

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES OF SECONDARY  
SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS,  
AND BOARD PRESIDENTS ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree Doctor of  
Philosophy in the Graduate School of  
the Ohio State University

By

Ronald Gene Helms, A.B. Ed., M.A.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Ohio State University

1972

Approved by



Adviser

Department of Social Studies Education

Copyright by  
Ronald Gene Helms  
1972

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the teachers, principals, and board presidents who participated and cooperated in this study, the writer extends his sincere appreciation. Acknowledgment is also extended to those who provided necessary assistance in the development of this dissertation:

Dr. Walley Fotheringham, Dr. James Uphoff, Mr. Dixon Call, Mr. Earl Raley, Mr. Modula Gohlar, Mr. Bryon Walker, Mrs. Dillion, Mr. Dave Kludy and Mrs. Juniper. The author is grateful for assistance provided by colleagues in the Kettering City Schools: Mr. Chester Roush, Mr. Glen Roberts, Mr. Charles Bernard, Mrs. Frances Edaler, Mr. Lou Gabbard, Mr. Joe Haven, Mr. Ken Durst, Mr. George Liston, Mr. Don Fitzsimmons, Mr. Ben Ankey, Mrs. Donna Gabbard and Mr. Ellis Miller.

The author is appreciative of the encouragement offered by Mr. Merle Hartshorn and Mr. Edward Martin of the National Council for the Social Studies. The author is also indebted to Dr. Raymond Mueasig for many suggestions and criticisms during the course of this author's doctoral program at Ohio State.

Grateful acknowledgment for the assistance, guidance, and direction provided the writer throughout his doctoral program is extended to the members of his committee: Dr. Paul Klohr, Dr. Eugene Gilliom and Dr. Robert Jewett. The writer especially wishes to acknowledge the assistance, counseling, encouragement and patience of Dr. Robert Jewett, Chairman of the Doctoral Committee.

The writer would also like to acknowledge Chuck and Linda Snowden who have contributed immeasurably to the success of this study. To the writer's wife, Sharon Ann, must go a special word of appreciation; her work in typing and editing was crucial to the completion of the dissertation. Finally special thanks to the writer's son Scott who learned patience.

## VITA

August 3, 1945..... Born, Grafton, West Virginia

1966..... A.B. Ed., Fairmont State College  
Fairmont, West Virginia

1966-1969..... Teacher, Carlisle High School  
Carlisle, Ohio

1968..... M.A., University of Dayton  
Dayton, Ohio

1969-1972..... Teacher, Fairmont East High School  
Kettering, Ohio

1972..... Adjunct Instructor,  
Wright State University  
Dayton, Ohio

## FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Social Studies Education

Social Studies Education. Professors Eugene Gilliom,  
Robert Jewett, Raymond Mueasig

Curriculum and Supervision. Professors Jack Frymier  
and Paul Klohr

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
VITA.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
 Chapter	
I. GENESIS OF A COMMITMENT.....	1
The Author's Commitment	1
Some Theoretical Considerations	4
Conclusion	13
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	16
Introduction	16
Academic Freedom Defined	18
Academic Freedom and Democratic Theory	28
Academic Freedom: The Opposition	35
Some Opposition Arguments	40
The Censors	42
Academic Freedom: The Classroom	52
Teachers	52
Teaching	63
The Teaching Process	63
Communism and Education	72
The Scopes Trial	76
Controversial Issues and the Student	79

Academic Freedom: Towards Resolution	83
National Council for the Social Studies	84
Some Legal Precedents	87
A Concluding Statement	93
Freedom with limitations?	93
Positive Action	95
Conclusion	101
III. METHODOLOGY.....	105
Population Parameters	105
Initiation of Questionnaire	109
Refinement of Questionnaire	111
General Questionnaire	112
Statistical Analysis	114
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY.....	116
The General Questionnaire	116
Principal's Return	118
Teacher's Return	119
Board President's Return	119
Statistical Compilation	120
Student Enrollment	120
Age-Sex Status	122
Degree Status	124
College Majors	125
Semester Hours	128
Professional Organizations	131
Experience	134
Occupation	137
Procedural Guarantees	138
Attitude Analysis	143
Procedural Safeguards	143
Teachers, Principals and	
Board Presidents	144
Selected Groups of Teachers	147
Academic Freedom	149
Teachers, Principals and	
Board Presidents	150
Selected Groups of Teachers	157

Open Classroom	161
Teachers, Principals and Board Presidents	162
Selected Groups of Teachers	165
V. SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS.....	171
Summary	171
Recommendations	184
APPENDIX.....	187
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	200

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2-1	Education Critics - Organizations.....	47
2-2	Teacher Response to Questionnaire.....	74
4-1	Returns of Teachers, Principals and Board Presidents.....	117
4-2	School Districts by Total Student Enrollment.....	121
4-3	Age-Sex Distribution of Teachers, Principals and Board Presidents.....	123
4-4	Degree Status of Teachers, Principals and Board Presidents.....	124
4-5A	Undergraduate Majors of Teachers, Principals and Board Presidents.....	126
4-5B	Graduate Majors of Teachers, Principals and Board Presidents.....	129
4-6A	Semester Hours in Selected Courses: History and Social Science, Social Studies Education.....	130
4-6B	Semester Hours in Selected Courses: Education Administration; all Education Courses.....	131
4-7	Teachers by Professional Associations...	132
4-8	Principals by Professional Associations.	133
4-9	Board Presidents by Professional Associations.....	134



4-10	Teachers, Principals, Board Presidents by Number of Years of Experience.....	135
4-11	Board Presidents by Occupations.....	138
4-12	Procedural Guarantees: Grievance Policy, Academic Freedom Policy, Read NCSS Statement Academic Freedom.....	139

It is the obligation of a democratic community to provide maximum opportunity for the full, free, and responsible exchange of ideas on matters of public concern.

Committee of Inquiry of the  
Philosophy of Education Society

One cannot but see danger in excessive reference to authority, and in the limitation of discussion at an age when personal convictions are beginning to be formed.

Andrei D. Sakharov

Our censure should be reserved for those who would close all doors but one. The surest way to lose truth is to pretend that one already possesses it.

G. W. Allport

Education is a kind of continuing dialogue, and a dialogue assumes in the nature of the case, different points of view.

R. M. Hutchins

The sense of unsolved social problems is all about us.... Unless educators prepare future citizens to deal effectively with these great questions, our civilization may collapse....

John Dewey

Mankind are greater gainers by suffering each other to live as seems good to themselves, than by compelling each other to live as seems good to the rest.

John Stuart Mill

If more children were taught to think, to analyze, to form intelligent judgments of their own, more of those same children, when they become part of the school's public would hold ideals of freedom of judgment for the teacher.

Howard K. Beale

## Chapter I

### GENESIS OF A COMMITMENT

"To feel a problem is to be aroused psychologically to the point where one wants to do something about it."

Hunt and Metcalf

#### The Author's Commitment

Six years ago this author viewed academic freedom as a nebulous concept which was primarily applicable to higher education, but which somehow was relevant to the secondary school. After three years of teaching experience, academic freedom was transformed from a vague topic to an important problem. Questions of methodologies and objectives had to be dealt with.

Were one firmly committed to a subject matter approach, then Krug's question, "Is it or is it not important for high school students to know about Pericles and the conquests of Alexander...?" would be unhesitatingly

answered in the affirmative.<sup>1</sup> Within a different frame of reference this question could become more complex.

In an attempt to crystallize his own philosophy of education, this writer became committed to the ideas of Jean Piaget:

The principal goal of education is to create men who are capable of doing new things, not simply of repeating what other generations have done--men who are creative, inventive, and discoverers. The second goal of education is to form minds which can be critical, can verify, and not accept everything they are offered. The great danger today is of slogans, collective opinions, ready-made trends of thought. We have to be able to resist individually, to criticize, to distinguish between what is proven and what is not. So we need pupils who are active, who learn early to find out by themselves, partly by their own spontaneous activity and partly through materials we set up for them; who learn early to tell what is verifiable and what is simply the first idea to come to them.

This writer, as a classroom teacher, could not reconcile an emerging desire to study controversial issues with a content coverage approach. Though the superintendent

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark M. Krug, History and the Social Sciences (Waltham, Massachusetts, Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967), 129.

and Board of Education readily accepted such mindless activities as memorization of presidents and charting how a bill goes through Congress, they found the study of certain controversial issues to be contrary to their concept of education. Thus, as classroom time continued to be spent in value clarification, problems developed between this teacher and the school administration.

Kohl points out in his chapter on "Troubles with Principals, Assistant Principals, and Other Supervisors," "A good teacher is one who obeys orders. An excellent teacher is one who obeys them cheerfully and willingly."<sup>2</sup> Kohl identifies the real question as "At what point does your job mean more than being honest and unable to go along with an oppressive system?"<sup>3</sup>

Later that year it was decided that this author's attitudes and methods were incompatible with community beliefs; consequently, he was requested to resign.

This negative experience engendered a commitment. This writer has spent the past four years researching the

---

<sup>2</sup>Herbert R. Kohl, The Open Classroom, New York: Vintage Books, 1969, 89.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 93.

problem of academic freedom and the secondary school. The present paper is an outgrowth of some of this research.

### Some Theoretical Considerations

How is academic freedom applicable to the secondary social studies teacher? Are there differences in perception of academic freedom by teachers, principals, Board of Education members? Are there differences of perception among teachers themselves? If differences do exist, is there any way of resolving them to the mutual satisfaction of teachers, principals, and Board of Education members? This study will examine the status of academic freedom in the secondary schools of Ohio, particularly as it relates to the social studies.

Today's social studies teacher has at his command a number of teaching methods. One of the most effective, as well as exciting, is the method of reflection. The proponents of this method contend that an examination of problematic areas of our culture should be the central concern of secondary social studies; however, these same proponents are cognizant of the inhibitions teachers experience because of uncertainty about academic freedom.

It is the contention of this writer that the successful implementation of the reflective method is contingent upon the existence of academic freedom.

Hunt and Metcalf profess that the social studies curriculum should be designed in such a manner as to permit the examination of values and beliefs in the closed areas. They hypothesize that

An intellectually vigorous as well as permissive and nonthreatening examination would enable young people to progress toward solution of their problems of self-esteem, identity, anomie, aleination, and self-actualization, while at the same time acquiring many of the cognitive understandings possessed by the social scientists.<sup>4</sup>

The curriculum of Hunt and Metcalf would be designed in terms of "issues to be studied"....<sup>5</sup> They declare that the "foremost aim of instruction in high school social studies program is to help students reflectively

---

<sup>4</sup>Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 31.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 170

examine the issue in the problematic areas of American culture."<sup>6</sup>

Oliver and Shaver assert that the social studies curriculum should expose the student to public problems. "With our society now facing its own survival problems, the assumption of adult concern for the society should and undoubtedly could be brought about at a much earlier age."<sup>7</sup>

Jean Fair strongly endorses the contention that students should explore controversial issues. She writes, "Students must exchange and test ideas rather than air mere opinion or conform to what is accepted by their peers, teachers, or community."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 288.

<sup>7</sup>Donald W. Oliver and James P. Shaver, *Teaching Public Issues in the High School* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), 236.

<sup>8</sup>Jean Fair, "Implication for Junior and Senior High Schools," Effective Thinking in the Social Studies, Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, Jean Fair and Fannie R. Shaftel, ed., (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967), 170.



Mark Krug insists that if young people are to become intelligent, sophisticated citizens, their "beliefs, values, and prejudices must be challenged and subjected to the test of critical research and critical thinking."<sup>9</sup>

Jewett argues that the "primary goal of the senior high school should be to produce the intellectually autonomous individual...." The student must have an opportunity to "come to grips with the crucial issues imbedded in his culture."<sup>10</sup>

In 1953 the National Council for the Social Studies asserted that "democracy is a way of life that prizes alternatives...." It was argued that students had a right to "study and discuss significant moral, scientific, social, economic, and political issues."<sup>11</sup> In 1964 Richard Gross

---

<sup>9</sup>Krug, op. cit., 204.

<sup>10</sup>Robert Jewett, "The Problems Approach and the Senior High School," (unpublished paper, Ohio State University, 1968), 1.

<sup>11</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Freedom to Learn and Freedom to Teach," Social Education, 280 (July, 1953), 217.

in writing for the National Council for the Social Studies wrote that "there should be no question that American schools are to deal with important problems...."<sup>12</sup> In 1967 the National Council for the Social Studies again stated that "students should have an opportunity to consider and evaluate differing points of view in the classroom."<sup>13</sup> In 1970 the National Council for the Social Studies expanded its statements.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the National Council for the Social Studies felt strongly enough about the matter of exploring attitudes, values, and beliefs that the entire 1971 yearbook dealt with this matter.<sup>15</sup> The National

---

<sup>12</sup>Richard E. Gross, How to Handle Controversial Issues, How To Do It Series, No. 14, (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1964), 1.

<sup>13</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Academic Freedom: A Policy Statement," Social Education, 31 (November, 1967), 605.

<sup>14</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher," Social Education, 34 (April, 1970), 489-491.

<sup>15</sup>Lawrence E. Metcalf, ed., Values Education, Forty-first Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971).

Council for the Social Studies wrote,

social studies education neither can nor should evade the questions of value. Value orientations are the foundations of social institutions, and the value for action.... Students need systematic and supportive help in examining differences among other persons and groups and in clarifying the value conflicts within themselves.<sup>16</sup>

The American Civil Liberties Union asserts that the teacher has a right to discuss controversial issues. Indeed they argue that controversy is inherent in the nature of our democracy and that it must be examined in the classroom.<sup>17</sup>

Thus it is evident that a sound theoretical framework does exist to support the teaching of controversial issues within the social studies curriculum. However, the success of the reflective method is contingent upon several variables which heretofore have not been subject to control by the classroom teacher. Prominent among these variables is the question of academic freedom. Until this question is

---

<sup>16</sup>Gary Manson, Gerald Market, Anna Ochoa, and Jan Tucker, Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971), 13.

<sup>17</sup>Ernestine Friedl, August Gold, et. al., Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools, (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1969), 8.

successfully resolved, the reflective method will not enjoy full and effective utilization. The following paragraphs document the widespread concern for the promotion of academic freedom. Hunt and Metcalf offer this observation:

Despite the theoretical soundness of a reflective approach to teaching social studies, many teachers do not feel free to use this method. It is frequently claimed that communities would fire teachers who provoked thinking in their students. Although some teachers are probably excessively timid and tend to underestimate the amount of freedom in their possession, there is doubtless much opposition to provocative types of teaching, particularly in the closed areas.<sup>18</sup>

Smith and Cox cite a study of the problem of academic freedom which concluded that teachers frequently engage in "voluntary censorship." They argue that the problem of academic freedom must not be underestimated. "The problem of censorship, voluntary or otherwise, is a very real one...."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies (New York: Harper and Row, 1955), 431.

<sup>19</sup>Frederick R. Smith and C. Benjamin Cox, New Strategies and Curriculum in Social Studies, New Trends in Curriculum and Instruction, John U. Michaelis, ed., (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969), 174-5.

Massialas and Cox recognize the necessity of academic freedom. They hold that there is a direct correlation between the degree of academic freedom and the teacher's effectiveness in dealing with controversial issues. They write that the individual teacher cannot be very effective in examining social policies and issues unless the school administration actively cooperates in supporting the study of controversial issues. The best way to implement this cooperation is the formulation of a districtwide policy on the teaching of controversial issues.<sup>20</sup>

Smith and Cox suggest that a major reason for teacher harassment, dismissal, or more subtle forms of persecution consists in the absence of school policies on the teaching of controversial topics. "There is a critical need for every school system to develop a philosophy on the teaching of topics upon which there are alternative points of view and differences of opinion."<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Byron G. Massialas and C. Benjamin Cox, Inquiry in Social Studies (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), 299.

<sup>21</sup>Smith and Cox, op. cit., 175.

The National Council for the Social Studies has been since the early 1950's, one of the most effective crusaders for academic freedom. The Council clearly states that the school administration has a responsibility to "publish guidelines and a clear policy statement regarding the right and responsibility of social studies teachers to deal with controversy."<sup>22</sup> The National Council for the Social Studies has argued this point rather strongly in its policy statements of 1953, 1967, and 1970. One has only to examine these writings to note that one of the fundamental concerns of the National Council for the Social Studies is the establishment of academic freedom within the public school.

Dr. James Uphoff found in a survey of Western Ohio that while 64 per cent of the districts surveyed encouraged their teachers to "cover current civic issues," none of the districts had a written policy to support teachers and students.<sup>23</sup> In another article Uphoff explored the folly

---

<sup>22</sup>Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Certification and Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Standards, National Council for the Social Studies, Standards for Social Studies Teacher, (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971), 10.

<sup>23</sup>James K. Uphoff, "Teaching Controversial Issues," Ohio Schools, (April 11, 1969), 20.

of the current practice of negotiating a grievance policy while ignoring the matter of developing an academic freedom policy.<sup>24</sup>

### Conclusion

On the one hand it is evident that the vanguard of today's thinkers about social studies education concur concerning the necessity for the study of controversial issues. However, there still remains the serious problems of implementing these recommendations. Thirty-five years ago Howard K. Beale observed that "vigorous, capable, intelligent people will not submit to the restraints of teaching."<sup>25</sup>

Anyone familiar with the teaching of the social studies is also cognizant of existing restraints. Beale contended that teachers will be free when they want freedom. The question that this researcher is concerned with is how

---

<sup>24</sup>James K. Uphoff, "The Academic Freedom Bit: Cart and Horses?" (Unpublished paper, Wright State University, 1971), 1.

<sup>25</sup>Howard K. Beale, Are American Teachers Free? Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, part XII (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), 753.

much freedom do teachers desire today? This study will examine the attitudes of secondary social studies teachers, principals, and Board of Education Presidents of Ohio on academic freedom. A survey was designed and mailed to sixty teachers, principals and Board Presidents. Chapter three will present a more extensive description of the methodology of implementing this survey. Chapter four will analyze the results of this survey.

The following are the hypotheses of this study:

1. More school districts will have adopted grievance policies than will have adopted academic freedom policies.
2. The number of city systems which have procedural guarantees; that is, academic freedom policies and grievance policies will exceed exempted village systems; the number of exempted village systems which have procedural guarantees will exceed county systems.
3. Teachers will value highest procedural safeguards for academic freedom; principals will value higher procedural safeguards than will Board Presidents.
4. Selected subgroups of teachers will value higher procedural safeguards than will other subgroups.



5. Teachers will value highest academic freedom; principals will value academic freedom higher than will Board Presidents.
6. Selected subgroups of teachers will value higher academic freedom than will other groups.
7. Teachers will value highest an open classroom; principals will value higher an open classroom than will Board Presidents.
8. Selected subgroups of teachers will value higher an open classroom than will other subgroups.

In conclusion chapter one has outlined the author's commitment, identified a theoretical framework for teaching controversial issues, and has established the correlation between the necessity of a written policy statement on academic freedom and the method of reflection. The hypotheses of the study have been listed. Chapter two will examine the literature in the area of academic freedom.

## Chapter II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Brady: "...Is it possible that something is holy to the celebrated agnostic?"

Drummond: "Yes! The individual human mind. In a child's power to master the multiplication table there is more sanctity than in all your shouted 'Amens!', 'Holy holies!', and 'Hosannahs!' An idea is a greater monument than a cathedral..."

Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee -  
Inherit the Wind

### Introduction

One of the central concerns of this study is the identification of an area which had particular relevance for the writer as well as for the social studies, that of academic freedom. Chapter one correlated the theoretical underpinnings of teaching controversial issues with the necessity for a written policy on academic freedom. This chapter will review some of the literature written in the area of academic freedom.

It should be noted that academic freedom as a problem area is not unique to the social studies. Research has been conducted in English and librarianship as well as in other areas.

A considerable amount of theorizing has been done in the area of academic freedom, but there has been little research. The Review of Educational Research and Encyclopedia of Educational Research offered some help, but most references were located only after a critical survey of bibliographies, guides, and other references.

It should be noted at the outset of this chapter that the intent is not to summarize all of the readings and research which appear in the bibliography. Only those items which were the most significant will appear in this review. Significant will be defined as dealing with classical literature, precedent-establishing, recent or high interest level. If this author were to recommend one piece of literature to the interested reader, it would without question be Howard K. Beale's Are American Teachers Free? Although written in 1934-35, it is still the most comprehensive writing to deal with the problem of academic freedom and the secondary teacher. This author would

certainly like to see Beale's work duplicated in a contemporary setting and with today's research techniques.

### Academic Freedom Defined

What does academic freedom mean? Does it mean the same thing to all people? Traditionally, academic freedom has been of concern only in the realm of higher education. The concept of academic freedom can be traced as far as Socrates and the eloquent defense he made in his own behalf when he was accused of corrupting Athenian youth. Academic freedom becomes more crystalized in the twelfth century with the establishment of the medieval universities. Universities were invested with broad privileges:<sup>1</sup>

1. Teachers and students were free to travel; both were protected from violence.
2. Teachers or students who had violated either sacred or secular law were tried in special university courts.

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 27, ff.

3. The university could suspend lectures or change its location in the event of conflict between "town and gown."
4. University graduates had the right to teach anywhere.
5. Personal property of teachers and students could not be taxed.
6. Teachers and students were exempted from military service.

Religious upheaval of a later century, however, reversed this trend. The Reformation placed many restrictions upon academic freedom; the Spanish Inquisition forbade the instruction of anatomy; loyalty oaths were instituted; books and lectures were censored.

It remained for the German universities in the eighteenth century to re-establish freedom of thought. Throughout the nineteenth century, German scholars could boast of their academic freedom. The German conception of academic freedom can be summed up by two words: Lernfreiheit and Lehrfreiheit. Lernfreiheit meant the absence of administrative coercions in the learning situation. This was especially applicable to the student; the student had no fixed curriculum, no required attendance, no required examinations (save the final examination), no controls upon their private lives.

Lehrfreiheit was predicated upon the assumption that knowledge was not fixed or final. Lehrfreiheit provided freedom for the professor to examine bodies of evidence and teach or publish his findings.<sup>2</sup>

Paulsen sums up academic freedom for the nineteenth century German university:

"The content of instruction is not prescribed for the academic teacher; he is, a searcher as well as teacher, attached to no authority; he himself answers for his own instruction and is responsible to no one else. Opposite him is his student with complete freedom to accept or reject; he is not a pupil but has the privilege of the critic or improver. There is only one aim for both: the truth; only one yardstick: the agreement of thought with reality and with no other outside authority."<sup>3</sup>

Early American colleges lacked the commitment to academic freedom which the Germans exhibited. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century with the establishment of such graduate centers as Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Princeton, and the University of Chicago that much thought was given to academic freedom. Finally, in 1915, 867

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 386-387.

<sup>3</sup>Paulsen, "Die Akademische Freiheit," 517. Cited by Ibid., 389.

university professors united to form the American Association of University Professors. With this relatively short history of concern in the U. S., today's social studies educators are attempting to determine how academic freedom is applicable to them.

Relative to this concern, it is useful to examine some definitions of academic freedom.

In 1919 John Dewey was asked to write an article on academic freedom. At that time Dewey defined academic freedom as the "freedom to teach in higher institutions of learning well-thought out principles and demonstrated truth, or to direct the search for these without the influence of political, bureaucratic, or religious authority."<sup>4</sup>

Arther O. Lovejoy, a contemporary of Dewey, defined academic freedom as the:

"freedom of the teacher or research worker in higher institutions of learning to investigate and discuss the problem of his science and to express his conclusions, whether through publication or in the instruction of students, without interference from political or ecclesiastical

---

<sup>4</sup>John Dewey, "Academic Freedom," Paul Monroe, ed., Cyclopedia of Education, Vol. 2 (New York: MacMillan, 1919), 700.

authority, or from the administrative officials of the institution in which he is employed, unless his methods are found by qualified bodies of his own profession to be clearly incompetent or contrary to professional ethics."<sup>5</sup>

Stephen L. J. O'Beirne writing in 1923 stated that academic freedom was the "immunity for the teacher from restrictions in communications of his knowledge...that he himself has learned. His choice of doctrine must not be determined by public opinion or political policy, by personal whims..., nor by servile obedience to the tyranny of the Church or state."<sup>6</sup>

In 1900 Elmer E. Brown write of academic freedom: "free instruction prepares the learner for both participation in and reaction upon his instructional environment."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Arthur O. Lovejoy, "Academic Freedom," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, I, 384, cited by Beale, op. cit., 3.

<sup>6</sup>Stephen L. J. O'Beirne, "Academic Freedom," Catholic World, CXVII (April, 1923), 25-26, cited by Ibid., 4.

<sup>7</sup>Elmer E. Brown, "Academic Freedom," Educational Review, 29 (March, 1900), 224, cited by Ibid.



