1965

A Survey of Sex Education Classroom Instructional Practices in Selected Public Junior High Schools Throughout the United States

Jerome Brison Altheide
Central Washington University

A SURVEY OF SEX EDUCATION CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES IN SELECTED PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Jerome Brison Altheide

October 1965

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

J. Wesley Crum, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Virgil J. Olson

_____

Luther G. Baker Jr.

_____

Dohn A. Miller

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express gratitude to Dr. J. Wesley Crum for his constructive suggestions and guidance in directing the study and writing of this paper, and to Dr. Virgil Olson, Dr. Dohn A. Miller, and Mr. Luther Baker for serving on the writer's graduate committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Whenever the term "sex education" has been used among a group of individuals concerned with junior high school education, it has brought forth many types of responses. Most of these reactions have been based on little empirical data because little research has been done on the classroom instructional practices in sex education employed in public junior high schools. The limited literature that has been published indicated that classroom instructional practices in sex education on the junior high school level differ greatly. Some school districts used the elementary and intermediate levels for developing pupil readiness for comprehensive sex education instruction to seventh graders (8:133) and others waited until the students were ninth graders (7:375). Likewise, some school districts used the junior high grades as a readiness program for sex education instruction on the senior high level (3:50) whereas, other school districts made no effort to give any type of sex education instruction.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to determine what was being done in selected public junior high schools throughout

the United States that had planned classroom instruction programs in sex education.

Importance of the Problem

Little has been known about the classroom practices used in junior high school sex education, but there has been great interest among laymen and educators. Many books and pamphlets have been written by such authors as Lester Kirkendall, Henry Sattler, and Joseph Haley in regard to sex education. However, little has been written concerning the actual classroom practices used in sex education instruction. Most writers have confined their writing in the field of sex education primarily to topics such as why sex education should or should not be taught, the methods to use in teaching sex education, or the construction of curriculum guides.

Research Procedures

Three form letters and two questionnaires were constructed and a five member pilot group read the form letters and filled out the questionnaires. After each member of the pilot group had read the form letters and filled out the questionnaires, the author talked individually to each person to assure that all questions conveyed the proper meaning. All problems encountered with the prepared material in this pilot study were corrected; then mimeographed copies were reproduced for distribution through the mail.

Form letters were sent to sixteen organizations such as the United States Office of Education, John Birch Society, and National Education Association in an effort to locate school districts with junior high school sex education programs.

One letter accompanied by a questionnaire was sent to each state department of instruction. Follow-up letters were sent until questionnaires from all fifty states were returned. After the literature had been reviewed and the questionnaire returns were received from the organizations and state departments of instruction, similar questionnaires and letters were sent to fifty-one school districts which were identified as having a planned program in sex education for junior high school students. See pages 52-63 for survey instruments.

Limitations of the Study

Little material has been published on the classroom practices employed in sex education, and a list of those schools which had a planned program in sex education in the public junior high schools of the United States was non-existent. Therefore, as the author reviewed the literature, analyzed the data recived from the organizations and state departments of instruction, he compiled his own list of school districts with sex education programs for junior high school students. Questionnaires were sent to all schools mentioned by any source as having an organized sex education

program. Since scientific sampling techniques were not used, the resulting list of selected junior high schools may have been incomplete and the quality of planned instruction programs within the selected schools may have varied widely.

No attempt was made to establish objectives for sex education at the junior high school level or to evaluate objectively the effectiveness of the programs reported. No study was made of schools that did not have sex education programs.

The term "sex education" was not defined in the letters or questionnaires that were distributed. Respondents were permitted to react to the term as they interpreted it. This was done in an effort to get as wide a response as possible. The data must be interpreted as representing the definitions held by the individual respondents.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Classroom Practices

All planned sex education studies, activities, and instruction that occurred under the direction of the school district were considered to be classroom practices.

Curriculum

The term curriculum was interpreted to include all those activities for which the school assumed any type of responsibility.

Junior High School

The junior high school was defined as a school that contained the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades.

Mixed Class

A mixed class was interpreted to mean a class including students of both sexes.

Segregated Class

A segregated class was considered to be a class which contained students of only one sex.

Sex Education

Sex education was defined as all of the curriculum that deals with the individual and group problems stemming from the biological fact that there are two basic types of human beings, male and female.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature on sex education was voluminous. There were many articles, pamphlets, and books dealing with what people felt should be taught, the grade level at which specific material should be placed, and how specific concepts should be handled. Many groups had prepared curriculum guides, but little had been written on the classroom instructional practices utilized by the junior high schools in teaching sex education.

A survey of the Education Index, the Readers' Guide, and the International Index revealed that few public junior high school programs in sex education had been published. No doctoral dissertation or Master's thesis pertaining to the topic could be located.

I. HISTORY OF SEX EDUCATION IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

The author found no reference to any history on sex education at the junior high school level. Periodical indexes, such as the Education Index and Readers' Guide made no mention of any article dealing with the history of sex education.

II. EXAMPLES OF CLASSROOM PRACTICES

The literature contained few detailed descriptions of sex education programs involving junior high schools. Those that were described are summarized below.

A Connecticut Suburban Community Program

The Connecticut suburban community program consisted of a team-teaching arrangement between the school nurse, the physical education teachers, and the guidance staff (8:132).

A readiness program for sex education consisting of four or five periods during the fifth and sixth grade years was used, but the concrete phase of instruction was not introduced until the students reached the seventh grade. From six to eight periods during the early part of the students' seventh, eighth, and ninth grade school years were set aside for question and answer periods. In these informal meetings all boys met with men from the guidance and physical education staffs, and the girls met with women from the same staffs. The school nurse worked in conjunction with both groups. These sessions were loosely structured, but selected reading and visual aids were used when appropriate (8:133).

Following these classroom sessions one evening meeting was held for mothers and daughters and one for fathers and sons. At these meetings the teachers who participated in the sex educational program gave short talks and reviewed the

topics that were covered. An educational film on sex education was shown, and as the meeting was concluded, the parents were encouraged to continue the sex education discussion at home (8:134).

