



DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 982

EA 009 461

AUTHOR Nelson, Jack L.
 TITLE Censorship Policy in a School District.
 PUB DATE Apr 77
 NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, N.Y., April 4-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; *Board of Education Policy; *Censorship; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Research; *Instructional Materials; Interviews; School Districts; *School Personnel; *School Policy; Sex Education; Teacher Responsibility; Textbook Selection

IDENTIFIERS New Jersey

ABSTRACT

Written policies governing schools convey the social and political context of the school. Controversial school topics produce situations in which censorship can develop. This paper is an examination of the laws, regulations, and local school policies in one district that relate to censorship. The purpose of the study was to discern the nature, compatibility, and operation of censoring policies. Interviews of school personnel were used to aid in making judgments about the actual operation of such policies. The usually controversial topics of patriotism, sex, and religion are the foci of this study of policies on censorship. The results can be useful in the consideration of school policies. (Author)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1977

Jack L. Nelson
JACK L. NELSON
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY 08902

CENSORSHIP POLICY IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT

JACK L. NELSON

Graduate School of Education

Rutgers University

Presentation at American Educational Research Association

April, 1977

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT WRITTEN APPROVAL OF AUTHOR

ED137982

EA 009 161

CENSORSHIP POLICY IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT

JACK L. NELSON

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

For as long as there have been schools there have been decisions on what is to be taught and what is not. To the extent that that decision is based purely on how much time or money or competence is available to use for teaching a topic, it does not fall within the normal use of the term censorship. When the decision on what is taught is influenced by political, economic, religious, sexual or other social norms, a negative determination can properly be considered censorship.

There are a variety of rationales to support forms of censorship in schools. Plato offers the relatively simple concept that the philosopher-king, knowing the truth and desiring to keep falsehood out of the view of lesser humans, must limit access to false knowledge by censoring it. Plato suggested that Homer's *Odyssey* be expurgated for immature readers. In Plato's time certainly the ultimate act of censorship occurred to Socrates, though not by the rationale proposed by Plato, when Socrates was found guilty of misleading youth in his school and he took hemlock as the most widely recorded act of self-censorship in western history. Less profound than Plato's arguments for censorship but certainly influential in what is taught to students in schools are the commonly used grounds that 1) the subject is too controversial at this time, 2) it is obscene (indecent, pornographic, licentious), 3) it has the potential to disrupt the school, 4) it is not a proper subject for public

discussion, 5) School-age children are too young to fully understand it, 6) it is politically (economically, socially) inconsistent with dominant American values, 7) it doesn't fit in the normal subjects taught in schools, 8) it is personally offensive, 9) it will be objected to by important groups in the community.

A recent issue of the English Journal carried a series of articles in a forum on "Censorship, the Law and the Teacher of English". Glatthorn initiates the forum with the observation:

We are in the midst of a wave of censorship and educational controversy that has not yet crested. The vicious battle in West Virginia, the Congressional attacks on "Man: A Course of Study," and the large number of local conflicts over textbooks and curricula are sure indications that the phenomenon is widespread, not localized, and long-lasting, not temporary. (Glatthorn, 1977, p.12)

The West Virginia conflict over the selection of teaching materials, which included strikes, threats and bombings, and the MACOS-inspired Congressional investigation into federally funded curriculum and material development, that produced a temporary moratorium on such funds and a clearly observable chilling effect on scholars, publishers and grant officers, are nationally reported indications of the apparent development of renewed vigor in school censorship efforts.

A variety of local incidents, known to relatively few people, illustrate the pervasiveness of the current efforts at control of what is taught. In Springfield, Oregon, a special issue of Life Magazine was banned by the school board from use in a high school class because it contains a photograph of a nude women. (New York Times, 1977) The Island Trees, Long Island, New York School Board banned nine books they classified as "educationally unsound". The

books included works by Bernard Malamud, Kurt Vonnegut, and Langston Hughes. (Civil Liberties, Nov., 1976) As Hart notes in his introduction to Censorship: For and Against, the list of banned or expurgated books constitutes a literary Who's Who. It would include Dante, Erasmus, Michelangelo, Cervantes, Galileo, Shakespeare, Descartes, Milton, Locke, Swift, Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, Jefferson, G. B. Shaw, Wilde, Ibsen, Kipling, Russell, Jack London, Upton Sinclair, Eugene O'Neill, Faulkner, Steinbeck, Hemingway, and even Walt Disney. (Hart, 1971, pp 6,7.)

