



1-1-1970

A Philosophical Justification for Sex Education in the Public School Curricula

Karl B. Groth

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Groth, Karl B., "A Philosophical Justification for Sex Education in the Public School Curricula" (1970).
Theses and Dissertations. 3572.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3572>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commons@library.und.edu.

T1970
G91

A PHILOSOPHICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR SEX EDUCATION IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULA

by

Karl B. Groth

Bachelor of Arts, St. Olaf College 1962

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Science

Grand Forks, North Dakota

January
1970

448088

This thesis submitted by Karl B. Groth in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

W. C. Koenig

(Chairman)

John L. Quaday

Quaday

William Johnson

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

A PHILOSOPHICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR SEX EDUCATION IN THE
Title PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULA

Department Physical Education

Degree Master of Science

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature _____

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to extend his sincere appreciation to Mr. Walter Koenig and Dr. John Quaday for their helpful guidance and assistance in the preparation and completion of this study; to Dr. Allan Sturges for the time taken as a member of the examining committee; to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thorman Groth, for their encouragement; and to his sister, Sylvia Groth, for her advice and inspiration. Finally, the writer is most indebted to his wife, Betty lu, for her continual patience and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Nature and Justification of the Problem	
Delimitations	
Limitations	
Definitions	
Related Literature	
Parents as Respondents	
Peers as Respondents	
Churches as Respondents	
Schools as Respondents	
II. METHODOLOGY	32
III. ANALYSIS OF RELATED LITERATURE	35
Parents as Respondents	
Peers as Respondents	
Churches as Respondents	
Schools as Respondents	
IV. DISCUSSION	46
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
Findings	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
REFERENCES	53

ABSTRACT

This study was an attempt to determine if the schools should be included as one of the major respondents to meet the need for sex education in present day society.

The purposes of the study were:

1. To analyze and evaluate library resources of written views and opinions for and against sex education.
2. To analyze and evaluate the limitations and potentialities of the four respondents to meet the need for sex education.

The procedure utilized by the writer in this study was the philosophical method of induction and deduction. The analysis was interpreted from the related literature which contained pro and con views, opinions, and studies about sex education and related areas by various individuals.

In this philosophical method of research the writer designed the study which elicited the kinds of facts needed to test the hypothesis. It was a subjective process. The writer chose a descriptive study and assembled the data that fit the purpose of the study.

Results of the study led the writer to conclude from the evidence available at the present time that the schools should be included as one of the major respondents to meet the need for sex education in present

day society. There was a consensus of opinion of authorities cited that all respondents must cooperate at the present time if the need was to be met.

It was recommended that the public schools should implement sex education in their curricula as a respondent justified to meet the need for young people.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

This study was an attempt to determine if the schools should be included as one of the major respondents,¹ along with parents, peers, and churches, to meet the need for sex education in present day society.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the study were:

1. To analyze and evaluate library resources of written views and opinions for and against sex education to determine if the schools should be one of the major respondents, along with parents, peers, and churches, to meet the need for sex education.

2. To analyze and evaluate the limitations and potentialities of the four respondents regarding the need for sex education.

Nature and Justification of the Problem

Time (1967), in an essay, cited a remark by Curtis Avery, "Sex education no longer has to be sold, it has been bought." Avery was probably referring more to sex in society than he was to the subject of sex

¹In this study respondent refers to an agent who felt compelled to answer the need delineated in this study-that was the need for sex education. Parents, peers, churches and schools were the respondents referred to in this study.

education. Sex had always been a topic of concern and controversy, but it had appeared that society had now elevated it to a rank of prime importance. The mass media sold sex as if it were the major part of an individual's personality, and a prime requisite for health, popularity, economic gain and social status. Suddenly, the adults in society became concerned about the behavior of youth. People began to wonder why the "sexual revolution" happened, if in fact, it had. Calderone (1965) felt that the behavior of young people was only a part of the whole problem: "that sex in our contemporary society had itself become a problem." She perceived the entire society to be uneasy about something that should be an integral part of a person's being.

It seemed unusual to this writer that a society that had valued sex so highly appeared to have little concern for the sex education of its children. A culture that saw the family as one of its most important institutions had done little to educate and prepare people for human sexuality. Yet, it was assumed that the primary purpose of America's educational system was to educate the whole child and prepare him to live in and contribute to his society.

Most people recognize that there has been a critical need for sex education for young people. Adults admitted that society had changed greatly during the last generation. Even though society recognized this need as well as the importance of sex education in this culture, the question of who had the responsibility of instructing youth in this area remained a much discussed and debated topic. It was this controversy which attracted this writer to the need for a study such as this.

The assumption that had been made by adults was that the responsibility for teaching sex education should be assumed by parents and, in some cases, churches and schools. Relatively few people, until recently, were concerned whether or not the students had been getting this education, because each of these respondents was assuming it was being done. Now, after recognizing how little had been done in the past, and the critical need this neglect had produced in the present, society recognized sex education as a way to possibly assist the adjustment of youth to the rapid changes in society. The question then emerged, "Who should do the job?"

Many school boards and school administrators were facing the problem whether or not sex education be taught? No matter which decision they would make, it would be necessary for them to justify their particular decision to parents as well as to other respondents who felt they, too, had a responsibility. This writer hoped that this study would help the school personnel concerned with this dilemma to better justify the inclusion of sex education in their school curricula.

Delimitations

This study was limited to:

1. an exploratory procedure
2. an examination of the pro and con opinions of authorities from various areas concerning the limitations and potentialities of parents, peers, churches, and schools as respondents who were attempting to meet the need for sex education in society
3. a philosophical approach.

Limitations

The limitations of this study were:

1. the use of existing resources that were accessible within the geographical area of the writer.
2. that it was not feasible for the writer, because of time and economy, to procure all available resources on sex education.
3. that the resources cited were analyzed and evaluated according to the writer's experience and judgment in the area of sex education.

Definitions

Sex education--Sex education was referred to as more than just education about sex. It concerned itself with the biological, psychological and social factors which affect personality and inter-personal relationships of minors. (students in the public school)

Public school curriculum--Public school curriculum was referred to as course offerings that were integrated into the educational programming structure of schools supported by city, state and federal taxes.

Peers--Peers were referred to as persons, in this case, students who were of similar rank and age, and were still considered responsible to parents.

Parents--Parents were referred to as adults, such as fathers, mothers, or guardians who were normally assumed to be the responsible agents of children including the ages of 10 through 21.

Churches--Churches were referred to as organizational structures of all religious faiths.

Need--Need was referred to as a necessity for sex education created by the misunderstanding and confusion about human sexuality.

Respondent--Respondent was referred to as an agent who felt compelled to answer the need delineated in this study--that was the need for sex education. Parents, peers, churches, and schools were the respondents referred to in this study.

Related Literature

The review of related literature focused upon the four respondents in society who were supposedly assuming the responsibility for sex education: parents, peers, churches, and schools. From the stated views and opinions in library resource materials of authorities from many areas, the writer discussed the limitations and potentialities of these respondents.

Parents as Respondents

Dr. Mary Calderone (Instructor, 1966) suggested "parents are not, under present circumstances the best people to give sex education to their children during adolescence." Reiss (1968) noted that the attitude of parents toward sex in their own families was the crucial area affecting the success of sex education programs. Even though parents admitted the importance of sex on the youngsters' future life, they have avoided discussing the subject with their children. They have rationalized that their children were not ready, or that they would give ideas to their children if they were told about sex. Parents,

however, were not as hesitant to talk about any other area with their children, only with sex. As a result, the influence of parents on the children's sex knowledge has decreased. Reiss felt that parents have not formulated their own feelings and attitudes about sex. In addition, parents were lacking the information and confidence to discuss sex in a conversation with their children.

Hinrichs and Kaplan (1966) stressed that not only was understanding sex education a problem, but also communicating with children. They stated:

It is ironical that we educate our children so much concerning the world in which they live and so little for themselves and living. We glorify, in many ways, marriage, family life, motherhood and fatherhood, but we leave preparation for these responsibilities largely to chance.

The sex education offered by parents was too emotional and confusing, often misleading, and usually incomplete and has led to early communication breakdown between adolescents and parents. The type of education children usually received was dictation of parental values. "Our children receive an indoctrination about their sex rather than an education, and this is conveyed mostly by the admonition, 'Thou shalt not . . .'" Kirkendall (1965) supported this theory by indicating any sex education young people received, not only from parents, was usually a matter of imposing or telling children about sex.