The Audubon Program

At Audubon Junior High School in Audubon, New Jersey, sex education was integrated into the classroom instruction of seventh and eighth grade students. In seventh grade physical education and health classes, individual and group conferences were held with pupils. The girls studied pamphlets and were shown the film The Story of Menstruation (9:29). The boys studied the following topics: seminal emissions, differences in size of the external genitalia, the undescended testicle, circumcision, malformation of the reproductive organs, menstruation, genital interest, masturbation, and differences in the sexual maturation of boys and girls (9:30).

In seventh grade music classes the physical and emotional changes in the body were discussed in relation to the changing of the voice which occurs at puberty in many people (9:30).

In seventh grade social studies the text Human Relations in The Classroom by Edmund H. Bullis and Emily E. O'Malley was used in the study of social adjustment and basic emotional needs of people (9:31).

In eighth grade science classes human anatomy, physiology, and reproduction were taught to mixed classes. The following topics were taught in the unit on human reproduction: heredity, mechanisms of heredity, trends and social implications of heredity, fertilization, prenatal growth and development, birth, and postnatal growth.

In eighth and ninth grade social studies the birth rate and related social problems were studied, and ninth grade science students studied venereal diseases and common contagious diseases. Local professional people and groups at Audubon such as doctors, lawyers, ministers and the Audubon Parent-Teachers Association were called upon in planning the sex education program (9:31).

The Rock Island Program

The sex education instruction at Central Junior High in Rock Island, Illinois, was not given to the children until a permission slip had been signed by their parents and returned to the school. In 1964 the Rock Island School District started a guidance course in which sex education was taught at Central Junior High School. The students met for two days a week and were segregated according to sex. The sex education program was divided up into six units during the first semester, and a list of these units was sent home to each parent. The first unit was a preparatory lesson on flowers, fish, birds, and animals. The second was entitled

"The Physical, Social, and Emotional Development of the Girl," and the third unit was similar except its emphasis was upon the boy. The fifth unit was on dating problems and conduct, and the last unit explained venereal diseases (10:53).

During the second semester attention was given to emotional maturity, the baby, gangs, and adolescence. A positive approach was used in which the "do's" were stressed and the "don'ts" were not mentioned.

Central Junior High School also used community resource people such as doctors, juvenile officials, social hygiene workers, and officials from the department of health in sex education classes. Many of these people spoke at Parent-Teachers Association meetings. This group sponsored an adult study program centered around hygiene (10:54).

The Columbia Program

In the fall four meetings were held before sex education instruction was started in the Columbia School System in Columbia, South Carolina. The parents met at the first meeting and discussed the aims and objectives of the sex educational program, and audiovisual materials were displayed. A general discussion and answer period concluded the meeting (3:15).

The second meeting was scheduled for fathers and sons, and motion pictures dealing with sex education were shown. Father and son relationships were discussed, and a discussion

and answer period concluded the meeting.

The third meeting was for mothers and daughters. Motion pictures on sex education were shown, and mother and daughter relationships were discussed. A discussion and answer period concluded the meeting (3:52).

The fourth meeting was for all parents. At this time the parents previewed the movies the students would be shown, and the main topics of the unit "Growing Up," which comprised the majority of the classroom sex education instruction, was presented. The thirteen topics within this unit were taught in the following sequence: physical health, personal appearance and grooming, mental health, getting along with the family, getting along with people, learning to be likeable, and internal and external changes during adolescence. Other topics were menstruation, boy-girl relationships, building character, the dangers of alcohol and tobacco, developing into manhood, and developing into womanhood (3:53).

The Winnetka Program

The Winnetka, Illinois, junior high sex education program (8:133) did not attempt to involve parents, but at the start of each year they were informed of the kind of material that would be covered in sex education classes by means of written notices which students took home.

The program included students in the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. In the fifth and sixth grades boys and girls

were taught sex education in mixed groups in science class. Such things as birth, health, biological processes and functions, and the human reproductive system were studied.

In the seventh grade sex education was studied in science class in much greater depth. Each student was required to take one semester of general science. In the middle of the term the boys and girls were separated and given group instruction in sex education. The instruction during these sessions covered the anatomy and physiology of the human reproductive system, the endocrine system and how it affects sex, and the social-hygiene and behavior implications. Audiovisual materials were available to the staff and their use was encourage (8:134). Two textbooks and one booklet were used by the classes. They were Finding Yourself by Lerrigo and Southard, Being Born by Francis B. Strain, and the booklet was "For Youth To Know" by Donald Boyer (8:134).

The Skokie Program

In Skokie Junior High in Skokie, Illinois, sex education was integrated with biology, and students visited a school operated nursery during the study of emotions and child development. Case studies which had been written by the nursery school staff were discussed in biology classes, and these case studies concerned such topics as temper tantrums, shyness, crying for attention, sex interest, and anti-social behavior. The students discussed ways to meet these re-

sponses in young children. In the spring of the year the students studied the biological functions of animals, but instruction was not given about the human body until students reached senior high school (8:49-50).

The Arlington Heights Program

In the Arlington Heights Public School System in Arlington Heights, Illinois, sex education was taught in health classes. From four to six class periods each year were devoted to sex education instruction, and as a culminating activity a film was shown at each grade level. At the sixth grade level the film Miracle of Reproduction was shown, and the film used in seventh grade varies. In the eighth grade the film Human Growth was used (2:227).

Two weeks before these films were shown a letter was sent home to each child's parents describing the sex education program and the instructional films. An evening meeting for parents was held before the students started receiving sex education instruction. The parents were given a chance to prevent their child from taking part in sex education instruction, but in the ten years this program was in operation no parent made such a request (2:228).

The San Diego Program

In the junior high schools of San Diego, California, two men and two women counselors took students on a voluntary bases in groups limited to twenty-five for a six-week

period. These students met with the counselor once a week and were excused from their regular classes. Parental permission was not required, although it was a few years prior.