The dismal history of censorship in schools is well documented in an earlier period in twentieth century America by Beale, Pierce and Gellerman. (Beale, 1936, 1941; Pierce 1933; Gellerman, 1938) Over a decade ago the documentation of censorship efforts and successes in schools was provided by Nelson and Roberts. (Nelson and Roberts, 1963.) Censorship activities beyond textbook selection, involving teacher and curricular decisions, is graphically illustrated in a case study on sex education. (Breasted, 1970) The relationship of censorship to academic freedom and the need for teachers to consider the issues raised by censorship are posed in a recent publication designed to acquaint teachers with differing rationales. (Nelson and Hering, 1976)

Legal and quasi-legal bases for restricting teacher judgment on curriculum and teaching materials have been examined in a variety of sources. (Nolte, 1973; Mason, 1970, Schimmel, 1975; Nelson 1968, 1976; Ness, April, 1975.) In addition to written laws and policies which restrict teacher and student access to information or ideas, there are also written documents which take a different view. These are usually statements on academic freedom, student

and teacher rights and library selection guidelines. (NCSS, April, 1975; Telford, 1974; Schimmel, 1975; NCTE, 1962; ALA, 1948)

Written policies governing censorship and freedom may not fully describe the reality of the school settings as perceived by school personnel. They may be unaware of such policies, ignore them, honor them in selected ways or fully adopt them. School personnel may have views of preferred policies or practices on censorship which are consistent with or different from those in existence in a school district.

Usually the policies and practices of censorship, under whatever rationale, are not expressed by using the term censorship. Such policies and practices are stated or used in more positive terms like decisions on curriculum, teaching materials and other sources to be used in schools.

Problem

This study is an examination of the relationship between written policies on curriculum and teaching material decisions and the perception of school personnel in a local district on such policies and their implementation. School censorship, for the purposes of this paper, is the school-related restriction of access to ideas for social or moral norm reasons. It can incorporate restriction by constituted authority, prior restraint and perceptions of threat.

Methodology

1. An analysis of written documents in the State of New Jersey covering decisions on curriculum and teaching materials was undertaken. These policy statements are contained in statutory law and the state Administrative Code.

2. An analysis of written policies on curriculum and teaching materials adopted by a local Board of Education was undertaken.

3. A selection of school personnel including members of the Board of Education, administration, library and teaching staffs in different schools in one school district was made. The selection was based on the potential of each interviewee to have had sufficient critical experience in the district to have clear perceptions of the operation of policies on curriculum and teaching materials.

4. An interview schedule was designed and a separate interview was conducted with each selected person.

5. Results of the interviews were compiled for comparisons and relationships to written policies.

Nature of Community

This school district serves a small community in a metropolitan area. Population of the community in the most recent census was about 15,000. Average family income was above average for the state (\$13,000). Median years of school completed by residents age 25 or over was slightly beyond high school. About 70 percent of the residents over age 25 are high school graduates. Public school enrollment approximates 2,200 students with a school staff of 172 Teachers, other professionals and administrators.

The Interview Sample

The number of interviews conducted was 19.

The sample to be interviewed was selected on grounds stated above. To obtain appropriate district-wide diversity, the sample was designed to include the following categories of school-related personnel.

School board membership.
Central administration.

Curriculum coordination.
Secondary school department head.
Elementary, middle and high school personnel.
Subject field teachers from most-likely subjects.
School administration.
Guidance.
Library.

There is no claim of random selection of respondents. Selection was purposeful and criterion-based: Level and quality of experience, diversity in position in district, and potential for knowledgeable response.

The sample interviewed was over 10% of the total school population.

Limitations

1. This is a study of written policies in one state at one point in time.

2. The district included in the study, and the individual interviewees are not necessarily representative of others in similar structures.

Notes on Research Strategy

1. Initial contacts were made to obtain permission to examine written policies and conduct interviews. The district superintendent gave approval. The president of the teacher's association also gave approval.

