. To maintain and improve the educational opportunities of children and youth.
2. To build in the teacher that confidence and freedom which comes with a sense of stability and security as a citizen in a free republic.
3. To protect teachers in preparing children and youth for loyal, effective participation in a democratically controlled society of free men cooperating for the common welfare.
4. To enrich community life by giving permanency and continuity to the service of the teacher.
5. To encourage boards of education to place the welfare of children above the selfish interests of those political or economic groups which may seek to dominate the school.
6. To guarantee employment conditions, providing a sense of security which will encourage teachers to attain the highest standards of professional competence.
7. To encourage the most promising young men and women to prepare for teaching as a life work, not as a steppingstone.
8. To set up definite, orderly procedures by which incompetent, unsatisfactory teachers may be dismissed.
9. To protect competent, satisfactory teachers from unjust dismissal.
10. To protect teachers in their exercise of their rights and duties as American citizens.6

Thus it will be seen that the principles of the National Education Association listed above would not only protect the worthy but would provide a means for removing the unworthy teacher. The principle that is outstanding for the purpose of this study, though, is number five, because in some communities the best teacher might be removed if he becomes too unpopular with a strong pressure group.

As for the specific situation in Texas, there would seem

---

to be room for improvement. Texas, it will be recalled, does
not provide for statewide tenure rules, but about 12% of the
teachers checked that their school system provides for "per-
manent tenure after a probationary period." These are only
local provisions, however, and are not state law.

As to the procedure in case of dismissal, 20% of the
ones that replied state that their school system provided
for a "guarantee of a hearing before dismissal." Also in the
related question of an "appeal to courts if dismissed," it
was found that 20% of the schools provide for that procedure.
It might be pointed out in this connection that most cases
of a school nature go through the school channels to the
highest school official usually before they are appealed to
the courts. Several teachers have lost their just claims to
benefits because they did not follow the procedure as out-
lined in the law.

The laws of the state do not provide for all situations,
but the main articles dealing with the question of tenure are
as follows:

[...]

They [Common School District Trustees] shall
have the power to employ and dismiss teachers; but in
case of dismissal, teachers shall have the right of
appeal to the county and State Superintendents.]

For the length of time that the Common School Districts
may hire teachers and administrative personnel, we find;

---

7 Article 2749, quoted in Public School Laws of the
State of Texas, 1945, p. 76.
That trustees of any Common School District or Consolidated Common School District shall have authority to make contracts for a period of time not in excess of two (2) years with principals, superintendents, and teachers of said Common School Districts or Consolidated Common School Districts, provided that such contracts shall be approved by the County Superintendent. . . . 8

When we come to the independent school districts we find that they can have longer contracts for teachers. Thus we see that:

The board of trustees of any city or town or any independent school district may employ a superintendent, principal, teacher, or any other executive officers in the schools therein for a term of not to exceed three years, provided that the board of trustees of an independent school district which had a scholastic population of 5,000 or more in the last preceding scholastic year may employ a superintendent, principal, teacher, or other officers in the schools therein for a term not to exceed five years. . . . 9

Although the law provides for contracts of longer than a year at a time, it seems to be the common practice in most schools to hire the teachers on annual contracts. There was some talk in the last legislature of providing for longer continuing contracts, but most of the attention and pressure of the teachers of Texas was on the passage of the Gilmer-Aikin School Laws, so the question of tenure will not come up until the next or succeeding sessions.

Regarding the history of tenure attempts in Texas one notes that:

Teacher tenure had met with opposition whenever it

8Article 2750a, Ibid., p. 76.

9Article 2781, Ibid., p. 97.
has been introduced into the Legislature of Texas. This opposition has been sufficient in the past to prohibit any form of tenure bill becoming law. Individual cities have set up their own tenure systems, but they have little or no legal basis.¹⁰

As for the dismissals it has been noted that:

Investigation of court cases and surveys have brought out that personal and petty complaints rather than inefficiency and dereliction of duty are the main causes of dismissal of teachers. . .¹¹

In this study no special attempt was made to send questionnaires to people in cities that were known to have a bad reputation as regards the freedom of teaching; the addresses were chosen from a representative group of teachers. Several instances might be found in the newspapers, though, if one keeps up with the news of student strikes and related news.

This study does not attempt to analyze the situation on the university level. Occasionally, however, a high school case of teacher freedom makes the news. One of the best known cases in Texas public schools is related to this question of tenure. It was on February 21, 1943, in violation of his contract and without previous notice, that C. L. Yarbrough, superintendent of schools at Port Neches, Texas, was discharged by the board of education. This case came before the attention of the National Education Association and they said that:


¹¹Ibid., p. 80.
Another significant angle of the case is that the dismissal under which Mr. Yarbrough was dismissed, establishes beyond question the need for legislative action to protect administrators and teachers from unwarranted dismissal. This points to the need in Texas for sound tenure legislation. In this case the superintendent had legal redress only because of the abrogation of contract. At the termination of a contract, which in the case of teachers and superintendents, frequently is at the end of each school year, there is no provision whatsoever for legal protection; yet every year there are cases of able and efficient teachers and administrators dismissed without justifiable cause, to the detriment of the educational progress of children, and contrary to the best interests of society in general. The case also shows a need for legislation to determine the respective functions of school boards and superintendents, and to provide for the recall of school board members who fail to function for the best interests of the schools.12

Fortunately, in the school election that followed, a new school board was elected and he was restored as superintendent. In most cases, however, in Texas the teacher or the superintendent would have lost out, since there is no tenure law for the whole state.

As stated above, some of the city schools have tenure regulations. One of the larger cities has a progressive policy in this respect and the school board had the following placed in the local paper as their policy:

1. Teachers shall be elected, retained and released on a professional basis.
2. In the event that termination of a teacher's contract be deemed necessary either during a contract or at the end of any contract year, such termination shall not become effective without a hearing before the board at which hearing the teacher shall be entitled to hear the evidence supporting the need for termination and present testimony on his behalf. Such hearings, however, shall be had only upon request of the teacher.

3. Causes for termination shall be:
   a. Moral conduct unbecoming a good citizen and a Christian.
   b. Failure to abide by established rules and regulations.
   c. Failure to cooperate with the superintendent, principal and supervisors.
   d. Incompetency and/or failure to use reasonable diligence in improving ability as a teacher.
   e. Advocating any form of government contrary to the established form of government of the United States of America. (No. 31).

Many other cities in Texas might get some ideas from the standards of teacher dismissal as the above West Texas city has established.

Another city teacher stated that they had a "five year contract after three year probation." (No. 2).

Some of the other typical comments on this question of tenure are as follows:

A teacher's position was threatened because she belonged to the Catholic Church about 1925. She is still teaching in the system. (No. 19).

Very few dismissals—think board would grant a hearing. (No. 19).

Any comment may cause dismissal at end of the year. (No. 42).

I know of no teacher being dismissed here, except for drinking. (No. 80).

We are at the mercy of the school board who are illiterate and easily influenced by propaganda. (No. 85).

Practically no protection except teacher shortage. (No. 110).

We have only a letter offering the renewal of the position and our answer by letter each year. (No. 50).

Teachers are seldom dismissed, but there would be
some notice given. They might have an opportunity to "reform." (No. 114).

No one is dismissed without just cause. (No. 158).

Superintendent's opinion is final. (No. 217).

Dismissal only in cases of extreme inefficiency. (No. 229).

Dismissed on public opinion, no hearing from co-workers. (No. 234).

Summary

In the hiring of teachers several factors are taken into consideration besides their teaching ability. In Texas some of the reasons that handicap teachers in getting employment and the per cent of the teachers who checked that factor are as follows: communists, 100%; atheists, 98%; socialists, 58%; religious liberals, 38%; Catholics, 35%; divorced persons, 25%; naturalized citizens, 17%; with a much smaller per cent of discrimination for residents of other states, married women, and Protestants. In times of teacher surplus, however, the factors might change; as for example, the married women would have more trouble getting teaching positions.

Texas does not have a state law for tenure, although it does permit continuing contracts of more than one year. Some cities have tenure regulations, but they do not have very much of a legal basis. Most schools hire the teachers by annual contracts, and can dismiss them for any reason, or without reason, at the end of the school year.
CHAPTER III

FREEDOM IN DISCUSSING CONTROVERSIAL IDEAS

In this chapter the main topics are the teachers' freedom to discuss controversial ideas and some pressures on his work.

The first part will analyze the freedom of discussion in the classroom. The second part will consider his freedom of expression outside the classroom. The last part of the chapter will contain some reasons for avoiding controversial ideas.

Freedom of Discussion in the Classroom

To one who is unfamiliar with the teacher's problems, he might assume that what the teacher and class discuss in the classroom would be of no direct interest to others in the community. Such, unfortunately, is not always the situation.

Before starting a consideration of these problems of academic freedom, however, it might be well to consider some outstanding principles or standards of a good situation that permits freedom of discussion in the classroom.

The question of academic freedom most often is thought of in connection with higher education, but it also has an application to the secondary and elementary level. While considering this entire question of academic freedom, it is worthwhile to keep in mind these guiding principles as listed by the American Civil Liberties Union:
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1. No interference with freedom of teaching in adult or higher education except upon judgments of juries of educators; not in lower schools except upon judgments of composite juries of administrators, community and teachers.

2. No limitation on classroom discussion relevant to the subjects taught.

3. Outside of schools, the same freedom for teachers as other citizens, with encouragement of participation in public affairs.

4. No interference with the right of teachers to organize for their own protection and freedom of teaching to affiliate with labor.

5. No unreasonable interference by legislatures with the school curriculum, the control of which would be vested in educational authorities and the teaching profession.

6. No compulsory religious practices in the schools, such as Bible reading.

7. Protection of the rights of students to organize for discussion of public issues, without faculty control. No disciplinary action against students because of religious, political, or other views or activities.

8. Opposition to all special oaths of loyalty for teachers as unfair discrimination and as harmful to free and open critical inquiry.

9. Strong tenure laws in all states to protect teachers against unjust dismissals.¹

Some people might say that the teacher does not need so much freedom, and some of their arguments will be considered later. Others might think that the right of academic freedom is not important anyway. As a partial answer to that thought, one of our leading educators had this comment to add:

Education may be called the life-giving principle of democracy. "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" is possible only where the people are adequately informed as to their social and political duties and rights. . . .

Freedom of inquiry, of study and investigation, of discussion and criticism, freedom of speech, and freedom

of teaching are therefore, inherent in the very concept of democracy.²

Regarding the question of the discussion of controversial ideas, one of the best references on the subject noted that:

Schools have always been free to handle as they pleased issues that the community does not care about. The community has never been willing to have schools or their teachers play active roles in the determination of questions that vitally concerned it. From era to era the vital interests of Americans have changed. Problems that a past generation regarded as important have ceased to interest a new generation.³

For an illustration of his first point, we shall note later how it is possible to have more freedom in discussing controversial issues at a distance than similar local matters of more interest to the community. As an illustration of his point about the vital interest changing, we have but to consider a little history: At first our main interests were politics and religion; now they are social and economic in nature. Each era means adjustments in the classroom as to what the community will permit to be discussed.

The question of what can be discussed will vary from one community to another, but the following list is suggestive:

Teachers and public, generally, placed at the top of dangerous topics to talk about in school—religion, sex, politics, and economics. The farther away a political education is, the more freedom the teacher has to discuss it, the survey disclosed. Only 7 per cent. felt that


international politics is in the danger zone for discussion; 14 per cent. felt that a teacher takes a risk in introducing consideration of national political affairs, while 22 per cent. believe that a discussion of local politics is most likely to get teachers in hot water. 4

Some teachers might like to avoid the discussion of all problems of a local nature, since they often arouse a little criticism. It is here, of course, that the student has his strongest interest.

Closely connected with the question of controversial discussions is the question of what textbook is chosen, since some teachers follow the book slavishly. In connection with this we also get an introduction as to how pressure groups work. On the textbook situation it has been noted that:

Southern states are beginning to adopt "Northern" texts; David S. Muzzey's history, for example, was recently adopted for statewide use in Oklahoma and Virginia. Yet it is still difficult to persuade Southern states to adopt either history or science texts by Northern authors. Some Northern writers have won adoption by finding a Southern co-author. Some publishers put out an edition for the North and another for the South. Many schools, however, have to yield to sectional prejudice still and use an inferior book written in their own section rather than a better one written in another part of the country.

. . . Several states have banned all books dealing with evolution or have ordered the offending passages deleted, among them Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas. "Ma" Ferguson, who was Governor at the time when the Texas Textbook Commission ordered all passages on evolution eliminated, declared, "I'm a Christian mother who believes that Jesus Christ died to save humanity, and I am not going to let that kind of rot go into Texas textbooks." 5

---

4 "Digest of a Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom of the National Education Association," School and Society, L (September 9, 1939), 351.

Another situation that has attracted attention in Texas and other Southern states is the elimination of textbooks that discussed evolution. Regarding this matter it has been noted that:

In Texas and a number of other states the word "development" is used instead of "evolution". Many publishers have instructed their authors to omit discussion of the subject entirely. Others are publishing two editions of their text-books, one for districts under Fundamentalist control and the other outside. 6

Thus, it would appear that Texas and the Southern states have less freedom of discussion of certain controversial ideas than the other states.