Leon Whipple wrote "...freedom of teaching means, technically, that the individual teacher, or the faculty, or teaching group shall be free to teach as their consciences see the truth without dictation from the State authority or private boards through their economic control of positions and advancements."<sup>8</sup>

In 1931 Frank P. Graham wrote that "freedom means the right of the faculty to control the curriculum, scholastic standards and especially matters pertaining to intellectual excellence...to organize their own independent associations for discussion and statement of views."<sup>9</sup>

The Dewey, Lovejoy, O'Beirne, Whipple, and Graham quotes were all printed in Beale's, Are American Teachers Free? Beale admits that during the infant days of the American Association of University Professors these men were primarily concerned with academic freedom in relationship to the university. More recent writers are in

---

<sup>8</sup>Leon Whipple, The Story of Civil Liberties in the U.S. 317, cited by Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Frank P. Graham, "The University Today," School and Society, 34 (December 26, 1931), 860, cited by Ibid.

concurrence with the general principles established by the earlier thinkers.

Sidney Hook writes that academic freedom is the "freedom of professionally qualified persons to inquire, discover, publish and teach the truth as they see it in the field of their competence. It is subject to no control or authority except the control or authority of the rational methods by which truths or conclusion are sought and established in the disciplines."<sup>10</sup>

The Harvard Law Review states that academic freedom is "that aspect of intellectual liberty concerned with the peculiar needs of the academic community."<sup>11</sup> MacIver says simply that academic freedom is "intellectual freedom within the institution of learning."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Sidney Hook, Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy, (New York: Cowles Book Co., 1970), 34.

<sup>11</sup>"Developments in the Law; Academic Freedom," Harvard Law Review, 81 (March, 1968), 1048.

<sup>12</sup>Robert M. MacIver, Academic Freedom in Our Time (New York: Gordian Press, 1967), 67.

In writing his book, Russel Kirk quotes W. T. Couch:

"Academic freedom is the principle designed to protect the teacher from hazards that tend to prevent him from meeting his obligations in pursuit of truth."<sup>13</sup>

Couch continues:

"The obligations of the teacher are direct to truth, and the teacher who, in order to please anybody, suppresses important information, or says things he knows are not true, or refrains from saying things that need to be said in the interest of truth, betrays his calling and renders himself unworthy to belong in the company of teachers."<sup>14</sup>

Francis Keppel sees academic freedom as preserving "the right to challenge, to dissent, to expound ideas honestly arrived at no matter how much they may be at odds with conventional thought and opinion, or even at odds with the views of the academy itself."<sup>15</sup>

The National Council for the Social Studies has been in the vanguard of those seeking to define academic freedom for the teacher. It states: "A teacher's academic freedom is his right and responsibility to investigate, interpret,

---

<sup>13</sup>Russel Kirk, Academic Freedom (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1955), 1.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>Francis Keppel, Freedom Is More Than Academic (New York: Sidney Hillman Foundation, 1962), 5.

and discuss all the relevant facts and ideas in the field of his professional competence. This freedom implies no limitations other than those imposed by general scholarship...."<sup>16</sup>

In his classical work on academic freedom, Beale identifies the components of academic freedom:<sup>17</sup>

1. Textbook selection
2. Curriculum design
3. Instructional methodology
4. Library establishment
5. Use of outside speakers
6. Open discussion of the virtues and faults of the school or school system
7. In-service improvement

It is evident that all of the above writers are in agreement concerning the intellectual freedom aspect of academic freedom. The literature indicates that three criteria were considered in discussion of academic freedom: research or inquiry, teaching, and publishing; heretofore, the secondary teacher has not functioned in the first and

---

<sup>16</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher," Social Education, 34 (April, 1970), 489.

<sup>17</sup>Beale, op. cit., 321.

third areas to any great extent. Also, there has not in the past been a great tendency to identify the public school teacher as an expert in subject matter. These reasons explain why most of the above writers have defined academic freedom in terms of the university setting. However, as the concept and the function of the teacher change, there is a need to redefine academic freedom as it relates to the secondary teacher.

Thus the Harvard Law Review points out that even though secondary and elementary teachers are not pursuing knowledge at its frontiers, the quality of instruction bears a positive correlation with freedom in the classroom.<sup>18</sup> Russel Kirk concurs; he argues that the problem of academic freedom is "almost as pressing" in the secondary school as it is in the university. Kirk reminds us that some would argue that academic freedom belongs to that category of rights known as "natural rights." It is part of a set of moral rights "long established by custom and prescription, and found by the test of time to accord with human nature

---

<sup>18</sup>"Developments in Law: Academic Freedom,"  
Ibid., 1050.

and civil social nature."<sup>19</sup> The Encyclopedia of Educational Research declares that the meaning and value of academic freedom "extend equally to all levels of education..."<sup>20</sup>

### Academic Freedom and Democracy

In 1953 the National Council for the Social Studies in commenting on the relationship of academic freedom to democracy asserted that "democracy is a way of life that prizes alternatives... In defending the freedom to learn and freedom to teach we are defending the democratic process itself." In concluding paragraph the Council states:

The National Council for the Social Studies has faith that when young people have freedom to learn from competent teachers who are free to teach, they will, as a group, make decisions that support the values associated with our democratic republic. They will be able to define problems, gather evidence in relationship to these problems, consider what is best,

---

<sup>19</sup>Kirk, op. cit., 4.

<sup>20</sup>Robert L. Ebel, ed., Encyclopedia of Educational Research (London: Collier-Macmillan, Ltd., 1969), 1.

and develop means appropriate to our democratic society for dealing with these problems....<sup>21</sup>

In 1967 the National Council for the Social Studies repeated its claim: "A diversity of points of view is essential to education in a democracy."<sup>22</sup>

And again in 1970 the National Council for the Social Studies reasserted its position.<sup>23</sup> Finally in 1971 the National Council for the Social Studies declared:

"Social participation in a democracy calls for individual behavior guided by the values of human dignity and rationality and directed toward the resolution of problems confronting society... A commitment to democratic participation suggests that the school abandon futile efforts to insulate pupils from social reality and, instead, find ways to involve them."<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Freedom to Learn and Freedom to Teach," op. cit., 219.

<sup>22</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Academic Freedom: A Policy Statement," loc. cit.

<sup>23</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher," op. cit., 489.

<sup>24</sup>Manson, op. cit., 14.

In studying the problem of freedom and authority, John B. Wolf centered his attention upon the following paradox: "Man can seem to be free in any society, no matter how authoritarian, as long as he accepts the postulates of the society, but man can only be free in a society that is willing to allow its basic postulates to be questioned."<sup>25</sup>

Long ago John Stuart Mill established what would be one of the fundamental principles of a free society:

If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind. Were an opinion a personal obsession of no value except to the owner; if to be obstructed in the enjoyment of it were simply a private injury, it would make some difference whether the injury was inflicted only on a few persons or on many. But the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race, posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is

---

<sup>25</sup>John B. Wolf, "Man's Struggle for Freedom Against Authority," Social Science and Freedom, University of Minnesota, 1955, 1.



almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error.<sup>26</sup>

In 1919 the American Federation of Labor's Committee on Education reported:

In democracy the primary requirement is a citizenship educated to straightforward, logical thinking, based on facts established by careful(ly) sifted evidence. The schools cannot develop this essential mental fibre if the pupils are carefully shielded from knowledge of the topics that men and women think about. Secondary only to a citizen's ability to do his own thinking, is his ability to make his influence felt in his group and community by effectively presenting his views to his fellows, and meeting opposition in a spirit of tolerance. This power of effective self-expression and the habits of tolerance, and of intellectual fairness toward opponents, cannot be formed without the discussion of topics that give opportunity for their exercise. Therefore, in order to enable the schools to perform one of their chief functions, preparation for active citizenship, the pupils should be encouraged to discuss under intelligent supervision current events and the problems of citizenship.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Beale, op. cit., 759.

<sup>27</sup>American Federation of Labor, Proceedings, 39, 1919, 431-432. Cited by Ibid., 755.

The Committee on Freedom of Inquiry of the Philosophy of Education Society correlated academic freedom with a free society:

A vigorous democracy continuously builds upon the faith that in matters of public policy (the people can decide what is best for them as a result of open discussion.) A democratic people puts its trust in procedures that provide a hearing for contending beliefs and the weighing of differing ideas. (Anything which prevents or restricts the process of public inquiry and the free communication of ideas interferes with the process by which the people decide what is good in every aspect of their common life.) In this manner, they seek to improve the institutions which serve them.

We have a distinguished tradition which affirms the right to engage in free and open inquiry into problems of public concern. Our Founding Fathers, knowing the free exchange of ideas to be indispensable to the progress of a free people, provided that "Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of Speech." Throughout our history we have attained, even in perilous times, a vital and abiding faith in the free expression and examination of ideas. Jefferson affirmed clearly this deeply held value. "If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve the Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." This tradition has been the keystone of this country's greatness.

When ideas are not freely exchanged and judged on their merits, decisions and judgments are controlled by the arbitrary authorities of the moment. Then, to hold a belief at variance with the views of those who hold arbitrary power is to risk suppression, perhaps by an official police power. Tyranny,

rooted in the effort to control the thoughts of men, may gradually come upon us if in timidity or thoughtlessness we fail to practice our tradition of speaking, hearing, thinking and choosing.

Mature minds cannot be developed where ideas deemed dangerous are kept out of our common life. We must provide, therefore, those conditions which make the full range of alternatives freely available for public inspection. To the degree that the conditions of open inquiry and communication are established we need have no fear but that our citizens will choose policies that advance the common good. Failure to accept this responsibility is to deny the very basis of self-government and thereby to surrender to tyranny.

Consequently, the freedom to inquire is a public necessity. Our society will be renewed not by those who know no other way to live but only by those who, knowing others, prefer the democratic way. Thus, the rights to inquire, to hear, to speak, are not rights we hold privately, but rights we share in common through our citizenship.

It thus becomes the duty of thoughtful citizens to protest the suppression of freedom of thought, inquiry, and communication wherever it may occur. In each instance, where the rights to hear and study and explore ideas are infringed, there is a present danger to our way of life and to the freedom of each of us. These rights should be exercised, to be sure, in a thoughtful manner, with full regard for the obligations of personal sincerity and integrity and a commitment to the ways of a free society. Yet responsible inquiry and expression are best safeguarded and nourished when intellectual freedom is held so dear that we protect the right of individuals to express even the most unwelcome ideas.

In the light of these considerations we affirm that the indispensable condition for the preservation and enrichment of our democratic heritage is the full and free examination of ideas. A living danger to a free society exists whenever a particular interested group appropriates for itself the right to censure ideas, to determine what others may hear. This course, though pursued in the name of democracy, can lead only to the subversion of our way of life. It is the obligation of a democratic community to provide the maximum opportunity for the full, free, and responsible exchange of ideas on matters of public concern.<sup>28</sup>

Thus a defense of academic freedom is synonymous with a defense of democracy. As Hunt and Metcalf point out, teachers who promote reflection in the closed areas are acting in "the spirit of America's most democratic traditions."<sup>29</sup>

It is not knowledge itself but the free search for and free dissemination of knowledge which differentiates the closed society from the open society. If the quest for knowledge is controlled, then the whole society is imprisoned. "Where its freedom is suppressed, the loss of integrity it entails undermines all other human values;

---

<sup>28</sup>Hunt and Metcalf (1955), op. cit., 432-3.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 432.

the whole society descends to a lower level."<sup>30</sup>

### Academic Freedom: The Opposition

Citizenship education is one of the chief concerns of those who press for academic freedom. It seems that everyone is for "good citizenship," but the key question is what is meant by good citizenship. Should the rule of education be to produce those whose central concern is the maintenance of the status quo or shall it produce an individual who has critical thinking skills and who is prepared to evaluate an ever-changing world?

Those who attack academic freedom do not value democracy. De Tocqueville observed, "there is no country in which there is so little independence of mind and freedom of discussion as in America." With the obvious exceptions of the dictatorial states, one wonders if this observation is not still true?

Americans value "democracy;" however, for most, this concept consists in two misconceptions: the common men

---

<sup>30</sup>Robert M. MacIver, Academic Freedom in Our Time (New York: Gordian Press, 1967), 262.

egalitarianism and majority rule. In reality, the distinctive feature of democracy in the United States is minority rights. It was not the Constitution by the Bill of Rights which created a democracy.

People who attack academic freedom have perhaps supplanted this value with another--prejudice, special interests, profit motive, power motive.... Those motivated by prejudice are probably assured that they have found the truth and are merely opposing all heresies.

W. T. Laprade offered this observation in 1950:

"I am often amazed at the lack of faith which Americans seem to have in the solidity and vitality of democratic institutions or of the values of free discussion and controversy. In many an American's mind there is an unacknowledged mental reservation that only that speech should be free which agrees with our point of view."<sup>31</sup>

Emerson, writing over 100 years ago, attempted to explain the reasons behind the American "lack of faith."

Because our education is defective, because we are superficial and ill-read, we are forced to

---

<sup>31</sup>W. T. Laprade, "Academic Freedom and Tenure," Report of Committee T for 1950, Bulletin of the AAUP, 37, (Spring 1951), 79. Cited by Ibid., 21.

make the most of that position, of ignorance. Hence America is a vast know-nothing party, and we disparage books, and cry up intuition. With a few clever men we have made a reputable thing of that, and denouncing libraries and severe culture, and magnifying the mother-wit swagger of bright boys from the country colleges, we have even come so far as to deceive everybody, except ourselves, into an admiration of unlearning and inspiration, forsooth.<sup>32</sup>

In his study, Beale was to share the doubts raised by Emerson. Beale concluded that the average American is conservative; doubts trouble him. He would rather not be bothered by thinking. "He is intellectually lazy, and questioning the notions he lives by forces him to think." The simplest solution is to suppress those who would engage doubt rather than silence the doubts once raised.<sup>33</sup>

In examining the thirty years between 1930 and 1960, Paul Violas reviewed over twelve hundred articles dealing with the various aspects of academic freedom. He concluded

---

<sup>32</sup>Beale, op. cit., 652.

<sup>33</sup>Beale, op. cit., 139.

that the idea opposition of academic freedom for the public school teacher bears a direct correlation to the fears of American society.<sup>34</sup>

In presenting a case against academic freedom, Edwin Schneider, assistant superintendent of Portland Public Schools in Oregon, writes that the origin of academic freedom was the university. It is a frontier of academic freedom to research, to discover new knowledge.<sup>35</sup> Schneider argued that there is little in the body of literature in education which holds that the public school bears any relationship to the discovery of scholarly research. In cited legal opinion Schneider quoted Justice Hugo Black:

The truth is that a teacher...of high school pupils no more carries into a school with him the complete right to freedom of speech and religion into a Catholic church or Jewish synagogue.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Paul Violas, "Fear and Constraints of Public School Teachers, 1930-1960," Educational Leadership 21 (Winter, 1971), 80.

<sup>35</sup>E. Schneider, "Academic Freedom in the Public Schools" National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin, 55 (February, 1971), 87.

<sup>36</sup>"Developments in the Law: Academic Freedom," Harvard Law Review, 81 (March, 1968), 1052.



This was followed by an opinion of George Baron:

...the teacher's freedom in secondary schools does not derive from the same source as that of the teacher in the university...It is drawn not from his right as a scholar to demonstrate to others of potentially equal intellectual stature truths pleasant or unpleasant, but from the responsibility nested in him by society...for the education of its young.... The teacher is more concerned with knowledge and judgments that are commonly current and have already been submitted to test...and for children and young people whose judgment is in varying degrees immature.<sup>37</sup>

One of the standard reasons for opposition to freedom is the argument that teachers will misuse academic freedom.

J. J. Stevenson of New York University maintains:

Independent thinking does not mean advance or originality in thought; it may be only erratic thinking. Opposition to prevailing opinion is no proof that the man is a "reformer"; his sincerity in independent thinking has nothing to do with the matter. He may be convinced that marriage is merely a survival of property rights; that a trade unionist, punished for dynamiting houses and imperilling lives, is a martyr in behalf of human rights; that ownership of land is positive proof of crime in the past or present; that the whole organization of society is based on injustice by the few; that the only hope for this world is overthrow of

---

<sup>37</sup>George Baron, "A British View of Brimstone," Teachers College Record (May, 1964), 668. Cited by Schneider, op. cit., 89.

all conditions now regarded as normal; but this sincerity gives him no right to demand that the college retain him and pay a salary that he may conduct a propaganda, at its expense, inside or outside of the classroom.<sup>38</sup>

#### Administrative and Board Attitudes

In 1928 John Dewey wrote, "There is, I am confident, much more autocracy on the part of superintendents and principals in public schools than by presidents and deans in colleges. Our lower schools are ridden by 'administrators': they are administration mad. An arms-lengths efficiency, conducted by typewriters from central offices, reaches into the classroom where all the educational work is done, and produces there the inefficiency of unresponsibility and routine..."<sup>39</sup>

In 1934 Superintendent Campbell of New York City stated that "there is no room in the public schools for any teacher or supervisor who does not live allegiance to the

---

<sup>38</sup>Beale, op. cit., 746.

<sup>39</sup>John Dewey, "Bankruptcy of Modern Education," School and Society, 27 (January 7, 1928), 23. Cited by Ibid., 373.

fundamental principle of the Constitution...." He continued, there is no room for any one who teaches "immature children subversive doctrines." Campbell further stated that the teacher's duty was to teach the students "the right attitudes toward American history and American traditions."<sup>40</sup>

Beale concluded that administrators would concern themselves with academic freedom only with great reluctance, if at all. "They are not interested in freedom." One characteristic of the successful administrator is skill in avoiding trouble. Beale found that many administrators chose to avoid the issue of academic freedom: "One learns not to place too much credence in the statements of administrators."<sup>41</sup>

Beale classified Board of Education members into three distinct groups: large-city politico, conservative businessman, good citizen. The large-city politico is interested in personal gain or power. Beale states that "the injury done

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., 110.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., xii.

American education and the money stolen and wasted through politics in school boards is incalculable." The conservative businessman type might be a businessman, banker, doctor, lawyer. Although this group represents a small proportion of the population, its members control school boards. The good citizen is the ordinary individual who means well but who had little knowledge of the educative processes. Beale's views are supported by G.S. Counts, who in his analysis of school boards found an absence of experts in education.

#### The Censors

In a study conducted at Harvard in 1961-62, Jack Nelson and Gene Roberts investigated the activities of pressure groups which attempt to influence the selection of curriculum materials. They found that these would-be censors all believe that their views are the only correct ones, and that the child will be subverted if he is exposed to an alternative philosophy.

One year the censor will be the businessman in fashionable Homburg and delicately tailored suit, demanding that children be taught the evils of municipal systems of power distribution. The next, trade unionist in shirt sleeves will be seeking to write the lanor viewpoint into

the texts. The censor may be the frail grandmother who fingers her cameo brooch as she tells the local school board that every book should warn the child of the perils of strong drink. Again, the assailant may be a stern fundamentalist who frets that evolutionist teaching will damn his child to Hell; or it may be the racist who finds something menacing in talk of brotherhood and equality of races.<sup>42</sup>

Too often society has yielded to the wishes of these groups.

A fundamental reason for the existence of individual or group "ax-grinders" is a lack of civic education commensurate with civic rights and powers. Since the country's founding there have been strong anti-intellectualist tendencies. There have been know-nothing and know-everything tendencies which have often exhibited evangelistic zeal.

Teachers too often have had to assume the posture of hired men whose job is to teach "whatever and how sooner they are bidden to teach by their comparatively uneducated employers."<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Jack Nelson and Gene Roberts, Jr., The Censors and the Schools (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1963), 24.

<sup>43</sup>MacIver, op. cit., 31.

Many pressure groups with totalitarian values will not take direct issue with the process of thinking itself, but instead advocate a return to the three R's or else accuse the schools of subversion. Adlai Stevenson identified this old trick and commented, "to strike freedom of the mind with the fist of patriotism is an old and ugly subtlety."<sup>44</sup>

Appeal to emotion can only succeed when the nature of thinking is misunderstood. Anyone familiar with the concepts associated with thinking can never believe that it encourages subversion. Neither will they believe that a reflective curriculum neglects the three R's.

In the past, critics of American education came largely from the extreme right wing. One example of right wing demagoguery is that of Mr. Allen A. Zoll. Zoll insisted that 90 per cent of texts and teaching are in large part subversive to American principles of freedom and individual liberty.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 21.

<sup>45</sup>Allen A. Zoll, "They Want Your Child," pamphlet of the National Council for American Education. Cited by MacIver, op. cit., 131.

Another example is the National Education Program of Dr. George Benson. Benson usually delivers a tirade not unlike the following:

The stakes are very high. If we fail it means a Communist World, a Godless World--the Dark Ages all over again.... If we build sterling Christian character we can have higher morality, greater moral strength.... If we can immunize our people to Communist infiltration and propoganda, then production will go up 4 percent or more a year....<sup>46</sup>

Or a John Stormer might launch an attack against progressive education:

Because of local control over schools, alert parents, informed school board members, and patriotic school administrators and teachers in many areas have been able to unite to do an outstanding job.

For this reason, the "progressivist" thinkers are actively advocating a massive program of federal aid to education which would ultimately remove control of the schools from the local level and transfer it to Washington. The appointment of one "progressivist" thinker as head of the Office of Education would insure that the amoral, socialistic theories of Dewey, Counts, and Rugg could be permeated into those schoolhouses and textbooks which

---

<sup>46</sup>Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, Danger on the Right. (New York: Random House, 1964), 87.

have thus far been immune."<sup>47</sup>

Beale classified the censor of the right into the following groups:

1. Ancestor-worshippers
2. Para-military organizations
3. Patriotic organizations

He then listed those organizations which were functional in 1934. Beale wrote that these organizations had several characteristics in common:<sup>48</sup>

1. They favor supernationalism.
2. They support huge armies and navies.
3. They hold reactionary economic, social, and political views.
4. They are prone to patriotic oratory.
5. They hate pacifists (whom they regard as traitors).
6. They violently oppose anyone who disagrees with them.
7. They attack an opponent's ideas by denouncing his motives, morals, and loyalty.
8. They are extremely self-righteous.
9. Many are ignorant of history.
10. They deny freedom to opponents.
11. They engage in repression in the name of ancestors.
12. They have never taken time to study the writings of such men as Lincoln, Jefferson, Madison, Paine, Franklin, Adams, and Washington.

---

<sup>47</sup>John Stormer, None Dare Call It Treason. (Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964), 122.

<sup>48</sup>Beale, op. cit., 524-525.



While several of the organizations which appeared on the Beale list are now defunct, 1972 versions still subscribe to the twelve tenets which Beale listed in 1934. Mary Anne Raywid has compiled a modern list of cities who have indicated the schools. The following table summarizes her research:

Table 2-1<sup>49</sup>

## Education Critics - Organizations

American Coalition of Patriotic Societies	Defenders of the American Constitution
American Council of Christian Laymen	Defenders of State Sovereignty
American Economic Foundation	Facts in Education
American Education Association	Fairfax Citizens Council
American Viewpoint, Inc.	Fifty Million Americans
American Education League	Friends of Minnesota
Anti-Communist League of America	Friends of the Public Schools of America
Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce	Institute of American Citizenship

(continued on next page)

---

<sup>49</sup>Raywid, op. cit., 10-21. For a more detailed analysis of these groups see Raywid's charts.

Table 2-1 (Continued)

Assoc. of Citizen's Councils of Mississippi	Iowa School Organization
Assoc. for Rural Education	Keep America Committee
Beverly Hills Freedom Club	Liberty Lobby
California Anti-Communist League	Michigan Coalition of Constitutionalists
California's League of Christian Parents	National Information Service
Christian Nationalist Crusade	National Sojourners, Inc.
Christian Party	Ohio Coalition of Patriotic Societies
Citizens for Better Education	Organization to Repeal Federal Income Taxes, Inc.
Colorado School Protective Assoc.	Patriotic Research Bureau
Committee for Home Rule in Vermont	1789 Club
Constitution Clubs of Illinois	Tacoma Study Club
Constitution Party of California	U. S. Chamber of Commerce
Constitution Party of Indiana	We, The People!
Constitution Party of Virginia	Wisconsin School Assoc.
Council for Basic Education	World Union of Free Enterprise
Defenders of American Education	National Socialists

In addition to the far right wing, many conservative businessmen in the past believe that they are safeguarding the schools against "dangerous ideas."

Another pressure group which has been active in censorship is the American Legion, through their National Americanism Commission. One of its most famous involvements came in 1938 when the Legion became committed to removing the Harold O. Rugg Social Science Series of textbooks from classroom use in the public schools.<sup>50</sup> In early January, 1941, R. Worth Shumaker issued a pamphlet entitled Rugg Philosophy Analyzed. Several other censorship activities ensued.