2. To limit contamination in responses, all interviews in a single school were conducted on a single day or on succeeding days. There was no apparent discussion of questions or possible responses among respondents prior to individual interviews.

3. The nature of the study is considered by some to be controversial and threatening. In one sense this perception by school personnel of the potential controversiality of any activity

is evidence of the nature of censorship in the schools. A striking illustration of this phenomenon occurred in the conduct of this study. It is reported here because it doesn't exactly fit under findings, but it is directly related and was a part of this investigation.

A local school district in the state was selected for study using document analysis and interviews identical to those used in the district reported herein. The Superintendent of Schools was contacted by telephone. The study was fully explained and he was asked to participate and to permit the study to be conducted in his district. He agreed to be interviewed on tape and to have the study conducted. A date and time one week later was set for the interview. The day of the interview, the Superintendent was not available at the time specified but, following a wait of 35 minutes, opened his office to permit the interview. As the tape recorder was being set up, the Superintendent asked a series of questions about the study and the kinds of items he would be asked. He appeared hesitant and wanted more information before the taping could occur. He was given a copy of the interview schedule which he read very carefully. He stated that he thought that members of his staff might not want to answer some of the questions. Although he was told that all interviews are voluntary, confidential and anonymous (which had been noted to him by phone and earlier in the interview period), he asked to reproduce copies of the interview schedule to submit to "his staff" in advance. He was told that that would negate the purpose for interviews as opposed

to questionnaires, that there were no "right" answers, and that predetermined or group-decision responses were not appropriate to the study.

The Superintendent stated, "Of course, we are a public school system. I don't want you to think we have anything to hide. . . But I'll have to check with my staff before we can go ahead with this."

He suggested a telephone call in one week to find the results of his staff consultation. At that time, the Superintendent stated by phone, "I don't think the district will be able to participate." No reasons were given for the change.

FINDINGS

Document Analysis: State

New Jersey has three categories of legal bases for educational policies. The State Constitution provides for legislative enactments on education. These are contained in New Jersey Statutes Annotated 18A. Statutory law provides for more detailed regulation of schools under the New Jersey Administrative Code.

Statutory law requires that districts provide "courses of study suited to the ages and attainments of all pupils between the ages of five and 20 years...but of course no course of study shall be adopted or altered except by the recorded roll call majority vote of the full membership of the Board of Education of the district." (NJSA, 18A:33-1) It further stipulates that "Textbooks shall be selected by the recorded roll call majority vote of the full membership of the board of education of the district." (NJSA, 18A:34-1)

Required courses, under state law, include United States history for two years in high school; civics, geography and history

Jack L. Nelson

of New Jersey in elementary school; alcohol and drug education. The American history course must include instruction on "the high standard of living and other privileges enjoyed by the citizens of the United States..." and other historical events that "tend to instill, into every girl and boy, a determination to preserve these principles and ideals (of American form of representative government)." (NJSA 18A:35-2). The New Jersey civics course has the stated objective of "producing the highest type of patriotic citizenship." (NJSA 18A :35-3).

State law also requires daily salute to the United States flag and repetition of the Pledge of Allegiance. An exemption is given for students who "have conscientious scruples against such pledge or salute, or are children of accredited representatives of foreign governments..." Those not required to say the pledge must stand at attention, boys removing headdress. (NJSA 18A:36-3)

Pupils must pursue the prescribed course of study in the schools. (NJSA 18A:37-1).

The New Jersey Administrative Code provides that the local superintendent of schools is responsible for supervising instruction and for advising principals and teachers or "procedures, methods and materials of instruction." In addition, it is the superintendent's duty to recommend textbooks, reference works, library books and materials of instruction for approval by the school board. (NJAC 6:3-1.12). The Code stipulates that instruction shall include "Creative use of various instructional methods, materials and equipment.", and "opportunities for pupils to participate in the study of individual, school and community problems." (NJAC 6:8-3.6) The local board of education is directed

to provide materials to implement the goals of the district and to adopt "an instructional materials policy which includes procedures for effective consultation with teaching staff members in the selection and utilization of such materials..." (NJAC 6:8-4.5)