The counselors were selected with care and the school district preferred them to be experienced married teachers with two or more children (11:236).

The counselors did not use any specific course of study, and the student groups were on an informal discussion basis (11:236). However, the counselors did attempt to cover certain areas of content in each session. In the first meeting reproduction and the vocabulary of the parts of the body were presented. At the second meeting menstruation, masturbation, the sex act, and social attitudes were discussed. At the third meeting the film Human Reproduction was shown, and emotions and their control were discussed. The topics for the fourth meeting were sex conduct and venereal disease; the fifth meeting dealt with courtship and marriage. Personal problems was the topic for discussion at the last meeting (11:238). Provisions were made for students to meet for private counseling if they had problems that they did not wish to discuss in front of the group. However, discussion was strongly encouraged (11:239).

III. SUMMARY

The review of the literature indicated that there was a variety of procedures used in handling junior high school sex education. Some school districts employed a team-teaching approach (8:132), whereas others used specialists such as counselors (11:136). Other school districts utilized health teachers (2:227), and some school districts used their regular classroom teachers to give sex education instruction (9:31).

Signed permission slips from parents were required before students were enrolled in sex education classes in one school district (10:53), however, in other school districts no type of parental permission was required (11:236). Some school districts had scheduled sex education classes (10:53); other school districts had non-scheduled classes (11:236).

Most school districts surveyed had some type of sex education orientation program for parents. Some schools held meetings for parents before sex education was given (3:51), whereas others held meetings after the sex education instruction had been completed (8:134). Other schools sent a note home with pupils to inform the parents that their children would be participating in sex education classes (8:133).

The grade level at which students received sex education instruction varied. Some school districts used the elementary and intermediate grades as a readiness program for

systematic sex education instruction designed for seventh grade students (8:133): other school districts started their readiness program in the seventh or eighth grade and did not start systematic instruction until the ninth grade (3:50).

CHAPTER III

A SURVEY OF PUBLIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES IN SEX EDUCATION

The data for this chapter were obtained from questionnaire returns from state departments of instruction and responding school districts. Each of the fifty state departments of instruction were sent a letter and questionnaire, and fifty (100 per cent) of the questionnaires were returned. Table I shows that each of fifty-one school districts were sent a letter and questionnaire, and that twenty-seven (53 per cent) of the questionnaires were returned. However, not all responses on the returned questionnaires were usable. As a result the percentages used in the tables were based on the number of responses to each section of the questionnaire.

I. PHILOSOPHIES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF INSTRUCTION

State departments of instruction differed in their philosophies regarding sex education in public schools. Table II indicates that out of fifty states twenty-one recommended some form of sex education while fifteen made sex education optional at the school district's discretion. Eight states had no policy regarding sex education while six did not recommend it.

TABLE I

SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONSES TO
LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

School Districts Sent To	Usable Returns	Unusable Returns	No Returns
San Diego, California	x		
Whittier, California	x		
Denver, Colorado	x		
Dade County, Florida		x	
Hollsborough County, Florida		x	
Miami, Florida		x	
Tampa, Florida	x		
Alton High School Alton, Illinois			x
Crystal Lake High School Crystal Lake, Illinois	x		
Genesso, Illinois			x
Highland Park, Illinois			x
Oak Park, Illinois			x
Winnetka, Illinois	x		
Clinton, Iowa	x		
Iowa Falls, Iowa			x
Waterloo, Iowa			x
Sanford, Maine			x
Baltimore, Maryland	x		
Harford County, Bel Air, Maryland		x	
Worcester County, Snow Hill, Maryland			x
Mankota, Minnesota			x
Minneapolis, Minnesota			x
No. St. Paul, Minnesota	x		
Payesville, Minnesota			x
St. Paul, Minnesota			x
Two Harbors, Minnesota			x
Billings, Montana			x
Tom's River, New Jersey		x	
Las Vegas, New Mexico			x
Branxville, New York	x		
New York, New York			x
Syracuse, New York	x		
Fargo, North Dakota			x
Grafton, North Dakota			x
Grand Forks, No. Dakota	x		
Cinncinati, Ohio	x		

TABLE I (continued)

School Districts Sent To	Usable Returns	Unusable Returns	No Returns
Klamath Falls, Oregon			x
North Bend, Oregon			x
Salem, Oregon	x		
Columbia, South Carolina			x
Huron, South Dakota			x
Sioux Fall, So. Dakota	x		
Salt Lake City, Utah Eranite District			x
Salt Lake, Utah	x		
Richmond, Virginia		x	
Olympia, Washington	x		
Renton, Washington	x		
Seattle, Washington	x		
Sumner, Washington	x		
Tacoma, Washington	x		
Vancouver, Washington			x
	21	6	24

TABLE II

POLICIES OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF INSTRUCTION ON SEX EDUCATION

States	Recommended	Not Recommended	Optional at School Dist. Discretion	No Policy
Alabama			x	
Alaska	x			
Arizona			x	
Arkansas			x	
California			x	
Colorado	x			
Connecticut			x	
Delaware			x	
Florida	x			
Georgia			x	
Hawaii	x			
Idaho				x
Illinois	x			
Indiana				x
Iowa			x	
Kansas			x	
Kentucky	x			
Louisiana	x			
Maine	x			
Maryland			x	
Massachusetts				x
Michigan	x			
Minnesota	x			
Mississippi			x	
Missouri			x	
Montana		x		
Nebraska				x
Nevada				x
New Hampshire			x	
New Jersey			x	
New Mexico		x		
New York	x			
North Carolina	x			
North Dakota	x			
Ohio		x		
Oklahoma		x		
Oregon	x			
Pennsylvania	x			
Rhode Island				x
South Carolina	x			
South Dakota		x		
Tennessee				x
Texas	x			
Utah	x			
Vermont				x
Virginia		x		
Washington	x			
West Virginia	x			
Wisconsin	x			
Wyoming			x	
Total	21	6	15	8

II. ORGANIZATIONS

Table III shows that sixteen organizations were contacted and nine responded. These groups seemed very interested in sex education but no information received pertained directly to this study.