Luckey (1967) pointed out that a problem for children was the parents' and adults' double standard. They told their youngsters to behave by certain values and then provided poor examples themselves by living according to different standards. In many cases, parents were not available to provide examples or answers at all. Szasz (1968)

indicated that many parents who attempted to provide sex education for their children were unsuccessful because their beliefs and practices were uncertain or were continuously changing. Thus, children were no longer listening since they felt a "degree of hypocrisy." As Hinrichs and Kaplan (1966) stated:

It doesn't require many such incidents for a child to learn that this is a subject not to be discussed with parents. Even though his curiosity seems to have been satisfied, it may reappear at a later time in more intense and unfortunate ways.

In an article in School and Society (1967), Anita Brothers blamed "The parent who pushes her daughter or son into early social activities and thus creates the teenybopper." Berger in the same article indicated that the "teenybopper" was the result of adolescence extending over a fifteen year period rather than five years because of this push for young people to act older than their age. All this, Walters and Stinnett (1968) noted was "based on the principle that fast growth is desirable, that if one learns something earlier, such as walking, he will finish the race as a winner." Therefore, they noted parents enjoyed their children more when they did not act their age, but when their behavior was superior to that of children their own age. This, however, applied to areas other than sex education. Some parents felt this could be learned later, others considered it a "frill" of education, while others considered it ideal for non-college bound students.

Hamburg (1968) felt that parents were confused and threatened by the "sexual revolution" or what appeared to be a change in attitude of young people about sex. The pill and other methods of contraception

threatened parents' traditional beliefs and practices of sex behavior. No longer were parents able to use fear as a factor for controlling the sexual behavior of children. Many parents admitted they were not able to cope with this problem because their children were "turned off" to them. Therefore, today's young people were not learning about sex at home.

Ironically, however, many parents wanted their children to receive sex education, but as Hamburg (1968) stated "they want them to learn the 'right things.'" Because parents were looking for some social agency to take over the sex education of their children, Simon and Gagnon (1967) felt this was good reason for parents not to have the main responsibility.

Young people themselves stated that they had not received adequate information from parents. In a Purdue poll of 1,000 teenagers, only "32% of the girls and 15% of the boys were informed by parents." (Manley, 1964) In a more recent survey, McCary (1967) discovered that two-thirds of a group of high school honor students criticized their parents because they did not take time to discuss the subject of human sexuality with them, and when they had, the students stated they "received only cursory information and that was faulty and garbled." Young people at a youth conference gave almost a universal complaint:

That parents were not able to or did not do an adequate job. They were judged in some cases to be uninformed themselves, to be suspicious of their children, to imply condemnation of a youth behavior if information were sought, to act ashamed of the topic, to appear shy and embarrassed, evasive or uncomfortable, and apparently unable to cope with the reality that their children were really growing up. (Couch, 1967)

Dr. Calderone (1966a) indicated that the inadequate background of parents and the lack of communication with children was rarely overcome by

"the one-time effort most parents are able to force themselves to make to tell their child the 'facts'" nor certainly by the sex education books or the phonograph record shoved at their children by so many parents.

McGuigan (1969) felt that the parents would have difficulty teaching sex education because:

The family is no longer considered the unit of production and the haven from the forces of the world where the weary breadwinner can rest his aching head. If anything, the family tends to be the center of domestic cares of people. Alcoholism, divorce, bankruptcy, juvenile delinquency, shoplifting, and mental illness have struck two out of every three families. It is, therefore, little wonder that our youth display a growing tendency to seek meaning in life outside of the traditional realms of the family, church, and school.

Kirkendall (1965) contradicted the belief that sex education was considered to be a function of the home and an obligation of parents only when he declared:

No one or two persons can be adequately prepared in a cosmos that has become as complex and as varied as is today's world. This is what makes sex education confined to the home less effective than that derived from many sources. In the latter circumstances children are much more likely to be well prepared to cope with the numerous and conflicting views and practices they will meet in out-of-family living than if their education is limited strictly to what the family can provide.

As Zimmerman and Bochnak (1967) stated, "The family has changed from a breeding ground of common values into a battle-ground of generations," making it difficult for any communication, particularly about sex.

Parents, however, according to certain authorities, were the prime people in the sex education of their children, and even, according to other authorities, the only group who should be involved. Helen Manley (1964) remarked:

Surely the home should be the source of the child's first sex education. Here he receives his conception of love, security, and family interrelations. Here he should learn that all parts of his body are good and should receive as much approval on his discovery of his penis as his toes. Here he should see that love means warmth and understanding along with some disagreements. His questions should be answered factually, with warmth and understanding, and the correct names of all parts of his body should be known to him.

The teaching of moral values was the prime responsibility of the parents, most authorities stated, provided they did it. Hinrichs and Kaplan (1966) remarked that "few would deny that the basic responsibility for educating children about their sex, origins, morality, and behavior as boys and girls belongs to their parents."

Calderone (1966a) recognized the importance of the parent in the child's sex education when she stated:

The parents cannot choose whether or not they will give sex education. They are giving it every moment of their lives, probably nonverbally, but the child reads the message loud and clear.

A child's sex education began at birth. Hinrichs and Kaplan (1966) pointed out that the way the parents acted toward each other, the way they held the child, the sound of their voices, the manner they had toward each other, how children were taught to play, walk, and love, were powerful factors in a youngster's sex education.

In a Goodhousekeeping magazine poll (1969), 92.4 per cent of the people sampled had voted that parents should be primarily responsible for sex education of their children. Only 26.7 per cent felt that the schools should be responsible for teaching sex education.

Couch (1967) noted, "parents were identified often for the first choice of many young people because they 'really know the

child' or 'it's their responsibility to help us form the right attitudes early.'"

Szasz (1968) indicated that parents played an important role, because, throughout history, sex education took place through two educational processes, one of which was the "process of raising children." He felt this could not be changed, since this had been and still was the process for passing on the family's basic moral codes dealing with human interpersonal relationship. As he stated, "This has been, and will continue to be, the primary educational domain of the family."

Most authorities agreed that the parents had the primary responsibility for sex education provided they had the essential knowledge and maintained open channels of communication with their youngsters. Masters summarized the importance of parents to their youngster's sex education when he said:

The greatest form of sex education is Pop walking past Mom in the kitchen and patting her on the fanny and Mom obviously liking it. The kids take a good look at this action and think, "Boy, that's for me." (Hall, 1969)

Peers as Respondents

The part that peers played in the sex education of each other has been a controversy for some time. Studies and opinions indicated a variety of information, but many groups, including peers, were concerned about what children learned from one another.

A study by Kirkendall and Calderwood (1965) indicated that peers were not learning as much as adults thought, and what they often learned, adults wished they had not learned. Most of what they learned was in the area of attitudes rather than facts. Youngsters learned

that they were curious and found out that sexual experimentation by fellow peers was common and often was accepted by other peers.

Calderwood and Beste (1966) pointed out that:

While peer groups are the main source of sex information for youth, there is rarely open communication past the junior high school years as the need to protect prestige or reputation tends to create a barrier, especially on topics such as masturbation and homosexuality.

Rather than engaging in serious discussion, students made off colored or meaningless remarks.

Kirkendall and Calderwood (1965) stated:

Much of what they learn comes from the innuendos of the mass media, or from the insinuations of older youth. Under these circumstances teenagers are unable to be frank and honest about their sexual uncertainties and perplexities, whether they are interacting with adults or with each other. They can acknowledge and accept only those experiences which are in accord with their feelings and expectations, and with what they believe to be the feelings and expectations of others.

Kirkendall and Calderwood (1965) also pointed out that the pressures by society placed on the sexes further complicated the youngster's sexuality. What was expected from the girls and boys confused children. As girls were expected to start dating early, the boys were to express their masculinity by sexually taking advantage of girls. "For these reasons what adolescents learn from each other is probably very little so far as accurate information is concerned, but a confusing morass when attitudes and expectations are involved." Calderwood and Beste (1966) stressed that real communication was not only a problem among sexes but also between them. Interchanges between the sexes were usually remarks to exploit or impress somebody. Boys were in more need of sex education because of a more active sex life, but had

less opportunity to acquire it from reliable sources. Girls were more assured of their information, but not as likely to open up among their own sex.

Couch (1967) indicated in her observations and discussions with adolescents that they felt the information they received from each other was of little value. What was learned the youngsters had little respect for, and felt that such a method was cheapened by dirty jokes, and therefore extremely inaccurate. The New York Academy of Medicine stressed adolescent ignorance with the statement:

Probably no previous generation of adolescents has had such an enormous wealth of scientific information made available to them, yet probably none has been left so ignorant and undisciplined in the ethical essentials. With this record of sex education, it is a small wonder that ignorance, misconception, and uncertainty are all too prevalent. (Hinrichs and Kaplan, 1966)

Eleanore Luckey (1969) was concerned about youths' questions and confusion. She pointed out that they wanted to know about pre-marital sex, masturbation and contraceptives, and they wanted to know the truth. Simon and Gagnon (1967) further indicated the type of information youth in society receive.