Document Analysis: Local District

The school board maintains a policy book which contains all approved policies for governing the district. Within these written policies are stated the responsibilities of the Superintendent of Schools, to include: advising the board about programs and practices in the schools; and recommending for board adoption all courses of study, curriculum guides and "major changes in texts..." A policy adopted in 1969 declares that "Teachers shall be entitled to full rights of citizenship--and no religious or political activities of any teacher, or the lack thereof, shall be grounds for any discipline... The Board and the Association agree that academic freedom is essential... Teachers shall be guaranteed full freedom in classroom presentations and discussions and may introduce politically, religiously or otherwise controversial material, provided only that said material is relevant to the course content."

Local district policies on decision-making include the establishment of a district-wide Instructional Council composed of administrator, teacher, association and high school student representatives. This council is intended to handle any district-wide problems, including curriculum questions.

In regard to library book selection, the written policy incorporates the School Library Bill of Rights and the Freedom to Read Statements of the American Association of School Libraries

Jack L. Nelson

and the American Library Association. The policy notes that selection is made by professional staff, and "regardless of political beliefs, race or religion of the author or the ideas expressed therein." It further states, "That this Board does not condone censorship..."

Interview Findings: Summaries

A copy of the interview schedule is attached as Appendix A. The schedule contains illustrative probe questions which were modified slightly or added to in the case of individual interviews.

Findings from selected questions in the interviews are summarized on Tables One through Five.

---REFER TO TABLE I---

Table One indicates some of the characteristics data from the sample. Most respondents had considerable experience in education and in the district. Almost 80 percent had more than 11 years experience and nearly 70 percent had obtained master's degrees.

---REFER TO TABLE II---

Table Two shows the self-reported familiarity with written policies at the state and local level. Nearly 75 percent of the respondents indicated no familiarity with state policies, while almost 90 percent stated familiarity with local policies. Administrators were the only respondents to claim familiarity with state regulations.

---REFER TO TABLE III---

Perceptions of respondents about the existing decision-making procedures in curriculum and materials selection, and their ideas of what such procedures should be are shown in Table Three.

Responses were categorized to reflect cited procedures for typical initiation of requests, review or advisory functions and final decision power.

Disparities among perceptions of existing procedures for curriculum decisions occurred at both the initiation and final decision levels. Administrators and professional staff differed in their views of who initiates curriculum decisions. There was broad consensus that the Board had final decision power, with the exception of guidance respondents who thought the Superintendent had final decision power.

Most respondents were not concerned with who ought to initiate curricular decisions but there was agreement among all categories of respondents but the Board member and most secondary teachers that the Board should have final decision power.

Decisions on teaching materials were perceived by all respondents as initiated by teachers. Limited review was noted, and a variety of perceptions of final decision power focused on either the Board or the teacher. Teachers and one central administrator thought teachers had final decision; other administrators and the library respondents thought the Board had it. The pattern of perceptions of what the procedure currently, with minor exceptions, was consistent with responses to what ought to be. There was a high level of satisfaction with the procedures.

---REFER TO TABLE IV---

Table Four summarizes categories of responses to questions asking interviewees to identify controversial topics, what they would want prohibited from study by students, and what criteria they would use to make such a judgment. Most respondents could

identify no controversial topics and no prohibited study. Under probe questions some respondents identified sex, religion and abortion as controversial. Racist propaganda was most often perceived as subject to prohibition. The most frequently noted criteria to be used in making censoring judgments were that "both sides be presented", and that the age of the student be considered.

---REFER TO TABLE V---

When asked whether or not certain activities should be required of all students, respondents provided answers summarized in Table Five. There is pending legislation in New Jersey requiring a period of silent meditation. The interview schedule used the term "silent worship". All but two respondents rejected silent worship, but five respondents indicated that silent meditation was suitable. Large majorities of each respondent group supported the required Pledge of Allegiance, American History and sex education.

Interview Findings: Commentary

Interview methods permit considerable latitude in responses and elaboration of dichotomous or ranked item responses. Tables One through Five show data which can be summarized. Other responses by individuals during the interviews are not easily subject to tabular presentation, but may convey more thoughtful consideration and depth of perception than tabular data. Common or striking commentary during the interviews is summarized here by categories.