III. PHILOSOPHIES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

School districts differed in their philosophies on sex education. Table IV illustrates that out of twenty school districts responding eighteen (90 per cent) felt sex education should be given in public schools. The school districts of Renton, Washington, and Sioux Falls, South Dakota, felt it should not be given.

Success and Failure

School districts which had junior high school sex education programs seemed to feel their programs were successful. Out of nineteen school districts responding Table V demonstrates that eighteen (95 per cent) felt their programs were successful and had experienced favorable community reactions. Only Salt Lake City, Utah, felt its program was unsuccessful and had experienced unfavorable community reactions.

TABLE III

ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED IN STUDY

Organizations	Responded	Did not Respond
American Home Economics Association		x
American Medical Association	x	
American Social Hygiene Association	x	
Association for Childhood Education International	x	
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	x	
Family Service Association of America		x
Federal Bureau of Investigation	x	
John Birch Society		x
National Catholic Welfare Conference	x	
National Council on Family Relations		x
National Education Association	x	
Public Affairs Committee, Inc.		x
The American Institute of Family Relations		x
United States Office of Education	x	
Washington State Department of Health	x	
Young Women's Christian Association of the United States of America, National Board		x
Total Organizations - 16	9	7

TABLE IV

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH FELT SEX EDUCATION SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School Districts	Should Be Given	Should Not Be Given
Bronxville, New York	x	
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois	x	
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota	x	
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x	
Olympia, Washington	x	
Renton, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
San Diego, California	x	
Seattle, Washington	x	
Sioux Falls, South Dakota		x
Sumner, Washington	x	
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington	x	
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois	x	
Total	18	2

TABLE V

FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE COMMUNITY REACTIONS TO JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School Districts	Favorable Reaction	Unfavorable Reaction
Bronxville, New York	x	
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois	x	
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota	x	
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x	
Olympia, Washington	x	
Renton, Washington	x	
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah		x
San Diego, California	x	
Seattle, Washington	x	
Sumner, Washington	x	
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington	x	
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois	x	
Total	18	1

Written Programs

Even though a school district had a sex education program did not mean the program was written out. Table VI shows that out of twenty school districts responding thirteen (65 per cent) had written out their sex education programs, whereas seven (35 per cent) had not written out their programs.

Grade Level Placement

School districts differed on the grade level placement of sex education instruction, and the junior high school program often overlapped into the elementary and high schools. Table VII indicates that out of eighteen school districts responding six had part of their programs in the primary grades, fifteen had some of their programs in the intermediate grades, nine had part of their programs in the junior high school and fifteen had some of their programs in the senior high school.

Teacher Preparation

School districts differed on their appraisals of the training that institutions of higher learning were giving teachers to prepare them for conducting sex education classes. Table VIII illustrates that out of fifteen school districts responding, eleven (74 per cent) felt the institutions of higher learning were doing an inadequate job. Four school

TABLE VI

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH HAD OR DID NOT HAVE A PLANNED PROGRAM FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SEX EDUCATION

School Districts	Had a Planned Written Program	Did Not Have A Planned Written Program
Bronxville, New York	x	
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x	
Olympia, Washington		x
Renton, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
San Diego, California	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
Seattle, Washington		x
Sioux Falls, South Dakota		x
Sumner, Washington	x	
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington		x
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois	x	
Total	13	7

TABLE VII

GRADE LEVEL PLACEMENT OF SEX EDUCATION
IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

School Districts	Primary	Intermediate	Junior High	High School
Bronxville, New York	x	x		x
Cincinnati, Ohio		x		x
Clinton, Iowa	x	x		x
Crystal Lake, Illinois				x
Denver, Colorado		x	x	x
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x	x	x
North St. Paul, Minnesota			x	x
Olympia, Washington		x		x
Renton, Washington		x		x
Salem, Oregon		x	x	x
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	x	x	x
San Diego, California	x	x	x	x
Seattle, Washington				x
Sumner, Washington		x	x	
Syracuse, New York	x	x		x
Tampa, Florida		x	x	x
Whittier, California		x		
Winnetka, Illinois	x	x	x	
Total	6	15	9	15

TABLE VIII

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH FELT THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WERE DOING OR WERE NOT DOING AN ADEQUATE JOB OF PREPARING TEACHERS TO TEACH SEX EDUCATION CLASSES

School Districts	Were Doing An Adequate Job	Were Not Doing An Adequate Job
Bronxville, New York		x
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denver, Colorado		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota		x
Olympia, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah		x
San Diego, California	x	
Seattle, Washington	x	
Sumner, Washington		x
Syracuse, New York		x
Tacoma, Washington		x
Tampa, Florida		x
Winnetka, Illinois		x
Total	4	11

districts (26 per cent) felt the institutions of higher learning were doing an adequate job.

Table IX demonstrates that out of twenty school districts responding eight (40 per cent) required teachers of sex education to take inservice training, and eleven school districts (55 per cent) did not require sex education teachers to take any extra form of academic preparation. Cincinnati, Ohio, required its teachers to take inservice training and special college classes.

Teacher Selection

School districts differed on the personal qualifications and academic training teachers should have to teach sex education in junior schools. Table X shows that out of nineteen school districts responding ten (53 per cent) had a definite procedure for selecting teachers for sex education. Nine (47 per cent) of the school districts did not have a definite procedure for selecting teachers for sex education.