A general example of Legion philosophy is exhibited in the 1933 speech of Harlan Wood, department commander of the American Legion in Washington, D. C.:

I am sure I speak the minds of all Legionnaires in this city when I say that the public school buildings, maintained as they are at public expense as instrumentalities of the Government, should not be used as forums for the expression

---

<sup>50</sup>Orville E. Jones, "Activity of American Legions in Textbook Analysis of Criticism," Doctor's Thesis (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1957). 184 pp. Abstract, Dissertation Abstracts, 17 (November 12, 1957), 2908.

of ideas and the spread of propaganda by persons whose views are well known to be opposed to the generally accepted principles of American Government and American political and economic ideals and whose views on controversial international questions emanate from an un-American, if not wholly anti-American, mind. The public school houses of the country should be maintained for the dissemination of American principles and American doctrines. They should not be subjected to even occasional use for the opposite purpose either during school hours or otherwise.<sup>51</sup>

Today, the Legion has discontinued its textbooks analysis and criticism; the organization is still devoted to citizenship training for the youth of the nation.

An example of current American Legion thinking on academic freedom might be cited from a speech of Robert E. L. Eaton, National Vice commander of the American Legion delivered before the Virginia Department Convention of the American Legion, July 17, 1971.

Academia seems to feel that it has a mission, based on some sort of inner arrogance, to change everything around us towards some sort of Utopia. Educators feel that because of their education they know what is best for us....<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Beale, op. cit., 102.

<sup>52</sup>R.E.L. Eaton, "Promotion of Chaos," Vital Speeches, 37 (September 1, 1971), 688.

Eaton then argued that there were two weaknesses in the educational system: academic freedom and tenure. He closed by stating that he was opposed to neither provided that they are "accompanied by a sense of responsibility."

Authors such as Beale, Commager, Epstein, Nelson and Roberts, and Raywid have written books documenting the censors as well as their tactics. Some censors have resorted to the rather simple-minded tactics of counting lines; others invoke the name of God and/or country; but most still exhibit the characteristics listed by Beale.

Educators who have taken the time to study these would-be censors of the right wing can usually deal with their tactics. However, more recently there have been censorship attempts from other areas, such as various groups representing racial, religious, or sexual interest. Ron Goldwyn commented, "I used to think of book burners as right wing nuts who saw hints of communism, socialism, integration and all those other heretical notions in every book. "Now pressure is coming from the left. Perhaps some curriculum materials need to be re-evaluated, but

tossing books in the ash can smacks of the Russians with their loose-leaf encyclopedias."<sup>53</sup>

The above account has attempted to reveal some examples of censorship in practice in America. As Beale points out, it is not necessary for these pressures to operate directly upon the teacher. If the principal, superintendent or Board is controlled, education might also be controlled.

"Until 'patriotic' organizations, radical, religious, political, and reformist pressure groups, the press, political bosses, business, radio and labor can be controlled and their hold on the schools broken, society can never have free teachers."<sup>54</sup>

### Academic Freedom: The Classroom

#### Teachers

In this section some attitudes of teachers toward academic freedom will be examined, some cases involving academic freedom will be reviewed, and an attempt will be made to arrive at some generalizations. No intention

---

<sup>53</sup>Ron Goldwyn, "Sambo on the Back Burner," Dayton Journal Herald (December 15, 1971), 49. See also Nelson, op. cit., 166-177.

<sup>54</sup>Beale, op. cit., 580.

is made to examine all or even a large portion of abusive situations which teachers have been involved. Anyone who has taken the time to review a number of these cases would develop a strong argument in defense of academic freedom. One of the best sources of these kinds of cases is the files of the National Educational Association's Dushane Fund.

It was in the 1920's that a North Carolina School was able to design and implement the following contract:<sup>55</sup>

I promise to take a vital interest in all phases of Sunday-school work, donating of my time, service, and money without stint for the uplift and benefit of the community. I promise to abstain from all dancing, immodest dressing, and other conduct unbecoming a teacher and a lady. I promise not to go out with any young men except in so far as it may be necessary to stimulate Sunday-school work. I promise not to fall in love, to become engaged or secretly married. I promise to remain in the dormitory or on the school grounds when not actively engaged in school or church work elsewhere. I promise not to encourage or tolerate the least familiarity on the part of any of my boy pupils. I promise to sleep at least eight hours a night, to eat carefully, and to take every precaution to

---

<sup>55</sup>Thomas Minehan, "The Teacher Goes Job Hunting," Nation 124 (June 1, 1927), 606. Cited by Ibid., 395-6.

keep in the best of health and spirits in order that I may be better able to render efficient service to my pupils. I promise to remember that I owe a duty to the townspeople who are paying me my wages, that I owe respect to the school board and the superintendent that hired me, and that I shall consider myself at all times the willing servant of the school board and the townspeople and that I shall cooperate with them to the limit of my ability in any movement aimed at the betterment of the town, the pupils, or the schools.

The annual salary was \$637.50. Although it is evident that stipulations have changed since the 1920's, some of the cases which follow might well be possible in 1972. In 1931 Principal Charles H. Tipton received a communist visitor and was soon after summarily dismissed without knowing the specific charges or his accusers, and without benefit of a hearing.<sup>56</sup>

In 1935 an appropriations bill for Washington, D. C., public schools provided: "Hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or

---

<sup>56</sup>Montgomery Advertiser, March 7, 1931. Cited by Ibid., 115.



advocating Communism."<sup>57</sup> The U. S. Controller-General then held that school employees could not discuss Communism in school or out. Before each paycheck was delivered, the teachers were required to sign a statement swearing that they had not violated this edict.

Sometimes teachers are not fired but are transferred to other assignments. Beale reports cases in which social studies teachers have been transferred to mathematics, to English, and even to janitorial duties as punishment.

Today's Education cites five recent examples of violations of academic freedom.<sup>58</sup> Mildred Downs, a second grade teacher with 26 years experience was not fired, but her contract was not renewed. She was charged with "teaching her second grade students to protest" and "inciting rebellion" in the classroom. Mrs. Downs did attempt to alert her students to some problems to which they could relate.

---

<sup>57</sup>"The Little Red Rider," School and Society, 43 (April 11, 1936), 513.

<sup>58</sup>"Guarding Your Freedom to Teach," Today's Education, 59 (November, 1970), 20-3.

In a second case Luke Callaway, an English teacher, was dismissed for implementing a curriculum design which he had created during a summer workshop.

Bennie G. Thompson, a bright young black teacher, was to suffer the same consequences as Mrs. Downs. Mr. Thompson claimed, "Any black teacher who doesn't adhere to the status quo gets ousted."

Keith Sterzing was to have his contract terminated following a unit on black studies. Finally, Miss Frances Ahern was suspended and then dismissed because she implemented a curriculum design called American Liberties and Social Changes, which was created during an NDEA summer institute at Columbia University.

The schools accorded none of these teachers due process. In the past such cases were forgotten. Today the NEA DuShane Emergency Fund provides legal expenses for federal court suits when due process under the First and Fourteenth Amendments is violated.

In addition to this aid from NEA, Frances Ahern and Sterzing are currently being supported by the National

Council for the Social Studies. The NCSS argues that a favorable decision in either case would be precedent-setting.<sup>59</sup>

In May, 1971, James A. Rowlands was fired from teaching at Waynesville High School. Waynesville is a small rural community near Dayton, Ohio. Rowlands claims that he was fired because he practiced the kind of teaching acceptable to schools like Centerville and Kettering. Principal Ervin B. Pack's evaluation of Rowlands reads as follows:

Mr. Rowlands has had some complaints from the parents and community about his methods, attitude, technique, and grading procedures. His classes do not reflect the community attitude entirely. His rapport with the students is better than what is indicated by the community. His innovations and methods of instruction are not readily accepted by some of the staff or the community entirely.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup>"Two Cases Supported by National Council for the Social Studies in Court," Social Studies Professional, 11 (November, 1970), 3-4.

<sup>60</sup>Michael Seiler, "New Ideas Put Teachers on Outside Looking In," Journal Herald (May 24, 1971), 21-2.

It is important to keep in mind that neither the Rowlands case nor the preceding five cases were taken from Beale. These occurred only yesterday. And they will continue to occur until procedural safeguards are instituted or until other changes occur.

According to Beale there are five aspects or concerns of academic freedom as it is applicable to the secondary situation:<sup>61</sup>

1. Freedom in ideas and beliefs.
2. Freedom in political participation.
3. Lack of bias in evaluating voiced or ethnic background.
4. Freedom in teacher's personal conduct.
5. Active teacher participation in curriculum design.

Beale holds that the problem of freedom in teaching is essentially the "same problem in all of its diverse manifestations." It matters not whether communism, anti-Catholicism or dancing is at issue. The problem in dealing with academic freedom is not so much in preventing dismissal. Subtle violations of freedom are far more important than dismissals. Beale pointed out that for every one dismissed there were hundreds of cases of subtle violations. The

---

<sup>61</sup>Beale, op. cit., 8-10.

teacher must be protected from repression short of dismissal. The teacher must have full self-expression; he must not be denied intellectual honesty.

It can be argued that not only are pressure groups, the general public, school administrators, and Board members opposed to academic freedom, but so too are teachers.

Beale argued that a majority of teachers do not need freedom because they themselves engage in little critical thinking.

"The average American teacher grew up in a home where there was neither time nor inclination for good reading, where conversation consisted mostly of small talk, where the only music was a cheap phonograph, where ideas, insofar as there were any, were acquired from the movies or from the Literary Digest, the Chicago Tribune, or a small town paper with the Tribune's prejudices but little of its news...."<sup>62</sup>

Beale continues that one of the fundamental reasons for the absence of critical thinking among teachers is the fact that vigorous, capable, intelligent people will not submit to the restraints of teaching. Very often a teacher will teach a unit on the basis of one college course. His instructor was probably a man of adequate

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., 637.

training; however, the teacher isn't able to support the original contentions made by the professor. If attacked by the D.A.R. or some other group, he cannot adequately defend himself. If he had adequate preparation he could summon quite a bit of knowledge to his defense.

A study made by John Lunstrum indicated that many teachers fail to comprehend their role in dealing with controversial issues.<sup>63</sup> Even though such organizations as the American Historical Association, Mississippi Historical Society, the National Council for the Social Studies, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Educational Policies Committee of the NEA have made official position statements, teachers remain confused in regard to treatment of controversial issues.

Beale also found that, by and large, teachers themselves did not cherish academic freedom. In his survey, he was concerned with the major issues of the day; for example, league of nations, income taxes, recognition of Russia, etc. He found that "thousands of teachers are

---

<sup>63</sup>John P. Lunstrum, "Controversial Issues, School Policies and Reflective Thinking," Social Education 26 (April-May, 1962), 189.

utterly uninformed and unaware of anything outside of their textbooks and the minutiae of small town life. Consequently, there was only a limited group of teachers capable of contributing material on freedom or even comprehending what freedom meant."<sup>64</sup>

Beale found many indifferent teachers: Many care nothing about freedom or the study of freedom, they want to go about their jobs and draw their salaries with as little effort as possible. "Many do not know they are not free and will be happier never to discover it." Beale states that the "average teacher is so conventional-minded that he, like the community, honestly feels that the unconventionalities of the teacher whose freedom is denied should really not be tolerated."<sup>65</sup>

Beale found that the "vast majority" of teachers conformed strictly to the norms of their respective communities. All too many have never done enough thinking to work out an explicit social philosophy. Beale argued that teachers were not trained to think, that too many people

---

<sup>64</sup>Beale, op. cit., xi.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., viv.

look upon teaching as an interim activity. Beale asserted that "a majority of teachers do not know what a controversial subject is." The first problem in our search for academic freedom is to create teachers who can think and question themselves; only then will there be generated a desire and need for freedom.

But perhaps that pusillanimity of public school teachers is no worse than that of college professors. Consider John Jay Chapman's description:

The average professor in an American college will look on at an act of injustice done to a brother professor by their college president with the same unconcern as the rabbit who is not attacked watches the ferret pursue his brother up and down through the warren to predestinate and horrible death.<sup>66</sup>

Today it is accepted knowledge that children form their attitudes and values long before entering college. If public schools are successful in creating open minds capable of thought these students will be prepared to reassess new information about a subject under consideration. If teachers are restricted in their freedom, what

---

<sup>66</sup>Kirk, op. cit., 98.



will be the effect upon the newly forming values and attitudes of youth? "Can teachers who are cringing, obedient, 'hired men,' cowards, and hypocrites create citizens of courage and integrity?"<sup>67</sup>

## Teaching

### The Teaching Process

There are many who take issue with public education today. Both professional educator and layman have sought to point out deficiencies and to recommend new courses of action. Literally hundreds of articles have been written in this vein. Represented here are three writers who oppose current educational practices.

Charles Reich argues that a fundamental purpose of the school is to train students to stop thinking and to start obeying. The public school has as its objective that the student should "abandon an aspect of self, thinking, questioning, feeling, loving...."<sup>68</sup> Instead of thinking

---

<sup>67</sup>Beale, op. cit., 775.

<sup>68</sup>Charles Reich, The Greening of America (New York: Random House, 1970), 130.

for oneself, the student learns the value of repeating what he is told. The student must respect authority. The school praises democracy, but trains students away from democracy.

Instead of creating critical minds, the schools reflect the following question: "Did you do the job that you were told to do?" "Do you remember what you were told?" "Have you learned to carry out a job carefully and accurately?" "Can you sit longer and concentrate harder than the others in the class?"<sup>69</sup>

Reich argues that teaching has given way to indoctrination. The purpose of teaching is to help the student think for himself and the purpose of indoctrination is to compel the student to accept the ideas of others. Reich asserts that most social studies courses as they are presently taught present a strongly biased point of view. "No one will admit that America might be a bad country, that text books might be boring and stupid...."<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 133.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid.

Philip Wylie charged almost thirty years ago that the school "is the instrument of stupidity and lies" according to Wylie there is far too much emphasis placed on rote memory of mythology which has little relation to fact. Wylie contended then that children should learn to distinguish between real objects and arbitrary ideas, between real laws and mere opinions, between facts and mere rules or prejudices. Wylie saw the teaching of history as a "shoddy performance.... American history of the school brand is a disgrace to the human cerebrum. It is as if America, an infallible nation, rose through heroism from dire persecution, with a shining and untarnished escutcheon."<sup>71</sup>

If the truth were taught, young people would be much better equipped when confronted by the many problematic areas of our culture. Wylie argued that the schools give no such approach to life; always there is the D.A.R., the Baptist church, the American Legion, and of course Tennessee. These factors combine to reduce education to a "public swindle, an assassination of sanity."<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup>Philip Wylie, Generation of Vipers (New York: Pocket Books, 1942), 81.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., 90.

There has been a tendency in this country to pursue the myth of "my country right or wrong." American history of the public school variety all too often has the ugly brand of thoughtless hero-worship imprinted upon it. Children learn that America has never lost, that noble purposes have always determined her course, that American leaders have been infallible, and that the revolutionists were always justified.

In a recent book Dick Gregory set out to expose a number of these American myths. Gregory wrote that the "continuing myth of American history dignifies the illicit acts of some and condemns the same acts when others do them."<sup>73</sup> Gregory then analyzed the following myths: Puritan Pilgrim, savage, founding fathers, black content, frontier, Mason-Dixon Line, free enterprise, emancipation, bootstrap, good neighbor, American rhetoric, and free elections.

Gregory concludes, "Living by myth or 'petrified opinions'...is dangerous and self-destructive. It is one

---

<sup>73</sup>Richard C. Gregory, No More Lies (New York: Random House, 1964), xiii.

thing to lie. But when a nation lies about itself so long that its people believe the lie, that nation is in deep trouble."<sup>74</sup>

Reich, of course, views the indoctrination of the myths which Gregory describes as inherent in the production of consciousness in people. Reich shares Gregory's evaluation that the perpetuation of these myths is dangerous and self-destructive, but Reich is more interested in what is happening to children as people. He sees students becoming "stupider." He sees "compulsory miseducation." This theme has been nurtured for some time by Silberman, Holt, Goodman, Kozol, Illich, Friedenberg, Kohl, Toffler, and others.

It is central to the thesis of this study that many of the complaints of the above authors are due in large part to a lack of academic freedom.

In a recent article in Social Education it was argued that there is a direct correlation between classroom effectiveness and a classroom climate in which the teacher respects student ideas and accepts student value positions.

---

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 253.

The article contended that openness can be more easily obtained in cases where support for examining value-laden issues is actively granted by administrators.<sup>75</sup>

Metcalf argued that one of the ironies of education is that some teachers believe that the practice of dishonesty is necessary in teaching patriotism. "There is nothing more irresponsible in the field of ideas than the suppression of evidence in the name of attitude or values education."<sup>76</sup> All too often the standard practice of teaching about patriotism has violated the principle of academic freedom.

John C. Weiser and James E. Hayes suggest that a major factor in teacher behavior in relationship to controversial issues is a distorted meaning of democracy and the Bill of Rights. Weiser and Hayes found that many experienced teachers do not value democratic methods. "The preoccupation of many teachers with authority and in particular with authority over children, arouses serious questions. How

---

<sup>75</sup>Jean Bernstein, Marilyn Tannebaum, et. al., "Examining Values in the Upper Grades," Social Education, 35 (December, 1971), 906.

<sup>76</sup>Metcalf, op. cit., x.

many teachers are there who really understand and practice democracy?" The same study found that prospective teachers did not deviate much from inservice teachers. They seemed to conform to a pattern which would permit them to "'fit in' rather than to provide for substantial change."<sup>77</sup>

In addition to these arguments there still remains the omnipresent attitude of fear. Hunt and Metcalf claim that teachers do not feel free to use the method of reflection. It is claimed that teachers would be fired if they engaged their students in thinking.<sup>78</sup>

The American public must support reflection in the closed areas. It may be assumed that Americans have a preference for democracy, but it would be a mistake to assume that Americans understand democracy well enough to defend it. Hunt and Metcalf argue that just as a citizen who goes to the polls intoxicated cannot be described as free, likewise a citizen who is the unreflective victim of cultured conditioning lacks the capacities of freedom.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>John C. Weiser and James E. Hayes, "Democratic Attitudes of Teachers and Prospective Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, 47 (May, 1966), 481.

<sup>78</sup>Hunt and Metcalf (1955), op. cit., 431.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., 435.

One closed area which Hunt and Metcalf speak of is that of politics. Thirty-eight years ago Beale cited some examples of regulation of discussion and actions relevant to politics. In 1925 Congress forbade the discussing of partisan politics in the schools in Washington, D. C. In 1923 the California Supreme Court decided that a teacher's discussion of a particular candidate "warrants dismissal since it introduces into the school questions wholly foreign to its purposes and objects, (and) stirs up strife among the students (and) disrupts the required discipline of a public school."<sup>80</sup>

On June 12, 1934, the Toledo, Ohio Board of Education resolved: "that no employee...shall initiate, aid or present any state legislator or local tax collection agency without first securing the approval of the Board of Education through the Superintendent of Schools."<sup>81</sup>

Twelve years later in 1946, John U. Michaelis was to observe the same behavior among those who restrict teachers.

---

<sup>80</sup>Beale, op. cit., 79.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., 80-1.



Michaelis concluded that the "most acute problems apparently arise in connection with the use of controversial materials and current events...."<sup>82</sup>

In a separate study, dealing with another closed area, Harry E. Hand found that English teachers ranked sex in modern novels as their most serious problem. One-fifth of the teachers in the Hand survey believed that "unfavorable attitudes on the part of the community, school officials, or parents towards using the modern novels" do exist in their particular communities.<sup>83</sup>

Sidney Hook argues, "No matter how controversial a subject may be, the teacher is justified in reaching or stating conclusions provided he has honestly made accessible to students the relevant data and arguments of the conflicting positions."<sup>84</sup> Hook would opt for a "give and take" session on controversial issues rather than an

---

<sup>82</sup>John U. Michaelis, "Current Instructional Problems in Secondary School Social Studies," Social Education, 10 (April, 1946), 309.

<sup>83</sup>Harry E. Hand, "Sex in the Modern Novel: A Teaching Problem," English Journal, 48 (November, 1959), 473.

<sup>84</sup>Sidney Hook, Education for the Modern Man (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), 171.

individualized learning process. But he contends that the rewards of critical thinking tend to diminish as the class exceeds twenty students.<sup>85</sup>

### Communism and Education

One of the most feared subjects in American education has been communism. Even today there is a persistent dread of communists infiltrating local faculties or of their teaching young minds to accept communist dogma.

Nevertheless, numerous school systems have for one reason or another adopted official communism courses. But there appears to be no consistent view as to the proper objectives. In a study conducted in 1964, Roland F. Gray found that many states have statutory regulations requiring the teaching of communism. Some states see communism as a total evil which should be taught as a menace to civilization. Some show concern for objective treatment of the subject, but want to ensure that "correct" conclusions are reached. Very few states intend that a rational, unbiased study occur; none advocate that an active communist be

---

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., 193-4.

utilized as a resource person.

There is a marked tendency to contrast the darkest realities of communism in the Soviet Union with the noblest ideas of American democracy. There is a general concentration on the so-called fallacies and failures of communism. Little or no attention is given to its strengths and its successes.<sup>86</sup>

Gray concludes that the purpose of these communism courses is not to provide an opportunity for reflection, but rather to indoctrinate youth with acceptable anti-communist views.

In addition to the documented attitudes concerning the teaching of communism, other research has indicated that teachers perceive opposition to any teaching of communism. In 1962 the NEA Research Division conducted a nationwide poll on communism. One question was: "Do you feel that there is opposition in your community to teaching about communism?" The teachers response appears in the following table.

---

<sup>86</sup> Roland F. Gray, "Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives," Social Education, 28 (January, 1964), 72.

Table 2-2<sup>87</sup>

Teacher Response to Question One:  
 "Do you feel that there is opposition  
 in your community to teaching about  
 communism?"

	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Total</u>
Yes, much opposition	6.1%	2.4%	4.5%
Yes, some opposition	15.6%	17.6%	16.5%
No, little or no opposition	43.8%	57.7%	50. %
Don't know	34.5%	22.3%	29. %

A further example of some American attitudes on  
 communism and education is contained in the following  
 letter.<sup>88</sup>

I am not a teacher here in California, but the  
 system has been impregnated so long with "Unesco"  
 and you know what it is and has done to any  
 system indoctrinated with it.

I came from Ohio about eight years ago and can  
 say with absolute(ly) (sic) candor that the  
 totalitarian system has had a great helper in  
 the "Progressive System."

The Godlessness, disloyalty, lack of teacher  
 background, poorly educated teachers; teachers  
 who ought not to be teaching as they have no

---

<sup>87</sup>"Teacher Opinion Poll," N.E.A. Journal, 51  
 (October, 1962), 56.

<sup>88</sup>Raywid, op. cit., 6.

interest in their work, only salary; many systems Red infiltrated; money spent on wrong things in school systems; Superintendents not interested in the basic work, some who emphasize frills to the exclusion of basic work; those who favor "soft" curricula and pass pupils on the number of years spent in the grade.

We need to begin at the first grade and on up through to revise the whole system. The parents also should be "reborn" to realize that they too must be interested in a sound educational system. The Parents and Teachers Ass'ns. should be renovated and Red Infiltration drained out of it (sic).

In his concluding chapter MacIver found that the communist was a "rare enough phenomenon in our halls of learning." If he did exist it was only as an extremely small percentage. Perhaps the most apt phrase attending to communism and American education is the "mountains were in labor and brought forth a mouse." This situation is certainly applicable on the secondary level.<sup>89</sup>

James B. Conant offered a similar observation.

"There are no known adherents of the Communist Party on our staff, and I do not believe there are any disguised communists either. But even

---

<sup>89</sup>MacIver, op. cit., 199.

if there were, the damage that would be done to the spirit of the academic community by an investigation aimed at finding a crypto-communist would be far greater than any conceivable harm such a person might do."<sup>90</sup>

In concluding their pamphlet, Combatting Undemocratic Pressures On Schools and Libraries, the A.C.L.U. quoted a report by the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S.:

We concur...that amateur anti-Communists "are about as useful as amateur brain surgeons" and that we have no need for "space-age witch hunters." In the fight against increasing pressures of our Communist foes, frenzy and panic are not reliable or effective weapons.... It is essential that we oppose Communism wisely, calmly, rationally and objectively.

