

December 2, 1963

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Weldon Lee Estes entitled "The Curricular Status of Religion in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Howard F. Alden
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Chris B. Goff
John W. Giddland
William E. BL
Earl M. Ranner

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton R. Smith
Dean of the Graduate School

THE CURRICULAR STATUS OF RELIGION IN LAND-GRANT
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Weldon Lee Estes
December 1963

33

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is indebted to many individuals for their assistance and encouragement in the completion of this study.

A special debt of gratitude is expressed to Dr. Howard F. Aldmon, Chairman of the committee, for his encouragement, council, and interest in the study. Without his words of counsel and encouragement, the writer would have been unable to complete the study.

Acknowledgement for invaluable help, encouragement, and manifest interest is expressed to the other members of the committee composed of Dr. Orin B. Graff, Dr. John W. Gilliland, Dr. Earl M. Ramer, and Dr. William E. Cole.

The writer is indebted to his wife, Elizabeth, and children, Angela and Lee, whose encouragement, inspiration, and sympathetic understanding, aided him to achieve his goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
General Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Statement of the sub-problems	2
Basic Assumptions	4
Limitations of the Study	5
Scope of the Study	5
The Significance of the Study	9
Definitions of Terms Used	11
Organization of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	14
Introduction	14
Significant Studies Relative to Religion in	
Higher Education	14
Significant Studies Relative to the Legal Aspect	
of Religion in Higher Education	24
Significant Studies Relative to Public Education	26
Summary	35
III. PROCEDURES	36
Introduction	36
The Selection of the Institutions	37

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Development of the Instrument	38
The Gathering of Data	39
The Analysis of the Data	40
Summary	43
IV. AN ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE CURRICULAR STATUS OF RELIGION IN LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	44
Introduction	44
General Information	44
Organization and Administration	46
Satisfaction of approach	52
Supervision and coordination of programs	55
Curricula	58
Courses in philosophy with religious content	58
Courses in sociology of religion	60
Courses relating to the church	61
Courses in the history of religion	61
Courses in religious ethics	62
Courses in psychology of religion	62
Courses in the Bible as literature	63
Courses involving the study of the Bible as a whole	64
Courses in the Old Testament	65
Courses in the New Testament	66

CHAPTER	PAGE
Criteria for determining content	67
Persons responsible for determining content	68
Syllabus describing course	69
Changes in the curriculum	69
Announcing and scheduling curricular offerings	72
Relationship of religion to total curricula	72
Faculty	73
Finances	73
Facilities	75
Miscellaneous	76
Summary	77
V. AN ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM INSTITUTIONS REPORTING SCHOOLS OF RELIGION AND BIBLE CHAIRS	78
Introduction	78
An Analysis of Data Relative to Schools of Religion	78
An Analysis of Data Relative to Bible Chairs	84
Summary	87
VI. THE RATIONALE AND THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE APPROACHES USED TO BRING RELIGION INTO THE CURRICULA	88
Introduction	88
The Rationale for the Presence of Religion in the Curricula	89
The Rationale for the Absence of Religion in the Curricula	92

CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary of Arguments For and Against the	
Major Approaches	95
The interdepartmental approach	95
The department of religion approach	97
The department of philosophy and religion	99
School of religion, affiliated foundation, and	
affiliated college approaches	100
Summary	103
VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR	
FURTHER STUDY	104
Introduction	104
Summary	104
Discussion of Data	106
Organization and administration	106
Curricula	108
Faculty	110
Finances	111
Facilities	112
Summary of Findings	112
Recommendations for Further Study	113
BIBLIOGRAPHY	114
APPENDIX A	125
APPENDIX B	129
APPENDIX C	132
APPENDIX D	139

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Positions Held by Respondents to the Instrument	45
II. Number of Years Religious Instruction Had Been Offered	47
III. Approaches Used in Offering Religious Instruction . . .	49
IV. Responses as to the Satisfaction of the Approaches . . .	53
V. Number of Faculty Teaching Religion Courses	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades the place of religion in state colleges and universities has received renewed attention. In 1920 the average offerings in religious education were 2.5 courses, in 1930 five course offerings in religious education, and the academic year 1955-56 showed an average of nearly nine course offerings in religion.¹ In the decade of the 1940's Merrimon Cuninggim reported 80 per cent of the tax-supported universities offered courses in religion.² A study made in 1955-56 reported that 97 per cent of the state universities offered courses in religion.³

Seymour A. Smith has indicated:

One of the several easy ways of provoking an argument in the academic scene is to pose the question, "Should religion courses be introduced in state universities?" While academicians, religious leaders and non-religious leaders have been letting fly at each other with theory-laden brickbats, the universities as institutions have been quietly answering the question in a definitive way by the practices they have adopted.⁴

¹Seymour A. Smith, "Religious Instruction in State Universities: A Report on Recent Trends," Religious Education, 53:290-4, May-June, 1958.

²Merrimon Cuninggim, The College Seeks Religion (New York: Yale University Press, 1947), p. 147.

³Smith, op. cit., p. 293.

⁴Ibid., p. 290.

An examination of the literature in regards to what tax-supported institutions are doing the nation over with respect to religion in the curricula reveals very clearly the current status. The fact remains theory or no theory, constitutional or unconstitutional, right or wrong, almost all of the tax-supported institutions are making curricular provision for religion.

The mere recognition of religion in the curricula of tax-supported institutions of higher learning does not indicate that all of the fundamental issues regarding the appropriate place of religion in state universities have been solved. It does, however, seem to indicate that, irrespective of barriers and problems which have existed in this area, tax-supported institutions have found ways of accommodating that which seems to them to be appropriate, the relating of the study of religion to the educational enterprise.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The general purpose of this study was to develop a body of systematic knowledge about the curricular status of religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities. The study was concerned with a complex set of relationships between Land-Grant colleges and universities and religion. It was a subject that could be viewed from every point on the religious, educational, and political compass. However, the fact that the place of religion in the curricula of tax-supported institutions was regarded as a

"controversial subject" was considered no reason for deferring further exploration of the issue.

While the contemporary concern over the curricular status of religion in tax-supported institutions focuses mainly on the public schools, the broader educational approach to the systematic study of religious subject matter forbids the exclusion of institutions of higher learning. Since World War I, the Supreme Court of the United States has been called upon to decide questions which involved the issue of the place, if any, which religion might occupy in the curricula of public education. Until the present time these decisions have been directly concerned with elementary and secondary schools, whose attendance to which is compulsory. The repercussions, however, have affected higher education as well.

Every age must rewrite its history and reshape its educational systems in the light of its accumulated experience. A. L. Sebaly of Western Michigan University had the following to say:

The next decade will be an exciting one for those who are interested in considering the extent to which the study of religion should be included in the curriculum. Among educators there is increasingly an openness of discussion about the area. There will be a change of emphasis in some of the subjects as they are related to religion. For example, in the field of sociology there is an increasing interest in the study of the institution of religion. And certainly there is an increasing interest in the study of the place of religion in psychology. Study and teaching in the various disciplines, however, are not enough. There is need for experimentation and research if the gains of the past decade are to be furthered.⁵

⁵A. L. Sebaly, "To What Extent Should the Study of Religion Be Included in the Curriculum?" Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1960), p. 76.

Statement of the Sub-problems

In order to fulfill the general purpose of this study, it seemed necessary to investigate the following sub-problems:

1. To determine the organizational and administrative approach for offering courses in religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities.
2. To determine where religion was included in the curricula of Land-Grant colleges and universities.
3. To determine what religion courses were offered in the curricula of Land-Grant colleges and universities.
4. To determine who constituted the instructional staff for religion courses in Land-Grant colleges and universities.
5. To determine the pattern of financing the program of religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities.
6. To ascertain the facilities used to house the program of religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities.

III. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

In a study of this nature it was necessary to make certain basic assumptions:

1. It was assumed that religion was a recognized social phenomenon in our society and as such was a legitimate subject for study in Land-Grant colleges and universities.
2. It was assumed that the presence of religion courses in the curricula of Land-Grant colleges and universities was within

the legal limits of the Constitution of the United States.

3. It was assumed that religion should have the same curricular status as any other discipline, both for teaching and research.

4. It was assumed that religion in a Land-Grant institution should be dealt with academically in terms of the pluralistic status of religion in America.

5. It was assumed that enough Land-Grant colleges and universities would participate in the study to permit the development of a valid, comprehensive report.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Certain limitations were pertinent to the study:

1. The study was limited to Land-Grant colleges and universities.

2. The study was limited to those functions relating to religion and was not concerned with other phases of the institutions' programs.

3. The study was limited to opportunities for undergraduate study in religion.

V. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This investigation involved a study of the curricular status of religion in the seventy Land-Grant colleges and universities in the United States which were founded or substantially developed

during the latter part of the nineteenth century. The names of these institutions are listed in Appendix A.

The support of these institutions traditionally is from taxation, the initial grants having been made in the Morrill Act, passed by Congress in 1862. Under this Act a grant of land amounting to 30,000 acres for each senator and representative in Congress was provided by the Federal Government for each State. Proceeds from sale of these lands were to be invested, and the income used to establish and endow:

. . . at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanic arts, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.⁶

In the years that followed the passage of the Morrill Act every state and eventually three United States territories established new colleges or combined the Land-Grant function with existing functions. As a result of the act, twenty separate colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts were founded; thirty-two state or territorial universities were established or further developed; and with the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890, seventeen agricultural and mechanical colleges for Negroes were

⁶American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, "Laws Affecting Land-Grant Institutions," Land-Grant Fact Book (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, 1962), p. 28.

developed in the South. Since that time one of the Negro colleges has lost its status as a Land-Grant institution.

In at least nine states, Land-Grant colleges were founded upon previously private institutions. In 1872, the State of Alabama accepted the gift of Eastern Alabama Male College at Auburn from the Methodist Church. In 1855, the College of California was incorporated, and twelve years later gave its land and facilities to the state on the condition that the state would establish a "complete university." Delaware College had been started as a Presbyterian school but became the recipient of 90,000 acres of land scrip as a result of the Morrill Act of 1862. Bluemont Central College was given by the Methodist Church to the State of Kansas in order to bring the Agricultural and Mechanical College to Manhattan. In Kentucky, the Agricultural and Mechanical College was set up in connection with a Christian Church owned school named Kentucky University. Maryland, Oregon, Tennessee, and West Virginia also built their Land-Grant schools on the basis of earlier private colleges. As would be expected, the patterns which had already been established in student life were not greatly altered by the additional curricular offerings and public appropriations. When the University of North Carolina added a Science Department to its program in 1867, the administration announced that students in the Science Department "would be required and expected to attend recitations, prayers, public worship."⁷

⁷Clarence P. Shedd, Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements (New York: Association Press, 1934), p. 16.

The program of today's Land-Grant college and university is the traditional campus offering of thousands of undergraduate and graduate courses. Though they continue to include the basic offerings in the fields of agriculture and engineering, approximately 40 per cent of their students are enrolled in colleges of liberal arts and sciences. The emphasis in the Land-Grant colleges has been on practical education without excluding the traditional.

The following figures illustrate the place of Land-Grant colleges and universities in the higher education system of the United States:

They enroll 20 per cent of the college population; they grant 40 per cent of doctorate degrees in all subjects; they confer about one-half of all doctorates in the sciences, engineering, and in the health professions; all of those in agriculture, and approximately one-fourth of the total in the arts and languages, in business and commerce, and in education itself. The Land-Grant institutions train almost half of all regular and reserve officers of the armed forces through ROTC programs. Of 36 living American Nobel Prize winners who went to college in this country, one half earned degrees from Land-Grant institutions.⁸

The United States Office of Education reported that at the present time only a fraction of the money Land-Grant colleges and universities spend on campus teaching and independent research comes from the Federal Government.

In fiscal 1957, the U. S. Office of Education reports that all the Land-Grant institutions together spent \$325,517,585 on campus instruction.

⁸"Centennial Section," Land-Grant Fact Book, op. cit., p. 1.

The Federal appropriations that year for instruction facilities and teacher salaries came to \$5,051,500. The income from the invested Land-Grant money came to \$3,328,705. This makes a total Federal contribution of \$8,380,205 or less than 3 percent of the amount actually spent.

The Federal Government provides additional money for experiment stations and extension courses run by Land-Grant colleges and universities. But this money cannot be spent for classroom instruction and departmental research, the biggest single annual expense of Land-Grant colleges in fiscal 1957--a typical year.⁹

It was within the scope of this study to provide a full, factual picture of the practices of Land-Grant institutions in making curricular offerings in religion and of factors which determine their policies with respect thereto.

VI. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

During the past decade there has been a marked interest in religion as it is related to public education, especially higher education. Evidence for such an assertion comes from the emphasis being placed upon the topic in books, journals, and periodicals. This assumption is further attested by the fact that "virtually all church-related colleges, independent or private universities, and state universities today offer courses in religion. Junior colleges and technical institutions have also begun to offer courses."¹⁰

⁹Ibid., p. 30.

¹⁰J. Edward Dirks, "To What Extent Should Religion Be Included in the Curriculum?" Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1960), p. 73.

The need of higher education for increased support and the serious inequalities of higher educational opportunities among the several states have accelerated efforts to secure federal aid for higher education. Along with this need, the failure of certain educational legislation in the past Congress because of aid to church-related schools has intensified the interest in the relation of religion and tax-supported institutions of higher learning.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court and current cases pending before the Court have aroused new interest in the meaning of the First Amendment. It was felt by the writer that the increased interest in this area gave a note of worthwhileness to the study.

No matter how one may interpret and appraise these signs of awakened interest in religion and public education, there is still the demand on the part of the institution of higher learning to give serious consideration to the subject. It is a part of the complex situation in which higher education finds itself. Information forthcoming from this study should prove to be valuable and useful to Land-Grant institutions and to other institutions of higher learning as they plan their future programs.

The writer felt that the determination of the future pattern of religious education in higher education presented a problem which deserved the earnest attention of schoolmen, statesmen, and churchmen, alike. Thus, it was entirely appropriate for this study to be pursued both extensively and intensively.

VII. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Land-Grant colleges and universities. The term "Land-Grant colleges and universities" is used to designate "a group of sixty-eight institutions of higher learning in the United States which were founded or substantially developed during the latter half of the nineteenth century by an act of Congress."¹¹

Religion. Religion is defined for the purpose of this study as "a particular kind of faith and practice entertained and propagated by its devotees as, the Christian or the Jewish Religion."¹²

Separation of church and state. The phrase "separation of church and state" is given the meaning that Justice Black gave it in the Everson v. Board of Education case.

Neither a state nor the federal government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another In other words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state.¹³

Education. Education is defined as assisting the seekers for more truth and a better life. Education is "an activity or endeavor in which the more mature of human society deal with the

¹¹Edward D. Eddy, Jr., "The Land-Grant Movement," Land-Grant Fact Book. op. cit., p. 2.

¹²Harold White (ed.), Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1951), p. 1435.

¹³Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U. S. 1 (1947).

less mature, in order to achieve a greater maturity in them and contribute thereby to the improvement of human life."¹⁴

Curriculum. In general, curriculum is interpreted to be the concrete presentation of educational aims and points of view and scope and sequence of content, as incorporated in courses of study and other curriculum bulletins.¹⁵

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is divided into eight chapters, each of which is concerned with a different phase of the study. Chapter I has presented the statement of the problem, the sub-problems, the limitations, the assumptions on which the study was based, the scope of the study with very brief attention devoted to the history of Land-Grant colleges and State universities, the significance of the study, and the definitions of terms used.

Chapter II reviews significant selected studies relating specifically to the investigation.

Chapter III describes the general development of the study with the procedures used in gathering the data.

Chapter IV analyzes the data secured from the completed questionnaires provided by participating Land-Grant institutions.

¹⁴J. Donald Butler, Four Philosophies and Their Practice In Education and Religion (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941), p. 63.

¹⁵Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1949), p. 118.

Chapter V analyzes the data from institutions reporting Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs.

Chapter VI sets forth the rationale for the inclusion of religion in the curricula. The second section discusses the rationale for the exclusion of religion from the curricula. The chapter also discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches used by Land-Grant institutions for making religion available in their curricula.

Chapter VII presents the summary, findings and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of significant studies related to this study. Selected studies that reported findings pertinent to this investigation are reviewed under the following headings: significant studies relative to religion in higher education, significant studies relative to the legal aspect of religion in higher education, and significant studies relative to religion in public education.