Teaching Methods

School districts differed in the teaching methods selected to conduct sex education classes in the junior high school. Table XI indicates that out of eighteen school districts responding thirteen (72 per cent) did not require signed parental permission slips for students: five (28 per cent) did. Table XII illustrates that out of eighteen school

TABLE IX

SPECIAL TRAINING THAT SCHOOL DISTRICTS REQUIRED SEX EDUCATION TEACHERS TO TAKE

School Districts	In-service Training	Special College Classes	No Special Requirements
Bronxville, New York	x		
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x		
Crystal Lake, Illinois			x
Denver, Colorado	x		
Grand Forks, North Dakota			x
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x		
Olympia, Washington			x
Renton, Washington			x
Salem, Oregon			x
Salt Lake City, Utah			x
San Diego, California	x		
Sioux Falls, South Dakota			x
Sumner, Washington			x
Syracuse, New York			x
Tacoma, Washington			x
Tampa, Florida	x		
Whittier, California			x
Winnetka, Illinois	x		
Total	8	1	11

TABLE X

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH DID AND DID NOT HAVE ESTABLISHED CRITERIA FOR SELECTING TEACHERS FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SEX EDUCATION

School District	Established Criteria	No Established Criteria
Bronxville, New York	x	
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota		x
Olympia, Washington		x
Renton, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
San Diego, California		x
Sioux Falls, South Dakota		x
Sumner, Washington	x	
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington		x
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois		x
Total	10	9

TABLE XI

SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT DID AND DID NOT REQUIRE SIGNED PARENTAL PERMISSION SLIPS

School Districts	Permission Slips Required	Permission Slips Not Required
Bronxville, New York		x
Cincinnati, Ohio		x
Clinton, Iowa		x
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denton, Maryland		x
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota		x
Renton, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon		x
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
San Diego, California	x	
Seattle, Washington		x
Sumner, Washington		x
Syracuse, New York		x
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois		x
Total	5	13

districts responding four (22 per cent) used team teaching; fourteen (78 per cent) did not. Table XIII demonstrates that out of twelve school districts responding six (50 per cent) gave instruction to mixed groups of students; six did not. Two of the twelve school districts had changed their policy on mixed versus non-mixed instruction since 1950, and Tampa, Florida, and Syracuse, New York, both changed to giving mixed group instruction. The school districts of Tampa, Florida; Whittier, California; and Bronxville, New York, attempted to integrate junior high school sex education with the total curriculum.

Audiovisual Materials

School districts' views differed on the adequacy of audiovisual materials for sex education. Table XIV shows that out of eighteen school districts responding thirteen (72 per cent) felt the audiovisual materials available were adequate. Five school districts (28 per cent) felt the audiovisual materials available were not adequate.

Resource People

Policies concerning the use of resource people in sex education varied among school districts. Table XV indicates that out of fourteen school districts responding eleven (79 per cent) permitted teachers to use resource people in sex education classes, whereas three school

TABLE XII

SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT DID AND
DID NOT USE TEAM TEACHING
IN SEX EDUCATION

School Districts	Used Team Teaching	Did Not Use Team Teaching
Bronxville, New York		x
Cincinnati, Ohio		x
Clinton, Iowa		x
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x	
Renton, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon		x
Salt Lake City, Utah		x
San Diego, California		x
Seattle, Washington		x
Sumner, Washington		x
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington		x
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California		x
Winnetka, Illinois		x
Total	4	14

TABLE XIII

SCHOOL DISTRICT PRACTICES IN MIXING SEXES FOR SEX EDUCATION CLASSES

School Districts	Mixed Groups	Unmixed Groups
Bronxville, New York	x	
Cincinnati, Ohio		x
Clinton, Iowa		x
Denver, Colorado		x
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
Sumner, Washington		x
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Total	6	6

TABLE XIV

ATTITUDES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REGARDING THE ADEQUACY OF AVAILABLE AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL USE

School Districts	Audiovisual Aids Were Adequate	Audiovisual Aids Were Not Adequate
Bronxville, New York		x
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denver, Colorado		x
Grand Forks, North Dakota	x	
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x	
Olympia, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
San Diego, California	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
Seattle, Washington	x	
Sumner, Washington	x	
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington		x
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois	x	
Total	13	5

TABLE XV

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH DID AND DID NOT PERMIT THE USE OF RESOURSE PEOPLE IN SEX EDUCATION CLASSES

School Districts	Used Resource People	Did Not Use Resource People
Bronxville, New York	x	
Cincinnati, Ohio	x	
Clinton, Iowa	x	
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota	x	
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah	x	
San Diego, California	x	
Sumner, Washington		x
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tampa, Florida	x	
Whittier, California	x	
Winnetka, Illinois		x
Total	11	3

districts (21 per cent) did not.

Religious Groups

Local church groups sometimes desired to participate in sex education programs, but Table XVI illustrates that out of seventeen school districts responding eleven (65 per cent) had a policy against any form of religious participation in sex education. Six school districts (35 per cent) allowed it.

Comparision to 1950's

Table XVII demonstrates that out of twenty school districts responding thirteen (65 per cent) reported that their school districts gave more sex education at all grade levels than in the 1950's. Five school districts (25 per cent) reported their school districts gave less sex education, and two (10 per cent) reported that their district gave about the same.

Research

School districts differed on the need for additional research in sex education. Table XVIII shows that out of twenty school districts responding eleven (55 per cent) felt that more research was needed: five school districts (25 per cent) felt that additional research was not needed, and four school districts (20 per cent) did not respond.