### The Scopes Trial

One of the classic examples of denial of academic freedom of this century occurred in Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925. Shortly before the trial Clarence Darrow observed:

Another generation will look back in amazement when it sees that any one in this generation undertook to stop the growth and the development of the theory of evolution. If the teaching of evolution should be excluded from the public schools

---

<sup>90</sup>James B. Conant. Final Report to Board of Overseers of Harvard College. Cited by Ibid., 158.

then all books treating evolution should be barred from the public libraries, and this would mean the exclusion of practically every book on science written in the last thirty years.... What America needs to know and what it seems to be realizing as revealed in its interest in this case is that the fundamental bedrock of liberty is tolerance and that tolerance means a willingness to let other people do, think, act and live as we think is not right; the antithesis of this is intolerance and means we demand the right to make others live as we think is right, not as they think is right. Nothing exemplifies intolerance more concisely and clearly than the law under which Scopes is to be tried.... After a while,...it is the setting of man against man and creed against creed, until with flying banners and beating drums we are marching backward to the glorious ages of the sixteenth century when bigots lighted fagots to burn the men who dared to bring any intelligence and enlightenment and culture to the human mind.<sup>91</sup>

Bryan, however, was to argue from an entirely different frame of reference:

As an individual, Professor Scopes is perfectly free to think and speak as he likes and the Christians of Tennessee will protect him in the enjoyment of these inalienable rights. But that is not the Tennessee case and has nothing to do with it. Professor Scopes was not arrested for doing anything as an individual. He is arrested for violating a law as a representative of the state and as an employee in a

---

<sup>91</sup>Des Moines Register, May 24, 1925. Cited by Beale, 245.

school. As a representative, he has no right to misrepresent; as an employee he is compelled to act under the direction of his employers and has no right to defy instructions and still claim his salary. The right of free speech cannot be stretched as far as Professor Scopes is trying to stretch it. A man cannot demand a salary for saying what his employers do not want said and he cannot require his employers to furnish an audience to talk to, especially an audience of children or young people, when he wants to say what the parents do not want said. The duty of a parent to protect his children is more sacred than the right of a teacher to speak, especially to teach what parents do not want taught when the speaker demands pay for his teaching and insists on being furnished an audience to talk to.<sup>92</sup>

The fundamental question at issue in the Scopes trial was not whether evolution was a sound hypothesis. The central question is: Is the teacher to indoctrinate or is the teacher to train students in the skills of critical thinking? "Is the duty of the teacher to create attitudes that will preserve the status quo and protect and perpetuate present beliefs? Or is it to develop capacity for life in

---

<sup>92</sup>Press release of Bryan in Chicago, June 2, 1925, Bryan M.S.S., 1925. Cited by Ibid., 256-7.



a changing, growing world that will steadily work toward a better social order?"<sup>93</sup> The Scopes trial really asked the question: Is the teacher a "hired man" committed to mindlessly follow the arbitrary dictates of his employer? Or does the teacher have an obligation to truth, to the larger society? Will the student benefit more from indoctrination of local beliefs or from an intellectual experience which accustoms him to deal with the consistent value judgments offered by life?

#### Controversial Issues and the Student

This section will review several studies dealing with students' perceptions of controversial issues. No attempt will be made to examine as such the newly emerging area dealing with student rights. In order to receive more information in this area the interested reader might consult such works as Student Rights Handbook; The Reasonable Exercise of Authority; The High School Revolutionaries; How Old Will You Be In 1984?; Student Power, Participation and Revolution; Up Against the Law: The Legal Rights of People Under 21; Saturday Review, "Why Students Want Their

---

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., 259.

Constitutional Rights Now"" and Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students In Colleges and Universities.

Academic freedom involves the right of the student to think for himself, to question, to discuss and to differ; it implies much more than the student simply accepting and reproducing the arguments and conclusions of the instructor.

Some studies question whether students really do think for themselves. In a study conducted in 1952 Richard E. Gross found that while a majority of students favored teachers opinions about controversial issues, many students qualified their "yes" in important ways. Gross concluded that a majority of students as the upper-senior-high school levels had already formed attitudes and opinions on the majority of controversial issues of the day.<sup>94</sup>

Ronald B. Edgerton in a study dealing with the junior high level found that students preferred teachers who would engage controversial issues, but that they preferred that teachers wait until asked before stating their opinions.

---

<sup>94</sup>Richard E. Gross, "Pupil Views on Teaching Opinions in Controversial Areas," School and Society, 76 (June, 1952), 296-7.

Edgerton found that the students appeared to be "closely divided in regard to teacher's opinion; parroting parents; and the necessity for seeing all sides."<sup>95</sup>

In his Ph.D. dissertation at Purdue, Roy E. Horton, Jr. attempted to study the attitudes of youth towards freedom as defined by the Bill of Rights. About 20 per cent of the students in the Horton study rejected basic freedoms. There was a positive relationship between rejection of freedom and acceptance of fascism. Yet, this some 20 per cent view themselves as the "best" Americans and most loyal supporters of American democracy.

Horton found that high school government courses did not contribute to positive acceptance of the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights; those who have had a course in civics tend to be less in agreement with the Bill of Rights. Horton hypothesized that civics courses concentrate more upon the mechanics of government than the values of democracy. "In considering the teaching of 'good

---

<sup>95</sup>Ronald B. Edgerton, "Do Pupils Want Teaching of Controversial Issues?" Clearing House, 18 (May, 1944), 334.

citizenship' one may well question the value of instructional objectives that consist of certain dates, names, etc. to be committed to rote memory."

Horton found that senior's beliefs were more crystallized than freshman's; the freshman was less certain of his attitudes in all areas measured. Thus the future of democracy may well depend upon the extent to which educators perceive the needs of youth and respond to them.<sup>96</sup>

In discussing education Sidney Hook writes:

The test of a student's education is whether he has acquired a basic literacy in certain skills and knowledge, and a sensitivity to the values of a humane and civilized culture; whether he can meet the problems he has been educated to meet; whether it enables him to find a center or basis around which to organize in a significant way his experiences.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup>Roy E. Horton, Jr., "American Freedom and the Values of Youth," in Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools, ed. by H. H. Remmers (Northwestern University Press, 1963), 57-58.

<sup>97</sup>Hook, Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy, op. cit. xvii.

The Harvard Social Studies Project was predicated on the basis of designing a conceptual model for handling important issues facing society. Among other findings Oliver and Shaver concluded that students can confront important political issues in a meaningful way.<sup>98</sup>

In summary, the studies tend to indicate a student preference for discussing controversial issues; that senior high students are more "set in their ways" than younger students; that traditional concepts of rote memorization and a mechanical coverage of content do little to influence students towards a positive acceptance of democracy; and finally, that newer curriculum designs and materials might well serve to produce an open situation.

#### Academic Freedom: Towards Resolution

As of this writing the concept of academic freedom is still nebulous. However, there are several groups which are actively engaged in crystallizing this concept.

---

<sup>98</sup>James P. Shaver and Donald W. Oliver, "Teaching Students to Analyse Public Controversy: A Curriculum Project Report." Social Education, 28 (March, 1964), 194.

Several professional organizations have issued policy statements; the American Civil Liberties Union has been in the vanguard of those proposing clarification; finally, some legal precedents have been established.

#### The National Council for the Social Studies

The National Council for the Social Studies has issued three very important policy statements on academic freedom. Reference has been made in other parts of this paper to the content of these statements. In addition, it was announced in April, 1971, that a separate N.C.S.S. Defense Fund was being established. The N.C.S.S. contends that a teacher must be free to "seek truth with his students" in dealing with problematic areas of our culture. Because there is a growing body of legal precedent defining and guaranteeing academic freedom, and because there is suspicion and fear due to changing times, changing content, changing materials, and changing methods, the N.C.S.S. has sought to "put teeth" into its policy statements.

The N.C.S.S. Legal Defense Fund seeks to act as a "first line of defense," by providing immediate protection

for teachers. "The thinking behind this is that many unjust actions might be prevented if school administrators and school boards had to deal immediately with legal counsel."<sup>99</sup>

The intent of the new fund is not to replace other sources but rather to supplement such sources as the Du Shane Fund or the American Civil Liberties Union. In order that monies might be provided for the new Legal Defense Fund, the N.C.S.S. House of Delegates recommended that the Board of Directors assess each N.C.S.S. member \$2.00.

In an open letter to the N.C.S.S. membership President Shirley H. Engle indicated that the Council was currently involved in court action in defense of Keith Sterzing and Frances Ahern.

President Engle stated:

The number of instances involving the firing of teachers because they are exercising academic freedom seems to be on the rise in the United States. The objective discussion of controversial issues is becoming more hazardous if

---

<sup>99</sup>Edward C. Martin, "The N.C.S.S. Legal Defense Fund," Social Education, 35 (April, 1971), 375.

not impossible in many schools. We, the members of the Council, teachers ourselves, cannot afford to ignore unjust and illegal firing for what is no more than good teaching as recognized by the standards of the profession.<sup>100</sup>

It was in response to President Engle's letter that the N.C.S.S. Legal Defense Fund was established. During a personal interview with Merrill F. Hartshorn and Edward C. Martin in Washington, D. C., April 5, 1971, this author was able to secure a copy of the Application for Financial Assistance.

Among other information the new form requests information concerning teacher grievance, legal proceedings, criminal prosecution, and legal hearing. The N.C.S.S. is cognizant that this is a small step, but nevertheless it is a step. The N.C.S.S. concludes that teachers' rights will be protected by the institution of a body of legal precedents. However, both Mr. Hartshorn and Mr. Martin stressed that while the N.C.S.S. would act in cases of denial of teacher rights, the N.C.S.S. primary concern is to have each local school district adopt its own

---

<sup>100</sup>Leroy Peterson, "Legal Status of Teacher Personnel," Review of Educational Research, 38 (June, 1967), 300.



statement of academic freedom. These statements would greatly serve to clarify the concept of academic freedom.

### Some Legal Precedents

Ernest van den Haag writing in 1962 stated that secondary teachers as opposed to professors do not have academic freedom. Van den Haag's contention was that academic freedom is applicable only to research scholars. The function of teachers was to transmit the cultural heritage.<sup>101</sup> Van den Haag's thesis enjoyed considerable support in past years; however, there is a growing tendency today to refute (via the court) such a thesis.

Leroy Peterson reported that academic freedom was applicable to a wider range of educational activities than ever before. Peterson's research was based upon an examination of statutes and court decisions.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup>Ernest van den Haag, "Academic Freedom in the United States," Law and Contemporary Problems, 28 (Summer, 1963) 516.

<sup>102</sup>Leroy Peterson, "Legal Status of Teacher Personnel," Review of Educational Research, 38 (June, 1967), 300.

The Warren Court declared five cases of loyalty oaths for teachers unconstitutional; it granted free speech protection to a teacher and pupil in two separate cases. The Court declared that in matters of associational freedom the dismissal of teachers must follow prescribed rules, and further, the teacher has a right to a hearing in which he can defend his action. The court, rather than establishing a clear cut precedent on matters of academic freedom, attempted to guarantee both the interest of the state and the freedom of the individual teacher by deciding each case as it arises.<sup>103</sup>

The American Civil Liberties Union declared that "the principles of academic freedom and civil liberties of teachers and students in colleges and universities are applicable to secondary schools."<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup>H. C. Hudgins, "What the Warren Court Decided," Educational Digest, 36 (November, 1970), 44-7.

<sup>104</sup>Ernestine Friedl, August Gold, et. al., Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1969), 4.

The A.C.L.U. is cognizant of two major differences between the university and the secondary school: research function and maturation level of students. The A.C.L.U. contends that too often School Boards and Administrators have made too much of these two reasons. Too often order has been stressed without regard for freedom. The A.C.L.U. argues that if young Americans are to value civil liberties they need to live in a community where such liberties are exhibited rather than in a climate of hostile repression. Of course accepted contemporary opinions do have a place in the classroom, but it would violate the American heritage if these were made exclusive. "No step should be neglected which will enable students to hear and to learn to evaluate strange and unpopular ideas."<sup>105</sup>

One perplexing question of academic freedom is that of loyalty oaths and loyalty non-oath law. Joseph E. Bryson in a Ph.D. dissertation examined court action relevant to loyalty oath and loyalty non-oath requirements. Bryson found that loyalty oath laws were constitutional and were a reasonable part of qualifications for employment. He

---

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., 5.

also found that no loyalty oath or loyalty non-oath law is unconstitutional for any of the following reasons:<sup>106</sup>

1. Violation of freedom of speech.
2. Infringement upon freedom of thought and belief.
3. Infringement upon freedom of press and assembly.
4. Classification as vague and indefinite.

However, the Courts have taken action since Bryson's writings. In the case of Keyishian V. the Board of Regents of New York the U. S. Supreme Court found that negative loyalty oaths which were vague were unconstitutional.<sup>107</sup> Thus the court held that any loyalty oath which precludes membership without proof of a "specific intent to further the illegal aims of the organization" cannot be imposed as a condition of employment.<sup>108</sup> Other Court rulings which provided additional freedoms for teachers in the area of loyalty oaths were Shelton V. Tucker, Stewart V. Washington,

---

<sup>106</sup>Joseph E. Bryson, Legality of Loyalty Oath and Non-Oath Requirements for Public School Teachers, Doctor's Thesis (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1961). Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, 22 (November 11, 1962), 3898-9.

<sup>107</sup>Friedl, op. cit., 6.

<sup>108</sup>Robert H. Charrin, Protecting Teacher Rights (Washington, D.C.: National Education Assoc., 1970), 25.

Cramp V. Board of Public Instruction of Orange Co. Fla.,  
Wieman V. Updegraff, and Whitehall V. Elkins.<sup>109</sup>

Even today the Supreme Court is unwilling to declare all loyalty oaths unconstitutional. The A.C.L.U. is opposed to the imposition of any oaths which go beyond the scope of Article VI of the Constitution. The A.C.L.U. opposes loyalty oaths because:

1. They may have an inhibiting effect on freedom of belief and expression.
2. ...they are probably inefficacious in detecting or curbing disloyal conduct.
3. Experience shows that...lawmakers tend to add on disclaimer provision and punitive sanctions, of clearly unconstitutional character....
4. When certain classes of employers are singled out...the requirement is discriminatory and demeaning.<sup>110</sup>

The N.C.S.S. as well as many other groups tend to see the courts as the important change agents. A historical example is the infamous University of Nevada case involving the persecution of Dr. Richardson by President Stout. In

---

<sup>109</sup>Ibid.

<sup>110</sup>Friedl, op. cit., 6-7.

the final analysis, Dr. Richardson was vindicated by rule of law, not by the A.A.U.P. or colleagues, or professional associations, or public protest, or learned societies.<sup>111</sup>

In the few cases reported by Beale in which the teacher attained any measure of success in thwarting the efforts of a punitive administrator or Board, it was always by rule of law. Beale reports a case involving a dispute between a superintendent and a teacher in Pennsylvania. James J. Stewart was felt to be a fine teacher by students, other teachers, community and Board of Education members. But he refused to back the local superintendent in his bid for re-election and also took issue with some of the policies of the superintendent. Consequently, Superintendent Chapman sought to rid the system of Stewart. The superintendent refused to approve Stewart a permanent teaching certificate. Stewart sought aid from the American Civil Liberties Union and threatened to bring suit. Because of the legal pressure the superintendent was forced to give in on the issue.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup>Kirk, op. cit., 71.

<sup>112</sup>Beale, op. cit., 121-22.

In another case noted by Beale, Alice Wood, a history teacher, was suspended in 1933 because she had discussed the Soviet Union. The teachers' Union took the case to court and had Miss Wood reinstated with pay.<sup>113</sup>

It seems clear, then, that the courts are the final safeguard of teachers freedom. It is beyond the scope of this paper to elaborate on all of the more recent court developments. Much had happened during the past twenty years, and with renewed leadership from the A.C.L.U., N.E.A., and N.C.S.S. on the important question of academic freedom, much more will happen. The interested reader would profit from an examination of the Friedl and Charrin documents referred to in preceding pages.

### A Concluding Statement

#### Freedom with limitations?

In the discussion of academic freedom, the question of limits is bound to arise: college teachers can have a degree of academic freedom but not elementary teachers. Those who state their acceptance of academic freedom almost always add qualifications.

---

<sup>113</sup>Ibid., 129-30.

The important question is, Who is wise enough to differentiate "safe" from "dangerous" ideas? Those who want place limits either do not value academic freedom or do not understand it. Freedom with limits implies bondage--bondage of the teacher to another person. Consequently, the seemingly innocuous statement, "I believe in freedom with limits," is somewhat inane.

Strange it is, that men should admit the validity of arguments for free discussion, but object to their being "pushed to an extreme," not seeing that unless the reasons are good for an extreme case, they are not good for any case. Strange that they should imagine that they are not assuming infallibility, when they acknowledge that there should be free discussion on all subjects which can possibly be doubtful, but think that some particular principle or doctrine should be forbidden to be questioned because it is so certain, that is, because they are certain that it is certain. To call any proposition certain it is so certain, that is, because they are certain that it is certain, to call any proposition certain while there is any one who would deny its certainty if permitted, is to assume that we ourselves, and those who agree with us, are the judges of certainty and judges without hearing the other side.<sup>114</sup>

If the elementary teacher is denied academic freedom, then the teacher has been placed under the arbitrary power

---

<sup>114</sup>John S. Mill, "On Liberty," On Liberty, and Other Essays, 26. Cited by Ibid., 764.



of another. Freedom is by far more important for the elementary student than for the college student. Freedom must not be confused with pedagogy. Attitude formation occurs in early youth. A child who is indoctrinated by unfree teachers runs a large risk of never being free.

Concerning the idea of freedom within reasonable limits, Beale reminds us that "freedom within limits" can be stretched to cover almost any conceivable degree of liberty or it may be a cover-up for the worst sort of restraint and tyranny.

### Positive Action

Community involvement in education is one of the "in things" today. Some schools were doing this as long ago as January, 1933. Superintendent Studebaker of the Des Moines system initiated small neighborhood forums, conducted during the evenings at the local elementary schools. Forum topics dealt with controversial issues of the day. The purpose was to educate the community. Studebaker's ideas were extremely successful.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., 729-32.

However, since many schools for one reason or another do not conduct such forums, it may become necessary to deal with censors. If censors become active a head-on clash should be avoided if possible.

Nelson and Roberts offer a plan of action:

- Be alert for the beginning phases of a textbook investigation.
- Insist that the charges be specific and that they be made in writing.
- Convince the administration and the board of education that, as the teachers who use the books, you are vitally concerned, you are willing to work on the problem and you have a specialized knowledge needed to meet the situation.
- Notify your national professional organizations of the situation arising in your community and keep them informed of its progress.
- Analyze the problem from the standpoint of its pattern, motivation, logic and methods.
- Do everything you possibly can to see to it that the books in question are thoroughly read and studied in their entirety.
- Invite those bringing the charges to visit extensively in your classroom.
- Leave no stone unturned to insure that both sides get a fair hearing.

- Avoid, as you would the plague, the use of namecalling, flag-waving, glittering generalities, card-stacking and other propaganda devices.
- See the situation through. 'Staying power,' as contrasted with 'straw-fire' enthusiasm, is called for.
- Use the incident to take stock of how good a job you are doing in your school.<sup>116</sup>

The A.C.L.U. recommends the following action:

1. Form a citizens committee of five or six community leaders to insure that all sides have a chance to be fairly heard.
2. Request public hearings by the Board of Education.
3. Ascertain that the time and place of these meetings is publicized well in advance and that there is an announced order of business. Further, make sure that minutes are kept in every case and are available for examination.
4. Request that charges be specifically stated in writing with documentation.
5. Guard against overlong meetings when decisions may be taken by small groups in the late hours of the night.
6. Obtain full press coverage.

---

<sup>116</sup>Nelson, op. cit., 198.

7. Seek aid from local colleges and universities, the State Education Association, American Civil Liberties Union, N.C.T.E., N.C.S.S., or A.L.A.
8. Get in touch with the State Board of Education and take appeals to it from the local board when necessary.<sup>117</sup>

Of course, negotiation with the Board of Education prior to controversy is the best safeguard. An example of a negotiable item dealing with academic freedom is a clause in the Board of Education policy in Hancock, Michigan public school. The clause read, "The private and personal life of any teacher is not within the appropriate concern or attention of the board except when it impairs the teacher's effectiveness in the classroom or position."<sup>118</sup>

The negotiable item which would solve many problems is a statement of academic freedom. This author contends that a well-designed statement would benefit all parties. As maintained throughout this paper, teachers who lack

---

<sup>117</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, American Civil Liberties Union, Combatting Undemocratic Pressure on Schools and Libraries, (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1964), 10-11.

<sup>118</sup>"Developments in the Law: Academic Freedom," op. cit., 1123-24.

such a statement will not perceive freedom, and their behavior will correspond to their perceptions. Richard Gross concurs that teachers should seek a statement of policy from their local board of education "rather than, through fear and insecurity, purposely refrain from studying and discussing in class the important problems that beset our society."<sup>119</sup>

James K. Uphoff maintains that while grievance policies are necessary, they do not come to grips with the matter of preventing complaints from developing in the first place.<sup>120</sup>

According to Uphoff, the academic freedom policy should do the following:<sup>121</sup>

1. Spell out Board philosophy.
2. Establish the right and responsibilities of all parties.
3. Indicate the boundaries within which instruction is to take place.
4. Establish, if necessary, the evaluation procedures which are acceptable.
5. Establish a complaint procedure.

---

<sup>119</sup>Gross, How to Handle Controversial Issues, loc.cit.

<sup>120</sup>Uphoff, Teaching Controversial Issues, loc.cit.

<sup>121</sup>Uphoff, "The Academic Freedom Bit: Cart and Horses?", op. cit., 2.

As previously discussed, the N.C.S.S. strongly endorses the concept of local academic freedom policies. Indeed, the 1967 N.C.S.S. statement centered upon model development to handle complaints and criticism. The 1970 N.C.S.S. statement specified that teachers have a right to a written academic freedom policy from the local board of education which:

1. Clearly states the right of students to learn and teachers to teach.
2. Provides guidelines and safeguards for the study of controversial issues.
3. Details procedures for investigating criticism of the study of controversial issues.
4. Insures fair procedures and due process should complaints arise about materials or methods of instruction.<sup>122</sup>

A review of recent cases involving teachers and academic freedom reveals that reaction to objections, complaints, and criticisms have been disorganized and haphazard. Without a clearly defined policy no one teacher, administrator, Board member, or parent has known what was or was not acceptable. Opponents of such a policy envision that a

---

<sup>122</sup>Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies, "Academic Freedom 2nd the Social Studies Teacher," op. cit., 489-90.

specific statement will become in effect a limitation.

This need not be the case. If a document is vague and nebulous it serves no real purpose. A well-written statement of academic freedom can serve teachers, administrators, Board members and parents. A specific, detailed document can provide a great deal more freedom than the present situation.

### Conclusion

The preponderance of thinking about academic freedom has occurred at the university level. An important question is whether freedom is as necessary for the teacher as it is for the scholar in quest of new truth. Perhaps more important is the question concerning the maturity of the children taught; should freedom be dependent upon age? If freedom is to be restricted on the elementary or secondary level, who is to decide when, how and to what degree it shall be curtailed?

Other important questions include the following. Should the public school teacher be subservient to the will of the state? Should the public school teacher give more

attention to being the "servant" of the people? Which public will control the schools? Which group is to decide what attitudes and ideas shall be instilled into children? Proponents of academic freedom are not unaware of abuse; most concede that abuse will occur, but that it is better to tolerate abuse rather than suffer censorship which could result in intellectual enslavement.

Recent American history is replete with the accounts of "would be" and successful censors. Damage occurs whether or not the censor is successful in his efforts. Demoralization can easily occur; the consequences may last for years. A search for subversives may or may not turn up a guilty party, but it is sure to intimidate the independent, the original, the imaginative, and the experimental minded. Both teachers and students are discouraged in their attempts at critical thinking; reading will be discouraged; criticism will disappear. The best minds will not submit to these kangaroo courts; the result will be poor teaching. Students will lack the ability to differentiate between independence of thought and subservience.



Henry Steele Commager writes:

The most powerful argument against the censorship of textbooks and the elimination of "un-American" ideas or anything critical of the "American spirit of private enterprise" is that such censorship will guarantee the elimination of textbooks with any ideas at all.... A society that attempts to put education and science and scholarship in strait jackets will find that in strait jackets there can be no movement, and that the result will be intellectual atrophy.<sup>123</sup>

Perhaps the ultimate solution to the problem of academic freedom lies in fulfilling an age-old goal of education: to teach people how to think. If more children were taught to think, to analyse, to form intelligent judgments of their own, these citizens would then later value freedom and, consequently, academic freedom.

Intelligent, well-prepared, enthusiastic teachers who are imaginative and creative in teaching and who are teaching few enough children that they can respond to them as individuals will not need regulation.

---

<sup>123</sup>Henry Steele Commager, Freedom Loyalty Dissent, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), 91.

In summarizing his book, Beale concluded:

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?<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup>Beale, op. cit., 778.

## Chapter III

### METHODOLOGY

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers.

William O. Douglas

#### Population Parameters

In the designing and administering of any survey, some limitation of population must be defined early. This study deals with the attitudes of educators in reference to academic freedom. The category "educators" in this study will include secondary social studies teachers, secondary school building principals, and Board of Education Presidents.