II. SIGNIFICANT STUDIES RELATIVE TO RELIGION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A study related to the present study was designed and reported by Parker. The study, "Religion at Land-Grant Colleges,"¹ was designed for the purpose of assisting South Dakota State College in developing a program of courses in religion. A questionnaire was framed and mailed to 125 universities and colleges in the United States supported by tax funds. Teachers colleges and normal schools were not included. Answers were

¹Donald Dean Parker, "Religion at Land-Grant Colleges," Journal of Religious Education, 42:80-85, March-April, 1947.

received from ninety-seven institutions. In general the questionnaire brought out the wide divergence of opinion regarding the problem of offering courses in religion in state-supported universities and colleges. Information was sought as to the manner in which courses in religion were taught in the various institutions and the percentage of students who took courses in religion.

Blakeman² in a study of religion in tax-supported universities made the following observations:

1. Unlike the picture of church-related and independent institutions, religion and Bible courses are never required of students. Religion, art, and philosophy must compete for patronage with many required core subjects.

2. Religion, where its ecclesiastical aspects and structure have been expressly omitted by governmental action, falls to a secondary status, academically.

3. The budgets of the Arts College of a tax-supported university customarily do not include generous sums for introductory courses in the humanities, philosophy and religion.

The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and the American Council on Education sponsored a study on College Reading and Religion.³ The

²Edward W. Blakeman, "A Realistic View of Religion in State Universities," Journal of Religious Education, 43:355-359, November-December 1948.

³The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and the American Council on Education, College Reading and Religion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 345 pp.

study consisted of reports written by groups of scholars and teachers, representing the several disciplines, on reading materials used in college courses. Each author chose those texts and reference works most frequently used in his field. The materials were studied with reference to the question: To what extent do college reading materials present religion fairly, adequately, and with understanding? Although points of view contained in textbooks are not necessarily identical with those of the classroom teacher, it was felt that they were representative of trends in the various studies included in the college curriculum.

The general conclusions drawn from the individual reports of the study were:

1. The authors had views and assumptions which were bound to color their conclusions.
2. There was also wide variation from field to field with respect to the manner in which religion was involved. For example, most textbooks in physical science made little reference to religion.
3. It was not possible to avoid religion entirely in such fields as history, philosophy, and English literature.
4. It was evident that religion was a neglected field of reading and study on the part of college students.
5. The lightness of touch and even ignorance with which intellectual issues having religious bearing were dealt with would seem little less than astonishing when the expansion of scholarship

in general was taken into account.

Seymour A. Smith reported a study⁴ concerning religious education in seventy state universities, including those of all states except Wyoming, Louisiana, and New York. The study was sharply focused on the large state universities. Selection was based on size and prominence as a rough rule of thumb.

The following conclusions were reported:

1. The time has now come when virtually all state universities acknowledge that by one device or another it is legitimate to include the systematic study of religion in the educational program of university students.

2. Although much public attention has focused on schools of religion and although many leaders among the major faith groups have urged the extension of such schools in relation to state universities, only a small number of state universities have adopted such an arrangement.

3. There is clear evidence that state universities are offering an increasing number of courses in religion.

The Committee on Teacher Education and Religion was commissioned by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, in 1953, to undertake a thorough study of the function of religion in teacher education and report its findings and conclusions.⁵ The study was financed through a grant from the

⁴Smith, op. cit., pp. 290-4.

⁵A. L. Sebaly, "Five Year Study of Teacher Education and Religion," Phi Delta Kappan, 40:314-17, May, 1959.

the Danforth Foundation for a period of five years.

In the course of the study, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education explored for five years through the work of fifteen pilot institutions the relationship of various subject matter disciplines to religion.

The policy-making groups within the AACTE reached the following agreements as a basis for the design of its Teacher Education and Religion Study:

1. It is the proper function of colleges and universities preparing teachers to teach an intelligent understanding of the role of religion in human affairs.

2. The area of study was defined as teaching about religion--a factual study of religion whenever and wherever it is intrinsic to learning experience in the various fields of study.

3. The aim of the study was intelligent understanding of the role of religion in human affairs.

4. The study was not to emphasize the development of religious literacy among prospective teachers in the sense of the great organized religious beliefs of the world and their principal tenets.

5. The study had further limitations in that it was not to seek the development of a sense of individual commitment in encouraging students to explore the resources of religion as a basis for durable conviction.⁶

⁶Ibid., p. 315.

The AACTE study was to be an academic enterprise, one which was limited in scope to curricular affairs; one which was concerned with where religion was intrinsic to the various disciplines taught by college and university teacher education institutions.

The Committee reported the following findings:

1. The extent to which a college or university pre-service teacher education program is producing teachers who are cognizant of the role which religion has played in the culture is dependent to a large degree upon the strength of the general education offering of that institution.

2. Any faculty group which wishes to study the relationship of teacher education to religion will have to accept the fact that much time will be spent in discussion and exploration to define the problem.

3. To have an effective study in the area of teacher education and religion, the local faculty and administration must be convinced that it is the proper function of colleges and universities preparing teachers to teach intelligent understanding of the role of religion in human affairs.

4. There are wide gaps in the available materials for study in the area of teacher education and religion.

5. Public school teachers and administrators do have problems in their day-to-day work which are related to religion.⁷

⁷Ibid., p. 316.

The AACTE's Committee on Teacher-Education and Religion through its five year study accomplished these things:

1. It demonstrated that the approach which it advocated for colleges and universities preparing teachers was workable.
2. It stimulated study and discussion in the general area of this Committee's concern.
3. It identified leaders who were willing to work on the problem.
4. It stimulated colleges and universities to study their total program of teacher education.
5. It discovered and developed techniques and processes for working in the area which were applicable to other curricular concerns of a college or university.
6. It identified many courses which had relevancy to religion.⁸

Milton D. McLean and Harry H. Kimber made an extensive study⁹ of programs of religion in twenty-five state institutions. The material for the study was originally gathered for a resource paper for the first National Consultative Conference on Religion in the State University held at the University of Michigan in November, 1958.

⁸Ibid., p. 317.

⁹Milton D. McLean and Harry H. Kimber, Teaching of Religion in State Universities: Descriptions of Programs in Twenty-five Institutions (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1960), 117 pp.

A pursual of the study left the impression of considerable variety in practice and a striking lack of agreement on just what a course in religion is. The study made it obvious that there were some institutions in which religion was regarded as an area of discipline that was worthy of a departmental structure of its own and that deserved to be investigated and taught (about) by qualified scholars in the field. Furthermore the authors pointed out that this could be done without violating the First Amendment.

The various programs described in the study were divided into two major categories--programs administered by the institutions and co-operative programs. The first category included departmental and interdepartmental programs, while the second included schools of religion and their types of co-operating programs. The colleges and universities involved provided most of the descriptive material and enrollment data.

The authors included in the study selected passages from the literature dealing with the beginnings and the rationale of the two contrasting programs, one in the Department of Religion at the University of North Carolina and the other in the School of Religion at the University of Iowa.

The findings of the study indicated a relatively high ratio of student enrollment when compared with data on the teaching of other elective college subjects. The data also revealed that the academic preparation of those teaching religion seemed to compare favorably with the preparation of teachers in other disciplines.

The final conclusion of the study was that religion could be presented in the curriculum of the state university by well-trained men in a disciplined and scholarly atmosphere and in such manner as not to remove all life from the subject.¹⁰

George A. Buttrick made a study¹¹ of Biblical thought and the secular university. The study was made in preparation for three lectures to be given at Rice Institute. The three chapters in the study were concerned with the delicate line between "assumptions and presumptions," "reason and revelation," and "mutual gifts." The first part of the study challenged the assumptions of both the church and the college, as for instance that the church has certain ready-made truths to impose on the educators or that secularism is hard-headed truth rather than a naive faith that is now being weighed and increasingly proved wanting. A good portion of this section dealt with an examination of human nature in its bearing on higher education.

The second portion of the study examined the boundaries of man's mind and what is continually presupposed by educators to be beyond those boundaries. It was Buttrick's theory that revelation, instead of commutating the mind to closed answers, opens the total inquirer to expanding horizons in the search for truth and for the

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 114-116.

¹¹George Arthur Buttrick, Biblical Thought and the Secular University (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1960), 83 pp.

presuppositions and implications of knowledge.

The final section of the study was a model of constructive thinking wherein the author, out of the wealth of his experience, offered the reader a list of "graces" that were distinctive to each of the two fields but which can create a mutual enrichment.

The gifts that higher education had bestowed on Biblical thought were given as follows:¹²

1. The college demonstrates a fellowship in which prejudice of rank and race has been measurably overcome.
 2. The defense of a rightful freedom by education.
 3. The resistance of indoctrination, however reluctantly received by the household of faith.
 4. The provision of "higher criticism" and "lower criticism" as a means of inquiry into the date, authorship, structure and purpose of the books of the Bible.
 5. The insistence by the university on truth and fact.
- The gifts of Biblical faith to the secular university were: the gift of faith itself, the gift of hope, and the gift of love.

The author pointed out that some on the side of religion would feel, of course, that he had compromised the place of religion both in life and education by insisting that the university religion had to be offered on a complete take-it or leave-it basis, whereas some, engaged in higher education would respond

¹²Ibid., pp. 50-55.

that he had sold education short by refusing to accept complete objectivity as the only possible basis of discussion of the two.

III. SIGNIFICANT STUDIES RELATIVE TO THE LEGAL ASPECT OF RELIGION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Studies dealing with the legal aspects of religion in higher education have been reported from various sections of the country. George H. Ball¹³ studied the law in the United States as it relates to the position of religion in a state university. The findings of the study were largely negative in the sense that there was practically no law or precedent which directly related to the position of religion in the state university. The author found that cases involving the state university were usually freedom of religion cases dealing with the issue of student's right to refuse to take a compulsory course in military science and tactics. Only one case involving compulsory attendance at chapel in a state university was found and that case was some fifty years old and was never appealed from the state courts.

The statutes and records of court decisions as they applied to the religious practices in the public schools were searched to discover if they were based on any principles which would affect the presence of religion in a state university. The study con-

¹³George H. Ball, "The Religious Practices of State Universities in the Light of Legal Requirements." (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1950), 240 pp.

cluded that it was dangerous to generalize from what was found in the law as it was applied to the public school situation for two critical factors were different:

1. The public school is a school where attendance is compulsory, and in the state university attendance is voluntary.

2. Students at the university level are more mature and less the victim of indoctrination than children. Therefore, the author concluded that it is impossible to forecast in advance of the court decision what weight the court will give to these factors.¹⁴

Fredric Mitchell made a study¹⁵ of the principal cases before the Supreme Court of the United States involving religion and education from a first case in 1894 to 1948. The procedure for the study was to examine the briefs argued before the Court, pertinent social forces associated with the cases, and the opinions of legal scholars on the Court's decisions.

The findings of the study indicated that the doctrine of separation of church from state, embodied as law in the First Amendment of the Constitution, becomes in the content of religion and education, an injunction prohibiting aid or hindrance of religion by state or federal agencies, including the public schools.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Fredric Mitchell, "The Supreme Court of the United States on Religion and Education," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., 1959), 326 pp.

Churches are equally prohibited in the realm of education from establishing themselves in law by gaining religious status or tax support for their educational programs or schools.

IV. SIGNIFICANT STUDIES RELATIVE TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education issued a report, The Relation of Religion to Public Education,¹⁶ in April, 1947. The Committee took a firm position against religious instruction--in the sense of indoctrination--in tax-supported schools, but contended vigorously for including in the public school program, for objective study, religious subject matter wherever it was intrinsically related to a given school discipline.

The following considerations were formulated as a result of the study:

1. It is the job of public education to introduce youth critically and appreciatively to the inclusive range of values of democratic culture, which is America at its best.

2. The forces of religion are an integral part of this culture and should be included therefore in the curriculum of public education.

3. The public school which, in colonial times, was the

¹⁶Committee on Religion and Education, The Relation of Religion to Public Education: The Basic Principles, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947), 167 pp.

interpreter to youth of a religion (church)-centered American society, has, bit by bit, yielded to the acidity of secularism until it is now offering youth a kind of education that disregards the subject of religion and, in particular, the Judeo-Christian heritage of western culture.

4. A result of this distorted instruction of youth to the American way of living is that (a) youth are not receiving the understanding and sanctions of religion they need to help them stand firm in our times, and (b) youth are being taught by indirection that religion may be a negligible human interest in the maintenance of a sound American democracy.

5. The public school, if it is to continue to serve the interests of our democratic culture, must rethink its function and reincorporate into its program a fit place for the subject of religion. The report sets forth how this task can be accomplished.¹⁷

The American Council on Education published a second report in 1953 under the title, The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion,¹⁸ which set forth an attempt by the Committee on Religion and Education to survey existing practices in this area and the opinions of educational and religious leaders with respect to the position which the committee had advocated.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 161-167.

¹⁸The American Council on Education, The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion (Washington: American Council on Education, 1953), 145 pp.

The Committee found a conspicuous lack of anything approximating an "American way" with respect to the relation of religion to public education. There were evidences of more or less deliberate avoidance of religious subject matter even when it was clearly intrinsic to the discipline concerned. On the other hand, the Committee found planned religious activities widely prevalent--activities that, in many cases, could by no stretch of imagination be reconciled with the rigid prohibitions set up by the United States Supreme Court in the Everson and McCollum cases. Finally the Committee found some attempts to steer a course between these extremes by means of objective study of religion in culture.

A significant result of the study was the apparent impossibility of designing any one policy, with or without judicial sanction, that would meet the widely diverse conditions existing in different parts of the country, especially in communities that were relatively homogeneous with respect to religion. The study also showed a high degree of receptivity on the part of educational leaders toward the general position which the committee had formulated and a corresponding readiness for experimentation designed to test its practicality.¹⁹

The Educational Policies Commission issued a highly significant report in 1951 under the title, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools.²⁰ In a section dealing with religion,

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 81-84.

²⁰The Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools (Washington: National Education Association, 1951).

the Commission placed emphasis on the teaching of religion as empirical cultural fact. The Commission designated this approach as "teaching about religion." The study concluded that the public schools can teach objectively about religion without advocating or teaching any religious creed and that knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our culture, literature, art, history, and current affairs.

Murra attempted to develop a theory²¹ that would differentiate between appropriate and inappropriate rules of religion in public education. A clue to possible solution of the problem was found in the fact that government in the United States was secular. Historical evidence was adduced to show that the federal government was deliberately founded on a thoroughly secular basis.

The hypothesis of the study was declared to be that a theory for differentiating between what the public schools should do and what they should not do with respect to religion can best be stated in terms of dichotomous distinction between the secular and the nonsecular, to wit: The assumptions underlying the functions of public schools should be secular, the objectives of public school instruction should be secular, and the content of public schools should abstain from nonsecular assumptions, from seeking the attain-

²¹Wilbur Fim Murra, "An Inquiry into the Role of Religion in the Public Schools of a Secular State," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1958), 490 pp.

ment of nonsecular objectives, and from teaching nonsecular curriculum content.

This hypothesis was then tested by applying it to concrete current issues involving the role of religion in public schools. It was concluded (a) that American public schools do not, and properly should not, teach secularism; (b) the public schools in a secular state including, specifically, public schools in the United States, should not teach religion; but (c) they do, and properly should, teach about religion. The study confirmed the hypothesized utility of the secular-nonsecular dichotomy as a theoretical basis for determining the proper role of religion in the public schools of a secular state.

Dierenfield²² investigated the current relationship between religion and American public schools on the elementary and secondary level. This effort was made to clarify, if possible, the extremely complex situation regarding the existing relationship between public education and religion.

The procedure of the study involved tracing the historical background of the problem from the first colonial settlements to the present time. The importance of the legal aspect of the issue led to a chapter on state and federal law. Typical practices

²²Richard B. Dierenfield, "An Examination of the Current Relationship between Religion and American Public Schools," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 1958), 378 pp.

presently used in public schools in their handling of religion made up another part of the investigation. An exhaustive reading of the literature in the area and analysis of current printed material used in schools with statements from a large number of school officials provided the source of material for this division of the paper.

The study arrived at the following findings and conclusions:

1. A great variation exists among schools in their policies regarding religion.
2. A wide difference of judicial opinion exists regarding religion in public education on all levels of state and federal courts.
3. Sectarians are pressing for more religious emphasis in public education.
4. Factual information on many of the aspects of relationship is not available.
5. Court decisions on the subject will increase as local practices are taken into court.
6. The factual "teaching about" religion is receiving powerful support from influential groups.
7. The Roman Catholic Church will continue to press for tax aid for their parochial schools on local and national levels.
8. Teachers in the public schools will be better educated to handle the teaching of religion in the future.²³

Cleo C. Beery²⁴ made a study to learn what eminent educators

²³Ibid.