TABLE XVI

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH DID OR DID NOT PERMIT THE PARTICIPATION OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS IN SEX EDUCATION

School Districts	Permitted Participation	Did Not Permit Participation
Bronxville, New York	x	
Clinton, Iowa		x
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x
Denver, Colorado	x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota		x
North St. Paul, Minnesota		x
Olympia, Washington		x
Renton, Washington		x
Salem, Oregon	x	
Salt Lake City, Utah		x
San Diego, California	x	
Seattle, Washington		x
Sumner, Washington		x
Syracuse, New York	x	
Tacoma, Washington	x	
Whittier, California		x
Winnetka, Illinois		x
Total	6	11

TABLE XVII

THE AMOUNT OF SEX EDUCATION GIVEN BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE EARLY 1950's IN RELATION TO 1963

School Districts	Less Given	About the Same	More Given
Bronxville, New York	x		
Cincinnati, Ohio		x	
Clinton, Iowa			x
Crystal Lake, Illinois			x
Denver, Colorado			x
Grand Forks, North Dakota			x
North St. Paul, Minnesota			x
Olympia, Washington			x
Renton, Washington	x		
Salem, Oregon	x		
San Diego, California			x
Salt Lake City, Utah			x
Seattle, Washington	x		
Sioux Falls, South Dakota			x
Sumner, Washington			x
Syracuse, New York			x
Tacoma, Washington			x
Tampa, Florida			x
Whittier, California		x	
Winnetka, Illinois	x		
Total	5	2	13

TABLE XVIII

SCHOOL DISTRICTS' FEELINGS ON
RESEARCH IN SEX EDUCATION

School Districts	Research Adequate	Research Inadequate	No Response
Bronxville, New York		x	
Cincinnati, Ohio			x
Clinton, Iowa		x	
Crystal Lake, Illinois		x	
Denver, Colorado		x	
Grand Forks, North Dakota	x		
North St. Paul, Minnesota		x	
Olympia, Washington		x	
Renton, Washington	x		
Salem, Oregon	x		
San Diego, California		x	
Salt Lake City, Utah		x	
Seattle, Washington	x		
Sioux Falls, South Dakota			x
Sumner, Washington		x	
Syracuse, New York		x	
Tacoma, Washington	x		
Tampa, Florida			x
Whittier, California			x
Winnetka, Illinois		x	
Total	5	11	4

IV. SUMMARY

The data gathered from the questionnaire returns from the state offices of education and school districts indicated that there were a great many feelings regarding sex education. Twenty-one state offices of education recommended the teaching of sex education, fifteen left it up to the local school district's discretion, eight had no pertaining policy, and six did not recommend it.

The feelings of school districts were mixed. Eighteen school districts favored sex education with two not in favor. Public reaction seemed to run in favor of sex education where the programs were in operation. Eighteen school districts reported a favorable public reaction with Salt Lake City, Utah, reporting a negative one.

Some school districts had a sex education program that was not written out. Thirteen school districts reported a written program, whereas seven indicated their programs were not spelled out.

The grade level at which school districts placed sex education varied and often overlapped. Six school districts had a primary program, fifteen had an intermediate program, nine had a junior high school program, and fifteen had a senior high school program.

School districts seemed to have mixed feelings on the training sex education teachers received from training

institutions. Four school districts felt the training institutions were doing an adequate job, while eleven felt an inadequate job was being done. Eight school districts had in-service training for their sex education teachers, and Cincinnati, Ohio, required its teachers to take special college classes. Ten school districts had an established criteria for selecting classroom teachers for sex education while ten did not.

School districts had varying opinions regarding methods, techniques, and procedures to be used in sex education. Five school districts required signed permission slips from parents while thirteen did not. Four school districts used team teaching and fourteen used some other method. Six school districts mixed sexes for classroom instruction while six segregated them. Thirteen school districts felt the audiovisual aids available were adequate while five felt they were inadequate, and eleven school districts permitted the use of resource people while three did not. Six school districts permitted religious participation in sex education and eleven had regulations against such participation.

No research was found which would indicate what was going on in the field of sex education in the early 1950's. However, thirteen school districts reported they gave more sex education in 1963 than in the early 1950's. Two districts reported they gave the same, and five reported they

gave less in 1963. Five school districts felt the research available on sex education was adequate, while eleven considered it inadequate.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Thirteen school districts reported they gave more sex education in 1963 than in the early 1950's. Two districts reported they gave about the same, and five reported they gave less. Approximately two-thirds of the school districts that responded to the question on research on sex education felt that the research was inadequate.

A relatively few school districts throughout the United States were found to have sex education instruction in the junior high school. The nature of those sex education programs in operation varied, and a favorable public acceptance was reported in all but one school district.

Some school districts used regular classroom teachers to give sex education instruction while others used only physical education teachers or counselors. Team teaching was reported by four school districts.

Signed student permission slips for participation in sex education classes were required by less than thirty per cent of the school districts reporting. Nearly all school districts surveyed had some type of sex education orientation program for parents.

The grade level at which students received sex education varied. Some school districts started their sex education program in the primary and intermediate grades. The literature indicated that elementary school programs are sometimes used as a readiness program for junior high school instruction. Other school districts started their sex education program during the junior high school years. Segregated classrooms were used by fifty per cent of the school districts that provided information on this question.

School districts expressed mixed feeling on the preservice training teachers received for sex education instruction. Approximately three-fourths of the school district respondents felt that an inadequate job was being done by the teacher preparation institutions. Inservice training was used by eight school districts and one required special college classes of its sex education teachers. Approximately half the responding school districts had an established criteria for selecting sex education teachers. Most of the school districts surveyed permitted the use of resource people and felt the available audiovisual aids were adequate but some expressed a negative feeling. Religious participation was permitted by six school districts but eleven had regulations against such participation.

The sex education programs of nearly two-thirds of school districts surveyed had programs that were written out.

II. CONCLUSION

The following tentative conclusions were drawn at the end of this study:

1. It was difficult to locate very many school districts which were recognized as having on-going sex education programs in their junior high schools.

2. Research reports dealing with sex education programs at the junior high school level were very limited in number.

3. Sex education programs at the junior high school level may use a variety of classroom practices and have public acceptance.

4. A number of school districts, organizations, and agencies have produced curriculum guides for sex education programs at the junior high school level.

5. The following organizations are among those that have been active in the field of sex education: American Institute of Family Relations, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, American Social Health Association, American Home Economics Association, and the American Medical Association.

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

During the development of the study, other concomitant problems became evident and seemed to warrant further

study. Among these were the following:

1. A study of the role of state education agencies with respect to sex education programs on the junior high school level.