Another item that is related to the freedom of discussion is the student and the parents. It has been noted that:

Over the heads of . . . teachers, . . . hangs at all times the sword of parental conservatism and anxiety. This is rendered the more difficult because, in manners and morals as well as economics, politics, and religion, the local community contains taxpaying parents of widely varying personal standards. The teacher knows and the community knows that the children ranged in their seats are wise in matters not in the curriculum, and that many of these children are rebelliously clamoring for the right to raise questions and to be outspoken in the face of the official and parental restraints. As one teacher said, "I am facing a new problem nowadays; my pupils insist on raising questions I dare not let them discuss though my conscience demands that I not clamp down on their honest questions. The things they say continually keep me on pins and needles for fear some of them will go home and tell their parents. I have an uneasy furtive sense about it all." 7

As for the subjects that are most likely to cause

6 American Civil Liberties Union, Gag on Teaching, p. 7.
trouble, perhaps the most noticeable are the social sciences because, if handled properly, they deal with living issues. The teacher of these subjects has a notable position in this respect since it is known that:

The teacher of social science can only escape presenting the necessity of choice in social affairs by fleeing from the world of reality to the land of abstraction. If this is the alternative, then civic instruction might as well be taken out of the schools. By its intrinsic nature, social science requires some picture of the process in which we live and work and when it is realistically conceived it must deal with what is here and now and also with what is emerging from the here and now.⁸

Other subjects cause trouble, too, but social science materials most often can cause trouble because of their nature and they discuss needed changes with the status quo. The question of freedom of discussion also depends on the place and time.

It is in the social sciences also that citizenship and the democratic attitude come in for the most consideration. Regarding this we find that:

Many thoughtful people believe that democracy can be preserved only if the schools succeed in developing independent thinking in future citizens so that democracy may function intelligently. Only schools where teachers and pupils are alike free can develop this kind of citizen.⁹

In addition to teaching a critical attitude or independent thinking the social studies, as well as other classes,

⁸C. A. Beard, A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools, p. 56.

have some responsibility as to the ever increasing use or attempts to use propaganda, even in the schools. On this it has been noted that:

Teaching resistance to propaganda is not easy. Authorities seem to agree that one should have (a) awareness of the existence of propaganda, (b) some understanding of its devices, such as name calling, testimonials, invitations to follow the crowd, the use of glittering generalities, and deliberate misrepresentation, (c) a critical attitude in weighing evidence, (d) training in the use of available resources of information, and (e) opportunity for free discussion of controversial ideas.10

Perhaps the generation now would be a better citizenry if the schools had taught them how to think and to recognize faulty reasoning, such as in a political campaign.

At the same time it is realized that in teaching the students how to think a teacher has to use tact and approach some subjects with care.

A teaching position is no trust to be used for a partisan purpose, however. As mentioned before, there is some threat about the possibility of spreading communism in the schools. Several people think that mere membership in the Communist Party should prohibit one's teaching. The state of Texas requires that all teachers must take a loyalty oath, the same one as taken by state officials. The same law also provides further:

Sec. 3. That any teacher or instructor in any tax-supported school, college, university or other institution

of learning in this State who shall have been found guilty of openly advocating doctrines which seek to undermine or overthrow by force or violence the republican and democratic forms of government in the United States, or which in any way seek to establish a government that does not rest upon the fundamental principle of the consent of the governed, upon and after a full hearing by the employing or appointing authority of such teacher or instructor, shall be dismissed from such service.\footnote{11}

This entire question of the threat of communism has probably been overplayed, not so much in what needs to be done but in the possible harm that might be done in "witch hunts" and the methods of investigating communism. The National Education Association in its meeting in Boston in 1949 voted almost unanimously "in favor of barring communists from teaching in American classrooms." \footnote{12}

Apparently there is no law so far in Texas that makes mere membership in the communist party a cause for dismissal in the public schools, but the trend may be noted by the passage of a law passed in the Texas legislature just closed. The bill applied to colleges, with these major provisions:

\begin{quote}
HB 837. Loyalty. Requiring students and faculty members of state-supported colleges and universities to make affidavit that they are not a member of or affiliated with any organization (Communist) or movement to subvert or overthrow the government of the United States or any of its subdivisions.\footnote{13}
\end{quote}

\footnote{11}Article 2908a, Sec. 3, quoted in \textit{Public School Laws of the State of Texas}, 1945, pp. 205-207.


Another method used by strong patriotic groups is to set up themselves as judge of what the students should read. An example of this will suffice:

"Radicalism" is often attacked by school rules or orders barring "dangerous" books or magazines. In Los Angeles, for instance, *The Nation* and the *New Republic* were excluded from school libraries by an order of June, 1921, because they were "undermining the economic principles of America." This order was periodically renewed in spite of a resolution of the High School Teachers' Association asking that the magazines be restored.\(^4\)

Teachers do not usually want to indoctrinate any of their classes to any particular belief but, by expressing no opinion verbally, they might lead some students to think that they are afraid to think out loud.

Also some conservative pressure groups often handicap teachers, as illustrated in the following reference:

Men who protest against radical propaganda in the schools usually object, not because they want schools free from indoctrination but because they wish to choose the ideas to be indoctrinated. In schools, therefore, where radical ideas are banned, conservative economic and social views and reverence for the status quo are habitually instilled into children. Conservatives do not call it indoctrination when they practice it. They merely "teach the truth" about social and economic problems or "acquaint children with American ideals." The indoctrination is frequently unconscious. Yet indoctrination it is. It is employed constantly, and objection to it is rarely raised.\(^5\)

The educators now generally agree that the schools must take into account some modern problems. At one time it was suggested by some people, though, that American History should not be concerned with recent history since it is too

\(^{15}\) Ibid.
controversial. Since any school that meets the needs of the students must face controversial ideas, it might be worth our attention to see some of the ways that have been suggested by superintendents as the best methods for handling their discussion in the classroom. They suggested this list, in order or preference:

1. Careful study of all angles of controversial questions, much research reading of competent views.
2. Class discussion following above.
3. Debates.
4. Committee reports.
5. Newspapers.
6. Interviews by students of leaders.
7. Presentation by adult advocates of opposing or variant views.16

From reading the above we are reminded of the adage that every question has two sides, and any teacher who only presents one side to every question has already reduced some of his usefulness as a teacher and example. This is not to say, however, that a teacher should never favor a viewpoint. Perhaps they should take a positive stand more often, especially if it is an undemocratic practice that is under discussion.

Now that we have seen some of the problems and hindrances to the freedom of discussion in the classroom, let's see what the situation in Texas is.

From an analysis of the questionnaires on Part IV, or the freedom to discuss several ideas, we find that there are

---

16Adapted from F. H. Bair, *The Social Understandings of the Superintendent of Schools*, pp. 52-53.
several limits to the fullest discussion of all ideas that might come up in class. Before starting on an analysis of what was found to be the practices in Texas schools, however, a brief explanation of the purpose might be in order. The purpose of the list of controversial ideas was to find out to what extent they could be discussed freely. Some of the people did not understand the purpose and left this page blank. By referring to the appendix it will be seen that the teachers were to check the practices in their community, beginning with number one for limited freedom or a teacher can "believe in if he does not say so openly," and going on up to five, with the fullest freedom of discussion. In Table 2 the results are summarized. At the left is the list of controversial ideas, while in the right column is the approximate per cent of schools in which teachers are not free to discuss openly the items that are listed.

By checking the order of the list we can note that these topics suggest some of the things in Texas that a teacher should approach with caution, if he is in certain communities.

This is certainly no exhaustive list of things that cause difficulty in Texas, but the list is suggestive of some "hot potatoes" in some communities. As for the topic of communism, some of those who answered this page placed a question mark in that column. It might be that some of those 28% who checked communism as a dangerous topic might
have been thinking of teaching the doctrine and not about communism. Another item that several left blank was "To abolish the Jim Crow Laws." Since so many left it blank, the topic is not listed in the Table, but 4% of those answering stated that it was a topic for teachers to believe in if they wanted to, but not to discuss. Possibly many of them did not know the meaning of the term.

TABLE 2

APPROXIMATE PER CENT OF SCHOOLS IN TEXAS IN WHICH CERTAIN IDEAS MAY NOT BE DISCUSSED OPENLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-existence of God</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denunciation of local men or officials for corruption</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of practices of local business men as unjust</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth control</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher membership in labor union</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of evolution</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemn the activities of the American Legion or the Daughters of the American Revolution</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government ownership of public utilities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialism</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval of the mayor’s plans or program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity of peaceful reform of capitalist system</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of the President or Governor of Texas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denunciation of practices of Big Business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemn the Truman Doctrine</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolish the poll tax</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise taxes on natural resources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object to the peacetime draft</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve of labor unions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political equality for Negroes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy of federal aid to public schools</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart also points out another statement already made—that local questions are likely to cause more trouble in the classroom than a similar question farther away. Take the example of the criticism of business practices—36% thought it a
dangerous topic for local men but only 6% for the same type of discussion when applied to "Big Business" or a national question. A similar situation also exists in reference to the discussion of local, as compared to national, political problems.

Moreover, the list approves the findings of others—that the most dangerous topics in the classroom are religion, politics, economics, and sex. We might add a fifth, the arousal of the ire of strong pressure groups, such as patriotic societies. It might be interesting to add that the safest topic for school discussion seems to be education, or the advocacy of federal aid to public schools, as listed here. On this particular item teachers were also allowed to discuss the matter with others within and outside the school, meaning that the teacher can talk about school anytime, but must use caution if he would stir the imaginations or arouse the curiosity of his students to investigate the ruling groups or the status quo.

About one-third of the group did not answer this part of the questionnaire, partly because they did not understand the purpose, but mainly because the elementary teachers didn't feel like they knew the conditions on things above their level. Of those replying to this part, about 80% said that they agreed with the community practice. The other 20% thought that the teachers should be allowed more freedom of discussion on the controversial issues listed.
Some of the typical comments that were written on Part IV about the freedom to discuss certain ideas are these:

I agree with the practices in our community. I have no wish for further freedom of discussion. (No. 19).

The teachers feel free to express themselves as they wish, unless they try to convert the student, and I agree with that. (No. 25).

If our school board has an established policy on most of these items, I am not aware of it. (No. 31).

Few of these occur in class discussion in the lower grades. (No. 72).

Very few seriously hinder democratic teaching. (No. 85).

I feel it would be unwise for me to discuss in any way any of these subjects. (No. 142).

We are allowed to discuss any subject in our class-rooms. I don't know about advocating. I talk quite openly and no one has ever protested. (No. 158).

Any of these could probably be discussed to a certain extent. We have no radical teachers. (No. 173).

All of these activities might be discussed impartially. I doubt, though, that a teacher would care to express too much of a definite opinion. (No. 213).

I believe that these should be more openly discussed. We can discuss most anything by a comparative approach, as long as we use common sense. (No. 229).

The only teaching restriction I have heard of here is that we are not to read too much of the Bible to our classes. (No. 247).

In May, 1948, two high school teachers were called before the school board for hearings after having been accused by students of teaching communism and of trying to influence students by bringing pressure to bear in requiring them to write letters to congressmen as a class assignment. Both teachers were cleared of the charges. One was given a promotion in his position. (No. 31).

Thus it will be seen that the atmosphere permits almost
unlimited freedom of discussion on most topics in some communities, whereas teachers feel very limited in others.

Freedom of Discussion Outside the Classroom

Generally speaking, a town or community that does not permit much freedom of discussion inside the classroom, allows little or maybe less outside. We might look a little more closely, however, at Part VI of the questionnaire—Criticism of local school or community. The teachers were asked to check several items in reference to this question: "Is the teacher free to criticize openly?"

The results are summarized below in Table 3. On the left side is the item referred to; in the right column is the approximate per cent of the schools in which they cannot be criticized openly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group or subject</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School board policies</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superintendent</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business practices of local men</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local social leaders and their activities</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices of strong groups in the community (e.g., American Legion)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graft in local politics</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above it will be noted that the teacher should be careful in criticizing others in the community.
It is not the purpose of the present writer to say that one should have unlimited right to criticize anyone, but merely to find out the pressures or limits to the freedom of the teachers.

It is not surprising to note that teachers in the majority of cases do not feel free in criticizing administrators or the school board. One teacher described his answer to this part very aptly by this reply, "... complete freedom of restraint is not to be desired by any group." (No. 188).

Another teacher probably expressed the view of many when she wrote "Loyalty to the school would prevent me from criticizing." Some of the other replies in regards to the criticism of others in the school or community are these:

I do not think a teacher would be smart to do any of the above openly. (No. 16).

I do not know but as long as I wanted my job I would not take a chance on it. (No. 80).

In the classroom, no. In a teachers' meeting, not too openly. (No. 72).

A teacher gets along better just to let the community run its own affairs. (No. 85).

Depends on administration. (No. 114).

We can criticize to them but not about them to others. (No. 158).

Yes, by using discretion. (No. 187).

Yes, but might not be the best policy in the long run. A good teacher should not do so. It would lead to dismissal. (No. 2).

It's not ethical to criticize the superintendent or principal. (No. 188).
The privileges are all enjoyed if desired but it is more or less in private conversations. (No.244).

Two of the teachers in their remarks also added that it would not be safe to criticize the PTA or the religious groups in the community. Finally, if a teacher has a complaint it would seem safest that he go directly to the person or group involved, and not to use other people or places as a sounding board, unless it is the textbook used.

Reasons for Avoiding Controversial Subjects

In this section we shall seek to find some of the reasons teachers do not feel as free to talk as they would like. We shall also note some other reasons that were not listed as part of this questionnaire.

There are several limits to the teaching of controversial ideas and freedom for teachers. Newlon listed three limits:

Freedom of teaching is limited in three directions. First, the work of the school should be adapted to the maturity of the learner. This does not mean, however, that young children are to be shielded from a consideration of critical social and other problems that come within their own experience. . . . A second limitation, . . . has to do with the nature and purpose of education; the school should be an educational institution and not an instrument of propaganda. The danger here is in fact actual. Many are the reactionary forces among us who seek to use the school to indoctrinate in behalf of the status quo. This is a direction in which no teacher has a right to go. Freedom of teaching does not permit the denial of education.

A third conditioning factor, always to be taken into consideration, is the limitation of local conditions. The wise teacher will always take account of the traditions, the mores, the cultural situation, in the community in which he works. This again is a psychological
limitation. . . . The far-seeing teacher will not employ words and acts which are likely to defeat this larger purpose by raising needless suspicion and fears in the minds of the people. . . .