The modal sources of sex information are age-mates who managed to put together off pieces of information, legend, and first-, second-, and third-, hand experience, frequently adding novel or innovative features that are purely consequences of distortions in the rumor process.

Even the youth themselves recognized a need for more information. An American Medical Association committee reported in a survey of high school and college students that over 70 per cent felt they needed more information than they had at present, or had received from their parents. Calderone (1966b) stressed that young people wanted standards by which to integrate sex into their total personality, not

sexual license. They were concerned with having an opportunity to talk about their confusions and perplexities and to establish meaningful relationships with other people, including adults.

Nevertheless, peer educating peer was an important part in the teaching of sex education and some authorities stated that it would always be an important, if not the most important, method of receiving sex education.

Gagnon and Simon (1969) wrote:

The peer group is the most important factor in sex education. At least, in the near future, there will be no substitution for the peer group in providing the young person with information about sex that is directly linked to the sexual experiences he is having.

This, they indicated, would be an advantage to peer groups over schools as a source of sex education, since they were able to do what schools found difficult which was to "relate sexual learning to sexual experience." Reiss (1968) noted that there was no way parents would prevent sexual information and sex attitudes from being filtered down from older youths to younger youths. The only thing parents could do was make a greater effort to initiate dialogue with their children even though they did not ask for it.

Kirkendall and Calderwood (1965) and Couch (1967) indicated that adolescents insisted that the sex education they received from other agencies usually came too late, or was poorly timed. In addition, it was usually given to them with no interrelationship or interchange. Nevertheless, adolescents had formed their own attitudes and values. As Hoyman (1967) pointed out, this was a "tribute to their maturity and integrity." The fact that their values were not always

the same caused some difficulty with parents and adults. However, Couch (1967) stated that the young people usually had long-range values about the purpose of sex education, when it should be taught, and what should be taught. According to Couch (1967), teenagers reported:

That often when parents have failed them in this subject, they have turned to older siblings, or to older friends for further information. In some instances there exists a greater feeling of trust and confidence between close friends than between a child and his parents.

Students usually turned to a close friend when faced with a crisis about sex.

Even though boys and girls disagreed among themselves on whether sex should be discussed on a date, most of the adolescents stated it was easier to discuss it here than with some adults. Calderwood and Beste (1966) noted that before conditions improved, adults were going to have to accept teenagers as they were.

Churches as Respondents

The responsibility of churches with respect to sex education, especially the moral aspects of sex, has always been considered of prime importance by many people. However, the church recently has been criticized by some authorities for its failure in the sex education of young people.

James Merrill, who works for the Lutheran Welfare Services in Minnesota, indicated at a conference at the University of Minnesota in 1966 that the young people of today were rejecting the churches and their teachings because the church was rejecting them. Unless the church changed its approach, today's generation of young people could reject the church completely.

Couch (1967) noted that young people were quite critical of the way the church had handled sex education. Their major complaint was "that the church stressed 'all the don'ts' and moralized to youth, although never really explaining why they shouldn't do things." Hettlinger (1966) observed that, while young people felt that school courses were shy outside the area of biological facts, they indicated that religious materials treated the issues in a highly idealistic way and underestimated the experience and knowledge of adolescents on sexual matters. Teenagers noted that books and materials used by the church were childish, old fashioned and uninformative. Hettlinger (1966) remarked:

The church must face the fact that occasionally love requires and justifies actions that are in conflict with what Christians have normally thought to be love's way. Whether we are capable of meeting such a challenge to humility I do not know, but I am sure we shall be of no help to young people until we do - indeed, we shall not even be heard by them.

Kaplan (1966) expressed that the churches were not making adequate adjustments to a growing urban society and to the challenges of modern materialism, industrialism, and scientific challenge. In Kaplan's article, Dr. Marty explained that the religions of today faced a dominant influence in secularism, and the churches were becoming the minority influence. Kaplan (1966) explained "Kids stop coming at the age of 14 or 15 if you can't show them how religion relates to their own experiences." As one boy in an article in Today's Education (1969) stated, "My more religious friends are the ones who seem to have the very conservative attitude toward sex. And I think they've been brought up with the idea that God says sex is wrong."

Calderone (1966a) reported that the New York Academy of Medicine declared "religious leaders are increasingly and honestly acknowledging that the church has too limited an opportunity to teach sex education to an adequate extent." Barr (1968) noted that "clergymen have largely ceased to influence behavior and have largely ceased to try."

Simon and Gagnon (1967) felt that not only were the churches ineffective in the past, but they would continue to be of little importance in the future.

The religious organizations that command the affiliation of most of the young have, in one form or other, opted for the role and have been almost universally ineffective. We are tempted again to say "fortunately," because so many of our major religious organizations maintain positions of condemnation of what we know the young have done and will continue to do regardless of what the churches say. (Simon and Gagnon, 1967)

Hinrichs and Kaplan (1966) noted that most religious leaders felt that the job of sex education was primarily for parents and then church, but when the parents failed, the church was not in the position to provide sex education alone.

Some authorities supported the church in its efforts to meet the youth's need for sex education. Kirkendall (1965) indicated that the churches were now attempting to overcome their reluctance to teach sex, and many churches had, or were in the process of developing, sex education programs for their church members. The churches were giving instruction in ethical standards and helping individuals develop a philosophy of life. Kirkendall (1965) stressed that:

The church has an important and essential contribution to make to the comprehensive sex education program because it plays a vital role in the formulation of ideals and in the development of moral values.

Students indicated that, if they had a serious sex problem, many of them would go to a clergyman for help. Hinrichs and Kaplan (1966) said:

Much of the best sex education, premarital counseling, and marital counseling is conducted by the clergy. They recognize that sex education can help young people understand themselves and prepare to make choices which will enhance and support family life rather than permit its disintegration.

The Roman Catholic Church was often cited as opposed to sex education. However, some parochial schools provided better sex education than public schools. The clergy were, in many cases, more concerned with the way sex education was presented. They usually presented sex not as something "evil and shameful" but something that was "God-given endowment meant to be used for the good of mankind," if used responsibly.

Wedel (1966) felt that the sexual revolution was caused by religion itself because of the churches' traditional teachings. Her feeling on the churches' new approach was:

The emphasis today on the fact that our sexuality is one of God's great gifts to man has significant theological implications. If we can accept this gift, use it joyfully, and not overemphasize it, we have moved ahead.

Schools as Respondents

The question of the schools' responsibility in the sex education of children has been debated by many authorities from many different approaches. These opinions covered a wide variety of areas concerning sex education and the school. Groups varied from complete opposition to complete approval.

Neil Ulman (1969) probably best summarized the current situation, when he said:

In the past six months myriad groups have sprung up across the country to denounce sex education as immoral, subversive, Communist-inspired, pornographic, and psychologically damaging to the young. The result: After five years of surprisingly smooth sailing, sex education in America is in trouble. The controversy is as bitter and emotional as any that ever racked the nation's schools.

Organizations such as PAUSE (People Against Unconstitutional Sex Education), POSE (Parents Opposed to Sex Education), MOMS (Mothers for Moral Stability), MOTOREDE (the Movement to Restore Decency), plus many more other locally organized groups were working to destroy sex education in the schools and were attempting to prevent any other schools from initiating new programs. Reasons that opponents of sex education gave varied greatly from one individual to another. One woman stated, "You break down modesty between boys and girls in the classroom and it leads to promiscuity." Another lady said "The educators have joined the pornographers in a diabolical plot." Robert Welch, founder and leader of the John Birch Society called sex education in the schools a "filthy communist plot."

Organizations that favored sex education in the schools, particularly SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States) and other organizations associated with it were being attacked by the opposition. The opposition mainly attacked personnel connected with SIECUS and their philosophy on sex education. "In my church children go to catechism classes just to learn a set of moral rules--to learn their faith. I don't want them taught in school that this is all just a matter of opinion." Another attacker stated:

Who's going to vouch for the moral integrity of the teachers that are going to give this instruction to children? I believe there are some teachers who would be sexually stimulated by talking about sex with children and thus would pry into student's sex lives. It could do a child tremendous psychological harm. (Ulman, 1969)

These remarks were typical of people that are opposed to placing sex education in the schools. Hinrich and Kaplan (1966) indicated four categories:

Opponents usually contend that sex education (a) is not a fit subject for young minds; it may give them ideas they wouldn't have, (b) is against their religious teaching, (c) is the responsibility of parents and not the schools, and (d) cannot be properly taught in the schools due to lack of teachers qualified in sex education.