Familiarity with written policies: Five respondents commented that they should know more about them but don't. Over half

Jack L. Nelson

said they had some familiarity with local policies but were very hesitant in response and suggested they really know comparatively little about them.

Decision Process on Curriculum: Only two commented on the Curriculum Committee of the Board of Education as a part of the process. One noted that teacher teams were involved in the initiation of courses. One stated that department teachers acted "democratically" and all decisions were by agreement. One said all innovation comes from the community. Another said, "The curriculum is made by the publishers by and large." The most general comment was that this community and district were unusual in freedom and openness.

Decision Process on Materials: Four respondents mentioned joint or consensus decisions involving teachers and administrators but said that administrators would, and should, resolve any disputes. One stated, "Board intrusion on decisions is inappropriate." One said that experts from the local university are sometimes consulted on materials.

Groups in Community Which Seem to Have Influence: Most respondents did not identify any when first asked. On second thoughts the following groups were identified by individual respondents: Music parents; German language parents; League of Women Voters; P.T.A.; Religious groups; middle and upper income parents of professional backgrounds. There was no pattern to responses.

Identified Controversial Topics: Four commented that no topics were controversial but teacher handling of a subject may be.

Identified Prohibited Subjects: Three respondents suggested that the students could read anything if their parents approved. One of these stated that "racist propaganda, though, was something else", and should be excluded from schools. Most respondents conveyed an initial response that the community and the schools were very open. When pressed on specific probes the tendency was to narrow the permissible subjects and limit access to those things which had parental, Board, administrator or department head approval. A common comment, typically after a pause, was that a subject was suitable if presented in a "balanced" or "two-sided" or "objective" or "historical" form.

CONCLUSIONS

1. State law in New Jersey puts major responsibilities for curriculum and teaching material selection in the hands of local boards of education. The law requires some subjects and patriotic rituals to be taught but expects local boards to act upon courses of study, texts and alterations. The law is relatively precise but has some apparent contradictions among requirements, decision structure and teacher creativity.

2. In the school district under study the written policies convey, in a rather patronizing statement, rights of citizenship to teachers, but are strong in the support for academic freedom and lack of censorship. This may be an unusual district in this respect.

3. Respondents generally reported very little familiarity with state policies and, although more, limited familiarity with local policies.

4. Respondents were generally supportive of the decision procedures they perceived in this district and had few recommendations for change in decision-making policies or procedures.

5. There was general agreement among respondents that agents other than teachers have and should have final decision power over curriculum but that teachers should have decision power over materials. This seemed to be a reflection of the respondents' positive view of how the system operates in this district.

6. While the state law provides the opportunity for school censorship policies to be undertaken in local school districts by the board of education, this district's policies and respondents' perceptions of actual operations place the locus of potential censorship at the administrator level or in the form of teacher or librarian self-censorship.

7. Although state policies are not as clear or supportive, indeed are restrictive of teacher freedoms, as district policies on academic freedom and relief from censorship, respondents did not appear threatened by policies at either level. The general response was that it was appropriate for the board of education or administrators to make curricular decisions, and for teachers to make decisions on selection of materials. There was broad consensus and apparent pride in the perception of freedom from restraints.

8. Respondent variability on the identification of controversial issues and prohibitable subjects suggests that the most likely form of censorship, if any, occurs at the level of self-censorship. There is a strong belief in the notion of balanced

or two-sided presentations of factual material, governed by the age of students and the relationship to the subject being taught.

9. The perceived nature of this community and its schools as open to ideas and opposed to censorship is widely shared and contributes to apparent high levels of school personnel morale. Enforcement of restrictive policies in existence at the state level would have a detrimental effect upon this morale.

10. Although respondents were generally opposed to the concept of censorship in schools, there was a tendency for respondents to be willing to impose it on selected subjects, speakers or materials which presented biased advocacy, or ideas considered too adult for students at certain ages. The belief in balanced presentations of facts has the potential for censoring any controversial issue where facts are not clear, as well as placing the school as an advocate of status quo by not permitting advocacy views which differ.