Subject to these three fundamental principles, no limitation whatever should be placed upon the problems to be studies in the schools by pupils and teachers.17

Another writer approached the subject from a different viewpoint when he listed these limits to academic freedom:

There are limits to academic freedom, freedom in teaching, or freedom of speech. They must not involve destruction of society or violence to the individual, crime or incitement to crime, mob violence, or falsehood. Freedom in teaching should involve responsibility, professional standards, scholarship, and obligations to the student, the community, and society. It means accommodation of individuality to social needs without destroying individuality. The freedom of the learner must be protected against arbitrary teachers.18

Regarding the question of rights for the student as well as for the teacher, we note this comparison:

In the last resort, freedom of the school is important not so much as a right of the teacher but as a right of the child. It is not a question whether an occasional teacher will abuse his freedom. Of course he will. There are fools, bigots, and martinet among teachers as in the rest of the community. Yet it is far better to suffer an occasional fool than to risk destruction of freedom. . . . Without freedom of criticism and citizens used to the exercise of freedom, democracy will dry up at the source.19

If one were to look for a good reason for academic freedom for teachers, he could find no better statement than that.

---


18Carter V. Good, Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, XXIV, No. 5 (May, 1938), 432.

Another angle to the limit of freedom is hinted in the following:

Not only the age of the pupils, but the type of school concerned affects the problem of freedom. Should a teacher in the public schools have less freedom because he is the servant of the state carrying out public wishes than the teacher in a privately endowed school, whose benefactor left no strings tied to his gift.20

As for the matter of freedom in private schools no general statement can be made that would apply to all. Many of them have more freedom than those controlled by the states, while others are greatly handicapped by the benefactors.

Another element that limits the freedom of teaching is our patriotism and pride. Thus, it has been noted that:

... America has become richer and more powerful... Therefore, to question the economic and social principles upon which it is built is un-American. National pride is added to other factors that make the average American resent or fear questioning of the status quo. Big Business, ... has exerted a powerful influence against freedom in the schools. But to blame business and overlook these attitudes of the average citizen is a distortion of the picture.21

Another weapon that limits the freedom of teachers is a special oath of loyalty for teachers. In 1945 the Research Division of the NEA revealed:

... that twenty-two states had oath-of-allegiance requirements for teachers. Some of these oaths were simple oaths of office requiring, in some instances, a pledge to the Constitution and a promise to perform faithfully the duties of a teacher. Other oaths attempted to control what the teacher taught in the classroom and even his thinking and activities after school hours. Penalties

21Ibid., p. 140.
for alleged violations of these oaths were usually dismissal or revocation of certificate, or both.22

As already noted on page 30, Texas requires a loyalty oath for teachers, but it does not apply to teachers in the private schools. It was passed in 1941. Wartime always tends to set further limits to the freedom of speech, not only in the classroom, but outside as well.

As for the effects of the loyalty oaths, one may note this viewpoint by Beale:

The teachers' loyalty oath, ... does not affect only a teacher who in any true sense of the word would be called disloyal. One result is to weed out teachers whose ideas are distasteful to some group in the community. The oath singles out teachers for a special test not required of lawyers and doctors and business men, and is therefore resented because of its implication of lack of loyalty in the teacher group. More important, however, is the fact that it stands a constant threat over the head of a teacher who holds unconventional views or does something the conservative elements of a community do not like. ... If it were not for the possibility of using the oath, once taken, for the suppression of freedom for the teacher, the groups sponsoring the oath would not bother to get it put upon the books.23

Thus it would seem that the threat is not so much to be feared by teachers because of proven cases of disloyalty but because of the possibility that those in power might abuse its real purpose.

An interesting contrast of those who favor the oaths is that attitude of a strong patriotic group.


23Fr. K. Beale, "Freedom for the School Teacher," The Annals ... , CC (November, 1938), 126.
The American Legion has worked for teachers' loyalty oaths in order to prevent teachers from "poisoning the mind of youth." The American Legion sees no reason why teachers should oppose such oaths, and does not consider them in any sense an abridgment of academic freedom. Opposition to loyalty oaths for teachers is regarded by the American Legion as so much additional evidence indicating the need for such legislation. The American Legion proposes to eliminate "subversive" influences in the schools, and urges its members to work in every possible way to see to it that the schools are taught by teachers who are "truly American." The American Legion considers its members peculiarly qualified to decide which teachers are and which are not good Americans and to determine what should and what should not be taught in American schools. At the same time, the Legion disclaims any desire "to dictate" to the schools.24

It might be noted that the viewpoint of the American Legion is similar to other patriotic organizations in regard to patriotism and how they would like to work through the schools or on the individual teacher.

It might be noted that the purpose of the teachers is to train the students in how to think, rather than teach them a blind faith in the present with the attitude that there is no need for any change, even in our American political and economic system. This thought was aptly described by Beale when he stated that:

Perhaps the greatest element of strength in democracy is that peaceful change can be brought about under it through free discussion and criticism that are impossible under dictatorship. Democracy cannot function unless the schools are permitted to train citizens capable of exercising freedom intelligently. Propaganda in favor of other systems can do no harm provided freedom of criticism has been preserved and provided the schools are able to train citizens capable of recognizing truth and making

free and intelligent choices. . . . The schools need protection, not against "dangerous" ideas, but against suppression of the freedom of discussion of all ideas in the schools, without which citizens of a democracy cannot be educated.25

It would appear, then, that we are getting close to one of the basic rights that we have in the preservation of our democracy, which is the main purpose of the "patriotic" organizations.

Finally, one of the best tributes to the importance of free discussions on controversial ideas in class is this one:

. . . More urgent even than the question, "Shall we turn 'left' or 'right'," is the question, "In what way shall it be decided whether we go 'left' or 'right'?" Will that choice be made by methods of violence or by those of free discussion in our own way or in ways alien to us, subversive of our national spirit? And the danger which chiefly threatens both us and our successors in America is that, without realizing it, we shall desert our principles of freedom. . . .

Our teachers must discuss controversial questions. There is no other program by which the education of a free people can be carried on.26

Not all the reasons for avoiding the discussion of controversial ideas, however, are pressures upon the schools. From a study of the question it was found that:

The reason mentioned most often was that pressure groups made the discussion of socio-economic questions a "dangerous undertaking." Second was the view that the formal curriculum and rigid program of the school had to be followed, hence current problems could not be introduced. Third and fourth were the ideas that parents classified such work as "fads and fancies," and that various forms of legislation, including laws against the


teaching of communism, restricted choice of problems and freedom in discussion. Other reasons were the admitted apathy of teachers, lack of teaching materials, teachers too busy, tendency of instruction to indoctrinate, lack of adequate preparation for such work in teacher training institutions, and the belief that pupils are "not interested in socio-economic problems." Teachers who progressed to deal with controversial issues did nothing more than "talk frankly" about them.27

It appears that the teachers are partly at fault, too, for the students not knowing more about controversial ideas, but in some cases the teachers are seriously handicapped for trying to "talk frankly" about these problems. The age of the students has a lot to do with their interests, but if a course is properly taught by one who is experienced in handling controversial ideas there usually is less difficulty in keeping their attention than many teachers find in teaching courses with a lot of memory work.

Not all communities allow the teachers the freedom they need, however, to arouse the interests of students and lead them into a realistic study of modern problems. For the ones who insist that teaching implies the right to teach the truth as they see it, there are a number of ways to see that they don't question the status quo too much. Some of the methods of keeping teachers subservient are these:

... Sometimes individual teachers are attacked and the dismissal is demanded. Sometimes the pressure is exerted through a school board member, the superintendent, or the principal. Dismissals occur only rarely in comparison with other forms of punishment. More common are withholdings of promotion, unsatisfactory ratings,

impositions of petty annoyances, removals to less desirable schools or to a basement room in the same school, or transfers to other subjects than the one the teacher is prepared to teach.

Not many penalties are necessary, as fear of penalty will suppress most teachers as effectively as punishment itself. Indeed, the real problem of freedom is not the occasional teacher whose indiscretion gets him into trouble, but the hundreds of teachers who, because of fear of trouble, refrain from teaching all they believe.28

This last sentence helps to explain why Beale thought the question of freedom of teaching was a more important issue than many would like to admit. For every case that comes to the attention of the public there are dozens of teachers who bow to the demands of pressure or public opinion and call it by the name of "being tactful." Still teachers must eat and only occasionally is a teacher to be found who is more interested in freedom than his pay check.

Although the following table does not list all the important reasons for teachers avoiding the discussion of controversial ideas, it does give a good idea on why teachers in Texas do not discuss those ideas more, both in the classroom and outside the classroom. The first column is the approximate per cent of those who checked that item as a reason for avoiding the discussion of controversial ideas in the classroom, the second column for the reasons of not talking more freely in the community, and the last part is the list of items as found in Part VIII of the questionnaire.

The biggest reason that was checked by the teachers for avoiding controversial ideas was public opinion, a force to be reckoned with in any community. It is possible, however, that public opinion would have permitted more freedom than many of the teachers tried. Another important reason for avoiding controversial ideas was the belief that teachers should avoid their discussion, especially outside the classroom. It is interesting to note that the fear of a reprimand has a larger per cent for avoiding classroom discussion than outside of class. Some of the items showed about the same per cent for inside and outside of the class.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In class</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>Reason that was checked for avoiding issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Fear of public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Belief that a teacher should avoid controver-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sial issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Feeling of futility of not conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fear of refusal of a good recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when applying for a position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fear of dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fear of reprimand or other discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Indifferent or in agreement with the commu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nity on most issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fear of disfavor that will prevent promo-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This might not be the most logical way to word the questions, but the table will give us some general ideas.

This table does not mean that half of the teachers
avoid the discussion of controversial ideas outside the classroom for fear of public opinion but, for those who do, the reason they gave was approximately that per cent.

There are, fortunately, several teachers who believe that the students need to know how to think for themselves and that the discussion of controversial ideas is useful for that purpose, among others. In the community, also, many teachers are helping the adults to solve some of their problems by speaking up when they have something to contribute.

Some of the typical comments on this section are these:

The superintendent has asked that teachers not express personal opinions. (No. 120).

Teachers here are allowed to discuss any public issue, provided that they don't try to involve the school in the matter. (No. 80).

I do not believe that local teachers feel a great deal of restraint. (No. 188).

I do not avoid the discussion of controversial issues when I have the facts. (No. 247).

Trends in Freedom of Discussion by Teachers

So far the discussion of the freedom of expression has been as it existed in the school term of 1948-49. We will attempt now to see if there is any noticeable trend in this matter. Predictions of things to come are hazardous, but perhaps the teachers' opinions listed below might be of value. Question eighteen was, "Would you like to see freer expression of views on controversial subjects, if the
community attitude would permit it?" The answers of the opinions were as follows: Yes, 62%; no, 14%; indifferent, 24%.

Before going on we might notice that one-seventh of the teachers did not want freer expression while one-fourth of the total were indifferent. The interesting fact, however, is that almost two-thirds, 62%, of the teachers in Texas would like to have freer expression for them if the community attitude would permit—a strong hint that they feel restricted whether or not there are rules on the subject of their talking freely.

Question number nineteen was one that dealt with the teacher and his relative freedom to enter discussions on controversial issues in community meetings. The question was "At forums or other public meetings do the teachers feel as free as the rest of the community to enter discussion on controversial subjects?" The replies were as follows: Yes, 48%, no, 52%; only on his subject fields, 33%.

Even in the community, it would appear, the teacher is not allowed full freedom to carry out the free exercise of his rights as a citizen, without being criticized. Only half of the teachers feel that they can enter into the discussion of controversial issues as freely as, say doctors, or lawyers. One might wonder, then, if some pressure groups expect the teachers to practice good citizenship or just teach their brand of citizenship.
The next question on this topic pertains to the trends of what the teachers expected in the years ahead. Question number twenty-three was worded: "Do you think the trend in your community is to allow more____, less____, or about the same____ freedom in discussing controversial subjects by teachers?" The replies were as follows: To allow more, 18%; less, 10%; about the same, 72%.

It would appear from the opinions of the teachers that in Texas for the years ahead that the amount of freedom in discussing the controversial issues will remain about the same. Some optimism was expressed by about one-sixth, or 18%, who thought the trend was to allow more freedom in the discussion of controversial ideas by teachers, but this hope was hindered when 10% said they thought the trend was to allow less freedom of discussion for teachers.

This trend that one-tenth of the teachers feared, the limiting of their freedom of discussion, is not hard to understand in light of current discussion about the right of communists to teach. As already mentioned, the NEA voted almost unanimously in favor of outlawing communists from classrooms, but at the same time they had some warnings:

Leading educators called for a halt to such "hysteria." Time and again they stressed that the overwhelming majority of teachers in this country are loyal, devoted American citizens, and that name-calling, use of Communist label and the like were not warranted.29

Summary

There are still several restrictions on the freedom of discussion of controversial issues in the classroom. This is due mainly because of the desire of strong economic, patriotic, political, and religious groups to keep the status quo. The local controversial issues always are more dangerous for the teacher to discuss than similar questions on the state or national level. In Texas classrooms about three-fourth of the teachers dare not discuss the possibility of atheism, one-half of them cannot denounce local men or officials for corruption, while about one-fourth of them dare not mention local business practices as unjust, birth control, communism, or the theory of evolution. Most other topics are less dangerous for classroom discussion. The amount of academic freedom varies; usually the large cities allow much more than the smaller towns.

Outside the classroom the teacher usually has to use caution in his discussions, especially in a small town. It is very dangerous to openly criticize the school board or the school administration. The main reason for avoiding the discussion of controversial issues is the fear of public opinion, followed by the belief that teachers should avoid controversial issues. Most teachers desire more freedom in discussion, but only 18% thought the trend was in that direction, while 10% thought there would be less freedom in the discussion of controversial issues by teachers.
CHAPTER IV

PERSONAL CONDUCT AND OTHER COMMUNITY
RELATIONS OF THE TEACHER

So far most of the analysis has been about the teacher, either in the classroom or his discussion of controversial ideas in the community. In this chapter we shall note the teacher's personal conduct in the community and some of the other relations of teachers in the community, such as some responsibilities or examples that people expect of teachers.