Iseman (1968) stressed that the problem of sex education in the schools was implementation before people were prepared. She felt that SIECIS's advice to schools that "any sex education is better than none" and "that any interested teachers can teach it," hurt the school programs if they were to improve what they now called sex education. Administrators faced the problem of sex education topics that went beyond the teaching of reproduction. Some schools placed all or most of these topics in their curriculums, or were about to in the near future. However, some schools were forced to withhold certain topics because of church or parental objection, as in the case of birth control. Thus, schools made "a mockery of their frank new sex-education programs . . . this placed sex education right back on the street corner."

Many schools were concerned with being left behind and, in order to get the teaching started immediately, resorted to drastic shortcuts. Much of the instruction was done in poor taste, and many

times what youngsters learned was not the intention of the material taught. Iseman (1968) declared:

Anything conveyed under the school roof is presumed correct. Students think that at last they are learning the truth. And this is why dishonest information or straight ignorance, as dispensed by teachers can be ten times more harmful than anything absorbed from the various gutters.

To place sex on such a subliminal level, Iseman (1968), felt was to show disrespect for students and insure the doom of programs related to sex education. A wide gap emerged between what students needed to know and the cheap information they received from schools.

Couch (1967) noted that young people were disappointed about the education they had received in schools. They expressed that they were taught very little new material, topics lacked depth, and many teachers "beat around the bush." The information came too late and the books used were outdated and often unavailable. The most common complaint was that the instruction had little relevance to understanding their own feelings as well as those of other children. One student remarked, "The school is probably afraid that if they talk too freely in a coeducational classroom, it might produce a general moral breakdown." (Couch, 1967)

Kirkendall (1965) observed that students were critical of the methods used by teachers. There was no openness or freedom to express their opinions, which resulted in failure to eliminate fears and misconceptions. They felt that the type of education they had received was imposed on them instead of being an interchange of views and attitudes. He felt that the schools' sex education had fallen below its hopes and expectations. He listed the reasons for the failure of

sex education in the schools as: the fears and prejudices of society reflected in the school as a cultural institution, inadequately prepared teachers, administrators' and teachers' fear of public criticism, and insecurity of teachers and schools.

Simon and Gagnon (1967) stressed that a few people assumed that sex education would lower rates of illegitimacy, venereal disease, or promiscuity. As a result, the sex education that was taught was nothing more than reproductive biology, or what was referred to as "plumbing" courses. This often desexualized sex by subserving its true meaning and made it almost appear nonhuman. The other assumption made about sex was that it would make people's lives more rewarding through managing social relationships. This type of education usually resulted in teaching social etiquette. Simon and Gagnon (1967) indicated that sex education often represented sex "as something that merely is or something that merely happens. It is almost never presented as something that is experienced, as something that is thought about."

Simon and Gagnon (1967) were extremely critical of the schools' rigid structure which they called "school system programming--a structure that is nearly totally resistant to innovation or even the incorporation of new experience." Therefore, critics were concerned about placing sex education in the school curriculum. They suggested that:

Our public school educators tend to be unintelligent and cowardly. The failure of the schools with so many children in so many areas of learning that require far less sensitivity and imagination raises the question of why we should assume that they will make a meaningful contribution with a topic of this complexity and delicacy.

George Szasz (1968) indicated that no studies have been done to show:

. . . what effects sex education in schools may have on an individual. No one has any idea about what psychological problems may be created in the classroom. It probably would be better for them to have learned about it from friends.

Szasz (1968) also pointed out that the school is controlled and bound by rules and regulations of governments and school boards. The subject of sex education concerned itself with attitudes and values, which the school could not dictate to people merely by changing the curriculum. Many people criticized the school for attempting to teach values contrary to those of parents. However, many authorities stated that this was exactly where today's educational system had failed. Calderone (1965) declared:

In the United States, the great failure of our education system has been not only the lack of sex education and failure to make clear the relationship between sex and morals, but indeed not making clear the connection between morals and human behavior of all kinds, including sex.

Also the School Health Education Study stated that two areas that remained blank in school health programs were definition of one's sex role and establishment of a value system. (Sliepcevich, 1964)

Reiss (1968) criticized schools by indicating that most of the courses that existed at the present time were characterized by: "(1) strong moralistic and propagandistic elements, (2) most physiological aspects, (3) isolated rather than integrated courses, (4) inadequately prepared teachers." He stated, "What is crucial is not the specific values but the fact that teachers are morally indoctrinating children in the name of education." He felt this was the case because of the methods and philosophy of public schools, as well as the fact that

public school teachers lacked the academic freedom necessary for teaching this type of subject matter.

One serious limitation that many authorities saw developing in schools dealing with sex education was that schools were attempting to teach it as a separate subject. Reiss (1968) was concerned that most schools would add "a type of moralistic, unintegrated, and poorly staffed applied course in sex education and then feel that they have taken care of the needs for sex education." Calderone (1965) also stressed that the subject of sex education would be best taught by placing it throughout the curriculum. As Frasier (1967) remarked, "Sex education or family life education cannot be carefully segmented to occur the second or fourth period each day. If we think it can, then we are taking it out of context."

The problem of teacher qualifications or teacher preparation for sex education courses was the greatest concern to parents, administrators, community, and even to the teachers themselves. Parents felt that, even though they were misinformed and unprepared to discuss sex with their children, many of them did not want the teacher doing it, or at least wanted to know something about the instructor. As one parent said, "What do teachers know about sex? They better stick to the 3 - R's." (McGonigle, 1967)

Malfetti and Rubin (1967) indicated that the problem of qualified teachers was one of the major stumbling blocks, along with the meaning of sex education, that prevented or delayed schools from developing sex education programs. There were very few teachers qualified to handle the subject and those who volunteered generally only wanted

to deal with facts in human reproduction, where they felt more competent and comfortable. They were not as willing to handle "touchy" subjects such as masturbation, homosexuality, or premarital intercourse. They also steered away from leading discussions on the values and responsibilities of sexuality. Therefore, sex education as a subject was of little value to anyone.

Johnson and Schutt (1966) noted that 82 per cent of the administrators who wanted to start sex education in their schools were concerned with finding qualified teachers, even though 84 per cent felt that schools had a responsibility to teach sex education. In an opinion poll conducted by Nation's Schools (1966), 37 per cent of the administrators in schools that provided sex education indicated the trouble spot was locating the right teacher. Iseman (1968) said:

It might help to realize that an untrained school teacher is only some other child's parent, and expecting some magic mantle of wisdom and clarity to descend on him as he enters the classroom is wishful thinking. To put such teachers in charge of sex education does not meet the needs of the students, but only meets the needs of the parents to have somebody, anybody, take them off the hook.

As an article in Time (1967) indicated, teachers who were teaching sex education often admitted that they were afraid of getting into trouble with parents, community, or school boards. Hamburg (1968) however thought that the teachers were worried. For years they were saying their community did not want sex education and now that they have indicated an interest, "It's the teacher's turn to panic." She felt they now have the same anxieties parents had previously. "Teachers, like everyone else, have somewhere to pass the buck. Their scapegoat is the teacher preparation institutions." Malfetti and Rubin (1967) carried

out a study in which they surveyed 734 teacher-preparation institutions. They found that eight per cent of the colleges surveyed offered a course or courses to prepare teachers to teach sex education, three per cent which were not offering courses intended to prepare teachers by offering courses in the future, and the colleges stated that approximately ten per cent of the teachers graduating each year were prepared to teach sex education.

The teachers main concern, as Wake (1966) stated, was:

Imparting the values of thirty families to thirty children in a group may appear to the teacher (and perhaps is) an impossible task. As with lying, stealing, and vandalism, the teacher thinks of himself as a supporter of values inculcated elsewhere but not as the prime builder of moral structure.

Gagnon and Simon (1969) summarized, "It is better to have no sex education than to have sex education designed only to reduce the anxieties of adults."

Even as there were many people opposed to sex education in the schools, others felt that sex education was an important part of the education of the child and should be in the school curriculum.

Helen Manley (1964) felt sex education was important in the schools since the school was the only institution which had children over a prolonged period of time. Therefore, the school had an opportunity and obligation to offset any unfavorable information the child had learned previously. "The school has definite responsibility for the total education of the child, and this includes the important phase of his living - his sex and family interests." She stressed that the school should help students make proper choices on moral codes, understand their sex roles, and formulate ideals and attitudes toward the family they lived in now and the one they would establish in the future.