²⁴Cleo C. Beery, "Public Schools and Religion: The Opinions of Nine Eminent Educators," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1960), 220 pp.

had thought about the role of public schools in the teaching of religion and to determine whether eminent educators believed that the teaching of religion and the practices of religious worship should be completely excluded from the public schools.

The inquiry was limited to opinions about religion in public schools. Six hypotheses were formulated with respect to the probable beliefs of the educators and an outline of pertinent ideas was developed for research. Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, William T. Harris, Francis Parker, G. Stanley Hall, John Dewey, H. H. Horne, William G. Bagley, and William T. Kilpatrick were selected for study. Their publications were studied, analyzed, and compared with the hypotheses.

The findings of the study were:

1. There was no agreement as to the exact meaning of the principle of separation or the extent to which religion should be included in, or excluded from, the public schools.
2. There were some who believed that religious practices such as Bible reading should be included in the curriculum while others insisted that such practices should be excluded.
3. There was no one who was able to discard his own beliefs and take a neutral or objective position in regard to the teaching of his own religious ideas in the public schools.
4. There were those who opposed both direct and indirect religious teaching in public schools.
5. There were none who consistently believed that demo-

cratic solution to the problem was the complete elimination of religion or of religious teaching from the public schools.

6. The attitudes reflected the changing philosophical and religious beliefs which were striving for dominance during the past 130 years.

In related areas not included in the hypotheses the educators were enthusiastic supporters of liberty, freedom of conscience, and democracy, and were anxious that religious doctrines should not be forced upon children in the public schools. They agreed that the teaching of morals and ethics was an important part of the public school curriculum. Whether morals and ethics depend upon religious sanction was a point of disagreement among the educators.

The conclusion was that the eminent educators did not believe in the complete separation of religion and religious ideas from public school education. Eight of the nine were unable to separate their own religious ideas from the ideas which they thought should be included in the public school curriculum. When an educator's own definition of religion and his own approved religious beliefs were compared with the ideas which he advocated for inclusion in the public school curriculum, there was close similarity. The educators appeared to be unaware of the fact that they breached the principle of separation at this point.

A study completed by Jack J. Cohen²⁵ attempted to provide a

²⁵Jack J. Cohen, "The Dilemma of Religion in Public Education," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., 1959), 305 pp.

theoretical basis on which to resolve the dilemma which faces American educators as a result of their adherence to the principle of separation of church and state and the ideal of free inquiry. The study first considered the principle of religious pluralism in the United States. The position of the author was that unity in a democracy must be formed both in theory and practice, without religious uniformity. The study showed why American policy cannot be viewed as Christian, why it cannot be founded on religious supernaturalism and why, on the other hand, its religious quality should be accorded recognition. This quality, the author pointed out, had to be understood in the context of the First Amendment.

Against this background, Cohen went on to explore several positions on the role of religion in public education. The thinking of Moehlman, Heber, Kouwenheven, Vogt, H. R. Niebuhr, Williams, and Kaplan was analyzed as a prelude to the author's presentation of his own view.

It was the author's thesis that democratic education required that American civilization be explored in all its facets, in order that students be free to elicit the universal values that it suggested and in order, too, that they be trained to enhance its universal quality by their own criticism. The writer identified this enterprise as religious in character and as being fully in accord with democratic institutions.

The last chapter showed how religion could be legitimately studied through the study of American civilization and through the

treatment of religion as concern for qualitative development of human personality.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a review of research which focused on (a) significant studies relative to religion in higher education, (b) significant studies relative to the legal aspect of religion in higher education, and (c) significant studies relative to religion in public schools.

The next chapter will focus on a description of the procedures used in the study.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

I. INTRODUCTION

The general purpose of this study was to develop a body of systematic knowledge about the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities. The purpose of this chapter is to present the development of the study and the procedures utilized in the fulfillment of the purpose. The selection of the sample, the development of the instrument, the gathering of the data and the analysis of the data are described as elements in the procedures used.

The interest in this study on the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant colleges and the state universities developed during the time the writer was engaged in formal course work at the University of Tennessee. A survey of the literature in the field of religion and higher education created an interest in this area. The possibility of developing such a study was discussed with members of the writer's doctoral committee who gave support to the possibility of such a study.

An investigation of source materials and conferences with interested persons indicated that an instrument for use in securing the desired data could be developed. From this point, the development of this study involved the following procedures.

II. THE SELECTION OF THE INSTITUTIONS

The institutions for this study were selected from the membership of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. These institutions were chosen as a basis for study because of their unique history and relationship to the Federal Government. These colleges were founded out of protest against the limited opportunities in the curriculum available in the traditional classical college. The wide-spread national interest in practical education for the youth of the working class led to the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 by the Federal Congress.

In May of 1963, an explanatory letter was sent to the Academic Vice-Presidents or Academic Deans of the seventy institutions that were members of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. The names of those academic officers were secured from current college catalogues. A copy of this letter may be found in Appendix B. The letter sought the cooperation of the Land-Grant institutions in the following two ways:

- (1) by requesting that the institution agree to participate in the study; and
- (2) by securing the name and address of the person best qualified to complete the brief questionnaire dealing with the curricular status of religion in the institution.

A self-addressed postal card was included with the letter for use by the academic officer in indicating the willingness of his institution to participate in the study and for use in providing the name and address of the person to whom the questionnaire should be sent. The returned

postal cards indicated that sixty or 90 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions were willing to participate in the study. Seven or 10 per cent did not return the postal card; two were unable to participate, and one was an agricultural and experiment station and not a teaching institution. A copy of the information on the postal card may be found in Appendix B.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

An instrument developed specifically for this study was designed during the spring quarter of 1963. The structure and the items in the instrument used for collecting the data were developed from information gathered from a review of the literature and from interviews with interested persons. The instrument was designed to require as little time as possible for completion by the respondents and was constructed in a manner believed to yield the desired information. Spaces were provided for the respondents to indicate the correct information by checking one or more appropriate answers. Where this technique was not possible, space was provided for the comments of the respondents.

The first draft of the instrument was completed and revised. The revised draft was presented to the doctoral seminar of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision for consideration and suggestions. Following this critique, the questionnaire was again revised and submitted to members of the doctoral committee for further suggestions. The instrument was put in final

form and duplicated in May, 1963. A copy of this questionnaire may be found in Appendix C.

The instrument contained forty-two questions under seven major categories which seemed appropriate to the purpose of the study. The seven major categories included in the instrument were: A. General Information, B. Organization and Administration, C. Curricula, D. Faculty, E. Finances, F. Facilities, and G. Miscellaneous.

IV. THE GATHERING OF THE DATA

The design and content of the instrument served as a guide that tended to limit the scope of the study to those categories which were in keeping with the problem and sub-problems of the study. The revised questionnaires were mailed to the sixty Land-Grant institutions that indicated their willingness to participate. Accompanying the copy of the instrument sent to the designated recipient was a letter of introduction, explaining the purpose of the study. Since some of the academic officers designated themselves as recipients of the questionnaire, it was necessary to write two letters to send with the instruments. Copies of these letters may be found in Appendix D. Envelopes with stamp and return address were enclosed with each instrument mailed.

A follow-up letter was mailed, where necessary, six weeks later. Fifty-four institutions or 90 per cent completed their instruments and returned them. Two other instruments were received

too late to be included in the study.

Supplementary data were secured from the most recent catalogues of participating institutions. The catalogues were used to secure descriptions of the courses whose titles were submitted in the questionnaire. Data from the questionnaires of eleven institutions were verified by comparing them with the information found in the official catalogues of these institutions.

V. THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The first step in processing the data was the assignment of code numbers to the instruments in order that the identity of the institutions would not be lost. The instruments were then separated by divisions and data from similar divisions were compiled.

The problem and sub-problems provided the basis for the analysis of the data. Data related to the general purpose were extracted from a synthesis of the findings in Chapters IV, V, and VI. Data related to each sub-problem were derived from the divisions of the instrument appropriate to the particular sub-problem.

The general information gained from the instruments was analyzed in terms of the position of the respondents, the size of the institutions, the number of years religion had been offered, and the total registrations for religion courses in 1962-63. These data yielded information reflecting the growth of religion programs in Land-Grant institutions and the percentage of students enrolled in religion courses for 1962-63. Comments regarding the

reason for the absence of religion courses in some institutions were analyzed separately.

Sub-Problem I

To determine the organizational and administrative approach for offering courses in religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities. Data from the instrument were analyzed to identify the most frequent organizational and administrative patterns used by Land-Grant institutions for making religion courses available in the curricula. The persons responsible for the supervision and coordination of the various approaches were identified and the status of the program was ascertained through an analysis of the data.

Sub-Problem II

To determine where religion was included in the curricula of Land-Grant colleges and universities. An analysis of data in terms of the departments or divisions that offered religion courses was necessary for determining the place where religion was included in the curricula. It was also necessary to take into consideration those approaches which made religion courses available, independent of the control of the Land-Grant institutions.

Sub-Problem III

To determine what religion courses were offered in the curricula of Land-Grant colleges and universities. Data from the instruments reflected the titles of the religion courses that were

included in the curricula of Land-Grant institutions. These data were analyzed and the courses classified under various headings. Where there was difficulty in classifying certain courses because of vagueness in the titles reported, the college catalogues were consulted as a means of gaining a description of the courses for proper classification.

Sub-Problem IV

To determine who constituted the instructional staff for religion courses in Land-Grant colleges and universities. Data from the section of the instrument on "Faculty" were analyzed for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of the instructional staff. Data relative to the selection, the number, the tenure, the ecclesiastical ordination, and the degree qualifications of the instructional staff for religion courses in Land-Grant colleges and universities were extracted from the questionnaire.

Sub-Problem V

To determine the pattern of financing the program of religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities. Data from questions thirty-six through forty were analyzed for the purpose of ascertaining the financial pattern of programs in religion at Land-Grant institutions. These data revealed the source of the revenue.

Sub-Problem VI

To ascertain the facilities used to house the programs of

religion in Land Grant colleges and universities. The identification of the facilities used to house the programs in religion necessitated the analysis of the data found in the section of the instrument designated "Facilities." These data were analyzed in terms of facilities provided by public and/or private funds.

VI. SUMMARY

Chapter III has presented the procedures and practices followed in fulfilling the general purpose of this study. The selection of the institutions, the development of the instrument, the gathering of the data, and the analysis of the data were discussed.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data received. Data concerning the organization and administration, the curricula, the faculty, the finances, and the facilities of the programs of religious education in Land-Grant institutions are analyzed.

CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE CURRICULAR STATUS OF RELIGION IN LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter treats the data from the fifty-four returned questionnaires, including both the statistical data and the additional comments. This number represented a return of 90 per cent of the sixty institutions that had previously indicated a willingness to participate in the study. Tables are used to present the statistical data. Where reference was made to special or additional comments by the respondents, symbols were used to conceal the identity of persons who supplied such data.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION

Table I shows that of the fifty-four instruments returned, three were returned by Vice-Presidents, three by Academic Vice-Presidents, one by a Provost, four by Deans of Academic Affairs, two by Deans of Instruction, three by Deans of Faculties, one by a Registrar, one by a Dean of Students, one by a Dean of Men, two by Deans of Arts and Sciences, one by a Dean of Science and Literature, three by Heads of Departments of Philosophy and Religion, four by Heads of Departments of Religion, two by Directors of Schools of Religion, eight by Directors of Religious Affairs, six by Professors of

TABLE I
POSITIONS HELD BY RESPONDENTS TO THE INSTRUMENT

Positions Held	Number of Institutions
Vice President	3
Vice President for Academic Affairs	3
Provost	1
Dean of Academic Affairs	4
Dean of Instruction	2
Dean of Faculties	3
Registrar	1
Dean of Students	1
Dean of Men	1
Dean of Science and Literature	1
Dean of Arts and Sciences	2
Head, Department of Philosophy and Religion	3
Head, Department of Religion	4
Director, School of Religion	2
Director of Religious Affairs	8
Professor of Philosophy	6
Professor of Religion	3
Director of Institutional Studies	1
Counselor in Religion	5
Total Institutions	54

of Philosophy, three by Professors of Religion, one by a Director of Institutional Studies and five by Counselors in Religion.

The range of resident student enrollment of institutions participating in the study for the school year 1962-63 was from 500, the smallest, to 25,000, the largest. Thirty-one institutions or 57.4 per cent of the respondents reported the number of years courses in religion had been offered at the institution. Table II shows five listed from 1 to 10 years; eleven listed from 11 to 20 years; five from 21 to 30 years; six from 31 to 40 years; and two from 41 to 50 years. One reported that religion had been offered since 1896 and another for the last one-hundred years.

An attempt was made to ascertain the percentage of the student body of each institution which registered for religion courses. Twenty-four institutions reported the total number of registrations for religion courses in 1962-63. The number ranged from fifteen in a school with an enrollment of 1,075 students to 2,075 in an institution reporting an enrollment of 25,000. The first number represented 1.4 per cent of the student body, while the second represented 8.3 per cent of the student body enrolled in religion courses. Data revealed that an average of 5.9 per cent of the student body in schools responding to the question enrolled in religion courses.

III. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Data from the instrument gave evidence that courses were being taught in Land-Grant colleges and universities, so far as

TABLE II
NUMBER OF YEARS RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION HAD BEEN OFFERED

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number of Institutions</u>
1 to 10 years	5
11 to 20 years	11
21 to 30 years	5
31 to 40 years	6
41 to 50 years	2
Other	2
Total Institutions	31

responsibility and administration were concerned, in eight different ways. These approaches are presented in Table III.

In the inter-departmental approach, courses in religion were treated in the various departments along with other subjects at state expense rather than in a single department of religion. Thus, a course in THE BIBLE AS LITERATURE was offered by the English department or in the PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION by the psychology department, and similar courses by the departments of anthropology, sociology, history, philosophy, et cetera. These courses in religion were accredited by the Land-Grant institutions and placed religion on a par with the other subject matter. The staff for the teaching of these courses was chosen from the regular staff members of the respective departments. In general, it appeared that such courses in religion were more often identified with the department in which they were offered rather than identified as religion courses. For example, a course in the SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION seemed to be regarded as a sociology course rather than a course in religion. Sixteen or 29.6 per cent of the participants in this study reported the use of this approach.

A second approach used by Land-Grant institutions for bringing religion into the curricula was the established department of religion. Six or 11.1 per cent of the institutions reported departments of religion. These departments of religion were accorded the same formal recognition as other academic disciplines. These institutions felt that the best way of relating religion to

TABLE III
APPROACHES USED IN OFFERING RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Types of Approaches	Number of Institutions
Inter-departmental	16
Department of Religion	6
School of Religion	5
Affiliated foundation	3
Affiliated college	1
Department of Philosophy and Religion	6
Department of Philosophy	4
Department of Social Sciences	6
No formal courses in religion	7
Total Institutions	54

the total curriculum was by means of a well-organized and broadly developed department of religion. This practice recognized religion as a proper field of major concentration.

A third means was by way of the affiliated foundation approach. Under the affiliated foundation arrangement, courses in religion were offered by religious bodies who had established "Bible Chairs" or "foundations" at their own expense adjacent to the college or university campus. The cooperating institution granted elective credits for these courses toward a degree. The religion teachers for these foundations were chosen and maintained by a board of trustees, the education board at the state level, and the religious body at the general or national level. Data from this study revealed that three of 5.6 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities resorted to this approach.

A fourth means of introducing religion courses into the curricula found in five or 9.3 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities was the privately financed school of religion whose courses were fully accredited by the college or university. The school of religion was supported by several religious groups combined to form an independent school of religion adjacent to or on the college campus. Many of these schools of religion began as a series of independent Bible chairs founded by different denominations. It was the opinion of the respondents that the church-supported schools could teach religion as against teaching about religion more effectively and more legally than where courses were

actually taught under the university and supported by the public with tax funds.

Thomas Jefferson first proposed this arrangement in 1822 when in a letter to Thomas Cooper, he suggested that the University of Virginia consider:

. . . the expediency of encouraging the different religious sects to establish, each for itself, a professorship of their own tenets, on the confines of the university, so near that their students may attend lectures there, and have free use of our library and every other accommodation we can give them; preserving, however, their independence of us and of each other.¹

The Department of Philosophy and Religion approach was reported by six or 11.1 per cent of the institutions. This approach was indicated when the disciplines of philosophy and religion were administered under one department. Land-Grant institutions offering courses in religion in a Department of Philosophy exclusively was the plan followed in four or 7.4 per cent of the schools.