Teacher's Personal Conduct in the Community

A prospective teacher might think that what he does after school hours is no one's business but his own. In some communities he would seldom be hindered in this respect, but the amount of interference will vary from one community to another, depending on the size and composition of the town. Some of the general restrictions on teacher's personal conduct as found by Beale are these, and his comments:

A teacher's conduct outside of school is more likely to cause trouble than his teaching in school. Restraints upon conduct are particularly irksome, too, to most teachers. Since a teacher's example probably has more influence on pupils than what he consciously "teaches," conduct is important. Standards of conduct have changed rapidly since the War. Things unthinkable before the War are now accepted. In small communities the teacher is the last to be allowed to adopt new practices. A large number of the individuals of a community indulge in a forbidden habit surreptitiously, long before the community as a group will tolerate it. Respectable citizens indulge privately in conduct they forbid to teachers. Most
governed not by rules but by unwritten traditions. The measurement of the freedom in conduct allowed in a given community is made difficult by social hypocrisy, under which teachers do some things privately that they would not dare do publicly. It is made difficult, too, by the fact that, concerning many matters, teachers and superintendents alike give assurance that teachers are "perfectly free" to do them whereas teachers do not do them because they know it would cause trouble. "Yes, we can, but we don't; at least, we don't publicly," is a usual response.1

About the only encouraging sentence from the quotation above is that there are fewer restrictions now than before the First World War. This is perhaps due mainly to a change of attitudes and a relaxation of mores rather than to a desire to give more freedom to teachers.

A further explanation of why the community restricts the teachers is given in this comment:

In his private life, too, the teacher is hedged about by restrictions. The theory seems to be that the teacher must be a model for the children of the community. So the teacher is expected to conform to standards of conduct not required of lawyers or physicians, or successful business men, or even of the child's own parents. Indeed, in their desire to hold up for their children a higher standard of conduct than they themselves have succeeded in maintaining, parents frequently complain of a teacher's indulging in pleasures they habitually give themselves.2

Another comment by a teacher in a small town is this:

From the moment you set foot in town as the new teacher, you are a public personage. Everything you do and say is an item of news and gossip.3

---


3Cook, op. cit., p. 297.
Although this last comment came from a midwestern teacher, a similar situation could be found in many small Texas towns. Perhaps this is not due so much to the desire of the people to make a teacher’s life miserable but that it is only natural to gossip about the latest news.

A woman especially has to watch her conduct outside of the classroom. A few remarks of her status are as follows:

A woman teacher must choose the men she knows carefully. Some towns require by rule or by contract that their women teachers shall not "keep company" with "young men"; others limit her to "only one young man"; others forbid teachers to "keep company" with other teachers. The hour at which a teacher comes in at night, the time at which he must retire, and the place where he must room and board are not infrequently prescribed. A woman teacher’s dress is often regulated by rule or custom. Bobbed hair a few years ago, cosmetics, sheer stockings, short skirts, sleeveless dresses, bright-colored materials, and unfastened galoshes have all been forbidden their turn.4

By looking at the last part of the above paragraph it will be noted that the teacher is given more freedom usually as time passes, but this is due to the change in community mores as well as other factors.

Another thing that might cause teachers trouble in the community is their participation in labor unions, especially in states or communities that are not in sympathy with labor unions.

It is dangerous for a teacher to belong to a labor union in some places, yet they often help him to have better tenure

and working conditions in towns that are favorable toward labor unions. Some of their useful work is as follows:

If the teachers today especially in our large centers, are not in the position of intellectual serfs, it is due more, I am confident, to the energetic and aggressive activity of the teachers' unions than to any other cause.

... If all teachers were within the teachers' unions ... who came into contact with the labor unions, with the working men of the country and their problems, I am sure that more would be done to reform and improve our education, ... than by any other one cause. ... 5

As for the labor unions in Texas for teachers we find:

Although Texas is given credit for having had the first teachers' union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, there has never been a strong teachers' union element within her boundaries. 6

While we are on the subject of agencies that help the teachers to improve their status and gain more freedom, we might mention, in addition to the American Federation of Teachers; other organizations. The National Education Association has a Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and a Committee on Defense of Democracy Through Education, both of which are working for teacher's freedom and legal rights, as well as giving publicity to situations where teachers have no legal rights, such as tenure, but have been mistreated.

5John Dewey, Address, "Why I Am a Member of the Teachers' Union," November, 1927, New York, quoted in Bruce Raup, Education and Organized Interests in America, p. 159.

Other groups also occasionally help teachers to have their rights, such as the American Civil Liberties Union.

Most of the limits to teachers' freedom in the community are due mainly to public opinion rather than legal requirements. There are, however, some situations that come under the regulations of state laws. The law does not go into detail but it does provide that teachers' certificates to teach may be cancelled under certain conditions. This law is as follows:

Any certificate may be cancelled for cause by the authority issuing it; and the State Superintendent shall have power to cancel any certificate upon satisfactory evidence that the holder thereof is conducting his school in violation of the laws of the State or is a person unworthy to instruct the youth of this State.\(^7\)

It is the vagueness of the word "unworthy" that sometimes causes trouble for teachers in their relations outside of the classroom. Quite often a teacher doesn't know how he stands until his case has been tried. This condition was well described in the following reference:

A school law case is a many-sided subject for study. For example, the law provides that a teaching certificate may be cancelled when the holder "is a person unworthy to instruct the youth of this State." What criteria shall we use to determine the meaning of "unworthy"? To some, a person who believes in the tenets of communism is unfitted to instruct the youth of this state; others would think him unworthy if he taught the precepts of the capitalistic system.\(^8\)

\(^7\)Article 2804, Cancellation of Certificates, quoted in Public School Laws of the State of Texas, 1945, p. 181.

\(^8\)Sam B. McAlister, Government and Law of the Public School System, p. v.
Some of the previous cases that have been considered might be a good list of things to consider in this respect, however. Some of the provisions of the Rulings of the State Department of Education on Article 2884, about the Conduct of Teachers, are as follows:

Immoral conduct with pupils is sufficient ground for cancelling a teacher's certificate.

... Dishonesty in financial matters and assisting minors in immoral matters are grounds for cancellation of a teacher's certificate.

The State Superintendent is not required to cancel a certificate when a teacher breaks his contract with one school to accept a better position.

Padding census rolls or assisting therein is sufficient grounds for suspension of a teacher's certificate.

Conviction of the offense of rape is ground for cancellation of a teacher's certificate.

The State Superintendent considers it sufficient grounds to cancel a teacher's certificate that such teacher drinks to excess, is guilty of immoral conduct and neglects the discharge of his duties.

Immorality justifies cancellation of teacher's certificate.9

It is known, of course, that most teachers would not knowingly do anything that would cause them legal trouble. There are, however, some things that can cause trouble for teachers even though many in the community do the same thing.

There are a number of things in Texas that prove quite serious if teachers are suspected of doing them. The summary of Part V of the questionnaire is found in Table 5. On the left is the approximate per cent of the replies of each item, according to its seriousness. The question was worded as follows: "If a teacher in your school system did one of the

---

following, check its implications, if it became known." The items are in the left column with the replies they checked.

**TABLE 5**

SERIOUSNESS OF CERTAIN PRACTICES OF TEACHERS IN THEIR PERSONAL CONDUCT, AS DETERMINED BY A SURVEY OF TEXAS TEACHERS' OPINIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Items or Practices</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Would be Fired, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Becomes the subject of unproved immoral charges</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gamblers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drinks away from school, if a woman</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dates students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Drinks away from school, if a man</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Smokes at school, if a woman</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dances</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Becomes unpopular with a strong group but is a good teacher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Joins a labor union</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seldom stays in community on weekends</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Has a date most every night</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Runs for office</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Campaigns for some other candidate</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Seldom goes to church services</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Attends the movie</td>
<td>1D0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table is for the most part self-explanatory. The order of rank is only relative, with only the last item of seriousness being considered. By looking at the list it is possible to get some ideas of why teachers are fired, or...
never rehired. It is interesting to note that if the teachers were fired for one of these reasons it would be for something other than his teaching in the classroom. It is not the purpose of the present writer to say that teachers should have unlimited freedom in the community, but merely to point out the seriousness of some of the things that sometimes get the teachers into trouble.

If a teacher is interested in the seriousness of any particular item he can find out approximately how serious the respondents thought it would be in their particular communities. By looking at the table in the first column, one can note the per cent of teachers who thought the item listed was not a serious matter in their town, such as movie going.

Another thing that needs to be pointed out is the vast difference of what is expected in different communities. In regard to this item, one can compare the matter of drinking. In about one-fourth of the schools a woman teacher would be fired if she drank within the community, whereas one-seventh of the communities would not consider it a serious matter, according to the teachers' opinions. This latter situation is probably due to the fact that they teach in a large city that is "wet" and many of the adults drink anyway. The same matter for men is less serious, but in almost the exact proportions. It would seem that in the matter of personal conduct there is more divergence from one community to another than of any other item pertaining to teacher freedom.
By looking at Table 5, beginning at the top and reading down the right hand column, it is possible to see what are some of the reasons that teachers are fired. This is only a list of factors outside the classroom, however, and not a complete list of things to avoid, even outside the community. It does not include inefficiency or other teaching situations that might lead to dismissal.

From the standard of community attitudes, then, it would appear that the worst thing a teacher can do is to become the subject of charges of immorality. It matters little in some communities whether a thing is true or not as long as certain people believe it to be so. Gambling appears to be the second most dangerous practice that might lead to dismissal. The rank is only relative, however, and some different rank might be determined if the items were weighted.

The question of drinking appears to be among the five most serious offenses for teachers in their personal conduct. Even in the same community, it might be pointed out, for a woman teacher to drink is considered almost twice as serious an offense as for men teachers doing the same thing.

Even the matter of dating causes a lot of trouble. Not very many object to a teacher going steady, if it's with the "right" person, but to date students would lead to dismissal in one-fourth of the schools of Texas while 46% of the total would consider it as a serious offense. Smoking at school is still risky for a woman, but for men it is different.
Dancing was at one time considered a far more serious matter for teachers than at the present time, due to the changes of our outlook on recreation. Only 5% of the schools, now would fire a teacher for dancing, although one-fourth consider it a serious offense.

Even unpopularity has its relation to dismissal. This would lead to dismissal in only 5% of the schools, if the teacher had a good record. It depends on who is the "strong group" in the community. Only a small number, 4%, of the communities would dismiss one for leaving the town most weekends, although several contracts a few decades ago had this matter mentioned in a different light.

Joining a labor union, according to the teachers' opinions, is a small matter, but this appears to be largely a conjectural issue since there are few, if any, teachers' labor unions in Texas now. Of course, a teacher could belong to other unions.

Running for office or campaigning for others seems quite harmless also. Nor is it essential for teachers to go to church, unless it is their desire, but this has not always been the same as it is now. And, finally, attending the movie appears to arouse the dislike of no one, at least not in the schools that were concerned in this study.

In summary, we might say that the teachers' personal conduct is not so much of the community's concern as it was at one time, but there are still several communities in
which the teacher would be better off to think twice before indulging in even some practices that many people in the community do with little criticism from the rest of the people in the community.

Some of the teachers who replied to the questionnaire may have misunderstood why some of the things were listed in this part. One teacher commented thus:

In every known society there are, and of necessity must be, certain restraints. The present need is not to eliminate these restraints, but to enable people to adjust themselves and live happily within these reasonable restrictions. Certainly teachers should realize this, and be the strongest defenders of public opinion which demands a high plane of morality and personal conduct. (No. 128).

The purpose of this study on Part V was to see what restraints the community had on teachers, not to list a series of items which the present writer thought that they should be allowed to do. In this connection, one of the things one might keep in mind is the original definition of freedom of teaching, as found on page two. Part of that statement reads as follows: "The teacher's conduct outside the school should be subject only to such controls as those to which other responsible citizens are subjected. . . ." If the teachers have that much freedom, then as a profession we have no complaint coming, but it is the petty annoyances that makes for dissatisfaction on the part of some teachers in some communities, especially the smaller ones.

The teaching profession has responsibilities, too, and
these are considered in the Code of Ethics that the National Education Association has worked out. In addition to the above criterion for a teacher's personal conduct it might be well to consider part of Article II, Relations to Civic Affairs, from the N. E. A. Code of Ethics which was adopted in 1941.

Section 5—A teacher's life should show that education makes people better citizens and better neighbors. His personal conduct should not needlessly offend the accepted pattern of behavior of the community in which he serves.10

Some of the most interesting comments on the questionnaires were related to the personal conduct questions. Some of the comments were as follows:

Our community is very, very broadminded. (No. 126).

As for running for office, it depends on the teacher availability. (No. 114).

Trouble is sometimes caused by unjust gossip by one or two women. (No. 145).

Drinking is OK if not carried to an excess. (No. 158).

If he is the right kind of teacher he wouldn't be running for an office. (No. 168).

Dating students is not permitted. (No. 188).

As for drinking away from school, it depends; one woman was a friend of the trustees and it didn't hurt. (No. 245).

A superintendent was dismissed twelve years ago for immoral conduct. (No. 250).

A Junior High School unmarried teacher was asked to resign this month because of unrestrained dating. The pressure came from narrow-minded citizens of the community. (No. 204).

I don't know of any other rule than to be a good moral citizen. (No. 2).

One of my Sixth Grade teachers was not rehired even though she had the recommendation of the superintendent and principal because of a slang statement used in fun at a bridge party.

As for the conduct of teachers, I have never heard of a case of someone being dismissed although we have a local Jimmy Fidler or Walter Winchell who has in the past divulged some acts of teachers and townspeople alike. (No. 215).

I feel that poor personality and lack of professional interest and activity are more serious shortcomings in this system than are the other things that this questionnaire deals with. (No. 229).