In an article in Today's Education (1969), Koontz observed that there were many youngsters who did not have a good family or religious background to rely on for sex education, so even though it was the responsibility of the home and church, the schools should also consider it part of their responsibility. It was in the school where children established friends and asked questions. The school was responsible for educating children on social and moral issues that challenged society and education to produce responsible citizenship. Kirkendall and Calderwood (1965) agreed that:

The major objective of sex education then would seem to provide everyone, whatever his age level, with the knowledge and insights needed for successful decision making and responsible management of the sexual impulse. The educational concern would be the integration of sex into a balanced and purposeful pattern of living.

Montagu (1968) declared:

Our schools must become institutes for the teaching of human responsibility, with this as the primary purpose of education, and instruction in the three "R's" as purely secondary to this main purpose. To understand the nature of human nature is not beyond the capacity of a child.

Szasz (1968) felt that schools should take steps to include sex education in the curriculum even against objections of parents since the schools should attempt to include any course which provided relevance between school and life recognizing that children cannot be isolated from social processes. Calderone (1966a) indicated that it was important at the high school level for adolescents to have the opportunity to correct deficiencies in distorted attitudes caused by individuals or experiences. Therefore, Szasz (1968) felt the:

Most important reason to introduce sex education in the schools is to raise a generation of individuals who will be in the possession of as much knowledge of themselves and others as will

be compatible with their education level, so that the emotionalism surrounding this aspect of human behavior will be somewhat reduced.

Calderone (1965) stressed that somebody must give children information about their sexuality because of today's changing society. Youth were given more freedom and unsupervised activities than earlier generations and they are getting more sexual information through mass media than ever before. In fact, many authorities believed that an absence of sex education in the schools was a form of negative sex education itself. Reiss (1968) agreed when he indicated that because of the free courtship today adults could not control or stop the flow of information and attitudes among young people. He added, however, that those opposed to sex education in the schools could "add an element of enlightenment and control to our youngsters' sexual life by supporting an unbiased approach to it throughout the educational system." Burleson (1967) felt that in order for young people to make decisions and judgments, any education that did not give them information about themselves and their sexuality was doing them a disservice.

Walters (1967) answered those who felt that sex education was the privilege of the family and not the school by reminding them that any learning of responsible conduct which affected the community, was the communities' responsibility and, therefore, the schools as part of the community have a share in that responsibility. He also felt that sex education should be a required part of the school program to offset the evasive education of parents and the inaccurate education provided by peers. He stated, "It is tragic that youth are so inadequately prepared for marriage and parenthood. There is a need for courses which

contribute to personality development and family success." Wake (1966) supported Walters in pointing out that, ideally, parents were the child's best sex educators, but they were not doing it, so the school was the place they could be reached if adjustments were made in the curriculum. This would make children better informed and he indicated this could be accomplished even more effectively if it were reinforced by the home and church.

Schlesinger (1967) indicated that the schools should make sex education required the same way spelling, mathematics and English were mandatory.

Simon and Gagnon (1967) stressed that even though the schools appeared to be the least effective agency for sex education at the present time, they should be supported because they probably would become the best in the future with their self-conscious programming. They also said, "The school should be able to do what the peer group can do. Talk about something when there is a need to talk about it."

To the question, should sex education be in the schools, many groups and organizations have answered:

Appropriate sex education courses in the schools are approved by: the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the United States Catholic Conference; the National Council of Churches; the Synagogue Council of America; the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; the Sixth White House Congress on Children and Youth; the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; the American Public Health Association; the National Student Assembly; YMCA and YWCA; the American Medical Association; the Sex Information Education Council of the United States - as well as many prominent educational organizations. (Putnam, 1969)

The United States Office of Education stated in 1966 that it would support sex education from kindergarten through college, and adult levels.

Along with these approval statements, administrators and teachers, as well as parents and students, indicated their feelings about sex education in the schools. Johnson and Schutt (1966) noted that 84 per cent of school board members and superintendents recently surveyed approved sex education in the schools, with 50 per cent expressing that the need was urgent. Almost 80 per cent of public classroom teachers surveyed in a poll by NEA Journal (1965) stated that sex education should be in the secondary school curriculum. Collins (1969) noted that in Moorhead, Minnesota, elementary teachers surveyed this past year indicated that 81 per cent were interested in an in-service sex education training program. Also in Moorhead, of 1,838 parents responding to a survey, 72 per cent were in favor of starting a sex education program. Hoffman (1966) surveyed 37 schools in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area by the use of a random sample. Of 644 teachers polled, 88 per cent agreed that sex education should be a part of the curriculum. Johnson and Schutt (1966) indicated in a Gallup Poll conducted in 1965 that 69 per cent of the parents across the nation approved of sex education courses. Kaplan (1966), along with many clergymen, agreed that sex education should be given serious consideration. Iseman (1968) summarized all of this when she said:

It is puzzling to find educators working so hard to "sell" something that adolescents are literally asking schools to offer: discussion of sexual values. These students want not only facts, but guidance from respected adults in their search for a satisfactory and workable code of behavior.

Another concern was whether teachers were qualified or being adequately prepared in the area of sex education. Luckey (1967) and Williams (1968) felt that the key to the effectiveness of sex education

was not the course content, but the insights, perception, and counseling skill of the teacher. Most authorities stated that it was not that difficult to find good teachers; that they were no harder to find than good teachers in other areas. Montagu (1968) felt that there were teachers who were able to teach sex education "because I had such teachers." Collier (1968) described it by saying:

Teachers with the basic qualifications are there in the schools right now - teachers who are sensitive to what their students are thinking about, who are genuinely interested in helping them to live better.

Many authorities agreed, however, that in-service training for these teachers would make the sex education program more successful, and that this could be done rather easily. Luckey (1967) and Marshall (1967) advocated team teaching to help solve the problem, while others recommended the specialists who had training, experience, and capabilities to handle sex education in the classroom. (Iseman, 1968)

Luckey (1969) summarized sex education in the school today when she stated:

Any sex education that goes on in the school today will be only a bit more than a drop in the bucket, but let us provide the best drop we can! The school has the advantage of reaching practically all children of all social classes and religious inclinations. If what we do is good, the effect will be widespread - but so will it be if it's not good.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The procedure utilized by the writer in this study was the philosophical method of induction and deduction. The analysis was interpreted from the related literature which contained pro and con views, opinions, and studies about sex education and related areas by various individuals. The purpose of the analysis was to justify the inclusion or exclusion of sex education in the public school curriculum.

In this philosophical method of research, the writer designed the study which elicited the kinds of facts needed to test the hypothesis. Any design chosen rested on the writer's ability to deduce the nature of the facts, which, through logical induction and deduction, would determine if the hypothesis was tenable or untenable. It was a subjective process. The writer chose a descriptive study and assembled the data that fit the purpose of the study.

The writer examined, compared, and analyzed from the pro and con opinions and viewpoints in the resource material the limitations and potentialities of parents, peers, churches, and schools as respondents to meet the present need for sex education in society.

The major contention of the analysis was that, since the need for sex education was not being met by parents, peers and churches, the public schools could justify including it in their curricula.

Since the information analyzed included people's theories and opinions, which could not be measured by an instrument of quantitative analysis, the writer was not concerned with a statistical method of analysis, but rather analysis and interpretation of qualitative data.

The data in the study were collected basically from library resources which furnished information for the purpose of the study. The resource materials included books, periodicals, journals, reports, surveys, pamphlets, and newspaper articles found in local libraries or owned by the writer. The information sought in these resources was found by using library card catalogue indexes, general indexes by Educational Index and Readers Guide to Periodical Literature, and yearly indexes such as Journal of School Health and Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation. Additional information was obtained from the bibliographies of various articles as well as materials owned by the writer.

Out of this examination, the writer tested the hypothesis that the schools should be included as a respondent along with parents, peers, and churches to meet the need for sex education. From all the available resource materials the writer selected the most representative, authoritative, reliable, and valid material, according to the writer's judgment, to comprise the related literature. The sources of this selected data included studies and articles by authorities in the areas of education, psychology, religion, sociology, and physiology, as well as opinions of laymen and parents concerned with this subject.

The design of examining and analyzing written material obtained through library resources seemed appropriate to this study because it

was the simplest and most convenient way to get a consensus of national opinions, views, and studies of authorities regarding their feelings about the place of sex education in public school curricula.