Recommendations

1. Further study in different settings.
2. Given the positive views of respondents about teacher freedom on materials selection, and general educational theory respecting academic freedom and censorship, state policies should be altered to be more consistent with this district's policies.
3. Despite existing policies and the consensus opinion from respondents on the proper locus of decisions on curriculum, the logic of academic freedom and teacher accountability for education would oppose relieving teachers of the basic decisions on courses.

Instead, it is recommended that educational programs, pre and in-service, be initiated to make teachers aware of their professional responsibilities on curricular decisions. It is also recommended that the teacher associations undertake efforts to alter state and local district restrictive policies.

TABLE I

Respondent Experience in Years, Degrees

	In Position				In District				Total in Education				Degrees		
	0-4	5-7	8-10	11+	0-4	5-7	8-10	11+	0-4	5-7	8-10	11+	BA	MA	Dr.
Board	1							1			n/a	-	-	1	
Central Admin.	2				1			1				2		2	
Bldg. Admin.	1	1	1			2		1				3		2	1
Teacher-Sec.	2	1	2	1	1		1	4	1		1	4	1	5	
Teacher-Elem.			3				1	2			1	2	1	2	
Guidance		1	1				1	1				2		1	1
Library			1	1		1		1				2	1	1	
TOTALS	6	3	8	2	2	3	3	11	1		2	15	4	13	2
% of N	13	16	42	11	11	16	16	57	05		11	79	21	68	11

N = 19

N/A = Not Applicable

TABLE II

Respondent Familiarity With Written Policies'

	State		Local	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board		1	1	
Central Admin.	2		2	
Bldg. Admin.	3		3	
Teacher-Sec.		6	5	1
Teacher-Elem.		3	3	
Guidance		2	2	
Library		2	1	1
	<hr/>		<hr/>	
TOTALS	5	14	17	2
% of N	26	74	89	11

N = 19

Data based on self-report

TABLE III

Perceptions of Existing and Appropriate Decision Procedures

Initiation:	Admin.	A,B,C			
	Teacher	D,E,F,G	d	B,C,D,E,F,G	B,D,E
	Community				
	Anyone	c,d	C,F		
Review:	Admin.	B,C,D,E,G	E,d	B,G	
	Dept. Head		d	D	
	Teacher				
	Parents		B,C,F		
	Committee	A,G,e		d	
Final Decision:	Board	A,B,C,D,E,G	B,C,F,F,d	B,C,G	B,C,d
	Supt.	F,c,d	A	A	
	Princ.	C,e	c,d,e	F,c,e	A,c
	Teacher		D	B,D,E	B,D,E
	Librarian			G	G

Note: Not all items produced responses

KEY:

Respondant	Majority Response Symbol	Minority Response
Board	A	
Central Administration	B	
Building Administration	C	c
Teacher, Secondary	D	d
Teacher, Elementary	E	e
Guidance	F	
Library	G	

TABLE IV

Perceptions of Controversial or Prohibited Topics and Judgment Criteria

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Totals
Controversial								
None	1	1	2	3		2	2	11
Sex		1		1	1			3
Drugs		1						1
Religion		1		2				3
Abortion			2		1			3
Political Advocacy				1				1
Women's Rights					2			2
Prohibited								
None	1	1	2	5	2	2	1	12
Racism	1				3			4
Deviant Sex (Porno)					1		1	2
Anti-Semitism		1						1
Radicals			1					1
Violence				1				1
Criteria								
Depends on Situation		1				1		2
Educ. Value	1	1						2
Possible Disruption	1			1				2
Age of Students			1	1		1		4
Teacher's Judgment				1				1
Program Goals				2				2
Present Opposition			1	3		1	1	6
Use in Other Schools					1			1

Note: Reported as number of responses. Respondents may have more than one response to each item.

Key: A: Board; B: Central Administration; D: Teacher, Sec.; E: Teacher, Elem.; F: Guidance; G: Library.