Although it is true that English teachers, librarians, biology teachers, and others might also reflect concern for academic freedom, in the designing of a survey it is

extremely useful to fix a common focal point. This researcher had decided early to identify primarily with the Academic Freedom Committee of the National Council for the Social Studies. Although the development of the questionnaire was a complex task, the discriminating reader can identify some relationship between this study's questionnaire and the National Council for the Social Studies' statements on academic freedom. Since these logical parameters were devised, it seemed wise to delimit the teacher population to secondary social studies teachers.

The task of choosing a secondary principal population was less complicated. The Ohio Educational Directory's compilation of building principals made this selection simply a matter of drawing from this compilation the necessary number.

It was decided that a survey of Board of Education Presidents might be representative of opinions of the entire board population, since presidents are elected by fellow members. In addition, Board Presidents have usually served more than one term and are, thus, representative of at least a continuing attitude of some of this community.

The State of Ohio has determined that: public education is to be administered according to three divisions: city districts, exempted village districts, and county systems. Consequently, in the determining of population samples, each of the three categories--secondary social studies teachers, building principals, and Board of Education Presidents--can be subdivided into three groups: city, exempted village, and county. This method would then indicate nine groups rather than three.

There were 3,342 secondary social studies teachers in city districts, 1,997 in county systems, and 253 in exempted villages.<sup>1</sup> There are 255 building principals in city districts, 418 in county systems and 50 in exempted villages.<sup>2</sup> There are 166 Board of Education Presidents in city systems, 409 in county systems, and 50 in exempted villages.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Bryon G. Walker, State of Ohio Supervisor for Social Studies, private interview held at The Ohio State Education Department, Columbus, Ohio, October 15, 1971.

<sup>2</sup>Kathleen Jenkins, ed., Education Directory, (Columbus, Ohio: Department of Education, 1970).

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

It had to be decided if a proportional number of population representatives were to be chosen from each of the nine groups or if a given number of representatives would be chosen regardless of size of groups. It was decided that a random sample of 20 per group, of whom a significant percentage returned their questionnaires, was by far preferable to a sample of 2,000 of whom only 1,000 returned the questionnaires.<sup>4</sup> Often within the field of education people are barraged with surveys, and so have become programmed to either filling them out or throwing them away; a surveyor must convince the man whose first thought is to throw a form away to take one half hour of his time and complete the survey. It was necessary, then, to emphasize to the survey population that as one of only twenty respondents the opinion of each was very important.

The population was thus defined at twenty of each of the nine groups, or a total of 180 respondents--sixty secondary social studies teachers, sixty secondary building principals, and sixty Board of Education Presidents. Since

---

<sup>4</sup>Dr. Walley Fotheringham, private interview held at Ohio State University, October 6, 1971.

the survey included three subgroups within each of the three larger groups, the initial contact letter to each teacher stated that he was one of twenty on his group chosen to participate in the study.

After the population itself had been determined statistically, actual names could be selected from current listings of positions of teachers, administrators and Board Presidents. The Ohio State Supervisor for Social Studies provided a computer print out which listed social studies personnel. School addresses were listed in the Ohio Educational Directory. Names and addresses of building principals were also located in the Ohio Educational Directory. The researcher was able to secure necessary personnel data about Board Presidents from the Ohio School Boards Association.

#### Initiation of Questionnaire

On April 4 and 5, 1971 this researcher met in Washington, D.C. with Mr. Merrill F. Hartshorn, Executive Secretary of the National Council for the Social Studies, and Mr. Edward C. Martin, staff associate. Mr. Hartshorn indicated that, in addition to the matters of academic freedom,

emphasis should also be placed upon the study of controversial issues. Another dimension of the questionnaire centered about the matter of a policy statement from Boards of Education.

With official encouragement from the N.C.S.S. this researcher next contacted Dr. James Uphoff, Professor of Social Studies Education at Wright State University and currently serving on the Academic Freedom Committee of the National Council of Social Studies. Mechanical considerations such as color of paper, cost of stamps, duplication, etc. were decided upon in subsequent meetings. It was also decided to do the research under auspices of Kettering City Schools. It was felt that official sponsorship would enhance returns.

As an officer in the Kettering Classroom Teachers Association, the researcher was able to interest the Executive Council in the need for a study on academic freedom. It was agreed that this researcher was to design a policy statement on academic freedom which the K.C.T.A. would later negotiate with the Kettering School Board.

In September, this researcher met with the Superintendent of Kettering City Schools and outlined the proposed



dissertation and its relationship to K.C.T.A. future goals on a statement of academic freedom. The superintendent was most receptive and consented to the use of Kettering City School stationary and envelopes. He also consented to having the returns mailed to Fairmont East High School.

Since both the superintendent and the Kettering Classroom Teachers Association were cooperating in the survey, the letter which accompanied the survey read in part, "The study is being conducted with the support and cooperation of the Kettering Superintendent of City Schools and the Kettering Classroom Teachers Association."

#### Refinement of Questionnaire

The central purpose of this questionnaire is to measure the attitudes of secondary social studies teachers, secondary building principals, and Board of Education Presidents in reference to academic freedom. It was hoped that certain items of the instrument would discriminate among these three groups.

An early questionnaire contained 350 items to cover the widest range of academic freedom. It was decided to attempt to categorize these items into some sort of logical

groupings. After this task had been accomplished it became somewhat easier to determine the most pertinent question as well as to discard the least relevant.

After the initial 350 items were categorized, a logical elimination process reduced the items to fifty. This reviewer invited members of the social studies and English Departments as well as the administration of Fairmont East High School to offer comments. Finally, the Kettering City Schools psychologist responded that the latest revision seemed to him to lack ambiguity and would serve as an instrument to measure attitudes in the area of academic freedom.

The final questionnaire was accompanied by a scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

#### General Questionnaire

In addition to an attitude questionnaire a general information questionnaire was necessary. Since this questionnaire, like the other, had to be designed to be read by a computer, numerical values were assigned to its answers although it was felt that names were not necessary

to the study and also that asking for respondents' names might discourage returns, nevertheless, some method of identification was necessary in order to classify returns in terms of teachers, Board Presidents, or principals and in terms of city, county, or village. Also, a record of returns was needed for bookkeeping purposes. Follow-up letters were sent to those who had failed to submit their returns, and, finally, phone calls were made to those who failed to reply after two successive letters.

A four-digit code was developed to identify each respondent. For example, 1101 meant teacher, city system, number one; 3217 meant Board of Education President, County system, number 17.

This researcher did want to know the size of enrollment for each school district but decided against asking for this information since it is a statistic which many respondents are unlikely to know. Because it was felt that this data might be useful, enrollments were obtained from The Ohio Almanac and coded onto the IBM card. The general data questionnaire asked information concerning age, sex, occupation, educational experience, occupational experience,

and professional association. It also determined if the schools had grievance policies and academic freedom policies. Finally, it queried as to whether the respondent had read N.C.S.S. statement on academic freedom.<sup>5</sup>

### Statistical Analysis

Mr. Modula Gohlar of systems engineering at Ohio State reviewed the questionnaire in terms of its adaptability to statistical and computer analysis.

Two tasks needed to be performed upon receiving the questionnaires from respondents. First, the general information data had to be compiled in terms of relevant tables. Since this involved simple arithmetic compilation, an electronic calculator assisted the researcher in the completion of this task. A more complicated task was that of statistical analysis of the attitude scale.

A conference on December 16, 1971, with Mr. Gohlar established the necessary computer programs. In late December computer runs were made. The attitude scale was analysed in terms of T-tests and analysis of variance.

---

<sup>5</sup>See appendix.

These two statistical techniques permitted discussions of the hypotheses to be reported at the .05 level of confidence.

This chapter has defined population, described the designing and refining of the questionnaire, and reviewed statistical analysis techniques. Chapter four will analyse the findings of the study.

## Chapter IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

In our society the search for knowledge must be free and unhampered. The spirit of free inquiry must be allowed to dominate the schools. Schools must not be transformed, as in Nazi Germany, into loud speakers for men who wield political power. Teachers must be allowed to pursue ideas into any domain. There must be no terminal points on discourse.

William O. Douglas

The present chapter presents and analyzes data compiled in a recent study about the social studies teacher, principal, and Board President in the State of Ohio. The general questionnaire ascertained background information of these three groups of people. The attitude questionnaire attempted to assess the attitudes of those surveyed towards academic freedom.

#### The General Questionnaire

The general questionnaire determined the status of social studies teachers, principals, and Board Presidents.

Such information as age, sex, occupation, degree, majors, preparation, experience, school enrollments, and membership in professional organization was sought. In addition, each questionnaire asked the respondent if his system had a Board-approved grievance policy and academic freedom policy; also, whether the respondent had read the National Council of Social Studies Statement on academic freedom.

Table 4-1 summarizes the number and percent of returns.

Table 4-1

RETURNS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND BOARD PRESIDENTS

T	N	%	P	N	%	BP	N	%
City	18	90	C	18	90	C	19	95
County	16	80	CO	19	95	CO	14	70
Village	18	90	E	18	90	E	16	80
Sub Total T	52	87	P	55	92	BP	49	82
Total All Returns = 156				% = 86.6				

Of 180 questionnaires sent out, 156 were returned. (Four more were returned after computations had been figured.) The 156 represented an overall 86.8 per cent return. Chapter three indicated some reasons for this

high percentage of returns. All three groups were very cooperative. One teacher who responded to a second request questionnaire explained her delay, "I am extremely sorry that I am so late in responding, but, I have five preparations a day and 189 students. It's just impossible to complete everything." Another teacher made a long distance phone call to apologize for his failure to send a reply on the first mailing.

#### Principal's Returns

As predicated, returns from principals exceeded all other groups. Of sixty questionnaires, fifty-five responses were returned. These fifty-five responses represented a 95 per cent return.

Not only were more responses received from principals, but this group was the most punctual in returns. During the first week of responses the ratio of principals' to teachers' to Board Presidents' responses approximated a 3:2:1 ratio.

Of twenty county principals surveyed nineteen responded for a 95 per cent return, representing the highest return of all the nine groups. City and exempted



village principals both reported eighteen returns or a 90 per cent response.

Principal behavior was probably due to the nature of their assignment. As a general occurrence these men are besieged with numerous reports to complete and file; to most, this survey was probably received as a matter of course. It can be concluded on the percentage of returns as well as on the promptness of returns that principals are the most efficient of the three groups in such matters as filing reports.

#### Teacher's Returns

Teachers had the second highest number of returns. Fifty-two of the sixty surveyed teachers responded, representing an 87 per cent return. The teacher return was the reverse of the principal return in terms of city, county, and exempted village. Both city and exempted village had eighteen responses or a 90 per cent response, while sixteen county teachers responded for an 80 per cent return.

#### Board President's Returns

Forty-nine of the sixty surveyed Board Presidents

responded for an 82 per cent response. The number of city Board President responses exceeded the other two groups. Of the twenty city Board Presidents surveyed, nineteen responded. This figure duplicated that of county principals to produce a tie for the highest responding group. It might be, as Table 4-11--Board Presidents by Occupations--attempts to indicate, that more Presidents within this group have a closer affiliation with white collar occupations and the nature of the occupation produced a higher return. Fourteen of the twenty county Board Presidents sent a response for a 70 per cent return. Exempted village Board Presidents returned sixteen questionnaires for an 80 per cent response.

### Statistical Analysis

#### Student Enrollment

Since one of the hypotheses was concerned with the relationship between size of district and attitudes towards academic freedom, enrollment information was compiled.

Since avoiding the request of information which the respondee is not likely to know encourages survey returns, enrollment information was not solicited directly from the

respondees. The Ohio Almanac supplied this information. Table 4-2 indicates the student enrollment for each of the nine classifications. It was determined that of the 156 school districts forty-one or 26 per cent were defined as large, and 115 or 74 per cent were defined as small. For the purposes of this study any district having in excess of five thousand pupils was defined as large.

Table 4-2

## SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

Enrollment	NT	%	NP	%	NBP	%	Total	%
0-1,000	3	6	5	9	5	10	13	8
1,000-2,000	9	17	18	33	12	22	39	25
2,000-5,000	20	38	21	38	21	38	62	40
5,000-10,000*	5	10	4	7	4	9	14	9
10,000-50,000*	9	17	1	2	6	11	16	10
50,000-100,000*	4	8	5	9	0	0	9	6
Over 100,000*	2	4	1	2	0	0	3	2
Total	52		55		49		156	

\*Defined as Large in this Study

Age-Sex Status

Table 4-3 indicates that forty-three social studies teachers were male; this represents 83 per cent of the group. The nine females represent 17 per cent. This figure contrasts with a recent O.E.A.- N.E.A. research finding. The O.E.A. Status Study of teachers determined that there were more women than men teachers.<sup>1</sup> This discrepancy on sex is based on the fact that O.E.A.-N.E.A. was surveying all teachers K-12 while this study was limited to 9-12 Social Studies teachers. Table 4-3 indicates that there are no female administrators. The table also indicates that only 8 per cent of Board Presidents are women.

---

<sup>1</sup>"A Profile of the Ohio Teacher," Ohio Schools, 69, December 10, 1971, 18. This O.E.A.-N.E.A. Study was conducted in the spring of 1971 and was based on returns of 2,083 public school classroom teachers.

Table 4-3

AGE-SEX DISTRIBUTION OF  
TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, BOARD PRESIDENTS

Age	T	%	P	%	BP	%
20-25	16	31	0	0	1	2
26-30	9	17	1	2	1	2
31-35	9	17	13	24	1	2
36-40	5	10	11	20	7	14
41-50	7	13	20	36	24	49
Over 51	<u>6</u>	12	<u>10</u>	18	<u>15</u>	30
Total	52		55		49	
<u>Sex</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>BP</u>	<u>%</u>
Male	43	83	55	100	45	92
Female	<u>9</u>	17	<u>0</u>	0	<u>4</u>	8
Total	52		55		49	

Table 4-3 also indicates that 31 per cent of all social studies teachers are age twenty-five or younger, that almost 50 per cent are under age thirty, but that only 12 per cent are over fifty-one years old. This compares with the O.E.A. study which indicates that the average age of all teachers

in Ohio was thirty-four years. While the table does not permit computation of mean ages for principals and Board Presidents, it can be established that a majority of principals are over thirty-five and that a majority of Board Presidents are over forty.

### Degree Status

Table 4-4

#### DEGREE STATUS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, BOARD PRESIDENTS

Degree Status	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	0	0	0	0	34	69
AB	16	31	1	2	2	4
AB+	16	31	1	2	0	0
MA	18	35	44	80	3	6
MA+	2	4	9	16	10	20
Total	52		55		49	

This study found that 100 per cent of teachers possessed at minimum a bachelors degree; 31 per cent were at the AB level, 31 per cent at the AB-plus level, 35 per cent at the MA level, and 4 per cent at the MA-plus level. This contrasts significantly with the O.E.A. study, which found

72 per cent of teachers at the AB level, 20 per cent at the MA level, and 1 per cent at the MA-plus level. It can be concluded that Ohio social studies teachers as a group have more education than teachers as a whole in Ohio.

As expected, this study found 96 per cent of principals at MA or MA-plus level, 2 per cent reported at AB and AB-plus level. Only 16 per cent of principals reported at the MA-plus level.

Sixty-nine per cent of Board Presidents reported no degrees; 4 per cent reported at the AB level; 6 per cent reported at the MA level, and 20 per cent reported at MA-plus level. Thus there is a sharp contrast in degree status among Board Presidents. A large majority report no college degree, while a significant minority report at the MA plus level. This minority was constituted largely of doctors and lawyers.

### College Majors

As reported in Table 4-4, all teachers were at a minimum AB level, 50 per cent of teachers identified themselves as social studies majors, 27 per cent as history majors, and 6 per cent as social science majors. Thus 83 per cent

of social studies teachers have undergraduate majors relevant to the subject matter which they are presently teaching. Of the remaining teachers 8 per cent identified this major as physical education, 4 per cent as math or science, 4 per cent as language and 2 per cent as other.

Table 4-5A

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OR TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS,  
AND BOARD PRESIDENTS

Undergraduate	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	0	0	0	0	27	53
Social Studies	26	50	13	24	0	0
History	14	27	5	9	0	0
Social Science	3	6	1	2	5	10
English/Speech	0	0	6	12	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	3	7
Business	0	0	6	12	1	2
Physical Education	4	8	9	16	1	2
Math/Science	2	4	10	18	9	0
Language	2	4	2	4	0	0
Other	1	2	3	5	0	0
<hr/>						
Total Social Science	43	83	19	35	5	10
Total Non-Social Science	9	17	36	65	17	34
<hr/>						
Total	52		55		49	



Thirty-five per cent of the principals identified subject matter relevant to social science as their undergraduate major; 65 per cent were non-social science majors. Fifty-three per cent of Board Presidents had no undergraduate majors; 10 per cent identified social science as their major; and 34 per cent were non-social science majors.

Table 4-5B indicates that 62 per cent of teachers identified graduate majors. Fifteen per cent identified history or social science as their major; 19 per cent identified social studies education. Twenty-two per cent identified areas not related to social studies. Thus 34 per cent of Ohio social studies teachers are pursuing or have graduate work relevant to the subject matter which they are teaching.

Only five per cent of principals identify social science as their graduate major. No Board Presidents identify a social science graduate major; however, 12 per cent did have a law degree. Due to these differences in background, there is some question as to the value which principals and Board Presidents might place upon social studies. The question which this study will answer is how much these two groups value academic freedom. It is

because of this diversity in frame of reference that this author hypothesizes that teachers will value higher academic freedom than the other two groups.

### Semester Hours

Table 4-6A summarizes the semester-hour status of teachers, principals, and Board Presidents in history and the social sciences and in social studies education. A large percentage of teachers have strong subject matter background; 47 per cent have over 51 hours of subject matter; 10 per cent have 100 or more semester hours in social science. There is not as much emphasis upon social studies education; only 29 per cent of teachers have more than ten semester hours of social studies education; 10 per cent of teachers have sixteen-twenty hours, and 4 per cent have over twenty hours. Table 4-6A indicates much smaller percentages of principals and Board Presidents having many semester hours in social science or social studies education. Only 9 per cent of principals had fifty-one or more hours of social science; 6 per cent of Board Presidents had more than fifty-one hours of social science. Ninety-two per cent of Board Presidents indicated that they had no social studies

education; only 5 per cent of principals specified that they had over eleven hours of social studies education.

Table 4-5B

GRADUATE MAJORS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS,  
AND BOARD PRESIDENTS

Graduate	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	20	38	1	2	32	65
Social Science	1	2	3	5	0	0
History	7	13	0	0	0	0
Social Studies						
Education	10	19	0	0	0	0
English/Spanish	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business	1	2	0	0	0	0
Math/Science	0	0	0	0	4	8
Physical Education	3	6	0	0	0	0
Guidance	6	12	1	2	0	0
Administration	0	0	49	89	0	0
Law	0	0	0	0	6	12
Medicine	0	0	0	0	3	6
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	1	2
Other	4	8	1	2	3	6
Total	52		55		49	

Table 4-6B summarizes the semester hour status of teachers, principals, and Board Presidents in education administration and all education courses. Almost one-half of social studies teachers have no administration courses; 90 per cent of Board Presidents have no administration

courses; 89 per cent of principals had twenty or more hours in administration.

Table 4-6B indicates that 73 per cent of Board Presidents have no education courses. Seventy-three per cent of principals had over forty-five hours of education courses. Sixty-six per cent of teachers had less than thirty-one hours of education.

Table 4-6A

SEMESTER HOURS IN SELECTED COURSES  
HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE: SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

History/Social Science	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	0	0	0	0	25	51
1-12	1	2	11	20	7	14
13-24	3	6	16	29	8	16
25-50	24	46	23	42	6	12
51-100	19	37	5	9	1	2
Over 100	5	10	0	0	2	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>		<b>55</b>		<b>49</b>	
Social Studies Educ.	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	9	17	33	60	45	92
1-5	10	19	9	16	3	6
6-10	18	35	10	18	1	2
11-15	8	15	3	5	0	0
16-20	5	10	0	0	0	0
Over 20	2	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>		<b>55</b>		<b>49</b>	

Table 4-6B

SEMESTER HOURS IN SELECTED COURSES  
EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION; ALL EDUCATION COURSES

Education Administration	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	24	46	0	0	44	90
1-5	12	23	0	0	1	2
6-10	7	13	1	2	2	4
11-15	3	6	1	2	0	0
16-20	5	10	4	7	0	0
Over 20	1	2	49	89	2	4
Total	52		55		49	

  

All Education Courses	T	%	P	%	BP	%
None	0	0	0	0	36	73
1-5	0	0	0	0	3	6
6-10	2	4	0	0	1	2
11-20	16	31	0	0	2	4
21-30	16	31	4	7	2	4
31-35	10	19	0	0	1	2
36-40	3	6	4	7	1	2
41-45	2	4	7	13	0	0
Over 45	3	6	40	73	3	6
Total	52		55		49	

Professional Organization

Tables 4-7, 4-8, and 4-9 classify social studies teachers, principals and Board Presidents by professional organizations. Ninety-six per cent of teachers are affiliated with a local organization; 79 per cent belong to

the O.E.A.; 23 per cent are members of the N.E.A.; 21 per cent are members of O.C.S.S.; only 17 per cent are N.C.S.S. members. In terms of combination, almost one-half of the teachers belong only to a local and O.E.A. Other combinations are reported in Table 4-7. These statistics indicate that, with the exception of local associations and O.E.A., social studies teachers are not very organization minded. The O.E.A. study concluded that there was a positive correlation between experience and organization membership.

Table 4-7

## TEACHERS BY PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Combinations	T	%	Associations	T	%
None	2	4	None	2	4
Local	5	10	Local	50	96
OEA	5	10	OEA	41	79
L, OEA	22	42	NEA	12	23
L, OEA, NEA	7	13	OCSS	11	21
L, OCSS	2	4	NCSS	9	17
L, OEA, OCSS	4	8			
L, OEA, NEA, OCSS	3	6			
L, NCSS	2	4			
Total	52				

Table 4-8 indicates that principal membership in O.E.A. and N.E.A. is comparable to teachers, but that their membership in O.A.S.S.P. and N.A.S.S.P. is much higher than teacher's membership in comparable organizations. Table 4-9 indicates that 88 per cent of Board Presidents are members of the Ohio School Board Association and that 20 per cent are members of occupation-related association.

Table 4-8

## PRINCIPALS BY PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Combinations	P	%	Associations	P	%
None	3	5	None	3	5
OEA	12	22	OEA	37	67
NEA	1	2	NEA	15	27
OASSP, NASSP	14	25	OASSP	39	71
OEA, OASSP	8	15	NASSP	22	40
OEA, NASSP	0	0			
OEA, O & NASSP	3	5			
NEA, OASSP	0	0			
OEA, NEA, OASSP	6	11			
OEA, NEA, O & NASSP	8	15			
Total	55				

Table 4-9

## BOARD PRESIDENTS BY PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Combinations	BP	%	Association	BP	%
None	5	10	None	5	10
OSBA	34	69	OSBA	43	88
OSBA & Occupation	9	18	Occupation	10	20
Occupation	1	2			
Total	49				

Experience

Table 4-10 indicates that all three groups have a wide range of number of years of experience. In terms of total experience, 12 per cent of teachers have less than three years of experience, 31 per cent are in the three-to-five year range, 27 per cent are in the six-to-ten year range, 13 per cent are in the eleven-to-fifteen year range, 8 per cent are in the sixteen-to-twenty year range, and 10 per cent are in the over twenty year category. However, a review of years in current assignment reveals a different story. Almost one-third of all Ohio social studies teachers have been in their current assignment for less than three



years; almost two-thirds have been in their current assignment for less than six years and only 4 per cent have been in their current assignment for over twenty years.

Table 4-10

TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, BOARD PRESIDENTS  
BY NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Total Experience	T	%	P	%	BP	%
1-2	6	12	0	0	5	10
3-5	16	31	0	0	21	43
6-10	14	27	7	13	10	20
11-15	7	13	17	31	6	12
16-20	4	8	6	11	7	14
Over 20	5	10	25	45	0	0
Total	52		55		49	

  

Current Position	T	%	P	%	BP	%
1-2	15	29	12	22	5	10
3-5	18	35	18	33	22	45
6-10	12	23	16	29	10	20
11-20	5	10	5	9	12	24
Over 20	2	4	4	7	0	0
Total	52		55		49	

The OEA study found that the median for total years in teaching was seven years, the median for years in the

present system was 4 years, and that 9 per cent of all Ohio teachers are first year teachers. Since this author's study was designed in terms of range with the last category being open, it is impossible to confirm the OEA statistics. However, the OEA's 9 per cent for all teachers in first year of experience compares with this study's finding that 12 per cent of all social studies teachers are in the one-to-two years of experience category. A high percentage of social studies teachers are in the three-to-ten year category. Using a prescribed formula to calculate median, the present study seems to indicate that the median for social studies teachers is also around seven years. Using the same technique on this study's "years in current position" it can be estimated that the median number of years is around four years. Thus the OEA study for years of experience for all teachers is comparable to this study's findings for social studies teachers.