One institution reported an affiliation with a private church-related college adjacent to or near the institution, but this institution had no organic connection with the Land-Grant institution.

Six institutions or 11.1 per cent offered their courses in religion through the Department of Social Studies. Seven or 13 per cent reported no formal courses offered in religion.

¹McLean and Kimber, op. cit., p. 6.

Satisfaction of Approach

In response to the question, "Do you feel that the approach used by your institution for including religion in the curricula is satisfactory?", thirty-five or 64.8 per cent of the respondents replied "yes," nine or 16.7 per cent "no," and ten or 18.5 per cent did not answer the question. These data indicated that, for the most part, the respondents felt that the approach used by their institution for including religion in the curricula was satisfactory.

A breakdown of the percentages on the satisfaction of approaches is presented in Table IV. Of the sixteen Land-Grant colleges and universities reporting the inter-departmental approach, nine answered "yes," four "no," and three did not respond to the question. All six of the institutions reporting Departments of Religion reported the approach to be satisfactory.

Five institutions cooperated with Schools of Religion. Four reported the approach was satisfactory, while one reported the approach was unsatisfactory.

Three Land-Grant institutions were served by Bible Chairs. Two of the respondents reported the approach was satisfactory, while the other did not.

One Land-Grant institution was affiliated with a private college. The respondent favored the approach.

Six of the institutions reported Departments of Philosophy and Religion in which religion courses were taught. Four of the

TABLE IV
RESPONSES AS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE APPROACHES

	Yes	No	Unanswered
Inter-departmental	9	4	3
Department of Religion	6	0	0
School of Religion	4	1	0
Affiliated foundation	2	1	0
Affiliated college	1	0	0
Department of Philosophy and Religion	4	1	1
Department of Philosophy	2	0	2
Department of Social Sciences	4	0	2
No formal courses in religion	3	2	2
Total	35	9	10
Per Cent	64.8	16.7	18.5

respondents favored the approach, one did not, and one did not respond.

Four institutions reported religion courses in the Department of Philosophy only. Two of the respondents reported this approach to be satisfactory; the other two did not respond to the question.

Six institutions offered religion courses through the Department of Social Studies. Four reported this approach satisfactory, with two not reporting.

Of the seven institutions reporting no religion courses of any kind, three felt this was satisfactory. Two felt it was unsatisfactory, and two did not respond.

In response to the question concerning the satisfaction of the approach, the respondents made the following comments. One institution with a Department of Religion replied, "We are uncertain of the best approach and have temporarily suspended the departmental program pending study and evaluation." Another institution utilizing the inter-departmental approach responded negatively and indicated that "the courses are offered by any member of the various departments who can fit it into his schedule who may or may not be qualified to teach it. The general climate created by this approach is one of looking upon religion as an extracurricular activity that is not appropriate to academic work."

One respondent whose institution had a Department of Philosophy in which religion courses were taught answered "no" to the

question and said, "I think the approach should be inter-departmental including a Sociology of Religion, Psychology of Religion, History of the Religion of Israel, and other courses in different departments." On the other hand, one respondent whose institution used the inter-departmental approach replied that this method was unsatisfactory and pointed out that "a unified program of religious studies, preferably at the departmental level is pathetically neglected here."

One state university whose respondent indicated "no" to the satisfaction of the inter-departmental approach had recently created a new Department of Philosophy and Religion. Another respondent whose institution provided religion courses in a Department of History, Government and Philosophy, indicated "yes" for our "small and somewhat informal offering." The courses were given in a sympathetic atmosphere.

Supervision and Coordination of Programs

An effort was made to ascertain whose responsibility it was in Land-Grant colleges and universities to supervise and coordinate the program of religion. Insofar as the inter-departmental approach was concerned there appeared to be very little or no supervision and coordination of the program. Rather, each department that offered courses in religion was responsible for its own courses with no effort on the part of the administration of the institution to coordinate the total program. On the other hand, four of the

six schools reporting Departments of Religion indicated that the Chairman of the Department had this responsibility.

The persons responsible for the supervision and coordination of the program in the Schools of Religion varied among the five institutions reporting such schools. For example, in one institution the Dean and the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in cooperation with the Dean and Faculty of the School of Religion had the responsibility. In two others a University Committee on Religious Education and the instructors were responsible for the supervision and coordination of the program. In institutions served by Chairs of Bible, the Coordinator of Religious Activities and the Director of the Chair were responsible for the supervision and coordination of the religious program. In those institutions which provided courses in religion through a Department of Philosophy or a Department of Philosophy and Religion, the Chairman of the department was responsible for the coordination and supervision of the program.

It was evident that the type of supervision and coordination of the programs in religion at Land-Grant institutions was contingent upon the approach used. Although there were varied means of supervision and coordination among all the institutions, there appeared to be a fairly definite pattern within institutions which used similar approaches. Committees on Religious Education or Coordinators of Religious Activities were the most prevalent means of institutional control in colleges with Departments of Religion,

while "common agreement" with no direct control was the means of control for Schools of Religion. In one institution the School of Religion was granted the same status as the other departments in the institution. Four Schools of Religion did not have the same status as other departments. Departments of Religion in five institutions had the same status as other departments, while one did not.

The data revealed that in institutions with Departments of Religion the heads of the departments were responsible to the following persons: The Dean, Dean of the College of Education, Dean of School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dean of the College of Letters and Arts. The heads of the Schools of Religion were responsible to the following persons: Dean of Arts and Sciences on Academic Matters, Head of Department of Social Sciences, Dean of School of Arts and Sciences, and a governing board of the school that is self-perpetuating.

Eight respondents advocated the establishment of an unofficial Department of Religion; eleven did not. No respondent advocated the establishment of a School of Religion. Two respondents reported there would be fewer problems of a secular nature if the religious programs in the Schools of Religion were the administrative responsibility of the university. Seven were in favor of an inter-departmental program with five against such a program. One advocated a Department of Philosophy and Religion and another felt that the Department of Social Sciences adequately served to offer religion courses.

One respondent whose institution was served by an affiliated college supported this arrangement with the following statement: "At a Land-Grant University it is believed better to handle the course work in religion as is the present practice at the university." Four of the five respondents with Departments of Philosophy and Religion advocated the establishment of an official Department of Religion. The other respondent advocated an inter-departmental program. Data revealed that the organization and administration of programs in religion at Land-Grant colleges and universities varied with the adopted practices of the respective institutions.

IV. CURRICULA

In answer to the statement, "Please list the number of courses and hours accepted toward a degree" a variety of answers was given. The number of courses offered that were accepted toward a degree ranged from one to twenty-five, with an average of 5.1 per institution. The number of hours accepted ranged from three to forty-four with an average of 12.3 semester hours per institution. Twelve to eighteen semester hours were frequently accepted. One institution offered twelve courses out of which forty-five semester hours could count toward a Bachelor of Arts degree. Another school answered "no limitation." Majors in religion were available in six or 11.1 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions participating in this study.

Courses in Philosophy with Religious Content

There were ten courses with various titles which dealt with

the philosophical aspects of religion. These courses involved a philosophical examination of religious ideas including such topics as the origin of religion; the nature of religion; the various concepts of God, the soul, immortality; and internal and external criticism of religion. They included the following titles:

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

PHILOSOPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

PHILOSOPHY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

ORIENTAL RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

THE PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIANITY

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THOUGHT

RELIGIOUS IDEAS IN WESTERN THOUGHT

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

There were four schools with only one course in the PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION which was the extent of their curricular offerings designed to emphasize religion.

Courses in thirteen institutions were concerned with the comparative aspects of religion. These courses examined the religions of the world along general lines. They usually included an investigation of Hinduism, Buddhism, Toaism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Islam, and Christianity. The courses were entitled:

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

WORLD RELIGIONS

RELIGIONS OF MANKIND

GREAT RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD

ASIAN RELIGIONS

RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD

MAJOR RELIGIONS OF THE EAST

MAJOR RELIGIONS OF THE WEST

ORIENTAL RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS LIFE AND THOUGHT

RELIGIONS OF PRIMITIVE PEOPLE

Courses in the Sociology of Religion

Seventeen Land-Grant institutions reported religious courses in the Sociology or Sociology and Anthropology department. In these courses, religion was treated from the cultural viewpoint. These courses involved a study of religion as a social institution with a special emphasis on the relationship between religion and cultural patterns and on the social and psychological functions of religious beliefs and practices. Materials for these courses were drawn from primitive, historical, and contemporary societies. These courses were entitled:

THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION

RELIGION, CULTURE AND SOCIETY

RELIGION AND SOCIETY

CULTURE AND SOCIETY

MAN, RELIGION AND SOCIETY

RELIGION AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION

RELIGIOUS GROUPS AND TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS IN MODERN SOCIETY
INSTITUTIONS OF PRIMITIVE PEOPLE
THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS
TRADITION OF WESTERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT
CONTEMPORARY TRENDS
CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS
ARCHAEOLOGY OF BIBLE LANDS

Courses Relating to the Church

Six Land-Grant institutions offered variously titled courses relative to the church. The courses had the following titles:

THE CHURCH
THE CHURCH IN A CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY
THE CHURCH AND THE FAMILY
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH SINCE THE REFORMATION
BEGINNINGS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Courses in the History of Religion

Courses concerned with the history of religion were offered in fourteen Land-Grant colleges and institutions. The titles were:

THE EARLY HISTORY OF ISRAEL
RELIGION OF ANCIENT HEBREWS
POST-EXILIC RELIGION OF THE JEWS
CULTURAL HISTORY OF PALESTINE
THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

HISTORY OF GREAT RELIGIONS

ORIGINS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY TO 1200 A. D.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

HISTORY DURING THE REFORMATION AND MODERN PERIODS

HISTORY OF RELIGION IN AMERICA

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE

U. S. RELIGIOUS HERITAGE

HISTORY OF AMERICAN RELIGIOUS FAITHS

RELIGION IN AMERICAN LIFE

Courses in Religious Ethics

The courses in religious ethics involved an analysis of the major areas of modern life in the light of the ethical teachings of religion with an examination of the religious faith upon which those teachings rest. Five institutions reported such courses. The titles included:

ETHICS OF WORLD RELIGIONS

CHRISTIAN ETHICS

ETHICS

Courses in Psychology of Religion

The psychology of religion courses reported by three Land-Grant institutions dealt with the bearing of psychology on religious thought and action, both past and present. These courses came under the following titles:

PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION

RELIGION AND PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Courses in the Bible as Literature

Sixty-five variously entitled courses taught in Land-Grant colleges and universities dealt with the English Bible. Sixteen courses in twenty-one schools dealt with the English Bible as literature; courses in nine institutions dealt with the Bible as a whole unit; twenty courses in eleven schools with the Old Testament; twenty-three courses in eleven institutions with the New Testament; seven courses dealt with the prophets, their times and ethical teachings. Fourteen courses were devoted to individual books or parts of the New Testament, including Paul and his epistles. Three courses were concerned with Jesus, His life and teachings.

The Bible was treated as a literary book in sixteen courses in twenty-one or 38.1 per cent of the institutions. These courses surveyed the types of literature in the books of the Bible including the reading and study of selected examples of different forms of poetry and prose. Consideration was also given to the influence of the Bible on modern literature. These course titles were:

LITERARY ASPECTS OF THE KING JAMES BIBLE

THE ENGLISH BIBLE

THE POETRY OF THE BIBLE

OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE

OLD TESTAMENT NARRATION

LIFE AND LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE LITERARY STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

BIBLICAL LITERATURE: OLD TESTAMENT

BIBLICAL LITERATURE: NEW TESTAMENT

THE LITERARY STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE

LIFE AND LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

MASTERPIECES OF SACRED LITERATURE

CLASSICS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

CLASSICAL MYTH AND THE BIBLE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

RELIGIOUS CLASSICS

Courses Involving the Study of the Bible as a Whole

Eight courses in nine institutions dealt with the Bible as a whole and were concerned with the nature of the Bible, its authority, and its message through a study of its development, and a survey of the content of the various books of the Bible. The courses carried the following titles:

THE BIBLE

THE BIBLE AND ITS BACKGROUND

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE

A SURVEY OF THE BIBLE

INTRODUCTION TO BIBLE STUDY

EXISTENTIAL INTERPRETATION OF BIBLICAL FAITH

THE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF THE BIBLE

Courses in the Old Testament

Thirteen Old Testament courses in eleven institutions were concerned with a survey of the text and content of the Hebrew Bible. The course titles were:

OLD TESTAMENT

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

SURVEY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

EARLY OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

LATER OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

ORIGIN AND CONTENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE PROPHETIC MOVEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Six courses dealt with portions of the Old Testament:

THE BOOK OF JOB

THE PSALMS

PROVERBS

ECCLESIASTES AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON

THE PSALMS AND WISDOM

LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Seven courses in eleven institutions in the Old Testament were concerned with the Old Testament leaders and their relationship to the divine-human drama of pre-Christian Hebrew History. These courses were taught under the titles of:

PERSONALITIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

PROPHETS OF ISRAEL

THE PROPHETS AND THEIR MESSAGE
OLD TESTAMENT CHARACTER STUDIES
SOCIAL TEACHINGS OF THE PROPHETS
PROPHECY AND THE PROPHETS
JEREMIAH TO JESUS

Courses in New Testament

Six courses in eighteen institutions involving a study of the New Testament were concerned with a critical examination of the texts of the New Testament in the light of their historical setting. The titles were:

NEW TESTAMENT
INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT
THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND
UNDERSTANDING THE NEW TESTAMENT
SURVEY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
NEW TESTAMENT LIFE AND LITERATURE

The following fourteen courses were devoted to a study of individual books or parts of the New Testament:

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT
STUDIES IN THE GOSPELS
THE EPISTLES OF PAUL
THE JOHANNINE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
THE GOSPEL OF JOHN
THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS
THE BOOK OF ACTS

NEW TESTAMENT CHARACTER STUDIES

THE BOOK OF REVELATION

THE GENERAL EPISTLES

CHRISTIAN BEGINNINGS - THE ACTS

THE LIFE OF PAUL

THE LETTERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

LUKE-ACTS

Three courses dealt with Jesus, His life and teachings:

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS

THE LIFE OF JESUS

Thus, it was evident that the curricular offerings in religion courses in Land-Grant institutions were multitudinous and included many varied titles.

Criteria for Determining Content

The data revealed that a high percentage of Land-Grant colleges and universities were without any institutional criteria for determining what constituted a course in religion. Of the forty-seven institutions reporting some type of approach to religion in the curricula, eight or 17.4 per cent indicated clearly defined criteria for determining what constituted a course in religion. In an institution with a Department of Philosophy and Religion, the following criteria were given:

1. academic (rather than parochial or ecclesiastical) approach to the subject matter; and

2. applicability in one of the established departments (e. g. philosophy, sociology, English).

A respondent reporting on a School of Religion gave the following criteria:

Before a course taught in the School of Religion can be or remain accredited, the Committee must be satisfied that it meets at least the following minimum requirements:

1. It must fully and completely comply with the constitutional provisions of the State of Wyoming prohibiting instruction in sectarianism.
2. It must contain intellectual content of substantial value.
3. It must not duplicate to any appreciable extent any courses contemporaneously offered in the University, or in the School of Religion.
4. Prior to the beginning of the course, the first time it is offered by a sponsoring group, a syllabus of the course must have been approved by the Committee.

An institution served by a Chair of Bible reported that the criteria were determined by a University Committee in cooperation with the Director of the Chair of Bible.

Persons Responsible for Determining Content

An attempt was made to ascertain who determined the content of a course in religion. Data revealed that the pattern varied with the approach used by the Land-Grant institution. In the institutions that used the inter-departmental approach, or had a Department of Social Sciences, the content of a course in religion was determined by the professor teaching the course and the department offering the course. The curriculum committee of the institution gave final approval.

In institutions reporting Schools of Religion or Bible Chairs, the content was determined by the instructors and approved by the Committee on Religious Education, if there was one, and the ecclesiastical organization supporting the foundation.

Syllabus Describing Course

In answer to the question, "Is there a syllabus describing in some detail the content of each course in religion?", twelve institutions reported "no." Three Land-Grant colleges and universities indicated there was not a description of the content of each course in religion included in the official catalogue.