2. An investigation, using scientific sampling techniques of past experiences, present activities, and future possibilities in the area of junior high school sex education.

3. Studies of the factors affecting public and professional opinion with respect to sex education in junior high schools.

4. Comparative studies of the results of having and not having sex education programs in public schools on the junior high school level.

5. A study of junior high school sex education program failures.

6. An investigation of the attitudes that cause people to support and oppose sex education in junior high schools.

7. The development of guidelines for the introduction of sex education programs in public junior high schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bassett, Claire K. "Current Thinking and Practices in Family Life and Sex Education in the Secondary Schools of the United States." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston University, Boston, 1956-57.

2. Campell, Robert P. "A Sex Education Program in the Junior High School," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 42:227-229, April, 1958.

3. Eggert, Chester Lee. "Programs In Action," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 39:45-68, December, 1953.

4. Gallwas, Lois. "A Report of Human Relations Classes Held in the Ninth Grade of Chula Vista Junior High School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, San Diego State College, San Diego, 1955-56.

5. Lamke, T. A. and H. M. Silvey. Master's Theses in Education. Cedar Falls: Iowa State Teachers College, Research Publications, 1956.

6. Lamke, T. A. and H. M. Silvey. Master's Theses in Education. Cedar Falls: Iowa State Teachers College, Research Publications, 1957.

7. Lloyd, Clifford E. "Sex Education in Ninth Grade General Science," The Clearing House, 23:375, February, 1949.

8. Marland, S. P., Jr. "Placing Sex Education in the Curriculum," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:132-134, December, 1961.

9. Stannard, Cedric. "Cooperative Planning for Family Life," California Journal of Secondary Education, 25:29-31, January, 1950.

10. Volk, Alma M. "Rock Island's Program of Sex Education," The School Executive Magazine, 65:53-54, May, 1946.

11. Wetherill, G. G., M.D. "Sex Education in the Public Schools," The Journal of School Health, 31:235-239, September, 1961.

APPENDIX

October 16, 1962
New College Apts. E-8
8th Street and Ruby

Dear Sir:

I am writing this letter to request your co-operation in helping me obtain information for my Master's thesis which is entitled A Summary of Sex Education Practices in the United States.

I am very much interested in what your group has done and advocates in relation to sex education within the public schools.

Would you please answer the following questions from your organization's view point or send me material which will answer them. Do you advocate laws for state-wide or nation-wide sex education? Have you developed any study guides or recommendations for teachers? If so, it would be appreciated if you would send copies for consideration in this study. Do you feel that the instruction the public schools are now giving in sex education is adequate? Why? Do you feel the emphasis on sex education in the public school curriculum has increased, decreased or remained constant since 1950?

I would appreciate you referring me to other organizations that also deal with this subject and to school districts which have planned programs in sex education. Any information you feel might benefit this study will be gratefully received and carefully studied.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely,

Jerome B. Altheide
Graduate Student
Central Washington State College

This study and the above letter have been approved.

Sincerely,

J. Wesley Crum
Dean of Instruction

New College Apts. E-8
8th Street and Ruby
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Sir:

I am writing this letter to request your cooperation in helping me obtain information for my Master's thesis which is entitled A Summary of Sex Education Practices in the United States.

I have been informed that your school district is doing a good job of instruction in relation to sex education, and I would like to learn more about it. Would you please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me.

I would appreciate receiving the names and addresses of other cities or school districts within your state which have well developed programs in sex education in their schools.

Would you please send me a copy of your district's sex education program. Any information you have which you feel would benefit the study will be gratefully received and carefully studied.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome B. Altheide
Graduate Student
Central Washington State College

Enc. 1

This study and the above letter have been approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. Wesley Crum
Dean of Instruction

January 18, 1963
New College Apts. E-8
8th Street and Ruby
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Sir:

On October 16, 1962, I mailed to you a letter requesting your cooperation in helping me obtain information for my Master's thesis which deals with classroom instructional practices in selected junior high schools throughout the United States. Your answer must have been lost in the Christmas season mail because I have not received it.

I am sending a second questionnaire. Would you please fill it out and return it to me. Your answers are very important and are needed for my study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome B. Altheide
Graduate Student
Central Washington State College

Enc. 1

This study and the above letter have been approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. Wesley Crum
Dean of Instruction

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON SEX EDUCATION PRACTICES

Date_____ City_____

School District_____ State_____

Name and official capacity of the person who will fill out this questionnaire_____

Please circle either "yes" or "no"

1. Yes No Does your state require by law that all public schools are to provide some form of sex education?

2. Yes No Does your state recommend that sex education be taught in the public schools?

3. Yes No Does your school district have a planned program for teaching sex education?

4. Yes No Do you feel that sex education instruction should be given by your district?

5. Yes No Are the primary grades included in your school district's sex education program?

6. Yes No Are the intermediate grades included in your school district's sex education program?

7. Yes No Are the junior high grades included in your school district's sex education program?

8. Yes No Do the students in senior high school receive sex education instruction?

9. Yes No Is more sex education instruction now given in your school district than was previously given in the early 1950's?

10. Yes No Were there any major reasons why an instructional program in sex education was started in your district? Please list them.
    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.
    5.
    6.

11. Yes No Does your sex-education instructional program have aims or objectives that are written out? If so, please attach a copy of the stated objectives.

12. Yes No Has your school district's aims or objectives in sex education undergone any significant change since 1950? What were the changes?_____

_____

_____

13. Yes No Do you feel the aims or objectives of your school district's sex education program are being met?

14. Yes No Has any significant changes in grade level placement of sex education instructional material taken place since 1950 in your district? What were the changes?_____

_____

_____

15. Yes No Is sex education instruction given to mixed groups of students? Comments_____

_____

_____

16. Yes No Has your school district's policy on giving sex education instruction to mixed or segregated groups changed since 1950? What were the changes?

_____

_____

17. Yes No Does your school district have an established criteria for deciding who will teach sex education classes? What criteria is used in this selection?