Table 4-10 indicates that principals are more likely to have been in education for a longer period than teachers. Nearly one-half of principals have been in education for over twenty years as opposed to 10 per cent of social studies teachers.

The estimated median for principals in terms of total number of years would probably be between eighteen and twenty years, as opposed to the seven year median for teachers. The estimated median for "years in current position" for principals is around four years.

Most Board Presidents are serving their second term; however, 14 per cent report that they have served a total of from sixteen to twenty years on the Board of Education. In the Board President column there is almost a one-to-one correlation between total experience and current position experience. The estimated median number of years of total experience as well as "years in current position" for Board Presidents is four years.

### Occupation

Table 4-11 indicates Board Presidents by occupational classification. Only 4 per cent of all Board Presidents are in education as an occupation; over one-fourth specified business; almost another quarter specified manufacturing. Sixteen per cent identified themselves as professionals--doctors or lawyers. As Table 4-11 points out, the preponderance of the better-educated Board Presidents are serving on city boards.

Table 4-11

## BOARD PRESIDENTS BY OCCUPATION

Occupation	CBP	%	Co.BP	%	EBP	%	Total	%
Education	2	11	0	0	0	0	2	4
Business	4	21	3	21	6	38	13	27
Manufacturing	3	16	4	29	4	25	11	22
Agricultural	1	5	5	36	1	6	7	14
Government	0	0	1	7	1	6	2	4
Law	2	11	1	7	1	6	4	8
Medicine	1	5	0	0	2	13	3	6
Denistry	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	2
Other	5	26	0	0	1	6	6	12
	19		14		16		49	

Procedural Guarantees

Table 4-12 summarizes the status of procedural guarantees in Ohio, providing information on grievance policies and academic freedom policies and also tabulating affirmative replies of those respondents who have read the current National Council for the Social Studies statement on academic freedom. Information is provided for each of the nine groups involved in the study. Previewing emphasis centers upon differentiating city system behavior from county and exempted village behavior. In the

interpretation of data, columns can be read vertically as well as horizontally.

Table 4-12

PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES: GRIEVANCE POLICY,  
ACADEMIC FREEDOM POLICY,  
READ NCSS STATEMENT ACADEMIC FREEDOM

	CT	%	COT	%	ET	%	Total	%
GP	17	94	8	50	13	72	38	73
AFP	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	2
NCSS	6	33	1	6	5	28	12	23
	CP	%	COP	%	EP	%	Total	%
GP	18	100	11	58	12	67	41	75
AFP	3	17	1	5	1	6	5	9
NCSS	2	11	1	5	3	17	6	11
	CBP	%	COBP	%	EBP	%	Total	%
GP	16	84	9	64	11	69	34	69
AFP	2	11	2	14	0	0	4	8
NCSS	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	2
Sub-total GP	53	96	27	57	36	69		
Sub-total AFP	6	11	3	6	1	2		
Total GP	= 113		% = 72					
Total AFP	= 10		% = 6					
Total NCSS	= 19		% = 12					

One hypothesis of this study was that more systems will have adopted a grievance policy than will have adopted an academic freedom policy. A total of 113 surveyed systems indicated they had a grievance policy; this represented 72 per cent of the total. However, only ten districts responded that they had instituted academic freedom policies, this representing only 6 per cent of the total.

The study did not attempt to evaluate quality of grievance policies. However, the questionnaire did request copies of academic freedom policies. Of the ten districts indicating possession of an academic freedom policy, four mailed copies. These ranged from a single paragraph to a four-page document. Only one of these documents approaches the specifications recommended by the National Council for the Social Studies.

Another hypothesis suggested that more city systems would possess procedural safeguards than exempted village systems, and that more exempted villages would have procedural safeguards than county systems. The data supplied from the study confirms this hypothesis. Ninety-four per cent of city teachers, 100 per cent of city principals, and

84 per cent of city Board Presidents responded that their district did possess a grievance policy. This meant that 96 per cent of all city districts now have grievance policies; whereas, the total percentage for all nine groups is 72 per cent. The total percentage for exempted village districts was 69 per cent, and, by and large, this percentage held constant for all three groups classified within exempted village. Finally, the total percentage of county districts which had a grievance policy was 57 per cent. Differences from group to group ranged from 50 per cent to 64 per cent. In no case did the highest percentage from any group within 16 county systems exceed the lowest of any of the six groups within the city and exempted village systems.

This study suggests that whereas there is relatively high acceptance of grievance policy, very few systems have enacted academic freedom policies. Of those academic freedom policies enacted and reviewed by this researcher, only one satisfied minimal NCSS standards.

Table 4-7 determines that only 17 per cent of all surveyed teachers are NCSS members. This probably accounts for the fact that only 23 per cent of all teachers indicate

that they have read the NCSS statement on academic freedom. This study has found that there is a wide range of positive responses to the NCSS statement among the three groups. Thirty-three per cent of city teachers responded in the affirmative when questioned whether they had read the NCSS statement. Exempted village teachers followed closely with a 28 per cent affirmative reply. However, county teachers reported only 6 per cent positive answer to this question.

At present the statistics of Table 4-12 do not relate a correlation between familiarity with the NCSS statement and implementation of it. Of course it may be that several systems are now in the process of adopting an academic freedom policy. Another section of this chapter will examine attitudes concerning the implementation of an academic freedom statement.

Table 4-12 indicates that 11 per cent of all principals surveyed have read the NCSS statement. Two per cent of Board Presidents responded that they have read the statement. If the NCSS statement is to have greater impact it must have greater dissemination among teachers, principals, and Board Presidents. NCSS members would be doing a service by sharing their information with people in a position to



implement change.

### Attitude Analysis

#### Procedural Safeguards

The third hypothesis of this study maintained that teachers would value highest the procedural safeguards; principals would value higher the procedural safeguards than would Board Presidents. Academic freedom procedural safeguards were defined in terms of official policy statements, official form letter, arbitration procedures, and administration procedures. Items 3, 8, 21, and 34 were designed to measure attitudes in this area. Analysis of variance of T-tests were used to determine significance at the .05 level of confidence. Teachers and principals were first compared; then teachers and Board Presidents were compared; finally principals and Board Presidents were compared.

No significant difference was reported on item 3 among any of the three groups. All three groups were in agreement that Board of Education and Administrative latitude was preferable to an official statement on academic freedom. Board Presidents were most in agreement with item 3; teachers agreed more with this item than did principals.

Significant difference was found on items 8, 21, and 34 between teachers and principals. Significant difference was found between teachers and Board Presidents on items 8 and 34 but not item 21. No significant difference was found between principals and Board Presidents on items 8, 21 and 34.

Item 8 stated that official Board of Education letters should be available to any member of the community who registered a complaint about curriculum. Teachers' mean score was 2.745, which indicated a weak degree of agreement. Principals' and Board Presidents' mean scores were 3.226 and 3.208 respectively. Thus, both principals and Board Presidents indicated comparable degrees of indecisiveness concerning this item.

Items 21 and 34 were comparable in meaning; both called for an official academic freedom policy. Teachers' mean score on items 21 and 34 was an identical 3.039. Item 21 stated that the Board of Education should provide a written policy which clearly states the right of a student to learn and a teacher to teach; item 34 held that a teacher should have a written Board of Education policy which clearly provides guidelines and safeguards for the

study of controversial issues. Principals' mean score on items 21 and 34 were 2.547 and 2.245 respectively. Board Presidents' mean scores on these items were 2.667 and 2.479 respectively.

Teachers were able to perceive comparable meanings for items 21 and 34 and reacted with identical responses. Teacher response indicates that teachers are on the borderline between "undecided" and "agree." Both principals and Board Presidents indicated a higher degree of agreement on item 34 than on item 21.

On the basis of this data teachers do not clearly reject procedural safeguards. They do favor official form letters for complaints. They reject an official policy in item 3; however, they indicate very slight agreement when asked on items 21 and 34 about the need for such a policy.

A consistent response would be acceptance of item 3 and rejection of items 21 and 34, or rejection of item 3 and acceptance of items 21 and 34. Since none of the three groups behaved consistently in regard to the three items, it may be that few people have clarified their values on academic freedom.

Principals indicate on item 3 rejection of an academic freedom policy, but accept such a policy when queried in items 21 and 34. Board Presidents' responses were comparable to those of principals. On item 3 Board Presidents are most ready to reject an academic freedom policy; teachers are more ready than principals to reject the policy statement. On item 21 principals are most ready to accept a policy statement on academic freedom; Board Presidents are more ready than teachers to accept the policy statement. On item 34 principals again indicate the highest degree of acceptance; board presidents indicate a higher degree of acceptance than do teachers.

On the basis of the data reported, teachers do not value procedural safeguards, but neither do teachers as a group reject these safeguards. As a group teachers are undecided. This study found that principals and Board Presidents had a greater tendency to favor these safeguards. It may be that principals and Board Presidents perceive an academic freedom policy as a limitation on teachers, or it may be that they honestly prefer a policy statement. This writer would suggest that none of the groups have clarified their values. In either case principals and Board

Presidents do seem to be open for suggestions on academic freedom policy statements.

A question still remains concerning teacher opinion. As a group teachers are undecided. But will opinions differ when one group of teachers is compared with another group? Another hypothesis of this study was that selected sub-groups of teachers would value procedural safeguards higher than would other sub-groups. Analysis of variance procedures or T-tests were used to determine significant difference at the .05 level of confidence. NCSS members and non-NCSS members were compared on items 3, 8, 21, and 34. There is no significant difference between the opinions of these two groups on these items. On item 3, NCSS members are undecided while non-NCSS members have a tendency to approve official form letters. On item 21, NCSS members have a greater tendency to favor a written statement on academic freedom than do non-NCSS members. On item 34, NCSS members again have a greater tendency to accept a written statement on academic freedom than do non-NCSS members. Even though the NCSS teachers have a slightly greater tendency to agree with written policy statements, there are no significant differences between NCSS teachers

and non-NCSS teachers.

This researcher was interested in learning if there were any given combination of teachers who would exhibit a preference for procedural safeguards over another combination. Thus the following groups were compared: city with county teachers; city with exempted village teachers; county with exempted village teachers; teachers from districts with student populations exceeding 10,000 with teachers from districts with populations less than 10,000; teachers under age twenty-six with less than six years teaching experience with older, more experienced teachers; teachers with undergraduate majors in social studies with teachers without undergraduate majors in social studies; teachers having eleven or more hours of social studies education and more than fifty-one hours of subject matter with teachers having less than eleven hours of social studies education and less than fifty-one hours of subject matter; men teachers with women teachers; teachers who have read the 1970 NCSS statement on academic freedom with teachers who have not read the statement; Ohio Council for the Social Studies teachers with non-OCSS teachers; teachers at the M.A. or M.A.-plus level with those below the M.A.

level, and teachers active in three or more professional organizations.

Items 3, 8, 21 and 34 were used in statistical comparisons with each of the above groups. No significant differences were found when these groups were compared. Mean scores of teachers were very close to the undecided level of opinion on procedural safeguards.

There were, however, two groups which did exhibit a significant difference of opinion on procedural safeguards. Teachers, principals, and Board Presidents from districts with academic freedom policies were compared with teachers, principals, and Board Presidents from districts without academic freedom policies. No significant difference was reported on item 3; however, significant differences were found on items 8, 21 and 34.

#### Academic Freedom

Another hypothesis held that teachers would place the highest value on academic freedom, and principals would value academic freedom higher than would Board Presidents. Items 16, 39, 2, 25, 7, 19, 28, 15, 6, 22, 12, 35, 33, 24, 26, 5, 2 and 27 were designed to measure attitudes in this

area. Analysis of variance and T-test procedures were used to determine significance at the .05 level of confidence. Academic freedom was defined in terms of the following: critical thinking and citizenship; classroom behavior and critical thinking; teacher personal behavior, teaching methods, administrative regulation, and specific controversial issues. First teachers and principals were compared; then teachers and Board Presidents were compared; finally principals and Board Presidents were compared.

Significant differences were found between teachers and principals and between teachers and Board Presidents on each of the items used for comparison. No significant difference was established between principals and Board Presidents.

Item 16 stated that any citizen should have the right to criticize or lawfully oppose any government policy or official without penalty or restraint. Teachers were in strong agreement. Both principals and Board Presidents were in agreement; however, Board Presidents gave higher value to item 16. Item 39 said a diversity of view is essential to education in a democracy. Teachers were in strong agreement; principals and Board Presidents indicated about the same



degree of agreement. Item 2 asserted that tomorrow's citizens and leaders should have wide exposure to discussion of controversial issues. Again teachers were in strong agreement; principals were in stronger agreement than were Board Presidents. Item 25 held that in preparing for effective citizenship students should learn the techniques and skills of lawful democratic dissent. Teachers were in strong agreement; Principals and Board Presidents indicated about the same degree of agreement. In sum, all three groups indicate general acceptance of general references to a citizen's behavior in a democracy. Teachers were in strong agreement on each of the items. By and large, principals and Board Presidents exhibited comparable degrees of agreement on each of the items surveyed.

Item 7 and 19 dealt with more specific classroom functions. Item 7 stated that classroom discussion should be permitted on points of view contrary to community standards. Teachers indicated strong acceptance of this statement. Board Presidents indicated a slightly higher degree of agreement than did principals. Item 19 said that one of the central tasks of the social studies teachers is to develop the student's ability to question

established views. Teachers were in a high degree of agreement. The mean score was 1.941, the lowest on any of the questions thus asked in this group. Again Board Presidents, with a mean of 2.583, were in slightly more agreement than were principals, who had a mean score of 2.736. Generally, as indicated by the difference in responses to these two types of questions, the more specific the behavior discussed, the lesser the degree of acceptance.

Items 28, 15, and 6 were concerned with the personal conduct of the teachers. Item 28 stated that a condition of employment should be that teachers will not express--in school or out--criticism of the administration or the Board of Education. Teachers disagreed with this proposition. Both principals' and Board Presidents' mean scores were in the undecided column; however, the Board Presidents were more in agreement with this item. Item 15 specified that in his private capacity the teacher should be able to hold and express publicly his views on religious, social, and political matters. Teachers were in strong agreement; Board Presidents agreed more with item 15 than did principals. Item 6 held that a teacher's personal, religious, political, and economic beliefs should come under

examination when his professional competence is being evaluated. Teachers disagreed with this item. Board Presidents' and principals' mean scores were in the undecided column, but Board Presidents indicated a higher degree of acceptance of item 6.

In sum, teachers prefer autonomy in their personal behavior, but Board Presidents and principals have not clearly decided this issue. Board Presidents on the one hand indicated some agreement that the teacher should have a private existence, but on the other hand were more willing than principals to evaluate a teacher's private behavior.

Items 22, 12, 35, and 33 centered about the role of teacher independence in the selection of course content, curriculum, materials, and teaching methods. Item 1 of the questionnaire stated that the teacher should have a right to participate in the development of the curriculum and the selection of teaching materials. All three groups' mean scores were within the strongly agree columns.

There was a significant difference of opinion between teachers and Board Presidents and between principals and Board Presidents on this item. Item 22 maintained that the classroom should be open to outside speakers whose

special competence the teacher may want to utilize in exploring a given issue. Teachers strongly agreed, while principals and Board Presidents were in the same degree of agreement. Item 12 said that teachers should adhere to a prescribed curriculum. Teachers were undecided; Board Presidents were in slightly more agreement on this item than were principals. Item 35 stated that the teacher's choice of teaching methods should be free from community restraints. Teachers were in agreement; principals and Board Presidents exhibited comparable degrees of being undecided. Item 33 held that a teacher should be permitted to select his own textbook and supplemental materials free from administrative or community restraints. Teachers' mean score was 3.137; principals' mean score was 4.057, and Board Presidents' mean score was 4.271. Teachers, then, have a slight tendency to prefer autonomy but are within the undecided column. Board Presidents have a greater desire than do principals to regulate curriculum materials. Thus, while there is agreement on item 1 -- that teachers should participate in the development of curriculum and in the selection of teaching materials, it is clear that principals and Board Presidents do not yet

feel that teachers should make these decisions independent of higher authority. Just what role the teacher should fulfill is still unclear.

The next two items, 24 and 26, were concerned with Board of Education authority. Item 24 stated that when community members question the suitability of curriculum materials, the final decision should rest with the Board of Education. Teachers were in agreement with item 24; their mean score was 2.431. Board Presidents' mean was 1.688 and principals' mean was 1.943. Item 26 maintained that the Board of Education and/or the administration should have the authority to rule that certain controversial issues not be discussed. Teachers were undecided about this, but principals and Board Presidents were in comparable agreement.

One must then question these groups' replies to items 16, 39, 2, 7, and 9. It should be remembered that these items dealt with the discussion of controversial items. On item 2, which stated that tomorrow's citizens need wide exposure to a discussion of controversial issues, and item 7, which specified that classroom discussion should be permitted on points of view which are contrary to

community standards, all three groups tended to have strong agreement. It is contradictory to agree with statements 2 and 7 while at concurrently agreeing with items 24 and 26. This writer would recommend that all three groups spend some time with value clarification. One cannot support academic freedom on the one hand, while supporting arbitrary decision-making on the other.

Finally, items 5 and 27 were concerned with topics which have in the past been a source of friction. Item 29 stated that students should be permitted to research, analyze, and discuss the implications of President Nixon's Supreme Court appointments. All three groups indicated strong agreement. Item 5 contended that teachers should have the option of discussing population control with students. Teachers' mean score was 1.843; principals' mean score was 2.170; and Board Presidents' mean score was 2.417. Item 27 stated that students should be able to research and discuss evolution. Teachers exhibited strong agreement and principals and Board Presidents were at comparable levels of agreement.

In sum, the three groups are as willing to accept discussion on the Nixon Court as they are on evolution. While

all three groups indicate acceptance of discussion of population control, there is less acceptance on this item than on the previous two. Further, the degree of acceptance on this item varies from group to group.

In conclusion, teachers do value highest academic freedom. No significant differences were found on any of the items between principals and Board Presidents. In addition, there was no consistent pattern of mean scores of principals and Board Presidents. Some items were valued higher by principals and some were valued higher by Board Presidents.

The sixth hypothesis held that selected sub-groups of teachers would value higher academic freedom than would other sub-groups. The following groups were compared: teachers from districts with student populations exceeding 10,000 with teachers from districts with populations less than 10,000; teachers under age twenty-six with less than six years teaching experience with older, more experienced teachers; teachers with under three years experience in current assignment with teachers having more than three years experience in current assignment; NCSS teachers with non-NCSS teachers; teachers with undergraduate majors

in social studies with teachers without undergraduate majors in social studies; teachers having eleven or more hours of social studies education and more than fifty-one hours of subject matter with teachers having less than eleven hours of social studies education and less than fifty-one hours of subject matter; men teachers with women teachers; teachers who have read the 1970 NCSS statement with teachers who have not read the statement; OCSS teachers with non-OCSS teachers; teachers at the M.A. or M.A.-plus level with those below the M.A. level; and teachers active in three or more professional organizations. Items 16, 39, 2, 25, 7, 19, 28, 15, 6, 22, 12, 35, 24, 26, 5 and 27 were used in statistical comparisons with each of the above groups. Analysis of variance of T-tests were used to determine significance at the .05 level of confidence.

No significant differences were found when comparing the following groups: Teachers under 26 having less than six years experience with teachers 26 or older having more than six years experience; teachers having less than three years experience in current assignment with teachers having more than three years experience in current assignment; men teachers with women teachers; teachers at the M.A. or M.A.



plus level with teachers below the M.A. level. Further, no significant difference could be established when teachers, principals, and Board Presidents having academic freedom policies were compared with teachers, principals and Board Presidents not having academic policies.

Of the remaining groups only one exhibited significant differences on three or more items. Teachers from districts with student populations in excess of 10,000 consistently placed higher value on academic freedom with items 28, 6, 5, 24, and 7, than teachers from districts having student populations of less than 10,000. Of seventeen items designed to test attitudes on academic freedom, teachers from larger districts differed significantly on five. This means that on thirty per cent of the items a significant difference did occur between the two groups. The statements with which teachers from larger districts were concerned dealt with population control, personal life, classroom discussion on views contrary to community standards, arbitrary decision-making by Board of Education, and teacher criticism of administration and Board of Education. Size of school district was the only factor which had a bearing on teachers' decisions.

NCSS teachers differed significantly from non-OCSS teachers on item 6, which stated that a teacher's personal, religious, political, and economic beliefs should come under evaluation when his professional competence is being evaluated. Teachers who had read the NCSS statement on academic freedom also differed significantly on item 6 from those teachers who had not read the NCSS statement. Both groups identifying with NCSS were more strongly opposed to this practice.

Teachers with undergraduate majors in social science felt more strongly about item 25 than teachers who did not have undergraduate majors in social science. Item 25 stated the necessity of students learning the skills of democratic dissent.

Teachers with eleven or more hours of social studies education and more than fifty-one hours of subject matter valued more item 22 than teachers with less preparation. Item 22 dealt with outside speakers.

OCSS teachers valued more items 16 and 35 than did non-OCSS teachers. Item 16 stated that any citizen should have the right to criticize or lawfully oppose any government policy or official without penalty or restraint.

Item 35 said that teaching methods should be free from community restraints.

Finally, teachers active in three or more professional organizations also felt more strongly about item 16; further, they valued higher item 2. Item 2 dealt with exposure of students to controversial issues.

In conclusion, the only factor which made a great deal of difference when teachers were analyzed was size of school districts. Other factors such as age, sex, experience, preparation, and professional organization did not appreciatively alter teacher attitudes about academic freedom.

#### Open Classroom

Another hypothesis offered was that teachers will value highest an "open classroom;" Principals will value this concept higher than will Board Presidents. Items 9, 36, 30, 37, 23, 20, 40, and 31 were designed to measure attitudes towards openness. Analysis of variance of T-test procedures were used to determine significance at the .05 level of confidence.

An open classroom is defined as a willingness to assist student engagement in value clarification. In an open classroom students will not be restrained in their thinking, opposing points of view will be represented, students need not agree with the teachers thinking, teachers will be free to express their own opinions, and no conscious effort will be made to reach correct conclusions. First teachers and principals were compared; then teachers and Board Presidents were compared; finally principals and Board Presidents were compared.

Significant differences were found between teachers and principals on items 9, 36, 30, 23, 20, 40, and 31. Significant differences were found between teachers and Board Presidents on all items. Only item 20 indicated a significant difference between principals and Board Presidents.

Items 9, 36, 30, 37, and 23 were designed to measure attitudes concerning student behavior. Item 9 stated that students should be discouraged from endorsing political statements or public officials in classroom discussion. Teachers disagreed with this item. Both principals and Board Presidents were undecided; however, Board Presidents

exhibited the greater tendency to agree.

Item 36 suggested that students should learn to consider the possible merits of differing viewpoints. Teachers strongly agreed with this item. Principals and Board Presidents had almost identical mean scores on this item; both indicated high degrees of agreement. Item 30 held that students should have the opportunity of discussing controversial issues with persons having opposing points of view. Teachers again strongly agreed with this item. Again principals and Board Presidents had almost identical mean scores; indicating high degrees of agreement. Item 37 specified that the student should feel free to reach any conclusion upon an issue that fits the facts as he understands them, without any limitation except that imposed by intellectual honesty. Teachers' mean score on this item was 1.784; principals; mean score was 2.019; Board Presidents' mean score was 2.271. All three groups agree on this item but agreement varies with teachers giving greatest acceptance to the item. Item 23 held that students should have the right to express opinions which differ from those of classmates or the teacher. All three groups' responses were within the strongly agree category, but teachers

exhibited the highest degree of acceptance, followed by principals and then Board Presidents.

From these items on student behavior it can be verified that teachers value highest an open classroom and that there is no significant difference between attitudes of principals and Board Presidents. However, there is a slight tendency for principals to exhibit a higher degree of acceptance of this the concept of openness.

Items 20, 40, and 31 dealt with teacher behavior in the promotion of an open classroom. Item 20 stated that teachers should refrain from expressing their own viewpoints within the classroom. Teachers' mean score was 3.686; principals' mean score was 3.113; Board Presidents' mean score was 2.583. Teachers are undecided, principals have a tendency to agree, and Board Presidents clearly agree with item 20. Item 40 specified that following discussion of an issue, the teacher should affirm the "correct viewpoint." Teachers were undecided but had a tendency to disagree; Board Presidents indicated a higher degree of agreement than did principals. Item 31 stated that the teacher should promote the fair distribution of differing points of view on all issues. All three groups

mean scores fall in the strongly agree column; however, teachers had the highest score, followed by principals and then Board Presidents.