TABLE V

Responses to Curricular Requirement Legislation

Potential Requirement	<u>Number of Opinions</u>							<u>Totals</u>
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Silent Worship Period								
Yes					2			2
No	1	2	2	6	1	2	2	16
Pledge of Allegiance								
Yes		2	3	3	2	2	2	14
No	1			2	1			4
American History								
Yes	1	2	2	5	3	2	2	17
No			1	1				2
Sex Education								
Yes	1	2	3	6	3	2	2	19
No								

Key: A: Board; B: Central Administration; C: Bldg. Admin.; D: Teacher, S.C.; E: Teacher, Elem.; F: Guidance; G: Library

CENSORSHIP POLICY IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jack L. Nelson

References

American Civil Liberties Union, Civil Liberties (November, 1976).8.

American Library Association, Library Bill of Rights (June 18, 1948; amended February 2, 1961, June 27, 1967.)

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

Beale, Howard K., A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (New York: Scribner's, 1941.)

Breasted, Mary, Oh! Sex Education (New York: Praeger, 1970)

Gellerman, William, The American Legion as Educator (New York: Teachers College Press, 1938)

Glatthorn, Allan A., "Censorship and the Classroom Teacher", English Journal, 66 (February, 1977) 12-15.

Hart, Harold H., Censorship: For and Against (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1971) 6,7.

Mason, Philip A., "Academic Teaching Freedom", NOLPE School Law Journal (Fall, 1970) 3-22.

National Council for the Social Studies, Social Education, 39:4 (April, 1975)

National Council of Teachers of English, The Students' Right to Read (Adopted, 1962).

Nelson, Jack and Gene Roberts, The Censors and the Schools (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1963).

Nelson, Jack L. & William Hering, Developing a Position on Academic Freedom and Censorship (Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium/ERIC, 1976).

Nelson, Jack L., "Nationalism and Education", Studies in International Conflict (Buffalo: SUNY Buffalo Press, 1968) 113-132

Nelson, Jack L., "Nationalistic vs. Global Education: An Examination of National Bias in the Schools and its Implication for a Global Society", Theory and Research in Social Education IV (August, 1976) 33-50.

New Jersey Administrative Code, Title 6 (State of New Jersey)

New Jersey Statutes Annotated, 18A (State of New Jersey)

New York Times, January 27, 1977.

CENSORSHIP POLICY IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT

Jack L. Nelson

References (cont.)

Nolte, M. Chestery, "From Scopes to Eppason and Beyond", NOLPE School Law Journal 3:1 (Spring, 1973) 37-47.

Pierce, Bessie L., Citizens Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth (New York: Scribner's, 1933).

Schimmel, David, "The Bill of Rights and the Public Schools: Change and Challenge, 39:4 Social Education (April, 1975) 206-213.

Telford, Thomas, "The Student's Right to Read (and Speak)", English Journal, 63.9 (December, 1974)

APPENDIX A

Interview Schedule - Policies in local districts

1. Name/code.
 2. Position: if teacher, what subject & grade(s).
 3. Years in position in school.
 4. Years in district
 5. Years experience in education
 6. Highest degree held; institution
-
1. Are you familiar with written state laws/regulations/policies regarding decisions on curriculum and selection of teaching materials?
 2. Are you aware of written policies in this district?
 3. Describe the process, as you understand it, for making decisions in this district.
 - a. on curriculum, courses.
 - b. on teaching materials, speakers
PROBE: Who initiates?; What groups or individuals have advisory power? What groups or individuals have decision powers? What is someone complains?
 4. Who SHOULD have advisory or consultative function in process?
 5. Who SHOULD have final decision power in process?
 6. In this community which groups seem most concerned or most influential in process of deciding on curriculum or teaching materials?
 7. What topics do you consider highly controversial for schools?
 8. Should any topics, teaching materials or speakers be prohibited from consideration in schools? PROBE: racist propaganda, group sex, religious dogma.
 9. If yes, what criteria should be used to make judgment?
 10. Have you had any requests for curriculum, courses, teaching materials, or speakers rejected?
modified?
Delayed beyond reasonable time?
 11. Have you decided yourself to control access of students to topics or materials? PROBE: reasons?
 12. Do you think we should have:
 - a. Period of silent worship in schools
 - b. pledge of Allegiance required daily
 - c. American History required
 - d. Sex education; in elementary school?
 - e. other?
 13. Have you any suggestions for what policies should exist to cover decisions on curriculum, teaching materials, speakers?