The related literature served as the basis for analysis. The analysis of the related literature was achieved by deduction and syntheses. Discussion, conclusions and recommendations followed. The hypothesis was discussed as to whether it was tenable or untenable.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

The related literature was the basis for the analysis in this study. The writer analyzed from the various pro and con opinions of authorities the limitations and potentialities of parents, peers, churches, and schools in an attempt to determine whether the school was an appropriate respondent to meet the need for sex education.

Parents as Respondents

Most authorities agreed that the parents were basically responsible for the sex education of their children. There was little argument on this even from the peers, churches, and schools who also agreed, and several reasons emerged to support the fact that sex education was basically a parental responsibility.

The most generally stated reason was the innate advantage of the family setting, although this sometimes became a disadvantage. Many writers pointed out that parents could not help but teach their children sex education, positive or negative, by the way they felt and acted toward each other and toward their children. Mary Calderone (1967) stated, "Sex education is often caught, not taught." Reiss (1968) stressed that the parents' attitudes toward sex influenced the youngster's attitude toward sex in future life. It was also noted that parents were primarily responsible for teaching moral values and

attitudes to their children, and therefore, should teach the values and attitudes toward sexuality they wanted their children to have. As Szasz (1968) indicated, for better or for worse, the family would remain the basic source for passing on moral codes.

Various polls indicated that parents themselves thought they had the primary responsibility for sex education, and in most cases, peers, churches and schools did not disagree with them. Young people polled expressed that parents should have the responsibility for sex education. Church and school personnel stated that the parents should be the essential respondents to the need for sex education with their organizations serving a secondary function, that of supporting the home.

Therefore, the consensus of opinion by most individuals was that the parents should be the major respondents to their children's needs for sex education.

Although there was no argument, the question most often asked was whether the parents would meet the need for sex education, and if they did, would it be done properly. Many writers noted that it was the parents themselves who were asking for help in responding to their youngster's need for sex education. Iseman (1968) indicated that parents were so afraid of making a mistake that they were willing to hand sex instruction over to the schools. Mistakes would then be the schools' fault, not the parents'.

The consensus of most writers on the parents' problem was the parents' lack of knowledge about the subject of sex. They had received little information or education when they were young because the subject was taboo when they were growing up. As a result many parents,

even if they wanted to, could not meet the needs of their children for sex education. They felt so unsure about what they knew and therefore, they had very few resources with which to meet their children's needs, desires, and even demands for sex education.

Another problem for parents was the lack of communication with their children. This most often occurred when the children reached adolescence, but it was also frequently common because of the parents' lack of knowledge and their attitude toward sex. Hettlinger (1966) pointed out that communications often ended because a parent who was shocked that their child knew something about sex, showed this surprise, and because this was not usually the case with other topics, the child interpreted it as disapproving and so never introduced the subject of sex again. Many writers stated that parent-child communication was the major reason for parents not meeting the need for sex education.

Other writers expressed opinions that the parents' own uncertainty about their values and moral attitudes toward sex created communication problems with youngsters. Young people, by observing the manner in which their parents and other adults responded to and disagreed about the subject, concluded there was no need to listen or learn from such indecisive and uncertain sources. Some youngsters assumed, too, that parents and adults were hypocrites because of the variance between what was told them and the way these same parents and adults acted.

Some authorities concluded that, even though parents had the knowledge and the confidence to tell their children about sex, they

could not teach them alone because of the rapid changes and development in present day society. Even though they had the basic responsibility for meeting the sex education need, it would be more successful if other groups helped them. Most authorities recognized the parents' basic responsibility; however, many were of the opinion that parents had not only failed to do the teaching, but pointed out that they were, in fact, incapable at the present time of meeting this need by themselves.

Peers as Respondents

Approximately three fourths of the authorities examined indicated that the main source of sex information for children at the present time had been their own peer group. There was no way anyone could prevent this since information of all types was generally passed back and forth. Peers generally had direct communication and often learned from one another's mistakes. Children often turned to each other for information because they had more trust and confidence at this level than they had, based on past experience, in parents, churches, and schools.

Peers were almost unanimously critical of the sex information they had received from other respondents trying to meet their needs. Some stated that the information they received was usually very sketchy and generally came too late. Others felt that, when they were given any sex information, it was imposed or told to them rather than in an interchange of ideas. However, many adolescents explained that what sex education was given to them seemed to contradict what the adults in society did, or what the mass media implied in terms of

values. Nevertheless, of the authorities examined, more than half seemed to feel that most children, particularly adolescents, had formed favorable attitudes and values in spite of the little education and information they had received.

While the peer group was the main source of sex information, many authorities felt that the information they received from each other was inadequate. Most of the studies done on peer groups indicated the weaknesses of this method and the need for better forms of sex education.

Studies indicated that much of what young people learned from each other was suggestive and inaccurate. Contrary to many authorities, Calderwood and Beste (1966) determined that there was little communication between peers beyond the junior high school level because of their need to protect prestige and reputation. Therefore, students were more curious than communicative, more concerned about making an impression than being honest and frank. Little important information was transmitted within the separate sexes and even less was exchanged between the sexes. Most authorities expressed the opinion that boys were in more need of sex information and education since they had a more active sex life; however, they usually received less education. What was passed on from peer to peer was usually more related to attitudes than it was to accurate sex information.

Young people were confused. Many studies indicated that the adolescents themselves thought the information they had received from peers was inadequate and of little value, but up to this time was better than what they had received from adults. Nevertheless, young

people stressed that they would prefer to learn from some other authority, namely parents, if the adults would accept teenagers as they are and discuss problems with them. In addition, the peers wished that the adults would challenge them by setting standards they wanted their children to have, living by these standards themselves and then confronting the adolescents with their code of ethics.

Churches as Respondents

Almost one hundred per cent of the authorities recognized the important role the church could play in meeting the present need of young people for sex education by dealing more creatively with moral values and attitudes. After citing parents as the primary agent of responsibility in the area of sex education, most people believed the second level of responsibility belonged to the church.

However, many authorities, including those directly involved with the church, had only recently recognized the church's potential in meeting young people's needs for sex education. With the exception of teenagers occasionally seeking out clergy with a serious problem, the consensus was that the church has been ineffective. Recently, however, churches began to make some changes in their programs and approaches to sex education, but most authorities indicated that they still had a long way to go.

Many complaints against the church were brought out in the studies examined by this writer. Young people criticized the churches because of their approach. The churches generally taught the "do's" and "don't's," but never the "why's." The teenagers also explained the church's materials were too moralistic: Most of the young people

were not asking churches the question they had about sex because they knew what type of answers they would get and they also knew that these answers were probably irrelevant to their needs. (Hettlinger, 1967).

The church was also criticized because of its highly idealistic attitude toward sex. Many authorities pointed out that church personnel underestimated the knowledge and experience of young people in sexual matters, and, therefore, were unrealistic with their answers.

The church, as it related to man as a sexual being, was being challenged today, both from within and without. Most authorities pointed to this as the major reason the church was being rejected by many of the younger generation. Young people prefer to look elsewhere for responses to their needs for sexual understanding and enlightenment.

The churches were seen primarily as outmoded in their teachings and thinking and in need of changes if they wanted to be a contributing factor to society's values and attitudes, particularly those of the younger generation. The church's potential was recognized by most authorities, but they were also quick to point out its weaknesses.

Schools as Respondents

The most controversial of all respondents considered was the school. Opinions ranged from those who thought the schools had no business teaching sex education to views that stated the school was the most effective respondent for meeting this need. Generally, however, most authorities cited in the study indicated the strengths as well as the weaknesses operative in schools as they attempted to fulfill the need for sex education.

Many authorities who reacted favorably to the school's involvement in sex education considered the educational convenience and responsibility of the schools. Those who argued for the school helping to meet the need stated that the schools would be very effective since they had children for a prolonged period of time and had the opportunity to offset the ineffectiveness and misguidance of parents, peers, religions, and mass media. Others, particularly Szasz (1968), stated that in order to make education relevant to life, the school had a definite responsibility to educate the total child.

Many stressed the fact that education experienced by children now was not making them responsible citizens, but were of the opinion that sex education would make them more responsible and effective members of the families with whom they now lived and the families they would establish in the future.

Other authorities cited many organizations and agencies which had given their approval for sex education in the schools as an indication of the necessity for the school's involvement in meeting the need for sex education.

Some authorities gathered facts and information to use as arguments against those who had mounted strong resistance to sex education in the schools. In answer to the argument that there was a lack of qualified teachers, some people felt that there were many qualified teachers in the schools at the present time who had the talents necessary for teaching sex education. Many teachers would qualify after in-service workshops, guided training and through team teaching. These authorities felt that lack of qualified teachers was no argument at all.