In sum, the hypothesis that teachers will value highest an open classroom and principals will value an open classroom higher than Board Presidents was confirmed.

This study's final hypothesis maintained that selected sub-groups of teachers would value higher an open classroom than would other sub-groups. The same groups of teachers were compared as were compared in a previous hypothesis comparing teacher groups on academic freedom. Analysis of variance of T-tests were used to determine significance at the .05 level of confidence.

No significant differences were found when teachers under age twenty-six having less than six years experience were compared with teachers 26 or older having more than six years experience. Also no significant differences were found when teachers who were at the M.A. or M.A.-plus level were compared with those having less than an M.A.

Of the eight items being assessed only item 31 was significantly different when teachers from larger systems

were compared with those from smaller systems. Teachers from larger systems more strongly agreed that the teacher should promote the fair representation of all viewpoints. When teachers having eleven or more hours of social studies and more than fifty-one hours of subject matter were compared, only item 23 showed significant difference. Teachers with less preparation more strongly agreed that students should have the right to express opinions which differed from those of classmates or of the teacher. Item 20 showed significant difference when men teachers were compared with women teachers. Men thought that teachers should express their viewpoints in the classroom while women disagreed.

Of the eight items compared OCSS teachers significantly differed from non-OCSS on two items. OCSS teachers more strongly agreed on item 23, that students should have the right to express opinions which differed from those of classmates and teachers. OCSS teachers disagreed on item 40, that following discussion of an issue the teacher should affirm the "correct" viewpoint. Non-OCSS teachers were undecided on this point.



Teachers active in three or more professional organizations significantly differed from those of less involvement on two items. Those more involved more strongly agreed on item 36, that students should learn to consider the possible merits of differing viewpoints. Those more involved disagreed on item 40, that following discussion of an issue the teacher should affirm the "correct" viewpoint; those less involved were undecided on this item.

Three items showed significant difference when NCSS teachers were compared with non-NCSS teachers. The mean score for NCSS teachers on item 23 was 1.000, which indicated that 100 per cent of NCSS teachers indicated "Strongly Agree" to the statement that students should have the right to express opinions which differ from those of classmates or teachers. The mean score of non-NCSS teachers was 1.512 on this item. NCSS teachers more strongly agreed on item 30, that students should have the opportunity of discussing controversial issues with persons having opposite points of view. NCSS strongly disagreed with item 40, that following discussion of an issue the teacher should affirm the correct viewpoint; non-NCSS teachers were undecided on this item.

When teachers who had read the 1970 NCSS statement on academic freedom were compared with those who had not read this document significant difference occurred on three items. Almost 100 per cent of teachers reading the NCSS statement agreed with items 31 and 36; the mean scores of other teachers were 1.513 and 1.462 respectively. Item 31 stated that teachers should promote the fair representation of differing points of view on all issues. Item 36 specified that students should learn to consider the possible merits of differing points of viewpoints. Teachers reading the NCSS statement disagreed on item 20, that teachers should refrain from expressing their own viewpoints within the classroom; teachers who had not read this document were undecided.

When teachers with under three years experience in current assignment were compared with those of more experience, significant difference occurred on three items. Teachers with more experience agreed more strongly on items 30, 31 and 36. Item 30 stated that students should have the opportunity of discussing controversial issues with persons having opposing points of view; item 31 stated that the teacher should promote the fair

representation of differing points of view on all issues; item 36 specified that students should learn to consider the possible merit of differing viewpoints.

One final group was compared. Teachers with undergraduate majors in social science or social studies were compared with non-social science or social studies majors. Significant differences occurred here also on items 30, 31, and 36. On all three items social science and social studies indicated almost 100 per cent "strongly agree." The mean scores for non-social science and non-social studies majors were 1.5476, 1.4762 and 1.4524 respectively.

In conclusion, when younger, less-experiences teachers are compared with older, more experienced teachers and when teachers at the M.A. level or above are compared with those having less preparation, no significant difference occurs in attitudes towards an open classroom. Of the eight items used to measure attitudes towards openness, only one item was significantly different in the following comparisons: teachers from larger districts with teachers from smaller districts; teachers with more professional and subject matter preparation with those having less preparation; and men with women teachers.

Significant difference occurred on two of the eight items used to measure attitudes towards openness when the following groups were compared: OCSS teachers with non-OCSS teachers; and teachers active in three or more professional organizations with teachers active in less than three organizations.

Significant difference occurred on three of the eight items used to measure openness when the following groups were compared: NCSS teachers with non-NCSS teachers; teachers reading 1970 NCSS statement on academic freedom with those not reading the statement; and teachers with undergraduate majors in social science or social studies with teachers not having undergraduate majors in social science or social studies.

## Chapter V

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A teacher who sets out as most teachers do to dictate the child's thoughts, to teach him what is right and what is wrong to do or believe, has himself no conception of intellectual freedom.

Howard K. Beale

#### Summary

The proponents of reflection maintain that the central concern of secondary social studies should be the examination of problematic areas of our culture. However, the successful implementation of this concern is contingent upon the establishment of academic freedom. If students are to have the opportunity to come to grips with controversial issues, then teachers must be secure in the knowledge that society values this examination. Academic freedom policies which have been negotiated and adopted at the local level can provide assurance for students, teachers,

principals, Board members, parents and community members that the process of developing democratic citizens who have the skill and desire to critically analyse controversial issues is valued.

Controversy is inherent in the nature of American democracy, students must have an opportunity to examine public issues reflectively; teachers must have an effective opportunity to discuss public issues. The optimum way to implement these needs is the formulation of a districtwide policy which provides for the teaching of controversial issues.

A major reason for teacher harassment, dismissal, or other more subtle forms of persecution consists in the absence of school policies on the teaching of controversial issues. While there may be a verbal desire on the part of some to "cover current civic issues," this desire needs to acquire the form of a written academic freedom policy. If vigorous, capable, intelligent people are to remain teachers they need the protection of an academic freedom policy.

Anyone familiar with the teaching of secondary social studies is also cognizant of restraints. Today, Beale's question, "how much freedom do teachers want?" is as important as when first asked in the 1930's.

The concept of academic freedom dates as far back as Socrates; the history of academic freedom is similar to the history of many of our civil liberties. By and large the chief interest in academic freedom at the secondary school level has occurred in the twentieth century; indeed the preponderance of the thinking has occurred since 1950. Although many opinions can be identified as to the meaning of academic freedom this author is in concurrence with the 1970 policy statement of the N.C.S.S. that "a teacher's academic freedom is his right and responsibility to investigate, interpret, and discuss all the relevant facts and ideas in the field of his professional competence. This freedom implies no limitations other than those imposed by general scholarship...."

However, there remains those who contend that the function of education is the maintenance of the status quo. Individuals who identify with this group have often valued prejudice, special interests, profit motive, power motive

and other motives more than academic freedom. Several authors have taken pains to point out that the average American is intellectually lazy and values his unquestioned faiths, beliefs, and myths.

A vocal minority of the above group seem eager to seize upon opportunities to safeguard the schools against "dangerous ideas." These minorities are the "ax-grinders," the censors. This group professes that the role of teacher is that of a "hired man" who is to indoctrinate young people with the current mythology of those enjoying power.

Today's teacher may experience as much difficulty in teaching students to value doubt as did his predecessor in the 1930's. Subtle violations of academic freedom are more common place than dismissals. It may well be argued that a primary reason that teachers do not have academic freedom is that teachers themselves do not value academic freedom. Many teachers fail to comprehend their role in dealing with controversial issues: many teachers are indifferent; many prefer to go about their assignments with as little effort as possible. Many teachers do not think or question themselves.



Today, more than ever before, the entire process of schooling is being re-examined. Too often in the past schooling has meant compelling the student to accept on blind faith the ideas of others. Students have been subject to "compulsory miseducation."

Some studies indicate that teachers do not value democratic processes; many teachers are committed to authoritarian practices and seek to teach via authoritarian processes. Can democratic values be taught in an authoritarian environment?

The N.C.S.S. has been persistent in its efforts to attain academic freedom at the secondary level. It has published landmark policy statements in 1953, 1967, and 1970. Many professional organizations have taken strong stands in favor of academic freedom. One of the most adamant groups has been the A.C.L.U. Perhaps resolution will occur within the courts of law. It seems clear that the courts are the final safeguard of academic freedom. Many precedents have occurred during the past twenty years; renewed leadership from such organizations as the A.C.L.U., N.E.A. and N.C.S.S. will continue the establishment of a code dealing with academic freedom.

Perhaps the ultimate answer to the problem of academic freedom is teaching people how to think. If more people were able to think, to analyse, and to form intelligent judgments, then there would be little controversy about academic freedom today.

Until these last two conditions are established; that is, code of law and intelligent, critical minded citizenry, the most effective means of establishing academic freedom is the implementation of an academic freedom policy.

The study measured and recorded the attitudes of secondary social studies teachers, principals, and Board of Education Presidents in the State of Ohio on academic freedom.

The general questionnaire obtained status information on social studies teachers, principals and Board Presidents of Ohio. Eighty-seven per cent of the questionnaires were returned. On the bases of these returns statistics were compiled on age, sex, occupation, degree, majors, preparation, experience, school enrollments, membership in professional organization, and presence or absence of grievance and academic freedom policies.

The study's first hypothesis, that more school districts will have adopted grievance policies than will have adopted academic freedom policies was verified. Seventy-two per cent of the districts surveyed indicated the adoption of grievance policies, while only 6 per cent indicated the adoption of academic freedom policies.

The second hypothesis that the number of city systems which have procedural guarantees; that is, academic freedom policies and grievance policies, will exceed exempted village systems and the number of exempted village systems which have procedural guarantees will exceed county systems was also verified. Ninety-six per cent of city districts have grievance policies, and 11 per cent of city districts have academic freedom policies; 69 per cent of exempted villages have grievance policies; and 2 per cent of exempted villages have academic freedom policies; 57 per cent of county systems have grievance policies; and 6 per cent of county systems have academic freedom policies.

While ten school systems were said to have adopted an academic freedom policy, of those examined only one satisfies minimal N.C.S.S. standards.

The third hypothesis of the study maintained that teachers would value higher the procedural safeguards than would Board Presidents. Academic freedom safeguards were defined in terms of official policy statements, official form letters, arbitration procedures, and administration procedures. All three groups concurred that Board and administrative latitude was preferable to an official statement on academic freedom. Teachers were more inclined than principals or Board Presidents to endorse official letters of complaint. As a group teachers are undecided on the procedural safeguards. Principals and Board Presidents had a greater tendency to favor these safeguards.

The fourth hypothesis contended that selected subgroups of teachers will value higher procedural safeguards than will other subgroups. No significant difference was found between N.C.S.S. members and non-N.C.S.S. members; of the other eleven teacher groups compared no significant differences were indicated. When teachers, principals and Board Presidents from districts which had academic freedom policies were compared with teachers, principals, and Board Presidents from districts without policies, a

significant difference occurred on three of the four items being surveyed. Clearly, those people from districts possessing academic freedom policies valued academic freedom policies higher than those people from districts which did not have academic freedom policies.

A fifth hypothesis asserted that teachers would place the highest value on academic freedom, and principals would value academic freedom higher than would Board Presidents. Academic freedom was defined in terms of the following: critical thinking and citizenship, classroom behavior and critical thinking, teacher personal behavior, teaching methods, administrative regulation, and specific controversial issues. All three groups indicate acceptance when general reference is made to citizenship behavior. Teachers indicated the greatest acceptance of the overall category of academic freedom. Significant difference was recorded between teachers and principals, and between teachers and Board Presidents. No significant difference was found between Board Presidents and principals. It was also discovered in analysing the three groups' responses to the items being measured that generally, as indicated by the difference in response to the two types of questions, the

more specific the behavior discussed, the lesser the degree of acceptance.

A second set of questions dealt with personal teacher behavior. Teachers prefer autonomy in this area; principals and Board Presidents are undecided. Board Presidents indicate a greater agreement than do principals that teachers should enjoy a private life, but Board Presidents are more willing than principals to evaluate a teacher's private behavior.

A third set of questions was concerned with teacher participation in the curriculum. A significant difference of opinion occurred between teachers and principals and between teachers and Board Presidents on this issue. While teachers prefer some independence in curriculum, principal and Board Presidents want to exercise final authority.

A fourth set of items stated that final authority should be vested in the Board. All three groups concurred; Board Presidents were in greatest agreement, followed by principals and then teachers.

A final set of items in the academic freedom category was concerned with specific instructional issues. The three groups indicate as much willingness to permit

classroom discussion of President Nixon's Supreme Court appointments as they do of evolution. There is less acceptance of population discussion.

In conclusion, of the three groups, teachers do value highest academic freedom. No significant differences were found on any of the items between principals and Board Presidents. In addition, there was no consistent pattern of mean scores of principals and Board Presidents; some items were valued higher by principals, and some were valued higher by Board Presidents.

The sixth hypothesis held that selected groups of teachers would value higher academic freedom than would other subgroups. No significant difference was found when the following factors were compared: age, experience, sex, preparation. Only size of district had any significant effect upon teacher behavior. Teachers from districts with student populations in excess of 10,000 consistently placed higher value on academic freedom. When factors such as membership in professional organizations, undergraduate preparation, and social studies education were compared, significant difference occurred on no more than two of the seventeen items being measured.

The seventh hypothesis asserted that teachers will value highest an "open classroom"; principals will value this concept higher than will Board Presidents. An open classroom was defined as a willingness to assist student engagement in value clarification. In an open classroom students will not be restrained in their thinking; opposing points of view will be represented; students need not agree with teachers' thinking; teachers will be free to express their own opinions; and no conscious effort will be made to reach correct conclusions.

Significant differences were found between teachers and principals on seven of the eight items being assessed; significant difference occurred between teachers and Board Presidents on all items. Significant difference occurred between principals and Board Presidents on only one item.

In regard to student behavior, teachers do value highest an open classroom. Principals and Board Presidents attitudes are comparable; however, there is a slight tendency for principals to exhibit a higher degree of acceptance of the concept of openness.

In regard to teacher behavior in the promotion of openness, teachers value this concept highest, followed by



principals and then Board Presidents. This identical ranking is applicable to the general concept of openness.

The study's final hypothesis maintained that selected subgroups of teachers would value higher an open classroom than would other subgroups. When the variables of age and experience and degree status were compared, no significant difference occurred. When the variables of school enrollment, preparation, and sex were compared only one item of the eight was significantly different. When O.C.S.S./non-O.C.S.S. membership and membership in three or more professional organizations/membership in less than three professional organizations were compared, two items were significantly different. When experience in current assignment, N.C.S.S./Non-N.C.S.S. membership undergraduate majors, and N.C.S.S. statement readers/non-readers were compared, three of the eight items were significantly different. In all cases of significant difference except one, teachers from larger school districts, or with more experience, or greater professional involvement, or greater preparation indicated higher agreement with the concept of openness.

### Recommendations

1. Many school systems have adopted grievance policies; the purpose of a grievance policy is to resolve a problem. Proponents of an academic freedom policy argue that preventing problems is by far more desirable than reacting to them. Teachers, principals and Boards of Education need to re-examine the logic of this "cart before the horse" practice.

2. Academic freedom is a relatively new concept for the secondary schools. There needs to be an extensive effort in this area to clarify values. Teachers especially must examine their values in the area of academic freedom.

3. If academic freedom is valued, then procedural guarantees will be necessary to implement it. Many teachers envision written policies as having a constraining effect; teachers need to become more familiar with the concepts of procedural guarantees.

4. Only a small proportion of teachers, administrators, and Board Presidents are familiar with the thinking of the N.C.S.S. The N.C.S.S. should formulate a program to insure systematic dispersal of its statements on

academic freedom. The N.C.S.S. statement should be available to the nation's secondary schools. While local districts will need to adopt their own unique versions of academic freedom policies, professional organizations such as the N.C.S.S. must exhibit greater concern.

5. The study revealed no significant difference in values of N.C.S.S. members and non-N.C.S.S. members on the matter of procedural safeguards. The N.C.S.S. must focus more sharply on defining the importance of procedural safeguards.

6. Teachers must become more assertive in their role as curriculum designers and content and method selectors. One recommendation is the institution of first-rate professional education departments which aspire to develop a clear sense of purpose in teachers.

7. Ultimately, principles of academic freedom must be established within codes of laws. Litigation efforts, local to nationwide, must be widely applied to achieve this objective.

8. If teachers are to function as true professionals, they must assume responsibility in the formulation and implementation of school policy. In short, teachers must become decision makers.

APPENDIX

KETTERING CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
3490 Far Hills Avenue  
Kettering, Ohio 45429  
Telephone: 298-8641

Chester A. Roush, Superintendent

November 5, 1971

You have been selected by a random sample technique as one of twenty teachers in the state of Ohio to participate in a status study of academic freedom, particularly as it relates to secondary social studies. The study is being conducted with the support and cooperation of the Kettering Superintendent of Public Schools and Kettering Classroom Teachers Association. It is being financed by an independent agency. In order for us to determine our course of action we need your advice as soon as possible.

The enclosed questionnaire is a method of soliciting your views in the area of academic freedom and has been designed to require as little of your time as possible while still providing the necessary data. At no time will any school or individual be evaluated. Although the questionnaire requests some general data, we are primarily concerned with your professional opinions.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed. Your cooperation and assistance in returning the questionnaire at your earliest convenience will be greatly appreciated. Results, without reference to personalities or schools, will be mailed upon request.

Very sincerely yours,

Ron G. Helms  
Committee on Professional Rights  
and Responsibilities

amb  
Enclosure

KETTERING CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
3490 Far Hills Avenue  
Kettering, Ohio 45429  
Telephone: 298-8641

Chester A. Roush, Superintendent

November 5, 1971

You have been selected by a random sample technique as one of twenty principals in the state of Ohio to participate in a status study of academic freedom, particularly as it relates to secondary social studies. The study is being conducted with the support and cooperation of the Kettering Superintendent of Public Schools and Kettering Classroom Teachers Association. It is being financed by an independent agency. In order for us to determine our course of action we need your advice as soon as possible.

The enclosed questionnaire is a method of soliciting your views in the area of academic freedom and has been designed to require as little of your time as possible while still providing the necessary data. At no time will any school or individual be evaluated. Although the questionnaire requests some general data, we are primarily concerned with your professional opinions.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed. Your cooperation and assistance in returning the questionnaire at your earliest convenience will be greatly appreciated. Results, without reference to personalities or schools, will be mailed upon request.

Very sincerely yours,

Ron G. Helms  
Committee on Professional Rights  
and Responsibilities

amb  
Enclosure

KETTERING CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
3490 Far Hills Avenue  
Kettering, Ohio 45429  
Telephone: 298-8641

Chester A. Roush, Superintendent

November 5, 1971

You have been selected by a random sample technique as one of twenty board presidents in the state of Ohio to participate in a status study of academic freedom, particularly as it relates to secondary social studies. The study is being conducted with the support and cooperation of the Kettering Superintendent of Public Schools and Kettering Classroom Teachers Association. It is being financed by an independent agency. In order for us to determine our course of action we need your advice as soon as possible.

The enclosed questionnaire is a method of soliciting your views in the area of academic freedom and has been designed to require as little of your time as possible while still providing the necessary data. At no time will any school or individual be evaluated. Although the questionnaire requests some general data, we are primarily concerned with your professional opinions.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed. Your cooperation and assistance in returning the questionnaire at your earliest convenience will be greatly appreciated. Results, without reference to personalities or schools, will be mailed upon request.

Very sincerely yours,

Ron G. Helms  
Committee on Professional Rights  
and Responsibilities

amb  
Enclosure

## GENERAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please check the appropriate response.

1. AGE
 

<input type="radio"/> 20-25	<input type="radio"/> 26-30	<input type="radio"/> 31-35
<input type="radio"/> 36-40	<input type="radio"/> 41-50	<input type="radio"/> Over 51
2. SEX
 

<input type="radio"/> Male	<input type="radio"/> Female
----------------------------	------------------------------
3. PRESENT OCCUPATION
 

<input type="radio"/> Education	<input type="radio"/> Business	<input type="radio"/> Manufacturing
<input type="radio"/> Agricultural	<input type="radio"/> Government	<input type="radio"/> Law
<input type="radio"/> Medicine	<input type="radio"/> Other _____	
4. COLLEGE DEGREE
 

<input type="radio"/> None	<input type="radio"/> AB	<input type="radio"/> AB+
<input type="radio"/> MA	<input type="radio"/> Other _____	
5. UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR
 

<input type="radio"/> Social Studies	<input type="radio"/> History	<input type="radio"/> Soc. Science
<input type="radio"/> English and Speech	<input type="radio"/> Business	<input type="radio"/> Physical Ed.
<input type="radio"/> Math or Science	<input type="radio"/> Foreign Language	<input type="radio"/> Other _____
6. GRADUATE MAJOR
 

<input type="radio"/> Social Science	<input type="radio"/> History	<input type="radio"/> Education
<input type="radio"/> English and Speech	<input type="radio"/> Business	<input type="radio"/> Physical Ed.
<input type="radio"/> Math or Science	<input type="radio"/> Foreign Language	<input type="radio"/> Other _____
7. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE)
 

<input type="radio"/> None	<input type="radio"/> 1-12	<input type="radio"/> 13-24
<input type="radio"/> 25-50	<input type="radio"/> 51-100	<input type="radio"/> Over 100
8. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION (UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE - EXCLUDE STUDENT TEACHING)
 

<input type="radio"/> None	<input type="radio"/> 1-5	<input type="radio"/> 6-10
<input type="radio"/> 11-15	<input type="radio"/> 16-20	<input type="radio"/> Over 20



9. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION (UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE)  
☐ None ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10  
☐ 11-15 ☐ 16-20 ☐ Over 20
10. TOTAL NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN EDUCATION COURSES (INCLUDE HOURS IN ANSWERS 8 AND 9)  
☐ None ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10  
☐ 11-20 ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31-35  
☐ 36-40 ☐ 41-45 ☐ Over 45
11. NUMBER OF YEARS ON BOARD OF EDUCATION (INCLUDE PRESENT YEAR)  
☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-5 ☐ 6-10  
☐ 11-15 ☐ Over 15
12. NUMBER OF YEARS ON PRESENT BOARD (INCLUDE PRESENT)  
☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-5 ☐ 6-10  
☐ 11-15 ☐ Over 15
13. PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP  
☐ None ☐ Ohio School Bd. Assoc.  
☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
14. DOES YOUR SYSTEM HAVE A BOARD APPROVED GRIEVANCE POLICY?  
☐ Yes ☐ No
15. DOES YOUR SYSTEM HAVE A BOARD APPROVED POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM?  
☐ Yes ☐ No  
(If yes, would you please enclose a copy.)
16. HAVE YOU READ THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SOCIAL STUDIES STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

## GENERAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please check the appropriate response.

1. AGE
  - ☐ 20-25
  - ☐ 26-30
  - ☐ 31-35
  - ☐ 36-40
  - ☐ 41-50
  - ☐ Over 51
2. SEX
  - ☐ Male
  - ☐ Female
3. PRESENT OCCUPATION
  - ☐ Education
  - ☐ Business
  - ☐ Manufacturing
  - ☐ Agricultural
  - ☐ Government
  - ☐ Law
  - ☐ Medicine
  - ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. COLLEGE DEGREE
  - ☐ None
  - ☐ AB
  - ☐ AB+
  - ☐ MA
  - ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR
  - ☐ Social Studies
  - ☐ History
  - ☐ Soc. Science
  - ☐ English and Speech
  - ☐ Business
  - ☐ Physical Ed.
  - ☐ Math or Science
  - ☐ Foreign Language
  - ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
6. GRADUATE MAJOR
  - ☐ Social Science
  - ☐ History
  - ☐ Education
  - ☐ English and Speech
  - ☐ Business
  - ☐ Physical Ed.
  - ☐ Math or Science
  - ☐ Foreign Language
  - ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
7. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE)
  - ☐ None
  - ☐ 1-12
  - ☐ 13-24
  - ☐ 25-50
  - ☐ 51-100
  - ☐ Over 100
8. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION (UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE - EXCLUDE STUDENT TEACHING)
  - ☐ None
  - ☐ 1-5
  - ☐ 6-10
  - ☐ 11-15
  - ☐ 16-20
  - ☐ Over 20

9. ESTIMATED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION (UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE)
- |                             |                             |                               |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> None  | <input type="radio"/> 1-5   | <input type="radio"/> 6-10    |
| <input type="radio"/> 11-15 | <input type="radio"/> 16-20 | <input type="radio"/> Over 20 |
10. TOTAL NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN EDUCATION COURSES (INCLUDE HOURS IN ANSWERS 8 AND 9)
- |                             |                             |                               |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> None  | <input type="radio"/> 1-5   | <input type="radio"/> 6-10    |
| <input type="radio"/> 11-20 | <input type="radio"/> 21-30 | <input type="radio"/> 31-35   |
| <input type="radio"/> 36-40 | <input type="radio"/> 41-45 | <input type="radio"/> Over 45 |
11. NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING AND/OR ADMINISTRATION
- |                             |                             |                               |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 1-2   | <input type="radio"/> 3-5   | <input type="radio"/> 6-10    |
| <input type="radio"/> 11-15 | <input type="radio"/> 16-20 | <input type="radio"/> Over 20 |
12. NUMBER OF YEARS IN CURRENT EDUCATION ASSIGNMENT (INCLUDE PRESENT)
- |                             |                               |                            |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 1-2   | <input type="radio"/> 3-5     | <input type="radio"/> 6-10 |
| <input type="radio"/> 11-20 | <input type="radio"/> Over 20 |                            |
13. PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS (CHECK ALL WHICH ARE APPLICABLE)
- |                                        |                                        |                                    |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> None             | <input type="radio"/> Loc. Classroom   | <input type="radio"/> OEA          |
| <input type="radio"/> AFT              | Assoc.                                 | <input type="radio"/> Loc. Council |
|                                        | <input type="radio"/> NEA              | for Social                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Ohio Council for | <input type="radio"/> Nat. Council for | Studies                            |
| Soc. Studies                           | Soc. Studies                           | <input type="radio"/> Other _____  |
14. DOES YOUR SYSTEM HAVE A BOARD APPROVED GRIEVANCE POLICY?
- |                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
15. DOES YOUR SYSTEM HAVE A BOARD APPROVED POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM?
- |                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
- (If yes, would you please enclose a copy.)
16. HAVE YOU READ THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SOCIAL STUDIES STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM?
- |                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|

## GENERAL DIRECTIONS

This is a survey of professional responses to selected statements about academic freedom as it relates to secondary education, particularly the social studies.