Changes in the Curriculum

Twenty-one or almost 40 per cent of the several Land-Grant colleges and universities participating in this study reported changes that had taken place in the area of religious education during the past five years. One of the institutions which had listed non-credit courses in the official catalogue of the institution for many years ceased this practice as of the current year. An institution which had only one course in religion in the Department of the Humanities had recently added two courses in religion in the Department of Philosophy. The two courses added were PHILOSOPHIES OF RELIGIONS OF THE EAST and MAJOR RELIGIONS OF THE WEST. Another institution had added a course in WORLD RELIGIONS for 1963-64 along with a seminar in the PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.

An institution in the South reported that three courses had been added by the Department of Philosophy, while eight courses in the Department of Religious Education had been temporarily suspended pending further study. One Land-Grant institution reported the addition of a graduate course entitled GRADUATE READINGS IN RELIGION. Another respondent reported that a seminar in religion had been added while two courses, THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS HERITAGE AND PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LEADERSHIP, had been changed from two-hour courses to three-hour courses. One course, PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION had been transferred to the Philosophy Department.

Two institutions reported that new departments had been established. In one, a new Department of Philosophy and Religion had been established, anticipating the addition of more courses in religion. The other school reported that a Department of Philosophy was being established and involved a course in the RELIGION OF MANKIND. The respondent also indicated more courses in religion were currently being planned. Another respondent reported that, during the 1958-59 school year, the name of the department was changed from Department of Religious Education to Department of Religion. Concurrently, the following curricular changes were made. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 312, OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY was changed to RELIGION 212. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 321, THE CHURCH, was changed to RELIGION 131, THE CHURCH. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 322, LIFE OF JESUS, was changed to RELIGION 222, LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS. The following courses were dropped: RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 341, CHURCH

ADMINISTRATION; RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 441, HOW TO TEACH IN THE CHURCH SCHOOL; RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 421, DIRECTING YOUTH GROUPS IN THE CHURCH; and RELIGIOUS EDUCATION 431, RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP OUTSIDE THE CHURCH.

One Land-Grant institution reported:

With the change in the University Calendar three new one credit courses are being introduced, maintaining the high level of academic integrity and competence usual to all courses. Such courses will be advantageous to the student 1) who wants to round out his academic program with some study in religion, but for whom a three credit course would mean a serious overload; 2) who is in a curriculum where electives in humanities/social sciences are severely limited; and 3) who wants to study a limited subject area in Religious Studies.

These courses are suitable both as a part of Liberal Studies and as an introduction to further courses in Religious Studies.

The new courses added were THE NATURE OF MAN, RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF GREAT MEN, AND RELIGION IN AMERICAN LIFE AND THOUGHT.

A large southern university reported the following religion courses had been added to the Department of Philosophy and Religion: THE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF THE BIBLE, THE JOHANNINE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, and THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL.

The following courses have been added to the Department of Religion in one Land-Grant institution: RELIGION 232, OLD TESTAMENT, and RELIGION 242, THE EPISTLES. Another Land-Grant institution reported that the following courses had recently been dropped: PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Still another respondent reported that, while no courses had been dropped, all courses were under "constant scrutiny and modification." In another school, college-wide change-over to the

semester system resulted in the dropping of INTRODUCTION TO CHURCH and combining NEW TESTAMENT SURVEY with LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF CHRIST to form the current course in NEW TESTAMENT LIFE AND TIMES. Three courses had been added: RELIGION IN AMERICAN LIFE, PSYCHOLOGY IN RELIGION, and WORLD RELIGIONS. An institution supported by a School of Religion reported "a fairly extensive revision, three years ago."

Announcing and Scheduling Curricular Offerings

Information was sought as to the person responsible for announcing and scheduling curricular offerings in religion. Data revealed that the persons responsible for announcing and scheduling curricular offerings in religion did not vary extensively from the announcement of curricular offerings in other disciplines.

Relationship of Religion to Total Curricula

In response to the question, "To what degree is the relationship of religion to the total curricula of your institution understood by all concerned?", 13 per cent indicated that the relationship was not too well understood. Some of the comments were: "There is little understanding," "Very slightly," and "not too well." On the other hand, other respondents remarked: "Same as other departments," "Well understood," and "It is understood as an integral part of the total curricula." Another remarked: "There is no question. Courses in Religion stand on exactly the same footing as any other courses."

V. FACULTY

The number of faculty members who taught religion courses in Land-Grant institutions are presented in Table V. Five institutions reported more than ten faculty members teaching religion courses, while eight reported from five to nine faculty members. Eight institutions indicated that these were not selected in the same manner as other staff members. In thirty-seven of the institutions the staff members who taught religion courses had tenure. Twenty-one or 38.9 per cent of the institutions had staff members who had been ordained by their respective ecclesiastical organizations. Eleven Land-Grant institutions reported that the staff members who taught courses in religion held no professorial rank. The degree qualifications of these staff members appeared comparable to those of other disciplines.

VI. FINANCES

Data gathered from the instrument regarding finances revealed that all but two of the Land-Grant institutions served by an inter-departmental approach, a Department of Religion, a Department of Philosophy, a Department of Philosophy and Religion, or a Department of Social Sciences paid their staff members from institutional funds from the regular budget. The two institutions that deviated from this pattern had voluntary unpaid teachers from the community clergy. The five Schools of Religion and the three Bible Chairs as well as the affiliated college received no state

TABLE V
NUMBER OF FACULTY TEACHING RELIGION COURSES

Number of Faculty	Number of Institutions
10-14	5
5-9	8
1-4	34
Total Institutions	47

funds for the salaries of staff members. The funds for these salaries were provided by the respective denominations or the staff members were local ministers who served without pay. In the case of the affiliated college funds for staff salaries were provided by the affiliated private college.

It was found that the programs in religious instruction in the Land-Grant colleges and universities were financed for the most part by regular institutional funds except in the case of the Schools of Religion and the Bible Chairs. One institution reported special fees other than the normal tuition for religion courses charged at the same rate per credit hour as other university courses. Church funds were used to finance the program of religion only in those institutions served by Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs.

VII. FACILITIES

Data were reported in regards to the facilities used by Land-Grant institutions for housing their programs in religion. All of the Land-Grant institutions except eight, 14.8 per cent, provided housing, lights, heat, and custodial services for their religion program. Four of the institutions which did not furnish the above mentioned items were served by Schools of Religion which furnished their own housing, lights, heat, and custodial services.

The three Bible Chairs furnished their own facilities and utilities. One Land-Grant institution provided classrooms for

those denominations with Bible Chairs that were without permanent facilities. In the Land-Grant institutions served by the affiliated college, the facilities, lights, heat, and custodial services were provided by the affiliated institution for those religion courses provided. Information revealed that approximately 86.2 per cent of the facilities, utilities, and custodial services were provided by the Land-Grant colleges and universities.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

Respondents were asked to give any other pertinent information relative to a program of religion which would assist an institution contemplating the reorganization of its program. Eight respondents responded to the question. A respondent at a large southern university with a Department of Philosophy and Religion reported:

In my opinion religion courses should be taught in a Department of Religion or a Department of Religion and Philosophy having equal status with the other departments on the campus. It should be the responsibility of the Chairman to recruit competent faculty to do this teaching. In this way the university can insure that a scholarly job is being done in this field. Some courses in religion should serve to meet a general humanities requirement.

One Land-Grant institution with a Department of Religion stated: "We are a seeker of information on this matter." Another with religion offered in the Social Sciences Department made this comment: "Our present program is undergoing change. It is expected that in the near future we shall have several more courses offered and perhaps a Department of Philosophy and Religion." A

state university served by a School of Religion stated: "Courses in religion offered on a college or university basis should be as objective and intellectually sound as those in other fields."

Another reported, "Our system has worked and can be made to work through inter-denominational cooperation." A third respondent with a School of Religion reported:

The biggest problem with a School of Religion organized and conducted by several church bodies is that of secularism. Although the University tries to maintain non-secularism through its supervision, this is not always possible. In addition, the instructors have a problem in getting together to develop the best possible program. If the instructors were administratively responsible to the University, I am sure we would have a better coordinated program. Our student pastors could then devote a full-time program to the secular work of their church among students.

IX. SUMMARY

This chapter has treated the data from the fifty-four returned instruments, including both the statistical data and the additional comments. General information was presented as well as data concerning organization and administration, the curricula, the faculty, the finances, and the facilities involved in the programs in religion at Land-Grant colleges and universities.

Chapter V will present an analysis of the data from institutions reporting Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs.

CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM INSTITUTIONS REPORTING SCHOOLS OF RELIGION AND BIBLE CHAIRS

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present a general analysis of the data relative to Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs which serve Land-Grant colleges and universities. Although only 15 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions used these approaches, this chapter was felt necessary because of the extent that Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs deviated from the other approaches. Data revealed that five or 9.8 per cent of the participating institutions used the independent School of Religion approach to provide actual instruction in religion, but gave regular university credit to students completing such courses. Three or 5.6 per cent reported the use of the ecclesiastical foundation or Bible Chair approach as a means of bringing religion into the curricula.

II. AN ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATIVE TO SCHOOLS OF RELIGION

The average student enrollment for the five institutions was 9,675. Four of the five institutions reporting Schools of Religion gave their total registrations for religion courses in 1962-63. The registrations of the four institutions for religion courses were as follows: 155, 360, 551, and 1,000.

One institution had had a school of religion since 1896, while another listed forty-one to fifty years; two gave thirty-one to forty years; and another, eleven to twenty years. Four of the respondents reported this approach to be satisfactory, while one reported in the negative. The respondent who reported "no" gave the following explanation: "The courses in religion should be offered by an administrative department within the University, such as the Department of Philosophy or Sociology." Another respondent who indicated "yes" gave this comment: "It has worked quite satisfactorily in the past. The major difficulty is financial. We are looking forward to eventual closer identification with the University proper."

The persons responsible for the supervision and coordination of the program in the Schools of Religion varied from institution to institution. For example, in one institution the Dean and the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in cooperation with the Dean and the faculty of the School of Religion were responsible. In two others, a University Committee on Religious Education and the instructors in the School of Religion were responsible for the supervision and coordination of the program.

In order for a religious body to become associated with the School of Religion at one Land-Grant institution, the Religious Education Committee must be satisfied that the following requirements had been met:

1. The sponsor must be an organized religious group or groups of national recognition. They must be directly responsible

either to the national executive authority of the sponsoring group or groups, or to some subdivision acceptable to the Committee, e. g. a district or local branch. The sponsoring group or groups must certify to the University that the instruction is intended to be permanent in character, and that there are sufficient resources, endowment, or assured annual income to successfully carry on the work.

2. The classroom in which the courses are conducted must be adequately heated, lighted and ventilated, must be equipped with adequate chalkboard space and with sufficient chairs, tables, or desk to handle individual students with comfort.
3. Appropriate library facilities must be available to the students. Each sponsoring group must have an annual expenditure of at least 100 dollars for books if all the purchased books remain in the library of sponsoring group. However, this library requirement may be met by the sponsoring group making an annual contribution of at least fifty dollars to the Librarian at the University for the purchase of religious books. These books are to be selected by the instructor and/or the University Librarian.
4. The instructor must make a report to the Committee, prior to the end of the spring semester of each year, on such forms as may be prescribed by the Committee, describing the library materials for which the minimum annual library expenditure was spent.

In four institutions the School of Religion did not have the same status as other departments in the institution. Two respondents reported that they did not favor the establishment of an official School of Religion and indicated that there would be fewer problems of a secular nature if the religious program were administratively responsible to the university. In reply to the question, "Does the School of Religion have the same status as the other Departments?" one respondent said:

We recognize the faculty of the School of Religion as a department of religion in the College of Arts and Sciences. However we would consider this department one in the same sense that botany and history are departments. We completely control and budget regular departments.

The number of semester hours that the various Land-Grant institutions accepted from Schools of Religion toward a degree averaged eleven semester hours per school. A major in religion was not available in any of the institutions cooperating with independent Schools of Religion.

The number of courses offered by Schools of Religion ranged from ten to thirty-six. The number of semester hours ranged from thirty to eighty-five. The average number of courses offered by the Schools of Religion was twenty-one, and the average number semester hours per school was forty-six. Three Land-Grant institutions reported clearly defined criteria for determining what constituted a course in religion while two did not. In one Land-Grant institution, the Committee had to be satisfied that each religion course met at least the following minimum requirements prior to accreditation:

1. It must fully and completely comply with the constitutional provisions of the State prohibiting instruction in sectarianism.
2. It must contain intellectual content of substantial value.
3. Instruction must begin and end in conformity with the University calendar as to the beginning and ending of semesters.
4. It must not duplicate to any appreciable extent any courses contemporaneously offered in the University, or in The School of Religion.

In a given semester, multi-sections of a course must be taught by the same instructor, except by special permission from the Committee in cases where the teaching load is too heavy for one man.

5. Prior to the beginning of the course the first time it is offered by a sponsoring group, a syllabus of the course must have been approved by the Committee.

In two institutions the instructors in the School of Religion and the Religious Education Committee of the university determined the content of a course in religion. In the remaining institutions the instructor and the administration of the School of Religion determined the content. One school required a syllabus describing in some detail the content of each course in religion, while four did not. Four of the Land-Grant institutions published the description of the content of each course offered by the School of Religion in the official catalogue, while one did not. Three respondents reported that curricular offerings in religion were approved through normal channels as in other disciplines; two did not. Two replies gave evidence of changes in curricular offerings of religion in the past five years.

The persons responsible for establishing policy varied from institution to institution. In one it was the Dean of the College, in another it was the University Committee, and in another it was the President and the Board of the University. Three institutions reported this arrangement to be effective. One institution indicated that the relationship of religion to the total curricula of the institution was understood by all concerned. On the other hand, four reported that this relationship was not understood to any great extent.

No institution reported that the faculty members in the

School of Religion were selected in the same manner as other staff members in the institution. The number of staff members in the School of Religion varied from two to twelve with an average of six per school. One school reported staff members who taught religion courses had tenure. All five institutions had staff members who had been ordained by their respective ecclesiastical organizations. Two out of five schools had faculty members holding professorial rank. The degree qualifications of these ranged from the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Divinity to the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Theology degrees.

The following minimum requirements were required by one Land-Grant college for instructors in the School of Religion.

1. He must hold a Master's degree or an acceptable equivalent thereof.
2. His education or training must have included a substantial amount of special instruction or training in the field of religion.

"A substantial amount of instruction or training in the field of religion" means at least 30 semester hours in the field of religion of which at least 10 semester hours must be at a level beyond that of a B.A. degree. "Field of religion" is interpreted as including: The subject matter of religion, the history and literature of Holy Scripture and the churches, ethics and philosophy of religion, comparative religion, and anthropological, sociological, and psychological studies of religion.

Adequate teaching experience may be acceptable in lieu of formal degrees and seminary training, but not for the above-mentioned minimum 30 semester hour requirement.

3. Except that he need not hold a Doctor's degree, he must be of such scholarly attainment and have had such teaching experience as to qualify him for appointment as an assistant professor on the faculty of the University.

4. He must have ample time for the adequate performance of his instructional duties. If he has employment additional to his duties as instructor in the School of Religion, the Committee may, at its option, require him to furnish a statement from his employer consenting to his employment as an instructor and certifying that, to the best of such employer's information and belief, the instructor has sufficient time (at least two hours per week in preparation for each credit hour) to devote to his studies as instructor.
5. It is not essential, but it is desirable, that instructors be clergymen by profession. The Committee recognizes that some groups sponsoring courses in The School of Religion may not maintain a professional clergy. Even if the sponsoring group does maintain a professional clergy, the Committee may accredit as an instructor in The School of Religion sponsored by such a group, a person who is not a clergyman by profession but the Committee shall not accredit any such person unless convinced that his qualifications are outstanding.

The programs in the Schools of Religion were financed by private funds from which the faculty members were paid. In one school special fees or tuition were charged for courses in religion.

One institution reported that courses in religion were taught in facilities owned by the State. The other four reported that the courses were taught in facilities owned by the School of Religion. Four reported that lights, heat, and custodial care were not furnished by the Land-Grant institutions. One reported that all of these were furnished by the Land-Grant University.

III. AN ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATIVE TO BIBLE CHAIRS

Three or 5.6 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities reported the use of the ecclesiastical foundation or Bible Chair approach as the means of bringing religion in the curricula.

In these ecclesiastical foundations or Bible Chairs certain religious bodies had stationed teaching ministers. It is the purpose of this section to present data relative to the institutions served by this approach.