Many groups attacked the schools as an ineffective respondent for meeting the need for sex education using some of the same arguments that individuals had used who were in favor of it. A small percentage of opinions and views cited attacked the whole idea of sex education in the schools. These attacks came from individuals as well as large organizations and the reasons they gave were as follows: that it was not a fit subject for young people because it would give them ideas; that sex education was in opposition to certain religious teachings, and therefore, must be kept out of the schools; and that teachers were not qualified and would give children the wrong information, attitudes and values. Many authorities recognized the weaknesses in these arguments, but the groups using them were usually emotional about the subject of sex.

A number of authorities concerned with the school's involvement in sex education looked to the school's abilities to carry out the responsibility, or carefully examined the programs already in the schools. Many were critical of the teaching content and methods used in the programs in existence. They claimed that most programs were giving just reproductive, biological information and nothing on topics with which the students were concerned or which would be of value to them. Other sources criticized the failure of the school programs to fulfill their claims. A common complaint given by authorities, as well as students, was that the courses tended to be indoctrination. The students themselves also indicated that information was often insufficient and irrelevant. They were disappointed with sex education in the school systems.

Various authorities, particularly those in the area of sex education, outlined what schools would have to do before their sex education programs would effectively meet the needs of children. They attacked, in many cases, isolated rather than integrated programs; programs that were short cuts in an attempt to meet the need; failure to reevaluate long existing programs; insecurity of teachers and administrators in the face of public criticism; and neglect of important aspects and areas because they were "touchy" subjects.

Most of the authorities recognized that schools were making a contribution to meeting the needs for sex education, but that, before they could be fully effective, certain problems had to be overcome.

The following statements summarize what the authorities cited in the study generally indicated about each of the four respondents that the writer felt were important in meeting the need for sex education:

1. Parents were recognized as the respondents who had the basic responsibility for meeting the need of young people in sex education, but at the present time they had problems with lack of communication between themselves and their children. They lacked knowledge. There were inconsistencies in their own attitudes and values and information available to them was inadequate. Consequently they were not doing a sufficient job.
2. Peers were recognized as the group that was the main source of sex information for children at the present time, but they were not meeting their own needs because

they were poorly informed and lack communication processes. The peer group also indicated their recognition of their need for guidance, interchange, and information from other sources because they felt the limitation of an exchange that involved only peers.

3. Churches were recognized as a potential respondent for teaching morals and values, but could not meet the needs of young people for sex education at the present time because their attitudes and approaches to the place of sexuality in society was too idealistic and moralistic, as well as irrelevant to the young people's needs.
4. Schools were recognized as the respondents who were attempting to meet the need for sex education at the present time with some effect as well as some disapproval from other respondents, but before they became consistently effective, the schools would have to solve several problems. The schools were also recognized as the respondents that would be effective in coordinating the efforts of all the other respondents, because of their position in, and obligation to, society.

The general consensus of approximately ninety-five per cent of the authorities cited in this study indicated that, in order for the respondents to meet the needs of the young people for sex education, the parents and the churches, as well as the schools, would have to cooperate and coordinate their efforts to the greatest possible extent if they wanted to be completely effective.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

In light of the related literature and the analysis of the related literature, the writer found various opinions among authorities, both within a specific area as well as between individuals in different areas. The writer was concerned with the consensus of opinion on each respondent's limitations and potentials. Even though there was agreement as well as disagreement among authorities, most of them recognized the critical need of young people for sex education in today's society. The writer concurred with the authorities that something should be done in an attempt to meet the critical need, and the sooner the better.

This, however, was where the controversy began. Few people would argue that society had not changed. The technological developments of this century, or for that matter, this decade, had deeply and significantly affected society. People were affected in total ways--physically, economically, socially and psychologically. Technological changes moved ahead so fast that society and individuals could not keep pace, thus creating many problems, especially those evidenced by the growing number of social and mental illnesses existing today. When the problem of the need for sex education in a rapidly changing society was recognized, respondents began to look around to see who was doing the job. When evidence began to indicate that nobody was completely

fulfilling the need, the question emerged around who could properly and effectively assume the role for meeting the need. It was this question that prompted the study.

The major concern of the writer was to determine through the exploration and interpretation of authorities' opinions in related literature if the school, as a relatively new respondent to the need, was justified in including sex education in its curriculum.

The writer, like most authorities examined in the analysis, had no quarrel with the assumption that parents were basically and inherently responsible for meeting their children's need for sex education. This responsibility had always been considered a part of the innate function of parenthood that seeks to mold values. However, it appeared that parents had not fulfilled this innate responsibility. It was obvious that if they had, society would not be facing such a critical need. Parents, by ignoring the need, willingly or unwillingly yielded this task to other respondents. In many cases, they were simply acting out of neglect in this area by their parents before them. In this decade parents lived in a society where they were not able to isolate their children. Even if they attempted to ignore the need for sex education, other forces were influencing their children's decisions. This forced the parents into a position of recognizing the situation and many parents began to seek guidance from other respondents.

Peers were considered (by analysis of most authorities) to be the main source of both good and bad sex information, albeit for each other. They were the main source not by design, since they were never given the major responsibility for education in any areas, but rather

by default through the ineffectiveness and neglect of adults and institutions. The writer recognized that exchange and communication among young people would never be terminated, but that it could be improved, through better and more meaningful sex education. Young people admitted themselves that their exchange was often mediocre, erroneous, or misleading, but more often than not this was their only recourse. Many of them were waiting for adults to make up their minds and genuinely respond with frank and open dialogue concerning appropriate standards and ethics. A question that concerned the writer was how this peer exchange among young people might be transferred to the other respondents? If young people were able to have some communication about sex among themselves when it had failed among, as well as between, other respondents, maybe the failure has been that adults have not involved the object of concern--the children--in the solution.

This writer noted that even though the churches were recognized as an important respondent to meeting the need for sex education, particularly in the area of moral values and attitudes, teenagers had widely rejected the churches' attempts. The writer believed, after reading information by various authorities including people associated directly with religion, that, unless the church changed its approach, it would not only be rejected by the young generation for failing in this area, but this might also contribute to a further alienation in general.

The writer initially assumed that the school, as an institution responsible for preparing people for adult life, was justified in attempting to meet the need for sex education. The results of this

study supported this assumption. The writer never assumed that the school would become the only respondent, only that it had a justifiable responsibility at this time in present day society.

With the present critical need for sex education, the writer believed also that the school would possibly become the most effective respondent for coordinating the efforts of parents, churches, and peers to meet this need. Schools, through their activities in the community, were usually in direct or indirect contact with the other respondents. They also had easy access to new materials, information, and equipment related to sex education. Students were with their peer groups, and were in a setting conducive to learning. Personnel that were qualified could take advantage of these factors if the school and community were willing.

The writer, although aware of some of the deficiencies of a school response to sex education, was, nevertheless, through this study made aware of many new conditions that must be considered before a sex education program could be successfully incorporated into the public schools. Before any program in sex education was introduced, consideration would have to be given to the purpose, aims, and objectives of the program, when would it start, who would teach it, how and where it would be taught, and how teachers would be prepared. Although these problems existed, the writer recognized that they would not all have to be completely solved before a program began. The important factor would be that school personnel recognized these problems, attempted to solve them and would constantly be reevaluating all phases of their sex education programs. To insure the most

success in meeting the critical need for sex education, more would be involved than simply justifying it in the school curriculum. Schools, churches, parents, and peers would have to be prepared for a cooperative effort through open dialogue and honest exchange that determined what the purpose and duties of each respondent were for meeting this critical need. The writer felt that the time was right now for these respondents to stop asking who should have the responsibility to meet the young people's critical need for sex education. If it was done on a cooperative effort, with all respondents working together, the need would possibly be met. Then the school would not be involved in this controversy because a new generation of young people would be doing their duty as parents teaching and preparing their children for future life as human sexual beings. However, as long as the idea of sex as a separate kind of behavior remained, and the question of who has the responsibility discussed, this could prevent it from being taught by anyone. How these problems could best be handled, the writer felt would be valuable and beneficial to future studies.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The analysis of written views, opinions and studies of various authorities for and against sex education to determine whether the schools should be one of the major respondents along with parents, peers, and churches to meet the need for sex education revealed the following information:

1. Parents were recognized as the respondents who had the basic responsibility for meeting the need of young people in sex education but evidence indicated they were not completely successful, nor capable.
2. Peers were recognized as the main source of sex information at the present time, but they were not meeting the need because of their lack of knowledge and communication.
3. Churches were recognized as a potential respondent for teaching morals and values, but up to this time, had almost completely failed in helping to meet the need.
4. Schools were recognized as respondents who were attempting to meet the need with some controversy, but had problems of implementation and justification.