A woman teacher did not cooperate with the rest of us as teachers. She dated high school boys, ran around with high school pupils, danced, drank, smoked. While directing a play one night one of the men went to the school and found her in an "unladylike" position on the piano while smoking. The trustees were called the next night and it was decided that they would talk to her and ask her to act differently. She heard of the meeting, went to it and "cussed out" everyone, including the superintendent (who had been trying to shield her). As a result, they paid her the remaining salary and asked her not to come back. They went to her father (she was about 21 or 22) to get her to stay at home but she refused. They had to put her under peace bond to keep her out of the school. This was an unusual case, but it is one of the things that hurt the teachers who want to do the right thing and enjoy themselves at the same time. This was no fault of the board or community. (No. 245).

This last example was quoted in full because it shows very clearly how some teachers without a professional attitude can do more harm for their fellow workers than the rest of the teachers can overcome in good will.
Thus, in summary, we see that the teachers do have more freedom now in personal conduct than they once had, due to changes in the community mores. Yet there still remain several restrictions on a teacher's private life beyond what the community demands of the rest of the people.

Size of the Community and Its Relation to Freedom in Personal Conduct

In this section an attempt will be made to see the relation of the size of the community and how much that matter affects a teacher's personal conduct in the community.

Before analyzing the situation in Texas, it might be well to consider what the national situation is like, according to Beale:

Freedom varies with the size of the community in which the school is located. In the great cities politicians and the well organized groups have great power. In spite of this, however, teachers in large cities on the whole have much greater freedom than elsewhere. There are several reasons for this. They are usually well organized into unions or other groups. They have obtained better tenure laws. A unified community opinion does not exist. Groups that in small places would control the schools are counterbalanced by opposing groups. The struggles of one group against another over the schools have left the teacher free from interference other than politics and favoritism... But the minute a teacher leaves the school building he is lost in the big city.\(^\text{11}\)

For a contrast, it would seem, he then comments on the small places in this manner:

The small town is more unified in sentiment. Church groups are more powerful. Teachers are known as teachers, wherever they go and whatever they do. Tradition, customs, and long-held ideas persist more tenaciously in the small town. New styles of dress arrive long before new ways of thinking. There are usually no tenure laws, and teachers' organizations with any power do not exist. . . .

Finally, the last size of community that he undertakes to compare is the suburban area, which has some of the characteristics of both, and yet like neither:

Between the great city and the small town, freedom varies with size and local conditions. Suburban communities fall into a class by themselves. They lack many of the factors that give freedom to teachers in the great city, which they adjoin. People are more likely to know one another. There is possibility of close control over the schools. People and ideas are fairly homogeneous; a preponderance of self-satisfied, newly prosperous business and professional folk breeds conservatism and complacency.

When one comes to a consideration of the freedom of conduct in Texas in relation to the size of the community, the study is handicapped somewhat because of the limited number of examples of each size of community, but it is hoped that some general conclusion can be reached. Also, it would be well to keep in mind Beale's comparison of the different size towns and his comments on them.

For the purpose of this comparison, question number twenty and twenty-one will be of the most use. The results of question number twenty are summarized in Table 6 below:

The question was as follows: Teachers in your community are

---

12Ibid., pp. 249-250.  
13Ibid., p. 250.
respected about as they should be, too much, not enough.

By looking at the table it will be noticed that the replies have been broken down into the separate sizes of communities in which the school was located. Across the top of the table is the size of the communities population, while on the left column is the nature of the replies, as listed above. The table shows not only the per cent of the replies to each item but also the number of teachers who marked items in the different size communities. This was done because the limited number of replies from each size of community reduces its validity.

**TABLE 6**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Under 500</th>
<th>500-2,500</th>
<th>2,500-10,000</th>
<th>10,000-50,000</th>
<th>Over 50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of respect is:</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As should be.</td>
<td>5 62</td>
<td>20 69</td>
<td>9 50</td>
<td>14 67</td>
<td>10 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much. ..</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough. ..</td>
<td>3 38</td>
<td>9 31</td>
<td>9 50</td>
<td>7 33</td>
<td>2 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most noticeable fact that one would see in the above table is that none of the teachers checked their community as respecting the teacher too much. Thus, we only have too little respect or about as it should be. As stated
before there are not enough questionnaires from each size of community to draw too close a distinction, but this table tends to point out the contrast between the very small town and the larger city. The per cent of the total for the first part, that teachers are respected about as they should be, is about 67%, while 33% did not have enough respect in their community, according to the teachers' opinions. The worst offender in this matter of respect for the teacher seems to be the small town of 2,500 to 10,000, followed by the communities smaller than that. It would seem that, in the Texas cities having over 50,000 population, the teacher is respected about as he should be in approximately four-fifths of the cities, whereas, in the smaller communities the same proposition would be two-thirds or less.

The next comparison will be question twenty-one which reads as follows: "Being a teacher in your community limits their freedom as citizens____, gives them more freedom____, makes no difference____." The results are shown in Table 7, which is arranged in the same manner as Table 6.

By looking at the table, it will be noted again that the number of teachers in each size of community would not make the table too valid. It appears on the surface, however, that the proportion might not be far from wrong. In the small rural towns having under 500 population, about half of the teachers checked that their communities tended to limit their freedom as citizens. In the large cities
that have over 50,000 population the teacher mixes in the community affairs as just another "citizen," once the teaching day is over. In these large cities it would appear from inconclusive evidence that only 8% feel restricted in their freedom, while in the town of 10,000 to 50,000 population about one-fourth of the communities seem to restrict a teacher's freedom. Another interesting comparison is that close to half of all the communities under 10,000 population tend to make teachers feel as if they are restricted just because they are "teachers," are are known by many people in the community as such.

**TABLE 7**

**THE RELATION OF THE SIZE OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE FREEDOM OF TEACHERS IN TEXAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being a teacher in your school:</th>
<th>Under 500</th>
<th>500-2,500</th>
<th>2,500-10,000</th>
<th>10,000-50,000</th>
<th>Over 50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No.</td>
<td>%)</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits freedom as a citizen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives more freedom...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes no difference...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this study does not have a large enough number of replies from each size of community, it would appear, in summary, that the larger the town, the more freedom a teacher is apt to feel, at least in personal conduct after
school hours. Within the classroom, however, no such general statement can be made because it is largely the administrators, school boards, politicians, and other groups that limit the teacher there—and they can be just as much of a hindrance in a large city, if not more so, as in a small town. Although some general statements such as these might appear fairly accurate, caution must be used before jumping to conclusions about a particular community since each has its own individuality and, in a sense, no community is "average." Although Beale's study was made for the nation as a whole, it would appear that his comments on the different size of communities would aptly describe the majority of the situations that exist in Texas.

Trend in Freedom of Conduct for Teachers

The freedom of teachers in their personal conduct is apt to increase slowly, according to the opinions as checked in question twenty-four. The question reads as follows: "Do you think the trend in your community is to allow more___, less___, or about the same___ freedom of personal conduct for teachers?" The results showed that the teachers thought that in about two-thirds, 65%, of the cases that the trend was to allow about the same amount of freedom in personal conduct, while one-fourth, 25%, would allow more. This picture was darkened somewhat, though, by the fact that 10% thought there was a trend for less personal freedom.
The picture appears better, though, for personal conduct than for the freedom of discussing controversial ideas, since only 18% thought that there was a trend for more freedom in that direction and the same amount of 10% for less freedom.

On the surface, then, it would appear that the people who really control things are more concerned about what teachers teach than in their personal conduct. The trend in both cases, though, appears to allow more freedom, gradual perhaps, but, except for waves of reaction, the trend seems to be going in the right direction. There are fears, however, on the part of many leading educators, that the issue of a few communist teachers might be used by certain groups as a cause for repression and reaction against the entire profession.

The Teacher's Community Relations and Responsibilities

In addition to his teaching duties, teachers in some communities are expected to have other responsibilities, such as raising money for worthy causes. His relations to the community will be considered in this section, except for his personal conduct, which has just been discussed.

The teacher's relations to the community are many and are not always pleasant. There are usually opportunities for service, friendship, and growth, though, if the teacher has the right type of personality.
Some teachers might think that they can remain aloof from the community. This appears highly improbable, however, and is not to be desired. If for no other reason, by knowing the community they can become better teachers. Regarding this matter it has been pointed that:

It is neither possible nor desirable for the school to function in a social vacuum; to the degree that it succeeds in drawing away from society its work becomes artificial, formal, and obstructive.\textsuperscript{13}

Also, there has been some criticism of teachers because they do not inform the public of their work. The matter of public relations and its importance is shown in the following:

\begin{quote}
... the only way in which the educator can save himself from the charge of being a "special interest" is to show genuinely that his function is an essential part of the process of reconstructing the social order in which his task takes form; ... Here he will find himself working not solely as the keeper of a school, but rather as a member of society helping to shape the conditions in that society for the richer living not only of children but of every one, regardless of age. Then and then only, can he hold his head up and lead with confidence a public disquieted by the uncertainty about education.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Another matter that sometimes causes confusion to a new teacher is that he does not know what to expect. This point is well illustrated in the following:

Persons who go into the teaching profession are not prepared for the consciousness of their position in the community. Living in the public eye comes as a

\begin{footnotes}
\item[14] H. K. Beale, \textit{Are American Teachers Free?}, p. 120.
\end{footnotes}
shock, and the individual as a teacher is not ready to deal with this phenomenon positively. In the training of teachers some consideration of this difficulty might be appropriate in order to equip the new teacher with some psychological expectation of what will occur.15

Another relation that the teacher has with the community is the community's influence on what he tries.

... The readiness of the inexperienced to accept as normal and right the unchallenged faults of the surrounding populace constantly neutralizes good teaching. ... In the sphere of good citizenship, the impressions received by pupils from what they casually see, hear or read in respect to local and more than local administration, nominations, elections, disputes, and motives, compete with the words of teacher and of text-book.16

Another aspect of this question of counteracting what the student learns outside the classroom is related to the question of propaganda. The teacher must help the students to know how to think critically, to recognize faults in reasoning, and to know propaganda when he sees it.

Knowledge of public opinion and propaganda is a matter of first importance to teachers and pupils; it is a central fact in the educational crisis. The kind of education America is to have in the years ahead, ... must depend upon the opinion of the majority of Americans. To checkmate the progress of demagogues, and of selfish, ignorant, or mistaken groups, it is necessary to know the nature of public opinion, how public opinions are formed; how propaganda is practiced by enemies of public education and democracy; and what the friends of education must do in the battle of propagandas.

Sometimes a whispering campaign is used to discredit a school or a school system or to divert attention from the efforts of worthy administrators and teachers. It

15Jean D. Crambs, "Teachers as a Minority Group," The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXII, No. 6 (February, 1949), 404.

has been said that the school is second only to the church as a subject about which people gossip.\textsuperscript{17}

In the face of criticism from people in the community, some teachers would like to bury themselves in their textbooks and forget the outside. This is not the democratic answer, though. Part of the answer is that teachers must take an active part in community problems and affairs. Some of the interesting contrasts of a teacher's obligations to the community were noted by Newlon:

\textit{The maintenance of freedom of teaching is at bottom a political problem. . . .}\textsuperscript{18}

He gives an example of this when he stated:

\textit{Let me insist, too, that the teacher as a teacher and citizen has political responsibilities that arise from the fact that he is a teacher. It follows that he must be politically informed. Teachers are, moreover, citizens, and as citizens have the right and obligations to participate actively in political life. . . .}\textsuperscript{19}

Then he brings out this challenging thought:

\textit{Those who think that teachers can keep out of civic affairs or politics and perform their educational function labor under illusion.}\textsuperscript{20}

If the above paragraph is true, as our changed economic and social conditions seem to confirm, then it is no longer a question of teachers taking an active part in community

\textsuperscript{17}The Improvement of Education, Fifteenth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, p. 162.

\textsuperscript{18}Jesse H. Newlon, Education for Democracy in Our Time, p. 141.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., p. 174.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 173.
affairs, but how they can better perform their out-of-class responsibilities as well as those in the classroom.

Question twenty-two of the questionnaire attempted to determine some of the community responsibilities teachers usually have and whether they dislike this additional work. The question is as follows: "Do any of the teachers in your school feel obligated to do any of the following additional non-school activities without pay. If so, check if it's against their personal desire." Following the question was a list of activities. The list does not include all non-school responsibilities that teachers have but they are suggestive. The results are in Table 3.

On the left hand side of the table is a list of certain activities, which is incomplete, that teachers sometimes do in addition to their school activities. The middle column is an approximate per cent of the teachers who checked that someone in their school felt obligated to perform the item listed and the last two columns show whether the teachers were willing to do these non-school duties or whether it was against their personal desire.

By looking at the order of the items that are listed, it is possible to get the approximate occurrence of the demands for certain responsibilities in the community. Thus we note that over half of the schools, 54½, seem to raise funds either through the school or the teachers feel obligated to help raise funds in some manner for the community.
Chest or Red Cross. These are worthy projects, however, but that two-thirds of the teachers objected to this obligation may show that the schools are used too much as a collection agency.

**TABLE 8**

APPROXIMATE PER CENT OF TEACHERS IN TEXAS WHO FEEL OBLIGATED TO DO CERTAIN NON-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES AND THEIR PERSONAL DESIRES THEREOF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item or activity</th>
<th>Feel obligated</th>
<th>Against their desire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise funds for Community Chest or Red Cross, . .</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on Civic committee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Sunday School...</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve with Girl Scouts . .</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve with Boy Scouts . .</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half of the teachers checked that some of their members feel obligated to serve on Civic committees, such as the Lions, Jaycees, Kiwanis or others. This does not mean that half of the teachers feel obligated but that teachers in half of the schools feel like they are obligated for duties that are non-school in character. The fact that only 30% of those who felt obligated on civic affairs is a good indication that those who do serve with civic groups usually do it willingly.

The other three items are similar to the above, but are
less in demand as a part of the teacher's time. It might be interesting to point out, though, that a larger per cent of the teachers objected to serving with the Boy Scouts than with the Girl Scouts. Due to the small number of some of the items, this particular division has some weaknesses in its validity. One possible answer to this situation may be that most sponsors of Boy Scouts who object do so because of so much time taken up by their work, lack of cooperation, or that the men teachers had rather use their spare time to make additional income for a family.