The student enrollments for the three institutions using the affiliated foundation or Bible Chair approach were 1,600, 8,142, and 6,000. The institution with an enrollment of 8,142 gave the total registrations for religious courses in 1962-63 as 528 or 6.5 per cent of the enrollment. Two of the Land-Grant institutions served by Bible Chairs gave the number of years that religion had been offered at their institutions. One gave one to ten years and the other gave thirty-one to forty years.

Two respondents felt the Bible Chair approach was satisfactory, while one felt that it was unsatisfactory. The respondent answering negatively made this comment: "Inadequate housing, poor relationship between "heads" and staff, limited courses, and the academic freedom of instructor is in question.

The coordinator of Religious Activities was responsible for the supervision and coordination of the program in religion in these three institutions. In one Land-Grant institution the Bible Chair had the same status as other departments in the institution.

The institutions averaged sixteen religion courses per institution or 30 semester hours. A major in religion was not available in any of the institutions served by Bible Chairs.

In two of the Land-Grant institutions the instructor

determined the content of each course in religion while in the other, the content was determined by the Department of Religious Education, the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Academic Council. Two of the institutions required a syllabus describing in some detail the content of each course in religion. The curricular offerings of one of the Bible Chairs were approved through channels normal for other disciplines. One institution carried the description of the content of each course in the official catalogue while two did not.

It was the responsibility of the administration in each of the institutions to establish policy relative to the relationship between the Bible Chair and the Land-Grant institution. This arrangement had proved effective in two of the institutions. The relationship of religion to the total curricula was satisfactorily understood in two of the institutions and not too well understood in the third.

The staff members in one institution served by a Bible Chair were selected in the same manner as other staff members, while in two they were not. Tenure was not held by any of the staff members who taught religion courses in Bible Chairs. The staff members who taught courses in religion were paid by their respective denominations who financed the Bible Chairs at the Land-Grant institutions. No special fees were charged for the courses taught.

The courses in religion were taught in facilities provided by the ecclesiastical organizations who also furnished the lights,

heat, and custodial services. On occasions one of the Land-Grant institutions served by a Bible Chair furnished facilities and utilities for those denominations without permanent facilities.

IV. SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to present a general analysis of the data relative to the Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs which served Land-Grant colleges and universities. Data revealed that 9.8 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions were served by Schools of Religion, and 5.6 per cent were served by Bible Chairs.

Chapter VI will present the rationale for the presence of religion in the curricula and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the major approaches used by Land-Grant institutions.

CHAPTER VI

THE RATIONALE AND THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF THE APPROACHES USED TO BRING RELIGION INTO THE CURRICULA

I. INTRODUCTION

Chapters IV and V treated the data from the fifty-four returned instruments including the statistical data, the additional comments, a description of the Schools of Religion serving Land-Grant institutions and a description of affiliated foundations. Data in these chapters revealed that over 87 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions, by one approach or another made provision for courses in religion, and for this work they offered regular college and university credit to their students. There were 29.6 per cent that reported the inter-departmental approach; 18.5 per cent the department of philosophy or the department of religion approach; 11.1 per cent the department of religion approach; 11.1 per cent the department of social sciences approach; 9.3 per cent the school of religion approach; 5.6 per cent the affiliated foundation approach, and 1.8 per cent the affiliated college approach. Thirteen per cent reported no formal curricular approach to religion.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the major approaches that were identified in the data. The first section of the chapter presents a discussion of the rationale for the general presence or absence of religion, while the second section presents a discussion

of the arguments for and against the major approaches utilized by Land-Grant institutions for making religion available in the curricula.

II. THE RATIONALE FOR THE PRESENCE OF RELIGION IN THE CURRICULA

Historical considerations argue strongly for the study of religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities. Religion was an integral part of western culture prior to the founding of America and therefore was transferred to American colleges and universities from the beginning. One of the most vivid examples of this was reflected in the Ordinance of 1787. It read:

Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Another consideration is that religion is an aspect and dimension of culture. Education has the task of transmitting cultural heritage; therefore, religion cannot be excluded from the curriculum. The development of general education during the past decade tends to give particular cultural justification to the inclusion of religion. Huston Smith gave the following to support the presence of religion in the curriculum:

Liberal education cannot rightfully claim its name if it omits the study of religion is a point of view which has become almost reaccepted in the United States Educators responsible for curriculum-planning now almost universally concede the need to throw some bridges over the chasm.¹

¹Huston Smith, "The Interdepartmental Approach to Religious Studies," Journal of Higher Education, 31:61, February, 1960.

It is further reasoned by those who advocate the presence of religion in the curricula that it is the responsibility of higher education to assist students in clarifying their religious thinking and help them adapt a "faith," if at all, after critical reflection and the consideration of alternatives rather than blindly or dogmatically. Everett J. Kircher wrote:

In order to foster growth of the human spirit in general, and the faith of the individual in particular, the public school and the liberal college must, paradoxically, confront the student with the faith of man in its manifold forms, provoke each to a reassessment of his own faith and drive each back into the vitalities of his own ideological tradition. He then entertains his faith in a different spirit from one who simply inherits his beliefs and who has heard only vaguely that there are others, for he has gone through the hazard of living with others, of learning to respect them, and of learning about their faiths.²

Again, the same rationale is given for an institution of higher learning to offer courses that explain and analyze contemporary religious institutions and their relationship to society as a whole, as there is for comparable courses in contemporary political, economic, and social theory. The bulletin of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas contained the following quotation:

A. and M. College of Texas is non-sectarian, but its high objectives cannot be achieved unless its educational program is founded on a solid religious life. Divorced from the spiritual aspirations of the individual and of the group, education cannot be complete. The basic purpose of education is a normal religious life to the end that young people may be not only more efficient but better motivated by a sense of duty

²Everett J. Kircher, "Teacher Education and Religion", Teacher Education and Religion, A. L. Sebaly, (ed.) (New York: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1959), p. 49.

and obligation. Thus, in an atmosphere of tolerance and mutual respect, every student is encouraged to maintain his ties with the religious group to which such association may be most fruitful.³

John Henry Newman said:

A university, by its very name professes to teach universal knowledge; (religion) is surely a branch of knowledge; how then is it possible for it to profess all branches of knowledge and yet to exclude from the subjects of its teaching one which, to say the least, is as important and as large as any of them? . . . In a word . . . such an institution cannot be what it professes.⁴

The object of education is also given as an integral part of the rationale for the inclusion of religion in the curricula of institutions of higher education. Lloyd A. Helms stated:

The objective of education is preparation for life. Religion should be included among the learning experiences. We should recognize that students come to the college campus with certain felt needs, including religion. Meeting the need for religion requires an effort by the administration and faculty to transmit to the students many phases of our religious heritage. Higher education must therefore include instruction in religion if it is to deal comprehensively with human knowledge and experience.⁵

Thus, in light of the above reasonings, the study of religion as an intellectual discipline becomes a valid field of scholarship in the academic community. As an intellectual discipline, it would receive the same rights, treatments, and privileges as any other discipline.

³Bulletin of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas 1962-63, Eighty-fourth college catalogue Edition, p. 89.

⁴John Henry Newman, The Idea of a University (New York: Longman's Green and Company, 1927), pp. 19-20.

⁵Lloyd A. Helms, "Recorder's Report" Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954 (Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1954), p. 114.

III. THE RATIONALE FOR THE ABSENCE OF RELIGION FROM THE CURRICULA

Data from the instruments revealed that 13 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities participating in this study offered no formal courses in religion. The exclusion of formal courses in religion from the curricula of some of the Land-Grant institutions is based on the separation of church and state principle. One respondent in answer to the question "If you are without course offerings in religion, please explain" answered: "As a state assisted university we have no program in religion, or specific courses under that category." Another replied in answer to the question: "Our state constitution is very restrictive with respect to course offerings in religion in state institutions."

The separation principle stems from the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution, which took effect in 1791, and which put certain limits on the government of the United States. Its first clause concerns the above point of view and reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" Mr. Justice Black in interpreting this Amendment said,

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or

disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between Church and State."⁶

Thus, the advocates for the exclusion of religion from the curricula feel that the introduction of the study of religion into the curricula, regardless of how it is done, is a violation of the American principle of the separation of church and state.

Others who hold that religion must be excluded from higher education do so for prudential reasons. Their argument runs that when they exclude religion, they are not discriminating against it. They merely intend that the college in this respect shall be neutral.

There are those who oppose the inclusion of religion in the curricula of institutions of higher education and raise the question as to whether a significant interest in religion is compatible with the ideals of liberal education. The advocates of this point of view have doubts about the compatibility of the two and are inclined to give a negative answer. They identify religious instruction with sectarian indoctrination and then rightly insist that the latter has no place in the liberal college. Huston Smith has pointed out that "Religion has infringed on the free conscience

⁶330 U.S. 1 (1947)

and liberties of countless men and women. The names of Brumo and Galileo, Descartes and Spinoza, Hobbes and Locke, Voltaire and Rousseau, Leibniz and Wolff, Kant and Fichte are enough to bring the sorry record to mind.⁷ The quality of religious instruction which has been carried on in times past also gives strength to this position. It is also felt that religion and liberal education are incompatible because genuine freedom is destroyed by a vital faith. Another group of opponents to the inclusion of religion in the curricula of tax-supported institutions indicates that it is not possible to separate entirely the knowledge of religion from the practice of religion.

Thus, the rationale for the presence or absence of religion in or from the curricula of tax-supported institutions of higher education stems from two principles deeply ingrained in the American tradition as the former, finds expression in an Act of Congress, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Within these two principles lie the seeds of inherent conflict still to be resolved. Herein religion is separated from the state but at the same time is "necessary" to education which is a function of the state.

⁷Smith, op. cit., p. 122.

IV. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE MAJOR APPROACHES

Data from the instruments revealed that a variety of approaches were used by Land-Grant institutions for bringing religion into the curricula. The strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches are examined in this section.

Inter-departmental Approach

The prevalent pattern in Land-Grant institutions was the inter-departmental approach. This approach was used by 29.6 per cent of the institutions as a means of making religion an integral important dimension of the departments of liberal learning to which it is naturally allied. Alex Miller supported this point of view when he wrote:

It is arguable whether religion should be treated as so generally it is, in a special department established for that purpose. Not only is the relation of religion to culture pervasive rather than departmental, but it would appear that established departments - philosophy, psychology, history, sociology, art, for example - fall short of their scholarly duty if they do not treat the religious dimension of each separate discipline, and the religious elements germane to their field.⁸

The reasoning is, that if religion is an aspect of culture, and if it is equally a dimension of knowledge in other fields, then it must be studied where it is met in the fields of literature, history, philosophy, and various others. Hence, this curricular

⁸Alex Miller, The Renewal of Man (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), p. 141.

method, it is felt, gives the needed scope to religion. It has the advantage of offering a challenge to the faculty of each department, and to each professional college to treat religion in its own way. Huston Smith stated:

Each of the arrangements has made, and continues to make, a significant contribution to the solution of the problem. But they leave unexplored one pattern - in many ways the most challenging of all, both in promise and in difficulty. This unexplored possibility is the inter-departmental approach to religious studies, a pattern which would introduce religion into the curriculum as an integral and important dimension of some nine departments of liberal learning to which it is naturally allied.⁹

The program at the University of Arizona supported this position:

University of Arizona has no separate department of religion. Students looking toward the ministry or church work as a vocation, as well as others seeking information or clarification in this field, are offered a number of courses in which the role of religion is emphasized as well as a few, mostly in the Department of Philosophy, in which it is the focal center.¹⁰

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology had the following statement in the official bulletin:

Massachusetts Institute of Technology considers that one of its responsibilities is to maintain an atmosphere of religious freedom for the individual, and, within the environment, to provide adequate opportunity for the development of spiritual maturity and the exercise of spiritual interest.¹¹

There are other educators who reject the inter-departmental approach and point out the following weaknesses. The course offer-

⁹Smith, op. cit., p. 62.

¹⁰The University of Arizona Record 1961-62, Vol. LIV, No. 4, July 1961, p. 423

¹¹The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Bulletin 1962-63, Vol. 97, No. 5, July 1962.

ings tend to be occasional and haphazard; the instruction is not always up to the best standards of scholarship required by the field or subject; the approach offers too little opportunity to expand the fields of major religious study and to maintain them on a continuing and stable basis; and under such treatment studies in religion tend to remain adjunct of the other fields and do not receive the academic attention believed to be merited by the studies in their own right. Theodore Greene pointed out these weaknesses in the following manner:

That it is not sufficient should be evident at once from our current conception of what a responsible study of other subjects involves. No one alert to the demands of historical study would tolerate the farming out of history to the other disciplines, despite the fact that all disciplines do, or should, be concerned with the history of their own progressive inquiry and of its subject-matter. Full-time professionally competent historians are needed to pull the specialized strands of history Similarly, a major phenomenon, like religion calls for a discipline of its own and for teachers and scholars who, in conjunction, can provide competent instruction in it. In short, a "department" of religion is as imperative, from a strictly scholarly point of view and without regard for creedal commitment, as a "department" of history or philosophy or art or literature.¹²

Department of Religion Approach

Those institutions with the above criticisms of the inter-departmental approach have sought to overcome the weaknesses through an established department of religion. There were 11.1 per cent of the institutions that reported this approach. A faculty committee of Louisiana State University, a Land-Grant

¹²Walter, op. cit., p. 80.

institution, made a thorough study of the place of religion in the curricula and finally made a recommendation, subsequently approved, that the university establish a department of religion within the College of Arts and Sciences because of its conviction that:

Any attempt to study those influences which have shaped world events would be incomplete if it did not include a study of religion and religious thinking; and that courses in religion can most effectively be handled through a separate department of religion with a capable and well-rounded man serving as head of that department.¹³

Clarence P. Shedd quoted the head of a state university as follows:

When asked his authority in establishing, some ten years ago, a department of religion at the University of Oregon, the late President Donald Erb said: "It was educationally indefensible to have departments and courses devoted to a study of political, economic, and social institutions generally, but a complete absence of any instruction in the field of religious instruction. In brief, the inclusion of religion in our curriculum was judged to be proper under the charter of the state and university, inasmuch as the right to give a well-rounded instructional program was unquestioned."¹⁴

This reasoning holds that the function of a department of religion is to provide the proper academic vehicle for the directly focused study which religion, as a distinctive subject, demands as other major aspects of human experience. Theodore M. Greene said:

Religion is so vast, complex, and distinctive a subject for scholarly research, and so important a field for undergraduate study that it merits full departmental status.¹⁵

The Oregon State University Bulletin gave the following statement in reference to the Department of Religion:

¹³Clarence P. Shedd, Religion in the State University, Hazen Pamphlet No. 16, p. 16.

¹⁴Ibid. p. 24-25.

¹⁵Walter (ed.) op. cit., p. 143.

The Department of Religion is nonsectarian in spirit and organization. Its purpose is three-fold: (1) Courses in religion seek to develop an appreciation of the nature and processes of religion in light of conditions affecting life today, thus enabling students to make such adjustment as will vitalize religion for them. (2) Courses are determined for the most part by the needs of students who are preparing for service in the fields of science, engineering, agriculture, home economics, teaching, etc. (3) Special attention is given to the religious education of those who anticipate leadership in churches of their local communities and those who plan to enter social service or religious vocations such as missionary work, the ministry, director of religious education, pastor's assistant, professional leadership of religious organizations, etc.¹⁶

George Thomas pointed out the weakness in the approach when he stated:

It is not enough for a liberal college to offer courses in a department. Religious facts, issues, and implications should be dealt with in every division, department, and course where they arise naturally.¹⁷

Failure to do this, it is believed, will at once contribute to the already considerable problem of compartmentalization of knowledge and permits the subject to be ignored by other disciplines.

Department of Philosophy and Religion

The proponents of this type of organization feel that it is a historical fact that philosophy and religion have again and again complemented one another; therefore, it is only appropriate that they complement each other in a department of philosophy and reli-

¹⁶Oregon State University Bulletin, Catalogue Issue, 1963-64.
No. 104, May, 1963.

¹⁷George F. Thomas, "Religious Perspectives in College Teaching: Problems and Principles," Religious Perspectives in College Teaching, Hoxie N. Fairchild (ed.), (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952), p. 13.

gion. Religion is most like philosophy in its credal component, and this makes it natural for religion and philosophy to work together in achieving theological precision, scope, internal coherence, and orientation to secular discovery. Data indicated that 11.1 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities supported a department of philosophy and religion. The weaknesses of this approach are basically the same as those mentioned in the section on department of religion.