5. There was consensus of opinion among authorities cited that all respondents must cooperate at the present time if the need was to be met.

Conclusions

1. The hypothesis in this study was that the schools should be included as one of the major respondents along with parents, peers, and churches to meet the need for sex education in present day society. The writer concluded from the evidence available at the present time that the hypothesis was tenable within the limits of this study.

Recommendations

1. The public schools should implement sex education in their curricula as a respondent justified to meet this need for young people.
2. Research should be done in the area of what guidelines should be followed in implementing sex education into the public school curriculum.
3. Research should be done to determine how sex education programs would be continuously evaluated and reevaluated.
4. Research should be done to determine what effect sex education programs have on students.
5. Research should be done to determine what would contribute to an effective coordination plan of all respondents to meet the need for sex education.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Barr, Donald. "Sex: A Serpent in Eden?" Vogue, CLII (September, 1968), 76.
- Buck, Jerry. "Sex Education in Public Schools Stirring Controversy." Forum, May 15, 1969, 14.
- Burleson, Derck L. "Sex Education: What are the Issues?" Senior Scholastic, XC (April 21, 1967), 13-14.
- Calderone, Mary S. "Sex - Health or Disease." Journal of School Health, XXV (June, 1965), 253-57.
- _____. "The Development of Healthy Sexuality." Journal of Health - Physical Education - Recreation, XXXVII (September, 1966a), 23-27.
- _____. "Goodbye to the Birds and Bees: An Approach." American Education, II (November, 1966b), 16.
- _____. Speech at Workshop, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minnesota. Summer, 1967.
- Calderwood, Deryck, and Beste, Leila Den. "Developing Open Communication About Sex With Youth." Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXVII (November, 1966), 524-26.
- Collier, James. "Sex Education: Blunt Answers for Tough Questions." Reader's Digest, XLII (June, 1968), 80-86.
- Collins, Dorothy. "Family Life Education Provides a Needed Perspective for Human Behavior." School Health News, Minnesota Department of Health, University of Minnesota Campus, Fall, 1965.
- _____. "Moorhead Schedules Sex Education Into Elementary Schools in Fall." Sunday Forum, June 15, 1969. C-12.
- Couch, Gertrude B. "Youth Looks at Sex." Journal of School Health, XXXVII (September, 1967), 332-39.
- Ferber, Ellean, and Sofokidis, Jeanette H. "Goodbye to the Birds and the Bees: What's Happening?" American Education (November, 1966), 16.

- Frasier, Roberta C. "Beware the Elephants." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (May, 1967), 380-82.
- Gagnon, John H., and Simon, William. "They're Going to Learn in the Streets Anyway." Psychology Today, III (July, 1969), 46-47 ff.
- Goodhousekeeping. "Should Sex Education Be Offered in Grade Schools?" CLXIX (July, 1969), 12-20.
- Hall, Mary H. "A Conversation with Masters and Johnson." Psychology Today, III (July, 1969), 50-58.
- Hamburg, Marian V. "Sex Education in the Elementary School." The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (November, 1968), 52-56.
- Hettlinger, Richard F. "Sex, the Church and the College Student." Religious Education, LXI (November - December, 1966), 418-24.
- Hinrichs, Marie A., and Kaplan, Robert. "The Home, the School, and Sex Education." Today's Health, XLIV (February, 1966), 16 ff.
- Hoffman, Richard J. "The Teacher's View: Should Schools Teach Sex Education?" Minnesota Journal of Education, XLVII (December, 1966), 27.
- Hoyman, Howard S. "Sex and American College Girls Today." Journal of School Health, XXXVII (February, 1967), 54-63.
- Instructor. "Sex Education: Where Does It Stand?" LXXVI (August - September, 1966), 24-27 ff.
- Iseman, Marjorie F. "Sex Education and What Do Your Children Actually Learn?" McCalls, XCV (January, 1968), 36-37 ff.
- Johnson, Warren R., and Schutt, Margaret. "Sex Education Attitudes of School Administrators and School Board Members." Journal of School Health, XXVI (February, 1966), 64-68.
- Kaplan, Harry. "The Sexual Revolution and Religious Education." Religious Education, LXI (November - December, 1966), 424-29.
- Kirkendall, Lester A. "Sex Education." SIECUS Discussion Guide, No. 1 (October, 1965), 1-12.
- Kirkendall, Lester A., and Calderwood, Deryck. "The Family, the School, and Peer Groups: Sources of Information About Sex." Journal of School Health, XXXV (September, 1965), 290-97.
- Luckey, Eleanore B. "Family Life Ed and/or Sex Ed." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (May, 1967), 377-80.
- _____. "Sex Education: Stop, Look, and Listen." Journal of Home Economics, LXI (January, 1969), 31-34.

- McCary, James L. Human Sexuality. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company Inc., 1967.
- McGonigle, Elizabeth. "What Do Teachers Know About Sex!" Scholastic Teacher Report, XC (April, 1967), 12.
- McGuigan, Frank E. "Social Revolution and Sex Education." Clearing House, XLIII (March, 1969), 12.
- Malfetti, James L., and Rubin, Arlene M. "Sex Education: Who is Teaching the Teachers?" Teachers College Record, LXIX (December, 1967), 312-22.
- Manley, Helen. "Sex Education: Where, When, and How Should It Be Taught?" Journal of Health - Physical Education - Recreation, XXV (March, 1964), 21-24.
- Marshall, William H. "Family Life Education and/or Sex Education." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (May, 1967), 382-84.
- Merrill, James. Speech at Family Life Workshop, University of Minnesota. St. Paul, Minnesota. October, 1966.
- Montagu, Ashley. "The Pill, the Sexual Revolution, and the School." Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (May, 1968), 480-84.
- Nation's Schools. "Parents Get Blame for Lack of Sex Education Programs." LXXVII (May, 1966), 95.
- NEA Journal. "Teacher Opinion Poll - Sex Education." LIV (February, 1965), 52.
- Putnam, Paul E. "Extremist Attacks on Sex Education." NEA Reporter (April 29, 1967), 2.
- Reiss, Ira L. "Sex Education in the Public Schools: Problem or Solution?" Phi Delta Kappan, L (September, 1968), 52-66.
- Roberts, Steven V. "Teaching of Sex Fought on the Coast." New York Times, April 13, 1969, 48.
- Schlesinger, Benjamin. "Sex Education: To Teach or Not to Teach." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (May, 1967), 389.
- School and Society: "Adults Cause Most Teenagers' Problems." XCV (December 23, 1967), 512 ff.
- School Health Education Study. Summary Report of a Nationwide Study of Health Instruction in Public Schools. Washington, D. C., 1964.
- SIECUS. "Brief History of the Current Campaign Against Sex Education." (May, 1969), 1-4.

- Simon, William, and Gagnon, John H. "The Pedagogy of Sex." Saturday Review, L (November 18, 1967), 74-76 ff.
- Szasz, George. "Sex Education: A Philosophical Approach." Journal of Health - Physical Education - Recreation, XXXIX (March, 1968), 42-45 ff.
- Time. "On Teaching Children About Sex." June 9, 1967, 36-37.
- Today's Education. "Teen-Agers Speak Out About Sex." LVIII (March, 1969), 23-26.
- Ulman, Neil. "Sex Education Courses are Suddenly Assailed by Many Parent Groups." Wall Street Journal, CLXXIII (April 11, 1969), 1.
- U. S. Commission of Education. Office of Education Policy on Family Life Education and Sex Education. Proclamation signed by Harold Howe, August 30, 1967, 1-4.
- Wake, F. R. "Are Parents the Best Sex Educators?" PTA Magazine, LXI (November, 1966), 5-10.
- Walters, James. "Should Family Life Education Be Required?" Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (May, 1967), 388-89.
- Walters, James, and Stinnett, Nick. "Should Family Life Education Be Required?" Journal of Home Economics, LX (October, 1968), 641-44.
- Wedel, Cynthia. "Reaping the Whirlwind." Religious Education, LXI (November - December, 1966), 429-34.
- Williams, Sally. "Family Life and Sex Education." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (March, 1968), 49-55.
- Zimmerman, Paul D., and Bochnak, Elizabeth. "Anything Goes: The Permissive Society." Newsweek, LXX (November 13, 1967), 74-78.