Some of the comments on the questionnaires in regard to the teacher's community relations and responsibilities are these:

Teachers here do not feel obligated to do the above items, but many do these activities. I think it's because they want to, though, and not because they are teachers. (No. 234).

The teachers I have known have been respected not as a group, but as individuals. Many of the teachers engage in the activities listed here, but they generally do so from a desire to be helpful without any thought of obligation in order to hold a job. (No. 189).

I might feel obligated as a citizen of the community but not as a teacher. (No. 56).

We have two teachers from neighboring towns who drive over to teach. They help with our community life if it is convenient. (No. 22).

Teachers I know do these—if they feel obligated or wish to; I don't know. (No. 72).

We don't feel obligated but it's a "good policy" if we do. (No. 204).

Another teacher listed Halloween Carnival as an activity
that their teachers supported, while another said that
they "donated" to all public endeavors.

Summary

The teacher is not as free outside of class in his per-
sonal conduct as the rest of the community, except in the
large cities where he is not well known. Some of the things
that other people do with impunity may cost the teacher his
position. About one-third of the teachers would be fired
if they became the subject of unproved immoral charges,
while about one-fourth would be dismissed for gambling, dat-
ing students, or drinking, if the latter were a woman teacher.

In the smaller communities the teacher has less personal
freedom in his conduct than in the larger cities and towns.
About half of the teachers in the towns under 10,000 popula-
tion thought that being a teacher limited their freedom,
one-fourth in the towns from 10,000 to 50,000 thought like-
wise, while only one-twelfth of the teachers in the large
cities of Texas felt restrained in their freedom of conduct.
In all sizes of communities, however, the teacher is re-
spected as an individual, and not necessarily as a teacher.

Men teachers usually have more freedom than women in
their personal conduct. There seems to be a trend to let
teachers have more freedom in their personal conduct.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF PRESSURES AND METHODS

Introduction to Pressure Groups Vs. Education

The previous four chapters have been a consideration of most of the issues relating to the freedom of teaching, such as the discussion of controversial issues within the classroom and the teacher's personal conduct outside the classroom. In this chapter the emphasis will be on the methods of groups who work through the schools or apply pressure directly on the teacher. An attempt will be made to find out the main sources of pressure on the schools or on the teachers, the methods they use, and some suggested methods for dealing with pressure groups. At the end of the chapter an attempt will be made to list some of the things that seem to be necessary for teachers to do in order to achieve an overall increase in the freedom of teaching, mainly on the national rather than on the Texas level.

Sources of Pressure

If someone is just starting out in his teaching career, he might wonder if pressure groups ever seek to work through the schools or if it is just talk. The answer would vary with the time and place but this illustration by a leading columnist will illustrate their importance sometimes:
If I read the signs rightly, we are at the beginning of a period of intense struggle for the control of public education. There is no longer a sufficient like-mindedness in most American communities to insure an easy harmony between the teachers and the mass of their fellow citizens. In fact, it almost seems as if there were hardly an organization in America which has not set up a committee to investigate the schools and to rewrite the textbooks.\(^1\)

The pressure groups that work through the schools do so for various reasons. Some are working for aims that help the educational program of the schools, while some are hindrances. Some of the nature of these demands is pointed out in Waller's study, which is referred to below:

It is well known that public schools officials are subject to demands and pressures by individuals and groups outside the school. Literally hundreds of useful and well-meaning persons and groups attempt to use the school's organization to accomplish their aims.\(\ldots\)

...\(\ldots\)

Demands vary in intensity from a mild request to a fight to the death. Many are casual, minor matters. Some are freighted with potentialities for great benefit or great harm to the community, to the schools, to the various individuals involved.\(\ldots\)\(^2\)

Regarding the question of how demands arise, Waller says:

Demands on the schools show a wide range of intensity, insistence, and importance. From those so mild as to be hardly more than requests, they increase in intensity to the bitter fights of powerful individuals and groups. Likewise, as regards insistence, some demands are not repeated, while others are persisted in for months or years.\(^3\)

The superintendent will be the focal point of many of

---


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 14.
these groups seeking to work through the schools. On this matter of pressure groups it has been noted that some of the main causes are these:

1. Desire of promoters of demand to continue their own regime.
2. Self-interest or self-aggrandizement . . .
3. Desire for "good service" or different services for the children.
4. Interest in persons versus interest in public welfare.
5. Spite, enmity, prejudice, and intolerance.
6. Clash of opinion and desire among outside groups.
7. The school official's manner, action, or attitude.
8. Lack of information or perspective on the part of the proponent.

By an analysis of some of these causes it will be seen that some of them can be classified as economic in nature, others are political, several are civic, while some of the remaining may come under the heading of personal conflicts.

When one consider the groups that work through the schools or teachers, he finds dozens of organizations, ranging from civic to political, from religious to business in nature. A few of the many names to choose from might be these: National Association of Manufacturers, Texas Association of Manufacturers, American Red Cross, Boy Scouts, Young Men's Christian Association, American Legion, American Bar Association, Chambers of Commerce, Daughters of the American Revolution, Parent-Teacher Association, local civic clubs, and others. This list is only suggested as a sample of the groups and not in any sense a complete list.

4Ibid., p. 16.
For a general classification of pressure groups and how they ranked in both interest and pressure, one may note the results of a study made in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. In that industrial section it was found that the interest groups ranked as follows: religion, welfare and health, professional, patriotic, civic service, industrial, political, and miscellaneous. But when one considers the rank according to pressure he finds this order: industrial, patriotic, welfare and health, political, professional, religious, civic service, and miscellaneous. Perhaps of most importance to the schools is the same group arranged according to their benefit to the school: civic service, welfare and health, religious, patriotic, professional, miscellaneous, industrial, and political.5

From a close check of the above lists one will note that some groups are far more powerful than their benefits should entitle them to demand things of the school. As for the political groups, for example, he finds that they were eighth in the order of benefit but fourth in pressure; while the industrial ranked seventh in benefit but first in pressure. By way of comparison one may note that the civic group ranked first in benefit but only seventh in pressure. In Texas the lists might be a little different, but one can conclude that the groups that exert the most pressure on the schools or teachers do not always benefit the schools

5 W. A. Yeager, Home-School-Community Relations, pp. 57-60.
the most; indeed, it can be shown that in some cases the reverse is true.

Methods Used by Pressure Groups

When one considers the methods used by pressure groups on the schools or against the individual teachers he finds a wide range. Often they like to provide some things that the school or the teachers can use. Some of their services are useful, some mediocre, and others of little value. Some of the most common services they like to provide, or means of working through the schools are listed below. They are listed somewhat in the order of their use by the schools: charitable, health or welfare service; active efforts of cooperation; campaigns of a special nature—thrift, safety, etc.; contests, awards; visual aids for school use; promotes good citizenship; promotes social organizations; furnish speakers; influence school problems, hiring teachers; leisure time activities encouraged; use of buildings, grounds; gifts to school; decrease taxes, curtail services; boosts athletics; critical attitude, selfish interest manifested.6

By looking at the above list it will be seen that many of the services are useful, but some groups like to work through the schools for selfish purposes. It is then that the school’s freedom is limited, especially when the pressure group is too strong to be denied its wish.

6Ibid., p. 58.
One of the most vociferous groups of all is the patriotic group. They sometimes seek not only to provide materials that might supplement the textbook, but to try to require certain patriotic exercises, to demand the teaching of their brand of historical truth, or in some cases to limit the discussion of the real facts on some subjects.

Another group that often proves to have much strength, especially in smaller communities, is the religious element. In some cases they are useful; often, however, they might restrain something that might be desirable for the students, such as social dancing. In a fairly homogeneous town they often make it difficult for anyone who is not a member of the majority group. One reason why they are not stronger is that the different groups tend to balance the demands of the others, in case there is no united religious front.

Perhaps the strongest group of all is business, either directly or indirectly. They sometimes work hand-in-hand with the politicians, but often they tend to act in a "service" capacity, such as being the head of the school board. Some make good members of the school boards, but others use their position for selfish purposes. Sometimes they limit the freedom of teachers in the discussion of controversial issues. Beale commented on business pressures as follows:

More important than all of these other controls is the power of business. Even business does not have the power it once had. . . . But if big business is under a cloud and has lost some of its prestige of the twenties, and if a few teachers have become a little less gullible
in accepting obvious propaganda at face value, none the less the businessman as an individual still controls our schools. He is still the leading citizen whose good will and friendship the teacher wants. He and his lawyer satellites and hangers-on still occupy most of the seats in our boards of education. His point of view is still accepted by teachers whose backgrounds are usually middle class. He still dictates the hiring and firing of teachers.

Closely allied to the businessmen in interest are the taxpayers’ associations. Their main interest is to pay no more in school taxes than they have to, regardless of the education of their neighbor’s children and their education. Their strength was most evident after the last depression, but the following reference shows us that they are still a force to be reckoned with:

There could be no more intimate and vital way for the educator to understand the American public than through the controversies and confusion which in the depression years have arisen around the question of the public support of “free” education. Here the educator, today and no doubt for some time to come, will feel intense pressure from the public.8

Perhaps the strongest force of all, though, if it is thoroughly aroused, is public opinion. This is rather difficult to define, but it is a combination of several forces, and the teacher is willing to obey its demand because they like to think of themselves as “tasteful” and not trying to stir up trouble. Beale calls public opinion an elusive element and then gives its importance:

8Bruce Raup, op. cit. p. 99.
Sometimes it is the resultant of several partially conflicting pressures of organized minorities. However, it is defined, it is an opponent few teachers dare arouse. It is often provincial in its attitudes. It is frequently wrong.  

Occasionally the opinions of a few key people have an influence out of proportion due to their number. In one of the questionnaires that was returned a good example of this was illustrated. The teacher went into detail about why some people in the community were "out to get the superintendent's scalp any way they can." (The details will not be quoted since he requested that he not be quoted). His conclusions, though, are useful as to what a minority can do to upset a school system. He wrote that:

Under the circumstances some things which ordinarily in this area would be of trivial significance become serious, and things ordinarily considered important become nothing. For this reason no matter how I am sitting today, in a way I feel like I am sitting on the side of Vesuvius! . . . any misstep on ideology might be seized on by certain groups. I think every teacher here is trying to practice that admonition, "Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves." (No. 178).

Until recently the matter of pressure from the national government has been almost overlooked. This might be a major influence in the future, however. The leading school officials in a recent yearbook stated that:

Recently the federal government has been exerting increasing pressure on the schools. . . . As long as federal funds are administered thru federal agencies for

specific purposes, increasing control of local education from Washington may be expected. 10

Another group of pressures that must not be overlooked is within the school itself. This situation was pointed out in the following:

If the teachers are to be free, they must be protected, not only against pressures from groups outside the schools, but also against the powerful restrictive forces inside the school; various methods of control short of dismissal, the play of favoritism, student opinion, interfering parents, donors of school funds, other teachers, supervisors, principals, school boards, superintendents. Until these elements are deprived of control of teachers or are won to freedom, and until a tradition of free expression that affects them all is established, no effective freedom for teachers can be established. 11

Although it might come as a shock to some, one of the reasons for lack of freedom for teachers is because of their fellow workers. This is explained in the following:

When one is discussing lack of freedom for teachers, he must remember that the majority of teachers do not need freedom, because they share the views of the community from which they sprang and in which they live. . . . Complete indifference of other teachers meets anyone who tries to do some social thinking and arouse his fellows to action. . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

In disillusionment and discouragement, caused to a large extent by the indifference of other teachers, most teachers who once had ambitions and ideals merely shrug their shoulders. "That's the use?" 13

One of the questions in Part VIII of the questionnaire dealt with the sources of pressure. It was worded as follows:

---

10 Expanding Role of Education, Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, p. 292.
12 Ibid., p. 636.
13 Ibid., p. 641.
"In the first column check those that put pressure upon 
teachers, either direct or indirect, which hampers their 
freedom of conduct or expression. In the second column 
number those that you checked, as far as you can, in the 
order of pressure each exerts, using 1 as representing the 
strongest pressure." The results are shown in Table 9. At 
the left is a list of pressures and the next column is the 
per cent of the teachers who checked that particular item 
for their community. The last column is the rank.

**TABLE 9**

**SOURCES OF PRESSURE UPON TEACHERS AND THEIR 
RANK AS LISTED BY TEXAS TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure group or individual</th>
<th>Per cent of schools in which they were checked</th>
<th>Order of pressure exerted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion of the community</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of schools</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business organizations or men.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactors of the schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civic organizations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By looking at Table 9 some interesting comparisons may 
be made. The most frequent pressure mentioned was the pub-
lic opinion of the community; also it was the strongest
listed in the particular communities where the teachers were that answered the questionnaire. Parents, apart from the general public, were listed as fourth in pressure exerted.

It is also interesting to note that the teachers listed the superintendent as having exerted the second most pressure, with the school board following close behind. The principal does not seem to exert near as much influence in the matter of applying pressure on the teachers as does the superintendent. This does not refer to the essential work of the school, but it means a pressure that "hampers their freedom of conduct or expression." Other teachers exert a strong pressure on their members also. Students exert little pressure in most schools. Students occasionally apply strong pressure on teachers, and in some cases have helped teachers who have been dismissed by school boards in an arbitrary manner.

This is no complete list of pressure groups. The table is suggestive, however, of some of the groups or individuals in the communities that tend to exert pressures upon the teachers which tend to limit their freedom of conduct or expression.

While one is on the subject of inter-school pressures, it would be well to keep in mind that the freedom of teaching is not measured by dismissals, or their lack, but by the way the teachers "feel" or sense their amount of freedom. For every dismissal there are several "threats" or "hints" that are just as effective for keeping the teachers in "line."
Some of the pressures that are applied on the teacher are useful but many are harmful to the educational program.