School of Religion, Affiliated Foundation, and Affiliated College Approaches

Although 70.3 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions adhere to the inter-departmental, department of religion, or department of philosophy and religion approach, there were 16.7 per cent who held that the limitations imposed on education by separation of church and state prevented the use of such approaches. Therefore it became necessary for religious bodies to offer courses open to election by all students at their own expense. Bainton stated:

The possibility at present is that a department of religion should offer courses given by Protestants, by Catholics, and by Jews working quite independently. This would be inculcating their own faiths. But this is impossible in a state university because of the limitations imposed on education by the separation of church and state. What can be done is that religious bodies at their own expense can set up faculties of theology on the university campus and offer courses open to election by all students for which the university will grant credits towards its own degree.¹⁸

¹⁸Walter (ed.), op. cit., p. 34.

Thus the independent schools of religion, the affiliated foundations, and the affiliated college approach developed.

It is felt that in a tax-supported institution religion is more effectively and more legally taught by one of these approaches. The rationale also follows that these approaches serve large groups of students according to tradition and at the same time engages church and state in given concrete problems relative to the spiritual need of the students. The schools of religion, the affiliated foundations, and the affiliated college approach were designed to complement not to duplicate the state curriculum.

The state law governing sectarian instruction in one Land-Grant institution served by a School of Religion reads:

No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the State accept any grant, conveyance or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes.¹⁹

A respondent whose university used the affiliated college approach stated, "At a land-grant university it is believed better to handle the course work in religion as is the present practice at this university." One Land-Grant institution served by an affiliated foundation had the following statement in its official catalogue.

Separation of Church and State does not dictate a separation of Religion and Education. To be complete, education should provide opportunities for religious education.

¹⁹Article VII, Sec. 11, Constitution of Nebraska, 1920.

Latter Day Saints, Protestant, and Catholic churches offer courses in religion at Utah State University for all University accredited non-sectarian courses completed at any of these churches. Any such courses taken are considered a part of the maximum load at Utah State College.²⁰

There are a number of weaknesses to these approaches which attempt to provide religious instruction for Land-Grant institutions outside the normal curricula. William Frankena held that it was inappropriate for a state university to:

Adopt a plan which it is not ready to pay for out of state funds. It would likewise seem questionable for it to answer pressure by giving credit for courses taught in religious centers which are not fully accredited colleges, for if they are such that it can also properly give credit for them it can also properly offer them itself. As for credits transferred from denominational colleges, it should do only if upon scrutiny they are clearly taught in the spirit and with the competence which it would ask of its own teachers if they were to teach them.²¹

Kenneth Morgan pointed out that:

When courses in religion are taught by members of the clergy who have not received the usual academic training and do not have full faculty status, the college community tends to regard the work in religion as peripheral directed more toward public relations than sound instruction.²²

Milton D. McLean and Harry H. Kimber stated the following:

Logic in permitting privately-supported religious agencies to administer a teaching program in which credit is granted in a public-supported institution is hard to defend in some academic circles. Yet the simple fact is that some public univer-

²⁰Utah State University Catalogue, 1962-63. Volume 62, No. 6, June 1962.

²¹Walters, op. cit., p. 306.

²²Kenneth Morgan, "The Teaching of Religion in Higher Education," The Teaching of Religion in American Higher Education, Christian Gauss (ed.), (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951), p. 119.

sities will not permit religion to be taught in a manner which respects the integrity of the subject.²³

Others hold that instruction by teachers chosen or nominated by sectarian groups, however competent, is regarded as being a weakness and gives the impression that the subject matter can be taught only from sectarian perspectives and not as other subjects taught in a liberal arts college. Blakeman had the following to say in regards to the weakness of the approach that is used outside the normal curricula.

Disadvantages are that (a) it divides the academic situation among many controls, tends to place a burden on administration and raises the question of state-church entanglement or "establishment"; (b) it relieves the state university of a rightful responsibility for religion, a phase of culture.²⁴

V. SUMMARY

The first section of this chapter presented the rationale for the presence of religion in the curricula of Land-Grant colleges and universities. The last section presented a summary of the arguments for and against the major approaches used by Land-Grant institutions for making religion available in the curricula.

The summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter VI.

²³Milton D. McLean and Harry H. Kimber, op. cit., p. 10.

²⁴Edward W. Blakeman, "Religious Education in Tax-Supported Colleges and Universities," Orientation in Religious Education, Philip Henry Lotz (ed.), (New York: Abington Press, 1950) p. 367.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

The rationale for the various approaches used by Land-Grant institutions for including religion in the curricula was presented in Chapter VI. The purpose of this chapter is to present the summary, findings, and recommendations for further study.

II. SUMMARY

The general purpose of this study was to develop a body of systematic knowledge about the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

The introductory chapter presented data descriptive of the various aspects relative to the problem and its divisional parts. The sub-problems, delimitations, and basic assumptions were delineated in this chapter. Terms used through the study were defined, and inferences were made to procedures to be utilized in making the study. A limited amount of space was given to a treatment of the background of Land-Grant colleges and universities.

Chapter II presented a review of research related to the study. The review of this research was focused on (a) significant studies relative to religion in higher education, (b) significant studies relative to the legal aspect, and (c) significant studies

relative to religion in public schools.

Chapter III discussed the procedures followed in the organization and development of the study. Data for this study were secured primarily through an instrument designed especially for this study. The instrument contained forty-two questions under seven major categories. Supplementary data were secured from the most current catalogues of the participating institutions. These catalogues were used to secure descriptions of courses whose titles were submitted in the questionnaires and to supplement the information given on the questionnaires where the respondents neglected to provide complete answers. Additional data were secured from interviews, and an extensive survey of the literature within the field.

The institutions for the study were secured through letters to the Academic Vice-Presidents or Academic Deans of the seventy Land-Grant institutions who were members of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. The letter sought the cooperation of these institutions in the study. A self-addressed postal card was included in the letter for use by the academic officer in indicating the willingness or unwillingness of his institution to participate in this study. Instruments were sent to those institutions who agreed to participate. The mailing of the instrument was followed by a second letter, where necessary, six weeks later.

Chapter IV involved an analysis of responses relating to

the curricular status of religion in Land-Grant institutions. General information was presented as well as data concerning the organization and administration, the curricula, the faculty, the finances and the facilities involved in the program of religion at Land-Grant colleges and universities.

Chapter V presented a general analysis of the data relative to Schools of Religion and Bible Chairs which served Land-Grant colleges and universities.

Chapter VI presented the rationale for the major approaches used by Land-Grant institutions for bringing religion into their curricula. The arguments for and against the approaches were discussed.

III. DISCUSSION OF DATA

Organization and Administration

In dealing with religion as an academic discipline, more than 85 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities had provisions for including religion courses in the curricula. Eight different approaches were identified. The inter-departmental approach was used by almost 30 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions, the department of religion by 10 per cent, schools of religion by 10 per cent, department of philosophy and/or philosophy and religion by almost 20 per cent, department of social sciences by 10 per cent and Bible Chairs by more than 5 per cent. Thirteen per cent of the institutions made no provision for formal courses

in religion.

The eight different approaches used by Land-Grant institutions indicated that the question of where to place religion courses was one of the perplexing problems facing administrators and committees responsible for introducing religion courses into the curricula. Should religion courses be concentrated in a single department of religion or should they be spread among other departments? Should religion courses be left to organizations independent of the Land-Grant institutions or should they be integrated into the total program of the institution? An analysis of the data revealed that there was no sharp consensus as to the best approach for the organization and administration of programs in religious education.

The fact that more than 85 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions made provision for instruction in religious education suggested a much more auspicious state of affairs in these institutions than was actually the case. To get a true picture it was important to note that in a number of institutions using the interdepartmental and department of philosophy approaches there appeared to be but a token acknowledgement of religion as a legitimate discipline for academic inquiry.

With 13 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities who made no provisions for formal courses in religion, it was recognized that the status of religion in tax-supported institutions under the United States Constitution was far from settled. Data revealed that the separation of church and state principle had a

definite impact upon the programs in religious education in Land-Grant institutions.

More than 65 per cent of the respondents were satisfied with the organizational and administrative approach used by their institution for bringing religion into the curricula, but the lack of enthusiasm that was shown in giving constructive comments in regards to some of the questions reflected an attitude of complacency.

Curricula

A wide diversification in religion courses were offered by these institutions. These courses were classified under the following main headings. There were those that emphasized the literature of religion. Sixteen courses in twenty-one schools dealt with the English Bible as literature. Courses in nine institutions dealt with the Bible as a whole unit; twenty courses in eleven schools with the Old Testament; seven courses dealt with the prophets, their times, and ethical teachings. Fourteen courses dealt with individual books or parts of the Bible. Other courses emphasized the philosophical aspects of religion. There were ten courses with various titles which were concerned with this area. Courses in thirteen institutions were concerned with the comparative aspect of religion. Such scientific approaches as the sociology or psychology of religion were emphasized in a number of institutions. Seventeen Land-Grant institutions reported religion courses in sociology of religion; three reported courses in the psychology of religion. A number of respondents reported courses

that emphasized the history of religion. Courses that related to the church and religious ethics were scattered throughout the curricula of the Land-Grant institutions.

In a number of institutions the course titles revealed the dominance of either a liberal protestant or a general humanistic perspective.

A high percentage of Land-Grant colleges and universities were without any institutional criteria for determining what constituted a course in religion. Of the forty-seven institutions reporting some type of approach to religion in the curricula, 20 per cent indicated clearly defined criteria for determining what constituted a course in religion.

The curricula offerings in religion in Land-Grant colleges and universities, although diversified, did not always reflect student needs. Only one institution made reference to the fact that courses in religion were adapted to meet student needs. Studies in religion are justified and should be provided to the extent that there is academic justification for them and that they can be maintained on a par with other courses and subject matter fields.

Changes that have taken place in religious education during the past five years were reported by 40 per cent of the Land-Grant colleges and universities participating in the study. It was impossible to note any discernible trends from the changes that were taking place. Data analysis revealed no particular pattern.

The attitude reflected in the following remark "we are seekers of information on the matter," seemed to be characteristic of those making change.

Higher education has been accused of making students non-religious or even irreligious. It is difficult to uphold this accusation objectively for the evidence showed that religious influences were present on most Land-Grant college and university campuses.

Faculty

The number of faculty members who taught religion courses varied from one to eighteen. Five institutions reported more than ten faculty members who taught courses in religion, while eight reported from five to nine faculty members. Eight institutions indicated that their faculty members who taught religion courses were not selected in the same manner as other staff members. In 74 per cent of the institutions the staff members who taught religion courses had tenure, and in almost 40 per cent these staff members had been ordained by their respective ecclesiastical organizations. Respondents from 77 per cent of the institutions reported that staff members who taught religion courses held rank.

The academic preparation of those teaching religion courses seemed to compare favorably with the preparation of other teachers in other disciplines. The problem of qualified teachers in religious education has been one of the criticisms of religious education in higher education. The teacher of religion courses at the

university level has no right to lead discussion of the Bible at the university level unless he is conversant with its original languages, and unless he has submitted himself to a curriculum of instruction and research that gives him a right to express judgments about the most intricate problems of literary structure and of historical relevance. Only those who have established their academic competence in this highly specialized field should be selected.

The issue of academic freedom also enters the situation. One institution indicated that the academic freedom of the teachers in religion was questioned. As long as academic freedom is a cardinal interest of higher education, it would seem appropriate that there should be no more restraint on the scholar in religion than in other fields. Under such circumstances the study of religion as an intellectual discipline becomes a valid field of scholarship in the academic community.

Finances

All but two of the Land-Grant institutions served by the interdenominational approach, a department of religion, a department of philosophy and religion, or a department of social sciences paid their staff members from institutional funds which came from the regular budget.

The programs in religious education in Land-Grant colleges and universities were financed for the most part from regular institutional funds except in the case of schools of religion and affiliated foundations.

Facilities

An analysis of the data revealed that Land-Grant colleges and universities furnished the facilities used to house the programs in religious education except in a few cases involving schools of religion and affiliated institutions.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following findings characterize the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant colleges and institutions:

1. Religion as an academic discipline was found in 86.5 per cent of the Land-Grant institutions.
2. Some Land-Grant institutions appeared to have but a token acknowledgment of religion as a legitimate discipline for academic inquiry.
3. The organizational and administrative approaches used by Land-Grant institutions varied among the colleges and universities.
4. Respondents usually favored the approach used by their institution as against approaches used in other institutions.
5. Great diversification characterized the titles of religion courses offered by Land-Grant institutions.
6. There were virtually no criteria for determining what constituted a course in religion.
7. No set pattern could be determined for the selection, the tenure, or degree qualifications of the instructional staff for religion courses in Land-Grant institutions.

8. Programs in nearly all of the Land-Grant institutions were financed totally or in part by the public-supported institutions except in a few cases involving schools of religion and affiliated foundations.

9. The facilities used to house the programs in religion were provided by Land-Grant institutions except in a few cases involving schools of religion and affiliated foundations.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Since this study was concerned primarily with a description of curricular religion, the analysis of the content of the courses in religion was beyond its scope; therefore, such a study would be advantageous.

2. This study made no attempt to evaluate the various approaches utilized by Land-Grant colleges and universities, and therefore further research in this area is needed.

3. More research is needed in the area of the administration of programs in religion.

4. Another vital area involves the preparation necessary for staff members who teach religion courses in Land-Grant institutions. That is, what academic preparation and professional experiences are necessary to perform the task.

5. The absence of an adequate theory relative to the place of religion in higher education presents a lack which deserves further study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ENTRIES

A. BOOKS

- Allen, Henry E. (ed.) Religion in the State University: Initial Exploration. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1950.
- Austin, C. Grey. A Century of Religion at the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1957.
- Bach, Marcus. Of Faith and Learning. Iowa City: State University of Iowa, 1952.
- Blakeman, Edward W. The Administration of Religion in Universities and Colleges. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942.
- Boles, Donald E. The Bible, Religion and the Public Schools. Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1961.
- Brunner, Henry S. Land-Grant Colleges and Universities 1862-1962. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bulletin 1962, No. 13.
- Butler, J. Donald. Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.
- Buttrick, George Arthur. Biblical Thought and the Secular University. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1960.
- Cogley, John (ed.). Religion in America: Original Essays on Religion in a Free Society. New York: Meridian Books, Inc. 1958.
- Cunningham, Merrimon. The College Seeks Religion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Fairchild, Hoxie N. (ed.). Religious Perspectives in College Teaching. New York: The Roland Press Company, 1952.
- Ferre, Nels F. S. Christian Faith and Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954.
- Fisher, Galen M. (ed.). Religion in the Colleges. New York: Association Press, 1928.
- Gauss, Christian (ed.). The Teaching of Religion in American Higher Education. New York: The Roland Press Company, 1951.

- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1949.
- Good, H. G. A History of American Education. New York: MacMillan Company, 1956.
- Harner, Nevin C. Religion's Place in General Education. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1949.
- Henry, Virgil. The Place of Religion in Public Schools. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1950.
- Jacob, Phillip E. Changing Values in College. New Haven: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1956.
- Johnson, F. Ernest (ed.). American Education and Religion: The Problem of Religion in the Schools. New York: Harper, 1952.
- Johnson, Alvin W. and Yost, Frank H. Separation of Church and State in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948.
- Kent, Charles F. Undergraduate Courses in Religion at Tax-Supported Universities. New York: National Council on Religion in Higher Education, 1923.
- Limbert, Paul M. (ed.). College Teaching and Christian Values. New York: Association Press, 1951.
- Lotz, Henry Philip (ed.). Orientation in Religious Education. New York: Abingdon Press, 1950.
- Lowry, Howard. The Mind's Adventure: Religion and Higher Education. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Madden, Ward. Religious Values in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1951.
- McLean, Milton D. and Kimber, Harry H. Teaching of Religion in State Universities: Descriptions of Programs in Twenty-five Institutions. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1960.
- Miller, Alex. The Renewal of Man. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- Miller, Alexander. Faith and Learning, Christian Faith and Higher Education in Twentieth Century America. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Miller, Frances P. (ed.). Religion on the Campus. New York: Association Press, 1927.