In responding to these statements it will be important to keep the following in mind:

1. The educational environment is on a 9-12 level.
2. The statements make reference to a situation as it will occur only relationship to a particular unit under study.
3. The academic maturity of a student will always be considered.
4. This is not a test; there are no right or wrong answers.

---

Sample Responses

---

If you <u>strongly agree</u> circle	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SA	A	NO	D	SD
If you <u>agree</u> circle	SA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> A	NO	D	SD
If you have <u>no opinion</u> circle	SA	A	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NO	D	SD
If you <u>disagree</u> circle	SA	A	NO	<input checked="" type="radio"/> D	SD
If you <u>strongly disagree</u> circle	SA	A	NO	D	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SD

---

SA-Strongly Agree	A-Agree	NO-No Opinion
D-Disagree	SD-Strongly Disagree	

---

- |                                                                                                                             |                      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. The teacher should have a right to participate in the development of curriculum and the selection of teaching materials. | SA   A   NO   D   SD |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|

- |                                                                                                                                                                 |    |   |    |   |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| 2. Tomorrow's citizens and leaders should have wide exposure to discussion of controversial issues.                                                             | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 3. In dealing with issues of academic freedom, it is better to provide the Board of Education and administration latitude rather than adopt an official policy. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 4. Citizens of the community should have the right to examine and criticize school materials.                                                                   | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 5. Teachers should have the option of discussing population control with students.                                                                              | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 6. A teacher's personal, religious, political, and economic beliefs should come under examination when his professional competence is being evaluated.          | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 7. Classroom discussion should be permitted on points of view which are contrary to community standards.                                                        | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 8. The Board of Education should have official form letters available to members of the community who might find reason to submit complaints about curriculum.  | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 9. Students should be discouraged from endorsing political statements or public officials in classroom discussion.                                              | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 10. As a condition of employment teachers should take loyalty oaths.                                                                                            | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

- |                                                                                                                                            |    |   |    |   |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| 11. The schools should concentrate more on the development of patriotism and Americanism.                                                  | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 12. Teachers should adhere to a prescribed curriculum.                                                                                     | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 13. Parents should have the right to have their children exempted from reading a given book.                                               | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 14. Parents should have the right to have a given book excluded from the curriculum.                                                       | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 15. In his private capacity the teacher should be able to hold and express publicly his views on religious, social, and political matters. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 16. Any citizen should have the right to criticize or lawfully oppose any government policy or official without penalty or restraint.      | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 17. Students should have the opportunity to compare democracy and communism.                                                               | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 18. Teachers who discuss the fallibilities of such famous Americans as Washington are undermining democracy.                               | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 19. One of the central tasks of the social studies teacher is to develop the student's ability to question established views.              | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 20. Teachers should refrain from expressing their own viewpoints within the classroom.                                                     | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

- |     |                                                                                                                                                  |    |   |    |   |    |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| 21. | The Board of Education should provide a written policy which clearly states the right of a student to learn and a teacher to teach.              | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 22. | The classroom should be open to outside speakers whose special competence the teacher may want to utilize in exploring a given issue.            | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 23. | Students should have the right to express opinions which differ from those of classmates or the teacher.                                         | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 24. | When community members question the suitability of curriculum materials, the final decision should rest with the Board of Education.             | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 25. | In preparing for effective citizenship, students should learn the techniques and skills of lawful democratic dissent.                            | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 26. | The Board of Education and/or administration should have the authority to rule that certain controversial issues not be discussed.               | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 27. | Students should be able to research and discuss evolution.                                                                                       | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 28. | A condition of employment should be that teachers will not express--in school or out--criticism of the administration or the Board of Education. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 29. | Students should be permitted to research, analyze, and discuss the implications of President Nixon's Supreme Court appointments.                 | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

- |                                                                                                                                                                                        |    |   |    |   |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| 30. Students should have the opportunity of discussing controversial issues with persons having opposing points of view.                                                               | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 31. The teacher should promote the fair representation of differing points of view on all issues.                                                                                      | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 32. Teachers should be able to discuss with students political, social, or economic philosophies which are in opposition to those of the U. S.                                         | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 33. A teacher should be permitted to select his own textbook and supplemental materials free from administrative or community restraints.                                              | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 34. The teacher should have a written Board of Education policy which clearly provides guidelines and safeguards for the study of controversial issues.                                | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 35. The teacher's choice of teaching methods should be free from community restraints.                                                                                                 | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 36. Students should learn to consider the possible merit of differing viewpoints.                                                                                                      | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 37. The student should feel free to reach any conclusion upon an issue that fits the facts as he understands them, without any limitation except that imposed by intellectual honesty. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |



Survey (Cont'd.)

199

- |                                                                                                                |    |   |    |   |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|
| 38. Students should have an opportunity for mature dialogue on issues of sex as the issues to a unit of study. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 39. A diversity of view is essential to education in democracy.                                                | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 40. Following discussion of an issue, the teacher should affirm the "correct" viewpoint.                       | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Articles and Periodicals

"Academic Freedom and Responsibility." School and Society, 98, March, 1970, 138-41.

"Academic Freedom--Meeting Attacks on Education." Progressive Education, January, 1952, 1-78.

American Library Association, Intellectual Freedom Committee. "How Libraries and Schools can Resist Censorship." ALA Bulletin, 56, March, 1962, 228-29.

Archer, Leonard. "It is Later Than You Think." Library Journal, 88, October 1, 1963, 3552-54.

Bach, Harry. "Clear and Present Danger." Library Journal, 90, September 15, 1965, 3681-85.

Ballinger, Stanley E. "The Social Studies and School Controversy." School Review, 71, May, 1963, 97-111.

Beall, L. L. "Academic Freedom and the Third Reich, Can It Happen Here?" Clearing House, 43, April, 1969, 483-7.

Bernstein, Jean, Marilyn Tannebaum, et. al. "Examining Values in the Upper Grades." Social Education, 35, December, 1971, 906-10.

Blandenburgh, R. M. "Does Academic Freedom Apply to Public School Teachers?" Educational Forum, 35, January, 1971, 153-6.

Bolmeier, E. C. "Legal Scope of Teacher's Freedoms." Educational Forum, 24, January, 1960, 199-206.

- "Book Rejection: Is it Censorship?" Library Journal, 87, June 15, 1962, 2298-2304.
- Brickman, W. W. "New Assaults On Academic Freedom." School and Society, 97, Summer, 1969, 268.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Newer Concepts of Academic Freedom." School and Society, 99, February, 1971, 72-3.
- Broderich, Dorthy M. "A Study in Conflicting Values." Library Journal, 91, May 15, 1966, 2257-64.
- Brown, Ralph Adams and Marian R. Brown. "Biography and the Development of Values." Social Education, 36, January, 1972, 43-48.
- Bryson, Joseph E. Legality of Loyalty Oaths and Non-oath Requirements for Public School Teachers, Doctor's Thesis, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1961, 244 pp. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, 22, November 11, 1962, 3898-9.
- Burress, Lee A. "Censorship is Capricious." Top of the News, 20, May, 1964, 281-287.
- Castagna, Edwin. "The Climate of Intellectual Freedom." ALA Bulletin, 59, January, 1965, 27-33.
- Committee on Academic Freedom, National Council for the Social Studies. "Freedom to Learn and Freedom to Teach." Social Education, 28, July, 1953, 217.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Academic Freedom: A Policy Statement." Social Education, 31, November, 1967, 605.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher." Social Education, 34, April, 1970, 489-491.
- Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, A. A. U. P. "Academic Freedom and Tenure; Statement of Principle." A. A. U. P. Bulletin, 42, January, 1956, 41-46.
- Counts, George S. "Should the Teachers Always Be Neutral?" Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1969, 186-189.

- Cyr, Helen. "Case of the Book that Wasn't There." Top of the News, April, 1966, 265-268.
- Davies, O. L. "Textbooks and other Printed Materials: Censorship." Review of Educational Research, 32, April, 1962, 130.
- "Developments in the Law; Academic Freedom." Harvard Law Review, 81, March, 1968, 1045-1159.
- Dewey, John. "Academic Freedom." Paul Monroe, ed., Cyclopedia of Education, vol. 2, New York: Macmillan 1919, 700-705.
- Eaton, R. E. L. "Promotion of Chaos." Vital Speeches, 37, September 1, 1971, 687-90.
- Edgerton, Ronald B. "Do Pupils Want Teaching of Controversial Issues?" Clearing House, 18, May, 1944, 332-34.
- Engle, Shirley. "N.C.S.S. in Defense of Academic Freedom." Social Studies Professional, 11, November, 1970, 2.
- Ernst, Morris L. "Some Aspects of Censorship." Wilson Library Bulletin, 39, April, 1965, 668-69.
- Farley, John J. Book Censorship in Senior High Libraries of Nassau County, New York, Doctor's Thesis, New York: N.Y.U., 1964, 386 pp. Abstract, Dissertation Abstract, 25, November 10, 1965, 5948-49.
- Fey, Harold E. "Censorship and Cultural Rebellion." Library Journal, 90, June 1, 1965, 2473-78.
- Fuchs, Ralph F. "Academic Freedom--Its Basic Philosophy, Function, and History." Law and Contemporary Problems, 28, Summer, 1963, 431-46.
- Gallup, George. "Second Annual Survey of Public Attitudes Towards Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 52, October, 1970, 98-113.

- Goldwyn, Ron. "Sambo on the Back Burner." Dayton Journal Herald, December 15, 1971, 49.
- Gordon, M. A. "Worst of Two Worlds." Ramparts Magazine, 7, April, 1969, 58.
- Gothberg, Helen. "Y.A. Censorship: Adult or Adolescent Problem." Top of the News, 22, April, 1966, 275-8.
- Gray, Roland F. "Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives." Social Education, 28, January, 1964, 71-72, 80.
- Gross, Richard E. "Pupil Views on Teaching Opinions in Controversial Areas." School and Society, 76, June, 1952, 295-98.
- Gross, Richard E. and William V. Badger. "Social Studies: Teaching of Controversial Issues." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: Macmillan, 1960, 1308.
- "Guarding Your Freedom to Teach." Today's Education, 59, November, 1970, 20-3.
- Hand, Harry E. "Sex in the Modern Novel: A Teaching Problem." English Journal, 48, November, 1959, 473-6.
- Hentoff, Nat. "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights Now." Saturday Review, May 22, 1971, 60-3, 73-5.
- Hudgins, H. C. "What the Warren Court Decided." Educational Digest, 36, November, 1970, 44-7.
- Johnson, Pamela H. "We Need More Censorship." Saturday Evening Post, 240, January 14, 1967, 8-10.
- Johnson, Warren R. and Margaret Schutt. "Sex Education Attitudes of School Administrators and School Board Members." Journal of School Health, 36, February, 1966, 64-8.

- Jones, Orville E. Activity of American Legions in Text-book Analysis of Criticism, Doctor's Thesis, Norman, Oklahoma, 1957, 184 pp. Abstract, Dissertation Abstracts, 17, November 12, 1957, 2908.
- Joughin, Louis. "Academic Due Process." Law and Contemporary Problems, 28, Summer, 1963, 573-601.
- Junel, Joseph S. "Do Teachers Have the Right to Indoctrinate?" Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1969, 182-5.
- Katz, Joe. "The Political and Economic Beliefs of Student Teachers in the Social Studies." Social Studies, 44, March, 1953, 142-5.
- Krug, Mark M. "'Safe' Textbooks and Citizen Education." School Review, 68, November, 1960, 463-80.
- Levin, Harry. "The Unbanning of the Books." Atlantic, 217, February, 1966, 77-81.
- "The Little Red Riders." School and Society, 43, April 11, 1936, 513.
- Lunstrum, John P. "Controversial Issues, School Policies, and Reflective Thinking." Social Education, 26, April-May, 1962, 189-92, 244-6, 274.
- Mart, James D. "Dismissal of a Permanent Teacher for Public Criticism of the School System." Hastings Law Journal, 15, February, 1964, 360-3.
- Martin, Edward C. "The N.C.S.S. Legal Defense Fund." Social Education, 35, April, 1971, 374-8.
- Mehl, Bernard. "Academic Freedom." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: Macmillan, 1960, 1-4.
- Michaelis, John U. "Current Instructional Problems in Secondary Social Studies." Social Education, 10, April, 1946, 307-311.

- Middletown Journal. Letters to the Editor, February 12, 1970, 5.
- Middletown Journal. Letters to the Editor, October 22, 1969, 5.
- Middletown Journal. Letters to the Editor, October 29, 1969, 5.
- Middletown Journal. Letters to the Editor, February 20, 1970, 5.
- Mollenkott, V. R. "Teachers, Students and Selfishness in the Seventies." Christianity Today, 14, April, 1970, 6-8.
- Monypenny, Phillip. "Toward a Standard for Student Academic Freedom." Law and Contemporary Problems, 28, Summer, 1963, 625-35.
- Moore, Everett T. "Why Do the Rightists Rage?" ALA Bulletin, January, 1962, 26-31.
- Morris, Arval. "Academic Freedom and Loyalty Oaths." Law and Contemporary Problems, 28, Summer, 1963, 487-514.
- Munnelly, R. J. "Teacher-Supervisor Conflicts and the Issue of Academic Freedom." Educational Leadership, 27, April, 1970, 673-7.
- Murphy, William P. "Academic Freedom--An Emerging Constitutional Right." Law and Contemporary Problems, 28, Summer, 1963, 447-86.
- Naftzger, Roger V. "Gulliver: The Right to Read." Top of the News, 22, June, 1966, 389-95.
- Neighbor, Howard. "Academic Freedom for Teachers." School and Community, November, 1968, 36-8.
- Nelson, Jack. "Censors and Their Tactics." Library Journal, 88, December, 1963, 4809-12.

- Nolte, M. C. "Those Ugly Lawsuits." American School Board Journal, 158, December, 1970, 34-5.
- Norris, Hoke, James Squire, and Robert F. Hogan. "Should We Censor What Adolescents Read?" P.T.A. Magazine, 59, March, 1965, 10-2.
- Peterson, Leroy. "Legal Status of Teacher Personnel." Review of Educational Research, 38, June, 1967, 296-311.
- Polner, Murray. "Community Pressure and Academic Freedom." Changing Education, Summer, 1967, 35.
- "A Profile of the Ohio Teacher." Ohio Schools, 69, December 10, 1971, 17-21.
- Rogers, Virgil M. "Don't Let the Censors Take You Unaware." Library Journal, 80, December 15, 1955, 2879-81.
- . "Toward Intellectual Freedom." ALA Bulletin, 51, April, 1957, 243-7.
- Schneider, E. "Academic Freedom in the Public Schools." N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 55, February, 1971, 85-93.
- Seiler, Michael. "New Ideas Put Teachers on Outside Looking In." Journal Herald, May 24, 1971, 21-2.
- "Sex Education Has Place in Junior, Senior High Schools." Nation's Schools, 65, March, 1960, 94.
- Shapiro, Sanford. "Freedom: The Intellectual Commitment." ALA Bulletin, 62, October, 1968, 1089-92.
- Shaver, James P. and Donald W. Oliver. "Teaching Students to Analyze Public Controversy: A Curriculum Project Report." Social Education, 28, March, 1964, 191-5, 248.
- Sherman, Stuart C. "Defending the Freedom to Read." Library Journal, 87, February 1, 1962, 479-83.



- Siebert, Sara and Linda Lapides. "Shudder to Think." Top of the News, 22, April, 1966, 259-64.
- Simon, Sidney B. "Values--Clarification vs. Indoctrination." Social Education, 35, December, 1971, 902-5, 15.
- Sloan, George W. "Censorship in Historical Perspective." Top of the News, 22, April, 1966, 269-72.
- Stout, Donald E. "Intellectual Freedom Landmarks: 1955-60." Library Journal, 86, June 1, 1961, 2035-42.
- "Teacher-Opinion Poll." N.E.A. Journal, 54, February, 1965, 52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. N.E.A. Journal, 51, October, 1962, 56.
- "Teaching of Controversial Issues." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: Macmillan, 1960, 1308.
- "Two Cases Supported by National Council for the Social Studies in Court." Social Studies Professional, 11, November, 1970, 3-4.
- Uphoff, James K. "Teaching Controversial Issues." Ohio Schools, 67, April 11, 1969, 20-1.
- van den Haag, Ernest. "Academic Freedom in the United States." Law and Contemporary Problems, 28, Summer, 1963, 515-24.
- Violas, P. "Fear and the Constraints of Public School Teachers: 1930-1960." Educational Theory, 21, Winter, 1971, 70-80.
- Weems, John E. "Textbooks Under Fire." Publisher's Weekly, 180, October 2, 1961, 22-4.

Weiser, John C. and James E. Hayes. "Democratic Attitudes of Teachers and Prospective Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan, 47, May, 1966, 476-81.

"'Witch Hunt' in Carlisle?" Middletown Journal, February 22, 1969, 4.

### Books

Beale, Howard K. Are American Teachers Free? New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Blanshard, Paul. The Right to Read: The Battle Against Censorship. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

Commager, Henry Steele. Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Douglas, William O. The Right of the People. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Epstein, Benjamin R. and Arnold Forster. Report on the John Birch Society, 1966. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. Danger on the Right. New York: Random House, 1964.

Gregory, Richard C. Nigger. New York: Pocket Books, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. No More Lies. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Hofstadter, Richard and Walter P. Metzger. The Development of Academic Freedom in America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

- Hook, Sidney. Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy. New York: Cowles Book Company, Inc., 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Education for the Modern Man. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Heresy, Yes Conspiracy, No. New York: The John Day Co., 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Paradoxes of Freedom. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1964.
- Horton, Roy E., Jr. "American Freedom and the Values of Youth." Edited by H. H. Remmers. Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Hunt, Maurice and Lawrence E. Metcalf. Teaching High School Social Studies. New York: Harper and Row, 1955 and 1968.
- Johnsen, Julia, ed. Academic Freedom. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1925.
- Kirk, Russel. Academic Freedom. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1955.
- Krug, Mark. History and the Social Sciences. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967.
- Kohl, Herbert R. The Open Classroom. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.
- Lawrence, Jerome, and Robert E. Lee. Inherit the Wind. New York: Bantam Books, 1955.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958.
- MacIver, Robert M. Academic Freedom in Our Time. New York: Gordian Press, 1967.

- McKeon, Richard, Robert K. Merton, and Walter Gellhorn. The Freedom to Read. New York: Bowker, 1957.
- Massialas, Byron G. and C. Benjamin Cox. Inquiry in Social Studies. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Metcalf, Laurence, ed. Values Education. Forty-first Yearbook for the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.
- Nelson, Jack and Gene Roberts, Jr. The Censors and the Schools. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1963.
- Oliver, Donald W. and James P. Shaver. Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.
- Raeymaker, Louis. Truth and Freedom. Pittsburg: Duquense University, 1954.
- Raywid, Mary Anne. The Ax-Grinders. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Reich, Charles. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Remmers, H. H., ed. Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools. Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.
- Sakharov, Andrei D. Progress, Co-existence, and Intellectual Freedom. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1968.
- Schultz, Mindella. Comparative Political System. Holt Social Studies Curriculum, Edwin Fenton, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1967.

Smith, Fredrick R. and C. Benjamin Cox. New Strategies and Curriculum in Social Studies. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. Social Science and Freedom. University of Minnesota, 1955.

Stormer, John. None Dare Call It Treason. Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964.

Stouffer, Samuel A. Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Williams, Cynthia, ed. Ohio Almanac 1970. Lorain, Ohio: Lorain Journal Co.

Wylie, Philip. Generation of Vipers. New York: Pocket Books, 1942.

#### Pamphlets

Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Certification and Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Standards, National Council for the Social Studies, Standards for Social Studies Teachers, Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.

Committee on Academic Freedom, American Civil Liberties Union. Academic Freedom, Academic Responsibility, Academic Due Process, New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. Combatting Undemocratic Pressure on Schools and Libraries, New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1964.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities, New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Where Do You Stand on Civil Liberties? New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Recent Court Case on Students' Rights. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1970.
- Charrin, Robert H. Protecting Teacher Rights, Washington, D. C. National Education Association, 1970.
- Friedl, Ernestine, August Gold, et. al., Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools, New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1969.
- Gross, Richard E. "How to Handle Controversial Issues." How to Do It series-- No. 14, Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1964.
- Keppel, Francis. Freedom Is More Than Academic, New York: Sidney Hillman Foundation, 1962.
- Manson, Gary, Gerald Market, et. al., Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.
- Office for Intellectual Freedom. School Library Bill of Rights, Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Labeling, Chicago: American Library Association, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Extreme Right in American Politics, Chicago: American Library Association, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Freedom to Read Statement, Chicago: American Library Association, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Policies and Procedures for Selection of Instructional Materials, Chicago: American Library Association, 1970.

- \_\_\_\_\_. What To Do Before the Censor Comes--and After,  
Chicago: American Library Association, 1962.

#### Public Documents

- Baker, Richard R., William J. Cole, et. al. Academic Freedom at University of Dayton. Dayton, Ohio, 1967.
- Jenkins, Kathleen, ed. Educational Directory. Columbus, Ohio: Department of Education, 1970 and 1971.
- McPortland, James, Edward L. McDill, et. al. Student Participation in High School Decision. Report number 95. Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1970.
- Patrick, John J. Political Socialization of American Youth: Implications for Secondary Social Studies. Research Bulletin No. 3. Washington, D. C.: NCSS, 1968.
- Wheeler, James, compiles. Social Studies Personnel. Columbus, Ohio: Department of Education, 1970 and 1971.

#### Unpublished Material

- Jewett, Robert. "The Problems Approach and the Senior High School." Unpublished paper, Ohio State University, 1968.

Uphoff, James K. "The Academic Bit: Cart and Horses?"  
Unpublished article, Wright State University, Dayton,  
Ohio, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Utopia Board of Education Policy on Controversial  
Issues." Bellevue, Nebraska, 1968.

#### Letters and Interviews

Dillion, Joyce. Private Interview at Ohio School Board  
Association, Columbus, Ohio, October 6, 1971.

Fotheringham, Walley. Private Interview at Ohio State  
University, Columbus, Ohio, October 6, 1971.

Hartshorn, Merrill F. Private Interview at NCSS in  
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1971, concerning academic  
freedom.

\_\_\_\_\_. Private Interview at NCSS in Washington, D. C.,  
April 6, 1971, concerning academic freedom.

Martin, Edward C. Letter to author, March 30, 1971,  
concerning academic freedom.

\_\_\_\_\_. Private Interview at NCSS in Washington, D. C.,  
April 5, 1971, concerning academic freedom.

\_\_\_\_\_. Private Interview at NCSS in Washington, D. C.,  
April 6, 1971,

Roush, Chester. Private Interview at Kettering Board of  
Education, Kettering, Ohio, September 29, 1971.



Uphoff, James K. Private Interview at Wright State,  
March 28, 1971, concerning academic freedom.

———. Private Interview at Wright State, October 7,  
1971, concerning academic freedom.

Walker, Byron G. Private Interview at Ohio State  
Education Department, Columbus, Ohio, October 15,  
1971.