This section does not list all the pressures exerted, but it does illustrate the fact that some groups that want to work through the schools or upon the teacher are not always interested in the welfare of the students, the main purpose for having schools and teachers. It must be added, though, that many of the groups in the community try to supplement and aid the work of the school, without trying to dictate how the school should be run.

Some of the comments on Part VII, Sources of Pressure, that were taken from the questionnaire, are as follows:

I have noticed that a teacher is considered good unless public opinion feels he or she is not good. (No. 60).

As far as I know there is no pressure on a teacher here. I have never felt any. (No. 158).

None exist in my school now. (No. 166).

There is very little direct pressure exerted. The main thing is the opinion of the community which may eventually affect your job. (No. 213).

None to mention. (No. 2).

An elementary teacher was dismissed after a year, although she was given a recommendation by the superintendent to teach in another school. She had a tough group of 42, including a board member's son, and little actual cooperation from the principal, superintendent, teachers, or parents. Her home life was unsettled and every chance to degrade any of her work was done. (No. 175).

Because a teacher insisted that church funds and activities be carried on according to the rules of the
association, a school board member voted against her. He had been one who misused funds. (No. 85).

The band director of the high school is not allowed to put his new ideas of bettering the band into practice. The only thing which seems to interest the school board is football, . . . He is not allowed to take his band to concerts, etc., more than one or two trips yearly. (No. 231).

In conclusion, it appears that the matter of pressure that is exerted on the school or the individual teacher will very considerably from one school system to another, and that the order of pressure is difficult to determine.

Suggested Methods for Dealing with Pressure Groups

As long as there are strong pressures placed on the school or on the teachers some thought should be given to methods of dealing with their demands. This is especially important because many of these requests do not become demands if they are handled properly at the beginning. Many groups merely want to make a small request or to get some information while others will fight with all they have to get what they want. In order to keep the pressure or strong interest groups satisfied as much as possible without harm to the school, Waller has suggested several ways for superintendents or teachers who deal with people with requests or demands. He first suggests that the teacher be treated courteously, be given an attentive hearing, and to grant his request if it seems best for the school.¹⁴

¹⁴Waller, op. cit., pp. 54-55.
Waller then suggests that the educators can take the initiative also. By doing so the school is often saved a lot of trouble, because they seek to supply the demands or needs of the community before some pressure group insists on something. He suggests these steps in taking the initiative:

1. Plan to have the people know the schools.
2. Increase the worth of the services of the schools.
3. Give due consideration to the attitudes of important groups in the community.
4. Search out the causes of actual or potential demands.
5. Capitalize on the opportunities offered by demands as well as by other contacts.
6. Cooperate with the leaders of the various community groups. One effective and economical means to such cooperation is through a President's Council.
7. Develop among the principals, teachers, janitors, and pupils an appreciation of the importance of public and school relations, and of the potentialities or evil with which every contact is fraught. Increases confidence and leadership in community affairs will come with increased participation.15

By taking the initiative the schools can often save themselves a lot of trouble from pressure groups—by fulfilling the needs of the community before someone demands them. If a group does insist on something that is not educationally sound, the public opinion of the community will usually support the school if it had a good public relations program with community support to begin with.

Finally, one of the best methods to deal with pressure groups, in addition to having a good school program, is to have a sound philosophy of education and to keep the needs of the students above all other considerations. One of the

15 Ibid., p. 65.
best sources available as to the important things to keep in mind is the following list:

1. Make the children's needs, not the wishes of any person or group, the criterion for each proposed change in education.
2. Grant a respectful hearing to all groups who seek it; investigate and weigh their proposals carefully.
3. Refuse to make the schools a catch-all for the legitimate work of other agencies and institutions.
4. Dare to pioneer with the school services and programs for which there is need, irrespective of current public attitude.
5. Keep the public informed about, and in sympathy with, each major forward step.
6. Provide adequate funds, personnel, and time for each new function and service rather than try to force it into an already crowded program.
7. Enlist the help of the professional staff, and often of lay leaders as well, in evaluating materials, projects, and suggested changes in school policy or programs.
8. Extend and enrich the school program, not by piecemeal, but according to a well-considered total plan.16

Suggested Methods for Increasing the Freedom of Teaching

In this section several methods will be considered which relate to the increasing of freedom for teachers.

Before considering that question, however, it might be well to consider the rank of Texas in comparison with the other states as to how much freedom we give to teachers. It is difficult to rank the states in a matter like this, but perhaps we can get some idea of about where we rank.

Regarding the different sections of the United States,

16Expanding Role of Education, Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, p. 296.
and the amount of freedom for the teachers they allowed.

Beale had this to say:

Throughout this study sectional differences in freedom have been indicated. In general, teachers seem to have greatest freedom in the Northeast, except Pennsylvania. The Middle West and far West have less, the Border States still less, and the South least of all. 17

Texas teachers do not have very strong labor union affiliations, either, while most of the states that do have tend to have more freedom for the teachers.

Nor does Texas have any tenure system, as most contracts are for one year at a time. By way of comparison about three or four of the Southern States have tenure laws.

Texas also is one of the twenty-two states that have a teachers' loyalty oath, which tends to restrict the teachers' freedom.

Although no exact order can be determined, it would seem that Texas ranks in the lower quartile of states, definitely in the lower half, as to the freedom of teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools.

There have been several methods suggested for teachers and those who are interested in teacher freedom as to how more freedom might be obtained, or at least to keep what progress that has been made. It will be noted in these suggestions, however, that they imply that freedom as a duty also carries some responsibilities. This latter thought was

well described by an N. E. A. committee in the following report:

... Ultimately academic freedom depends upon the skill, preparation, ethics, scholarship, and good judgment of the individual teachers. The history of every profession has been colored with persecution so long as the profession contained incompetent and irresponsible practitioners. Thru technical knowledge, research, scientific attitudes, and human understandings a profession builds prestige and public confidence. No teacher is entitled to academic freedom simply because he is a teacher, but he does deserve freedom whom he possesses the recognized skills and capacities of his profession. A wise teacher respects the opinions and customs of the community; he seeks to lead, not to push, the people toward high social goals and behavior; he deserves public confidence because he deals ethically with the public.18

It will be noted in the above that the emphasis is upon the individual teacher and his abilities, not on unlimited freedom. Even a teacher with the best of qualifications, however, might get into trouble at times, even though he is entirely in the right. The National Education Association, in order to protect those who are in the right, has offered to help them in any way they can. That service is described as follows:

... the N.E.A. Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom stands ready to come to the aid of teachers who need its help. Where no legal protection can be applied, the stimulation of public opinion often serves a good purpose. An investigation awakens unsuspecting school patrons and citizens to the realization of the facts. It is the professional duty and privilege of the N.E.A. Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom to aid teachers who need protection from unjust treatment.19

18Report of the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom, 1949, p. 27.
19Ibid., p. 27.
In this connection it might be mentioned that one of the five members of that committee is Sarah Gaskill of the University of Texas. Also, on occasions, the American Civil Liberties Union and the American Federation of Teachers have come to the assistance of teachers who had been denied their rights.

It might be interesting to add, incidentally, that the latest report of the N. E. A. Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom lists fourteen cases that it has investigated. Two of these were in Texas; at Los Angeles Heights, and Kenedy. In the latter case, which is rather extreme, twelve of the thirty-six teachers failed to be reelected by the school board, with no warning of dismissal, no reasons stated, and even the teachers themselves did not know about their dismissals until they learned in a roundabout way from hearsay.20

On the other hand, not all teachers are interested in the question of freedom, even for themselves; at least not to the point of doing something about it. Regarding this idea it has been noted that:

In view of these many pressures, it would seem that teachers should be restless under restrictions. For the vast bulk of the profession, nothing could be farther from the truth. Teachers as a whole are a conservative, respectable, job-holding group. Even if they escape the known forces shaping their ideals and actions, they are still in bondage. Their thought on social issues is illogical, unclear, and incomplete, because teachers

themselves are aim inhibited. This is due both to lack of tenure protection and to the coercion of the mores.\textsuperscript{21}

It is not all of the teachers' fault though. Newlon claims that a large part of the reason why teachers are not ready to assume their proper place is due to their training. Regarding this idea he says:

The teachers of this country are not ready for these responsibilities. This is in part due to the rapid expansion of our schools, to the concept of education as learning of facts, to administrative and supervisory practices, to low salaries, and to the inadequacy in social knowledge through the professional education that has been provided in teacher-training institutions. There is no greater need in American education than the remaking of the professional education of teachers. The responsibilities for the general teaching situation and for the complacency of so many classroom teachers must be placed squarely on the shoulders of those who are responsible for the professional education of teachers and for the administration of the schools.\textsuperscript{22}

One of the methods that has been suggested for the teachers to increase their freedom is to work with other groups who have their freedom limited. Yet many do not realize the connection of teachers to the bigger problem of civil liberties. This was brought out in the following:

To the majority of the profession today it is an unthinkable proposition that intellectual freedom is to be secured only by means of general defense of civil liberties, and that such a defense calls for a joining of forces with others in the community.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{21}Cook, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 325.


The teachers' organizations must also share in the responsibility for the freedom of teachers:

In the case of unfair or unwise dismissal the profession must be prepared to conduct energetic and appropriate inquiries and, by resort to the courts, if necessary, see that justice is done, damages assessed, and reinstatement achieved. The tradition must be established in American schools that the teacher will be protected in the efficient performance of his professional duty. It is particularly imperative that isolated teachers in small communities shall not be left virtually defenseless. Otherwise, as experience has already indicated, the teaching of the social sciences will become mere mockery.24

Another step that must be taken by the teachers in order to have the respect that they need is to choose a course of action, to lead some, and not to wait until they are told to do something. On the question of what to do about the social changes it has been suggested that:

In a period of social transition leaders of a public undertaking such as education should not try to play the game safe—merely attempting to follow the lead of their society. Sooner or later this policy breaks down; because a society in a period of transition is not only confused and uncertain, but as already indicated, it is also sharply divided within itself. ... Viewed simply, therefore, from the low level of self-interest, education cannot afford to serve whatever forces happen at the moment to control the affairs of the state.

... In times of social transition inaction in education is in reality a form of action. To attempt to follow the policy of neutrality means, in effect, that the educator throws his influence on the side of the groups now entrenched in power and privilege. ... In a period of social transition, the educator who becomes a mere politician, guided solely by immediate expediency, evades one of his major educational responsibilities--

that of helping a people to become effectually intelligent about its vital problems.\(^{25}\)

Another matter that must not be overlooked is the source of money for education and the relation of a depression on the teachers. This was emphasized by Newlon:

> What are the prospects for the immediate future, for the next five or ten years? . . . that depends primarily on two factors, on economic conditions and on the extent to which teachers inform themselves and effectively organize to protect this freedom. The tendency of a social system toward repressive measures in time of crisis has already been noted.\(^{26}\)

Some writers have attempted to list some of the steps that should be taken to increase the teachers' freedom. One writer emphasized the part of the school and its program as follows:

> Before complete freedom of teaching in the public schools is possible, considerable improvement must be made in legislation, the control of schools and the character of school boards, the training of teachers, employment and tenure conditions, salaries, the curriculum, and physical facilities.\(^{27}\)

The report of the Commission on the Social Studies stated some of the steps to improve the status of the teachers as follows: Achieve a stronger position of leadership in the community; better teacher training, with emphasis on

---


social and other current problems; economic security, academic freedom; and the abandonment by the teachers of their indifference or seclusion from the rest of the community. 28

Cooke suggested these proposed roads to more freedom:

1. Professionalization of teachers.
2. Educating the public to an approval of greater freedom through public relations.
3. Legal protection for teachers through tenure laws.
4. The unionization of teachers to seek a livable wage.
5. Teachers be given the opportunity to participate more effectively in the planning of school policies. 29

These methods, if carried out in Texas should improve the present status of teachers considerably.

As to the question of whether or not more freedom for teachers is desirable for the good of society, it has been pointed out by Beale in his conclusion that:

After careful weighing of the factors pro and con, with full realization of all the difficulties involved, the author has ceased to ask whether freedom is possible, how much of it can be allowed to teachers, whether it will be abused. Of course, it will be abused. The really important question is: Dare society face the consequences of not permitting the teachers of the next generation complete freedom? 30

Summary

The outside demands and pressures on the schools or on the individual teachers are many and varied in nature,

28 Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission, edited by the Commission on the Social Studies, pp. 126-128.


as well as in intensity. The leading pressures, depending on the size of the community, are usually of a religious, economic, patriotic, and personal nature. The political pressure is sometimes strong, especially in large cities. In Texas the strongest pressure on the teachers is public opinion, followed by the superintendent, school board, and the parents. In handling these demands the best method is to have a good public relations program, to treat courteously all visitors with requests, to work with other groups wherever possible, but to resist all demands that do not fulfill the needs of the students.

In order to improve the freedom of teachers, some of the best methods are these: To improve the training of teachers, to have stronger teachers' organizations that seek to protect teachers whose rights have been denied, to establish a tenure system in Texas, and to improve teacher respect by their cooperation with other worthy groups that can supplement the work of the school.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary
This study is an analysis of certain factors that are related to the freedom of teaching in Texas. Most of the information was obtained by an analysis of eighty-eight replies to a questionnaire sent out by the writer, which was supplemented by magazine articles and books. The people who replied were for the most part classroom teachers, with some administrative school workers, but for the purpose of this study all of the school workers were called teachers. The study concerned the freedom of teaching in the elementary and secondary schools, and, although no question was asked as to the type of school taught, it appears that most all of the teachers were in the public schools.

The amount of freedom of teaching will vary from one community to another, depending on the size of the town and other factors, but this summary will attempt to give an answer as to the freedom of teaching in the average school and community in Texas, unless otherwise specified.