- Newman, John Henry. The Idea of a University. New York: Longman's Green and Company, 1927.
- O'Neill, J. M. Religion and Education Under the Constitution. New York: Harper and Brothers Publications, 1949.
- Porter, David R. (ed.). The Church in the Universities. New York: Association Press, 1925.
- Shedd, Clarence. Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements. New York: Association Press, 1934.
- _____. Religion in the State University. Hazen Pamphlet No. 16, 1948.
- Shuster, George N. Education and Moral Wisdom. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1960.
- Smith, Seymour A. Religious Cooperation in State Universities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1957.
- Snavely, Guy E. The Church and the Four-Year College. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955.
- Taylor, Marvin J. (ed.). Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Thayer, V. T. Religion in Public Education. New York: The Viking Press, 1947.
- Towner, Milton C. (ed.). Religion in Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Trueblood, D. Elton. The Idea of a College. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959.
- Von Gruening, John Paul (ed.). Toward a Christian Philosophy of Higher Education. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Walter, Erich A. (ed.). Religion and the State University. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.
- White, Harold (ed.). Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1951.
- Wilder, Amos N. (ed.). Liberal Learning and Religion. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.
Land-Grant Fact Book. Washington: 1962.

Committee on Religion and Education. The Function of the Public
Schools in Dealing with Religion. Washington: American Council
on Education, 1953.

Committee on Religion and Education. The Function of the Public
Schools in Dealing with Religion. Washington: American Council
on Education, 1947.

The Educational Policies Commission. Moral and Spiritual Values
in the Public Schools. Washington: National Education Asso-
ciation, 1951.

The Edward W. Hazen Foundation and the American Council on Education.
College Reading and Religion. New Haven: Yale University Press,
1948.

C. PERIODICALS

- Abrams, Irwin. "What's Missing on the Campus?," Phi Delta Kappan, 39:310-13, April, 1958.
- Ashton, J. W. "Outlook for Religion in State Universities," Religious Education, 54:139-48, March, 1959.
- _____. "Place of Religion in a State University," Religious Education, 54:128-30, March, 1959.
- _____. "Teaching of Religion in the State University," Phi Delta Kappan, 40:311-13, May, 1959.
- Aubrey, E. E. "Religion in Public Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, 26:413-19, November, 1955.
- Beach, Waldo. "Faith and Morals on the College Campus," 19:124-7, September, 1959.
- Blakeman, Edward W. "A Bibliography: Religious Education and the Public Schools," Religious Education, 43:163-180, May, 1948.
- _____. "A Realistic View of Religion in State Universities," Journal of Religious Education, 43:355-59, November-December, 1948.
- _____. "Developing an Indigenous Religious Program in a State University," Religious Education, 35-36:67-76, April-May, 1941.
- _____. "Religion at State Universities," Religious Education, 25:326-331, April, 1930.
- Conway, Don. "Religion and Public Education in the States," International Journal of Religious Education, 32:34-40, March, 1956.
- Dirks, J. E. and Sebaly, A. L. "To What Extent Should the Study of Religion be Included in the Curriculum?" Current Issue in Education, pp. 73-6, 1960.
- Eddy, G. N. "Religion in a General Education Program," Journal of Higher Education, 27:25-34, January, 1956.
- Elliott, Harrison S. "Syllabus on Religion in Higher Education," Religious Education, 37:5-21, January, 1942.
- Engleman, K. L. "Teachers Will Study the Bible," Journal of Religious Education, 38:12, September, 1961.

- Garber, L. O. "Four Church-State Controversies: How They Affect Education," Nation Schools, 69:66-8, June, 1962.
- Gerant, L. "Religion at State-Owned Institutions," Religious Education, 52:375-83, September, 1957.
- Gilbert, A. "Proper Function of the Publicly Supported Institutions," Journal of Higher Education, 30:200-4, April, 1959.
- Harshbarger, L. H. "Role of Religious Studies in General Education," Journal of General Education, 13:169-79, October, 1961.
- Helms, Lloyd A. "Recorder's Report," Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954.
- Hutchinson, J. A. "Four Questions on Religion and General Education," Journal of General Education, 13:149-59, October, 1961.
- Johnson, F. E. "Place of Religion in the State-Supported University: A Review Essay," Journal of Higher Education, 30:229-33, April, 1959.
- Little, Lawrence. "Syllabus on Religion and Public Education and Selected Bibliography," Religious Education, 54:163-180, April, 1949.
- Matlock, William H. "Instruction in Religion in State Universities," Educational Review, 40:256-265, October, 1910.
- McLean, Milton D. "Religion and Public Higher Education: An Appraisal," Christianity and Crisis, 19:127-30, September 21, 1959.
- _____. "The Religious Situation on the College Campus," Religious Education, 51:403-09, November-December, 1956.
- Parker, Donald Dean. "Religion at Land-Grant Colleges," Religious Education, 42:80-85, March-April, 1947.
- Rice, A. H. and Hunt, R. L. "Religion: Its Relation to Public Education," Nations Schools, 66:59-65, March, 1961.
- Robb, J. W. "Religion and Higher Education," Religious Education, 53:447-52, September, 1958.
- Sebaly, A. L. "Five Year Study of Teacher Education and Religion," Phi Delta Kappan, 40:314-17, May, 1959.
- _____. "To What Extent Should the Study of Religion be Included in the Curriculum?" Current Issues in Higher Education, Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1960.

- Shedd, C. P. "Open Doors for Religion in the State University," Journal of Higher Education, 30:222-8, April, 1959.
- _____. "Religion in Higher Education - Retrospect and Prospect," The Christian Scholar, 38:16-18, December, 1955.
- Sibley, L. A., Jr. "Survey of Research in Religious and Character Education," Religious Education, 54:235-68, May, 1959.
- Smith, Huston. "The Interdepartmental Approach to Religious Studies," Journal of Higher Education, 31:61, February, 1960.
- Smith, Seymour A. "Religious Instruction in State Universities, A Report on Recent Trends," Religious Education, 53:290-94, May-June, 1958.
- Wornom, H. E. "Critical Issues of Religion in Public Higher Education," Religious Education, 54:97-107, March, 1959.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Ball, George H. "The Religious Practices of State Universities in the Light of Legal Requirements." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1950.
- Beery, Cleo C. "Public Schools and Religion: The Opinions of Nine Eminent Educators." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1960.
- Cohen, Jack J. "The Dilemma of Religion in Public Education." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, New York, New York, 1959.
- Dierenfield, Richard B. "An Examination of the Current Relationship between Religion and American Public Schools." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 1958.
- Johnson, Annis Howard. "A Survey of Religious Education in State Universities and of the Moral and Spiritual Life of Certain University of Tennessee Students with Generalizations therefrom." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1925.
- Mitchell, Frederic. "The Supreme Court of the United States on Religion and Education." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, New York, New York, 1959.
- Murra, Wilbur Fim. "An Inquiry into the Role of Religion in the Public Schools of a Secular State." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1958.
- Neale, James Ralph, Jr. "Inter Religious Cooperation: An Initial Exploration." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1954.

E. COLLEGE CATALOGUES

(arranged alphabetically by states)

ARIZONA

The University of Arizona Record. 1961-62-63. Vol. 54,
No. 4, July, 1961.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Bulletin, 1963-64.
Vol. 97, No. 4, June, 1962.

OREGON

Oregon State University Bulletin, Catalog Issue, 1963-64.
No. 104, May, 1963.

TEXAS

Bulletin of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of
Texas, 1962-63. Vol. 9, No. 1, February 1, 1962.

UTAH

Utah State University, 1962-63 Catalog. Vol. 62, No. 6,
June, 1962.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

1. Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama
2. Alabama Agricultural &
Mechanical College
Normal, Alabama
3. University of Alaska
College, Alaska
4. University of Arizona
Tuscon, Arizona
5. University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas
6. Agricultural, Mechanical
& Normal College
Pine Bluff, Arkansas
7. University of California
Berkeley 4, California
8. Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado
9. University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut
10. The Connecticut Agricultural
Experiment Station
New Haven, Connecticut
11. Deleware State College
Dover, Delaware
12. Florida Agricultural &
Mechanical University
Tallahassee, Florida
13. University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
14. University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
15. Georgia Insitute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia
16. Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, Georgia
17. University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii
18. University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho
19. University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois
20. Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana
21. University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware
22. Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
23. Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
24. University of Kentucky
Lexington 29, Kentucky
25. Kentucky State College
Frankfort, Kentucky
26. Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
27. Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
28. University of Maine
Orono, Maine
29. University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
30. Maryland State College
Princess Anne, Maryland
31. University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts
32. Massachusetts Insitute of
Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts
33. Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

- | | |
|--|---|
| 34. University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota | 48. North Dakota Agricultural
College
Fargo, North Dakota |
| 35. Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi | 49. Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio |
| 36. Alcorn Agricultural &
Mechanical College
Alcorn, Mississippi | 50. Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma |
| 37. Lincoln University
Jefferson City, Missouri | 51. Langston University
Langston, Oklahoma |
| 38. University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri | 52. Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon |
| 39. Montana State College
Bozeman, Montana | 53. Pennsylvania State
University
University Park, Pennsylvania |
| 40. University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska | 54. University of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico |
| 41. University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada | 55. University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island |
| 42. University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire | 56. Clemson Agricultural College
Clemson, South Carolina |
| 43. Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey | 57. South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, South Carolina |
| 44. New Mexico State University
University Park, New Mexico | 58. South Dakota State College
College Station, South Dakota |
| 45. Cornell University
Ithaca, New York | 59. University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee |
| *46. North Carolina State College
Raleigh, North Carolina | 60. Agricultural & Mechanical
College of Texas
College Station, Texas |
| 47. Agricultural & Technical
College
Greensboro, North Carolina | 61. Tennessee Agricultural &
Industrial State University
Nashville, Tennessee |

*A unit of the consolidated University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

- *62. Prairie View Agricultural &
Mechanical College
Prairie View, Texas
- 63. Utah State University
Logan, Utah
- 64. University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont
- 65. Virginia Polytechnic
Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia
- 66. Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia
- 67. Washington State University
Pullman, Washington
- 68. West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia
- 69. University of Wisconsin
Madison 6, Wisconsin
- 70. University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

*Texas A & M and Prairie View A & M are units of the Texas
A & M College System, College Station, Texas.

APPENDIX B

Contact Letter and Enclosed Card

The University of Tennessee
College of Education
Knoxville 16, Tennessee

As a part of my doctoral work at the University of Tennessee, I am conducting a study which requires the cooperation of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. The general purpose of this study is to develop a body of systematic knowledge about the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant institutions.

Will you please assist me by filling in the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me at your earliest convenience? The development of a valid, comprehensive report necessitates the participation of each Land-Grant College and University. A copy of the report will be sent to you upon its completion.

Enclosed you will find a self-addressed envelope for use in returning the questionnaire.

I should like to thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this study and expend a portion of your valuable time in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely yours,

Weldon L. Estes
1800 Yale Avenue
Knoxville 16, Tennessee

(Enclosed Card)

_____ is (willing, unwilling) to
(Name of institution)
participate in your study. Send the questionnaire to:

Name _____

Address _____

APPENDIX C
The Instrument

Please return to
Weldon L. Estes
1830 Yale Avenue
Knoxville 16, Tennessee

Questionnaire completed by:
Name _____
Address _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: The general purpose of this study is to develop a body of systematic knowledge about the present curricular status of religion in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

A. General Information

1. Name of your institution _____
2. Resident student enrollment of your institution in 1962-63

3. Number of years religion has been offered at your institution:
____ a. 1 to 10 years ____ d. 31 to 40 years
____ b. 11 to 20 years ____ e. 40 to 50 years
____ c. 21 to 30 years ____ f. Other _____
4. Total registration for religion courses in 1962-63 _____
5. If you are without course offerings in religion, please explain.

B. Organization and Administration

6. Which of the following organizational approaches is used by your institution for including religion in the curricula?
If more than one approach is used, please indicate.
____ a. Inter-departmental ____ f. Department of Philosophy & Religion
____ b. Department of Religion
____ c. School of Religion ____ g. No formal courses in religion
____ d. Affiliated foundation ____ h. Other _____
____ e. Affiliated college

Questionnaire - page 2

7. Do you feel that the approach indicated in the question above is satisfactory? Yes___ No___. If no, please explain. (If additional space is needed, please use the back of this sheet.)
8. Who is responsible for the supervision and coordination of the program in religion? _____
9. What type of institutional control exists between the Department/School of Religion and the institution? _____

10. Does the Department/School of Religion have the same status as the other Departments/Schools in the institution? Yes___ No___
11. To whom is the head of the Department/School of Religion responsible? _____
12. Would you advocate the establishment of an official Department of Religion? Yes___ No___; School of Religion? Yes___ No___; Interdepartmental program? Yes___ No___; Other? _____
_____. Please comment.

C. Curricula

13. Please list the number of courses and number of course hours accepted toward a degree. Number of courses_____ Number of hours_____ (qtr. hrs.; sem. hrs.)
14. Is a major in religion offered? Yes___ No___. If yes, what degree is granted for this major? _____
15. Please list the departments that offer courses in religion, the titles of the courses and the number of credit hours given for the courses. (If additional space is needed, please use the back of this sheet.)

Department of _____	Department of _____
Course titles & Cr. hrs.	Course titles & Cr. hrs.

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

(3)

(3)

(4)

(4)

Questionnaire - page 3

Department of _____ Department of _____

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

(3)

(3)

(4)

(4)

16. If your institution accepts for credit courses in religion offered by an affiliated foundation. Please list the titles and the credit hours given for the courses. (If additional space is needed, please use the back of this sheet.)
17. If your institution accepts for credit courses in religion offered by a School of Religion, please list the titles and the credit hours given for the courses. (If additional space is needed, please use the back of this sheet.)
18. If your institution accepts for credit courses in religion offered by a church-related or private college, please list the titles and the credit hours given for the courses. (If additional space is needed, please use the back of this sheet.)

Questionnaire - page 4

19. Does the institution have clearly defined criteria for determining what constitutes a "course in religion?" Yes____
No____. If the answer is yes, please list the criteria.
20. Please state who determines the content of a course in religion and how this content is determined.
21. Is there a required syllabus describing in some detail the content of each course in religion? Yes____ No____.
22. Is there a description of the content of each course in religion included in the official catalogue of the institution? Yes____ No____.
23. Are curricular offerings in religion approved through normal channels as in other disciplines? Yes____ No____. Please explain.
24. What curricular changes have been made in religion in the past five years? What courses added? What courses dropped?
25. Who is responsible for announcing curricular offerings in religion?_____. Curricular offerings in other disciplines?_____.
26. Who is responsible for scheduling courses in religion?_____. Courses in other disciplines?_____.
27. If cooperation with an affiliated foundation or private college is the approach used in offering religion, who is responsible for establishing policy relative to the relationship between your institution and the affiliated organization?_____.

Questionnaire - page 6

E. Finances

36. Are the staff members who teach religion courses paid from institutional funds: Yes___ No___. If no, please explain.

37. How is the program of religion in your institution financed?

38. Are any special fees or tuition charged for courses in religion? Yes___ No___.

39. Are any church contributions used to finance the program of religion in your institution? Yes___ No___.

40. Are the lights, heat and custodial services furnished by the institution? Yes___ No___. If no, please explain._____

F. Facilities

41. Are all courses in religion taught in facilities owned by your institution? Yes___ No___. If no, please explain.

G. Miscellaneous

Please give any other pertinent information relative to a program of religion which would assist an institution contemplating the reorganization of its program. (If more space is needed, please use the back of this sheet.)

APPENDIX D

Letters to the Participants

The University of Tennessee
College of Education
May 21, 1963

Recently, _____ informed me that _____ would participate in a study which I am conducting as a part of my doctoral study at the University of Tennessee. The general purpose of this study is to develop a body of systematic knowledge about the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

_____ suggested that the enclosed questionnaire be sent to you since you are the person most familiar with the religion program at your institution. Will you please assist me by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me at your earliest convenience?

The development of a valid, comprehensive report necessitates the participation of each Land-Grant institution. A copy of the report will be sent to you upon completion.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for use in returning the questionnaire.

I should like to thank you in advance for your willingness to expend a portion of your valuable time in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely yours,

Weldon L. Estes

The University of Tennessee
College of Education
May 21, 1963

Thank you for your willingness to participate in my study concerning the current curricular status of religion in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Enclosed you will find the questionnaire and a self-addressed envelope for use in returning it.

I would like to thank you for your willingness to participate in this study. If my projected schedule can be met, you should receive a copy of the report in early December.

Sincerely yours,

Weldon L. Estes

The University of Tennessee
College of Education
Knoxville 16, Tennessee
June 20, 1963

I know you are a busy person, but will you please give me a little of your time? In May, I sent you a questionnaire relative to the "Curricular Status of Religion in Land-Grant Colleges and Universities." Will you please fill in the questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience? Your assistance is needed very much and will be greatly appreciated.

If you have already completed and mailed the questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Weldon L. Estes
1800 Yale Avenue
Knoxville 16, Tennessee