_____

_____

18. Yes No Do you feel most teachers could teach a sex education class? Explain:_____

_____

19. Yes No Does your school district require those teachers who will be giving sex education instruction to take certain college courses in preparation? Explain:_____

_____

20. Yes No Is sex education taught as a separate class in your school district? At what grade levels is it taught in this manner?_____

21. Yes No Is sex education instruction integrated with other subjects in your school district? If yes, list the subjects with which it is integrated and the school levels involved in each._____

_____

_____

22. Yes No Does your school district use in-service training as a device to prepare your staff for giving sex education instruction?

23. Yes No Are resource people utilized in the sex education classes in your school district? List the major classifications of resource persons utilized.

_____

_____

24. Yes No Has your school district's policy changed since 1950 on the use of resource people in the sex education classes? If so, please indicate the types of problems experienced._____

_____

25. Yes No Have any problems arisen since 1950 because resource people were used in sex education classes? If so, please indicate the types of problems experienced.

_____

_____

26. Yes No Before a student can be enrolled in a sex education class in your district, must his parents give permission?

27. Yes No Generally speaking, has your local community reacted in a favorable manner toward your sex education program? Explain:_____

_____

28. Yes No Do you feel the sex education program has been a success in your school district? If no, why not?

_____

_____

29. Yes No Has your school district ever utilized team teaching as a means of giving sex education instruction?

30. Yes No Do you feel that more research studies on sex education need to be conducted?

31. Yes No Does your school district co-operate with or seek advice from the local church groups in conjunction with the sex education classes?

32. Yes No Do you feel colleges and universities are doing an adequate job to prepare teachers to give sex education instruction? If no, what would you recommend?_____

_____

33. Yes No Do you feel the audiovisual aids on sex education which are available at this time to school districts are adequate? If no, why not?_____

_____

_____

Please return this questionnaire with a copy of your school district's sex education program to:

Jerome B. Altheide
New College Apts. E-8
8th Street and Ruby
Ellensburg, Washington

SEX EDUCATION CHECK LIST

Please check the squares which describe your school district's practices in sex education.

	PRIMARY 1-3	INTERMEDIATE 4-6	JR HIGH 7-9	SR HIGH 10-12
Sex education instruction is given				
Taught by classroom teacher				
Taught by specialist				
Taught as a separate subject				
Taught as an integrated subject				
Utilizes resource personnel				
Taught to mixed groups				
Taught to groups segregated by sex				
Parent's permission is required				
Taught by team teaching				
Close cooperation with churches				
Required by state law to be taught				
Use of special books for sex education classes				
Use of textbooks that contain data on sex education				
Use of sex education audio-visual aids				

October 16, 1962
New College Apts. E-8
8th and Ruby
Ellensburg, Washington

Dear Sir:

I am writing this letter to request your co-operation in helping me obtain information for my Master's thesis which is entitled A Summary of Sex Education Practices in the United States.

If your state has a sex education program that is required by law or that is recommended by the state superintendent of public instruction, would you please send me a copy. Would you also please fill out the enclosed questionnaire on sex education and return it to me.

I would greatly appreciate receiving the names and addresses of cities or school districts within your state which have planned programs in sex education in their schools.

Any information you have which you feel would benefit this study will be greatfully received and carefully studied.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome B. Altheide
Graduate Student
Central Washington State College

Enc. 1

This study and the above letter have been approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. Wesley Crum
Dean of Instruction

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON SEX EDUCATION PRACTICES

Date_____ City_____

State_____

Name and official capacity of the person who will be filling out this questionnaire_____

Please circle either "yes" or "no"

1. Yes No Does your state require by law that all public schools are to provide some form of sex education?

2. Yes No Does your state recommend that sex education be taught in the public schools?

3. Yes No Do any school districts within your state have a planned program for teaching sex education. If yes, please list the names and addresses of those school districts which have especially well developed programs in sex education._____

_____

_____

_____

4. Yes No Do you feel sex education should be taught in your state's public schools? Comments:_____

_____

_____

5. Yes No Are the primary grades included in your state's sex education program?

6. Yes No Are the intermediate grades included in your state's sex education program?

7. Yes No Are the junior high grades included in your state's sex education program?

8. Yes No Do the students in senior high school receive sex education instruction?

9. Yes No Is more sex education instruction now given in your state's public schools than was previously given during the early 1950's?

10. Yes No Are there any significant reasons why your state does or does not have a planned state-wide program for sex education? Please list them.
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

11. Yes No Does your state's sex educational program have aims or objectives that are written out? If so, please attach a copy of the stated objectives.

12. Yes No Has your state's aims or objectives in sex education undergone any significant change since 1950? What were the changes?_____

_____

_____

13. Yes No Do you feel the aims or objectives of your state's sex education program are being met? Comments:

_____

_____

14. Yes No Is sex education instruction given to mixed groups of students? Comments:_____

_____

_____

15. Yes No Do you feel most teachers could teach sex education? Explain:_____

_____

_____

16. Yes No Does your state require those teachers who will be giving sex education instruction to take certain college courses in preparation? Explain:_____

_____

_____

_____

17. Yes No Before a student can be enrolled in a sex education class in the public schools in your state, must his parents give permission?

18. Yes No Do you feel the sex education program has been a success in your state? If no, why not?_____

_____

19. Yes No Do you feel that more research studies on sex education need to be conducted?

20. Yes No Do you feel colleges and universities are doing an adequate job to prepare teachers to give sex education instruction? If no, what would you recommend?_____

_____

21. Yes No Do you feel the audiovisual aids on sex education which are available at this time to school districts are adequate? If no, why not?_____

_____

_____

Please return this questionnaire with a copy of your state's sex education program. Also would you please include the names and addresses of school districts within your state which have planned programs in sex education. Please send this along with other information you feel might benefit this study to:

Jerome B. Altheide
New College Apts. E-8
8th Street and Ruby
Ellensburg, Washington