In the hiring of teachers several factors are taken into consideration besides their teaching ability. In Texas some of the reasons that handicap teachers in getting
employment and the per cent of the teachers who checked that factor for their school system are as follows: Communists, 100%; atheists, 98%; Socialists, 58%; religious liberals, 38%; Catholics, 35%; divorced persons, 25%; naturalized citizens, 17%; with a much smaller per cent of discrimination for residents of other states, married women, or Protestants. In times of depression and teacher surplus, however, the factors might change; as for example, the married women teachers would have more trouble getting positions.

Texas does not have a state law providing for tenure, although it does permit continuing contracts of more than one year. Some cities have tenure regulations, but they do not have very much of a legal basis. Most schools hire the teachers by annual contracts, and can dismiss them for any reason, or without reason, at the end of the school year.

There are still several restrictions on the freedom of discussion of controversial issues in the classroom. This is due mainly to the desire of strong economic, patriotic, political, and religious groups to keep the status quo. The local controversial issues are always more dangerous for the teacher to discuss than similar questions on the state or national level. In Texas classrooms about three-fourths of the teachers dare not discuss the possibility of atheism, one-half of them cannot denounce local men or officials for corruption, while about one-fourth of them dare not mention local business practices as unjust, birth control, communism,
or the theory of evolution. Most other topics are less
dangerous for classroom discussion. The amount of academic
freedom varies, depending more on who controls the schools
and local affairs rather than the size of the community.

Outside the classroom the teacher usually has to use
cautions in expressing his thoughts, especially in the small
town. It is very dangerous for a teacher to openly criti-
cize the school board or the school administration. The
main reason listed for avoiding the discussion of contro-
versial issues is the fear of public opinion, followed
closely by the belief that teachers should avoid contro-
versial issues. Most teachers desire more freedom in dis-
cussion, while 10% thought that there was a trend to limit
the freedom of discussion of controversial issues by teach-
ers. About 18% thought the trend was to allow more freedom
of discussion.

The teacher is not as free outside of the classroom as
the rest of the community, except in the large cities where
he is not very well known as a teacher. Some of the things
that other people do with impunity may cost the teacher his
position. About one-third of the teachers would be fired
if they became the subject of unproved immoral charges,
while about one-fourth would be dismissed for gambling,
dating students, or drinking, if the latter were women teach-
ers. Men almost always have more freedom of conduct than
the women teachers.
In the smaller communities the teacher has less freedom in his personal conduct than teachers in larger towns. About half of the teachers in the towns under 10,000 population thought that their freedom was limited because they were teachers, one-fourth in the towns from 10,000 to 50,000 thought likewise, while only one-twelfth of the teachers in the large cities over 50,000 in Texas felt restrained in their freedom of conduct. In all sizes of communities, however, the teacher is respected as an individual, and not necessarily because he is a teacher.

The outside demands and pressures on the schools or on the individual teachers are many and varied in nature, as well as in intensity. The leading pressures, depending on the size of the community, are usually of a religious, economic, patriotic, and personal nature. The political pressure is sometimes strong, especially in large cities. In Texas the strongest pressures on the teachers are public opinion, followed by the superintendent, school board, and the parents. In handling these demands the best method is to have a good public relations program, to treat courteously all visitors with requests, to work with other groups wherever possible, but to resist all demands that do not fulfill the needs of the students.

In order to improve the freedom of teachers some of the best methods that have been suggested are these: To improve the training of teachers, to have a stronger teachers'
organization that thinks first of the needs of the students but also to protect their own freedom, to establish a tenure system in Texas, and to improve teacher respect by their cooperation with other worthy groups.

Conclusions

1. Texas does not have a state law that provides for teacher tenure, but some cities have provisions for such.

2. Most teachers in Texas are employed by annual contracts, although the law permits contracts of from two to five years, depending on the type of school district.

3. It is almost impossible, if not entirely so, for a confessed Communist to get a teaching position in a Texas elementary or secondary school.

4. There are several other groups that are seriously handicapped in seeking a position in Texas, other than being a Communist, such as Socialists, atheists, religious liberals, Catholics, and a few others.

5. In times of depression the married women teachers and non-local applicants have more difficulty in getting a teaching position.

6. Since Texas does not have a tenure law a teacher, regardless of his ability, has no legal remedy or appeal to the courts if his contract is not renewed at the end of the teaching year.

7. The classroom teacher does not always have the freedom he needs to discuss current problems with his classes,
especially if he thinks too many changes should be made with the **status quo** in the community.

8. In the communities where the academic freedom is limited the most dangerous topics for class discussion are sex, religion, politics, and economic changes.

9. In about one-third of the schools of Texas the teachers do not feel free to denounce local men or officials for corruption.

10. The discussion of local issues by teachers is more dangerous than the discussion of similar issues on the state, national, or international level.

11. There is a gradual trend for teachers to have more freedom in discussion of controversial issues, although most of the teachers thought the trend was to remain about the same.

12. In his personal conduct the teacher is expected to set an example for his students and the community expects several things of teachers that it does not demand of others.

13. About one-fourth of the schools of Texas would be inclined to dismiss teachers who gambled, dated students, or drank, if the latter case was a woman teacher.

14. Men have more freedom in their personal conduct than women teachers.

15. The large cities almost always permit more freedom of personal conduct for teachers than do the smaller communities. Half of the teachers in towns under 10,000
population felt that their freedom was limited while less than 10% of those in the cities over 50,000 thought the same way.

16. The teachers are sometimes expected to teach Sunday School, raise funds for certain campaigns, or to do other extra non-school activities, but it is usually because they feel obligated as a citizen of the community rather than because they are a teacher.

17. Teachers are respected as individuals, and not because they are members of the teaching profession necessarily.

18. The strongest pressures, depending on the size of the community, are usually of a religious, economic, patriotic, or political nature.

19. The demands on the school vary considerably from one community to another, depending on its size and composition.

Recommendations

1. Texas should provide for a sound tenure system that will protect teachers who are doing a good teaching job.

2. There should be less discrimination in the hiring of teachers, especially because of religious factors.

3. The teacher should be judged on the basis of teaching ability rather than because he is from another community or because a woman teacher is married.

4. Teachers should feel free in every community to lead
the students in a discussion of current problems that arise in connection with their courses of study, in order that the students might learn to think critically and recognize faulty reasoning.

5. The teacher should feel as free as the rest of the community in the discussion of controversial issues outside of the classroom.

6. The community should allow the teachers as much freedom in their personal conduct as the rest of the professional workers in the community have.

7. The teachers should feel free to express opinions on issues under study, but they should not use their classroom for partisan or sectarian purposes.

8. The teacher training institutions should help their students to be prepared to handle controversial issues, to become more professional in spirit, and to help their students to understand current problems that arise in connection with their teaching.

9. The teachers' organizations should assist teachers who are denied their legal rights or are given arbitrary treatment by school boards or others.

10. The schools should have a better public relations program.

11. Teachers should realize that the freedom of teaching also implies some obligations.
Dear Former North Texas State College Student:

In order to make an analysis of some problems met by teachers in Texas public schools it is necessary to use this questionnaire. Since most of the material can be answered by check marks, I trust that you will find a little time to cooperate in order to make the study complete.

From this research I hope to ascertain the freedom of teaching in Texas, not only in the classroom, but on community restrictions, such as a teacher's personal conduct and the freedom to discuss controversial subjects.

The success of this graduate thesis will necessarily depend upon your cooperation. Please answer all questions that you can. In case a question does not fall within the experience you have had, answer it with the practice that you believe would exist in your community or school system if the issue did arise. If you are not teaching now answer questions on the basis of your last teaching position.

Use the back of these sheets or additional ones for comments that can't be answered in the space provided. Give dates in all cases mentioned, with major attention to those since 1936. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope. Please return it by October 20, 1948. Let me assure you that your cooperation will be appreciated.

All information will be treated in strict confidence. Neither you, the name of your town nor the name of your school system will be mentioned. No one except the present writer will have access to your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Floyd Cokendolpher

I certify that this is a bona fide research thesis and that all material will be considered confidential.

James C. Matthews, Dean
School of Education,
North Texas State
Teachers College
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QUESTIONNAIRE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION:
1. Name (Optional, will not be quoted)
2. Sex
3. Town (Will not be quoted)
4. Approximate population of town
5. Level of school you work in: Elementary_Junior High_Senior High_Both
6. Years of educational work
7. Years in this school
8. Kind of educational work: Teacher_Superintendent_Principal
9. Subjects taught
10. Leading business interests of town (e.g., coal mining, cotton growing)

II. TENURE:
11. Does a teacher in your school system have:
   A. Permanent tenure after a probationary period Yes No
   B. No protection against arbitrary dismissal Yes No
   C. No protection save yearly contract Yes No
   D. Guarantee of a hearing before dismissal Yes No
   E. Appeal to courts if dismissed Yes No
   F. Other comments on dismissals

III. RACE, GREED, SEX, PARTY:
12. Which of the following would in your school or school system be disqualified or seriously handicapped:

   In getting a position In keeping it if fact becomes known without previous misrepresentation

   A. Naturalized citizens Yes No Yes No
   B. Residents of other states or towns Yes No Yes No
   C. Divorced persons Yes No Yes No
   D. Married women Yes No Yes No
   E. Republicans Yes No Yes No
   F. Socialists Yes No Yes No
   G. Communists Yes No Yes No
   H. Religious liberals Yes No Yes No
   I. Atheists Yes No Yes No
   J. Catholics Yes No Yes No
   K. Protestants Yes No Yes No
   L. Others(Specify) Yes No Yes No
IV. IDEAS:

13. On the basis of the practice of your community and school system, check the freedom of teaching to discuss each of these ideas, according to the number that corresponds to the local practice:

1. Believe in if he does not say so openly.
2. Discuss impartially in class if he expresses no opinion.
3. Express favorable views in class if he does not attempt to convert students.
4. Propagandize in class.
5. Advocate outside of class.

Also check whether you approve of the local practice on each of the issues concerned.

| Practice Agree Disagree | A. Theory of evolution | B. Socialism | C. Abolish the poll tax | D. Raise taxes on natural resources | E. Condemn the Truman Doctrine | F. Object to the peacetime draft | G. Approve of labor unions | H. Advocacy of federal aid to public schools | I. Denunciation of practices of Big Business | J. Disapproval of the mayor's plans or program | K. Communism | L. Abolish the Jim Crow laws | M. Political equality for Negroes | N. Condemn the activities of the American Legion or D. A. R. | O. Birth Control | P. Government ownership of public utilities | Q. Non-existence of God | R. Denunciation of local men or officials for corruption | S. Criticism of the President or Governor of Texas | T. Criticism of practices of local business men as unjust | U. Teacher membership in labor union | V. Necessity of peaceful reform of capitalist system | W. Others (Specify) |
V. PERSONAL CONDUCT:

14. If a teacher in your school system did one of the following, check its implications, if it became known. Would be fired,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Serious or never rehired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. CRITICISM OF LOCAL SCHOOL OR COMMUNITY:

15. Is the teacher free to criticize openly: (Check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School board policies</th>
<th>The superintendent</th>
<th>The principal</th>
<th>The textbooks used</th>
<th>Business practices of local men</th>
<th>Local social leaders and their activities</th>
<th>The practices of strong group in the community (e.g., American Legion)</th>
<th>Craft in local politics</th>
<th>Others (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
VII. SOURCES OF PRESSURE:

16. In the first column check those that put pressure upon teachers, either direct or indirect, which hampers their freedom of conduct or expression. In the second column number those you checked, as far as you can, in the order of pressure each exerts, using 1 as representing the strongest pressure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exert pressure</th>
<th>Order of pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Other teachers</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Students</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The principal</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The superintendent</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The school board members</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Parents</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Public opinion of the community</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Business organizations or men</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Benefactors of the school</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. American Legion</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Local civic organizations</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Local or county politicians</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Religious groups</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Others (Specify)</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. REASONS FOR AVOIDING CONTROVERSIAL SUBJECTS:

17. A. Check the reasons why teachers refrain from discussion (in class or out) of controversial subjects:

In class Out

1. Fear of dismissal
2. Fear of reprimand or other discipline
3. Fear of disfavor that will prevent promotion
4. Fear of refusal of a good recommendation when applying for a new position
5. Fear of public opinion
6. Feeling of futility of not conforming
7. Belief that a teacher should avoid controversial subjects
8. Indifferent or in agreement with the community on most issues.
9. Others or comments

18. B. Would you like to see freer expression of views on controversial subjects, if the community attitude would permit it? Yes ___ No ___ Indifferent ___

19. C. At forums or other public meetings do the teachers feel as free as the rest of the community to enter discussion on controversial subjects? Yes ___ No ___ Only on his subject fields ___ Others (Specify) ___
IX. COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

20. A. Teachers in your community are respected about as
they should be____, too much____, not enough____.

21. B. Being a teacher in your community limits their
freedom as citizens____, gives them more freedom____,
makes no difference____.

22. C. Do any of the teachers in your school feel obligated
to do any of the following additional non-school
activities without pay.
If so, check if it's against their personal desire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Feel obligated</th>
<th>Against desire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach Sunday School</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve with Boy Scouts</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve with Girl Scouts</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on civic committees</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise funds for community</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chest or Red Cross</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Specify)</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
<td>Yes_ No_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. TRENDS:

23. Do you think the trend in your community is to allow
more____, less____, or about the same____freedom in
discussing of controversial subjects by teachers?

24. Do you think the trend in your community is to allow
more____, less____, or about the same____freedom of
personal conduct for teachers?

XI. SCHOOL RULES:

25. If your school or school system has ever drawn up rules
or a statement of policy concerning the teacher's con-
duct or his freedom in expressing views on controver-
sial subjects, please send them in as they will be very
helpful. (Name of school or town will not be mentioned).

XII. SPECIFIC CASES:

26. Please specify, on a separate sheet or on the backs of
these sheets, any further comments. If you have known
of any dismissals or teachers discipline or threatened
(directly or indirectly) in some way for conduct or
views expressed please give the details and dates of
each case. Such information will make this study much
more complete and useful. All facts will be kept in
strict confidence. No one except the researcher will
see your questionnaire or other comments.
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