

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1950

An Evaluation of a Parochial School Education

Frederick Rehwaldt

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_rehwaldtf@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rehwaldt, Frederick, "An Evaluation of a Parochial School Education" (1950). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 320. <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/320>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

AN EVALUATION OF A PAROCHIAL SCHOOL
EDUCATION

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Practical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Frederick Rehwaldt

June 1950

Approved by:

Arthur C. Repp
Advisor

Otto E. Johnson
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. GENERAL STUDY OF THE SCHOOL	9
III. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS	14
IV. RESULTS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	19
V. RESULTS OF GENERAL EDUCATION	27
VI. EFFECT ON SUBSEQUENT CHURCH LIFE	38
VII. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF PETERSON'S TWO STUDIES	45
VIII. CONCLUSION	67
APPENDICES	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Respondents in Each Age Group	15
2. Length of Marriage of Respondents	15
3. Number of Children Compared with the Length of Marriage	15
4. Number of Years Each Respondent Attended Parochial School	17
5. Number of Respondents Graduated in the Years 1936 to 1945	17
6. Average Communion Attendance Per Year of the Respondents	39
7. Summary of Church Activities of Respondents	39
8. Summary of Percentage of Income Contributed by Respondents	41
9. Summary of Occupations of Urban School Graduates	47
10. Summary of Occupations of Rural School Graduates	48
11. Summary of Urban School Graduates' Education Beyond High School	50
12. Summary of Urban School Graduates' Apportionment of Church Contributions	65
13. Summary of Rural School Graduates' Apportionment of Church Contributions	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was an attempt to evaluate the elementary training of a particular parochial school.

The scope of this study was:

1. To learn what are the stated aims and objectives of a certain parochial school.
2. To investigate whether the stated parochial school has reached its aims and objectives.
3. To compare the results of the investigation with the results of other similar studies.
4. To make a statement as to what degree the parochial schools are reaching their aims as far as such a statement can be made on the basis of this and other studies of a similar nature.

Before choosing a school whose graduates would answer the questionnaire, qualifications were set up which the school had to meet. These qualifications were that the school must have a certain amount of stability and it must have clearly expressed aims which it sought to carry out. The stability of the school was measured by the length of time that the teachers taught at the school and by the social and economic background of the children that attended the school. If the social and economic background of the children had changed over the course of years, the results of the

study would not be very reliable.

The manner by which this study was undertaken was to send out a questionnaire to graduates of a parochial school, seeking to discover their opinion of their elementary school training.

The survey was carried out in a large congregation located in the middle class section of a city having a population of approximately one million people. The section in which the school was located was built up in the late nineteen-twenties.

The questionnaire used to obtain the information basic to the study was drawn primarily on a questionnaire worked out by the Rev. Emil Peterson. This instrument had been devised in connection with a seminar course in the field of education with Professor Ove S. Olson, Ph. D., head of the Department of Education at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota.¹ Peterson's questionnaire was used with only minor changes so that legitimate comparisons and conclusions could be drawn between the two studies.

The questionnaire and the letter accompanying the questionnaire were mailed to the graduates on February 1, 1950. A stamped self-addressed envelope was included with the

¹Emil F. Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (September, 1946), 704.

letter and the questionnaire. A request was made for a reply on the questionnaire by March 1, 1950.

The pastor of the congregation had announced to the Walther League society and in the church's weekly bulletin that the graduates were going to receive the questionnaire.

On February 22, 1950, a postcard reminder was sent to all the graduates who had not returned their questionnaire. At that time fifty percent of the returns had not been received. The responses to the postcards brought the returns up to fifty percent of the total number of questionnaires sent out. At the beginning of March all who had not answered the questionnaires were contacted personally by telephone.

Ninety-four questionnaires were mailed out to graduates of the school who had graduated between the years 1935 and 1945. The graduates of those years were chosen because it was felt that they would represent a typical cross section of the school's work in recent years. None were chosen who graduated after 1945 because it was felt that they would be too young and immature to give as an objective an answer as would those who graduated before 1945. The total number of returns was sixty-four. The percentage of returns was sixty-eight percent. The school graduated 135 children during the period of 1935 to 1945. The percentage of returns on the total number of graduates was forty-seven percent.

Much of the material was obtained from the question-

naire because it was the only method that the information could be secured. The following qualifications were used as a guide in revising and setting up the questionnaire that was used:

1. One should bear in mind the demands made upon the time of the respondent.
2. The questions should apply to the situation of the respondent.
3. The purpose of the questionnaire must be constantly kept in mind.
4. Definite limitations should be made.
5. The questions should be clear.
6. The responses should be of such a character that they can be easily summarized.²

The above qualifications were considered before the questionnaire as it was sent out was finally adopted.

In the questionnaire one question was misunderstood by five of the respondents. The question asked, "Did you experience any advantage when you transferred to public schools?" Five of the respondents thought that the question wanted to find out if they experienced any advantage by transferring to a public school. The question sought to discover whether the parochial school offered them an advan-

²Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, Douglas E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research, (New York: Appleton Century Co., 1940), pp. 337-339.

tage which they experienced after transferring to a public school. Peterson did not report that any of the respondents in his two surveys misunderstood the question. One question should have been omitted. This question sought to determine how the graduates divided their church contributions. It was found after the questionnaires had been sent out that the congregation divided the contributions in its budget.

The following questions in Peterson's questionnaire were changed or omitted:

7. Did you enroll in a Junior High School?

8. Did you finish Junior High School?

23. Would other types of religious training have meant the same?

30. How would you rate the secular education received in the Lutheran Day School?

49. What portion of your income is contributed to your church?

Questions number seven and eight were dropped, because the public school system in the area where this survey was made had no Junior High School in its educational system. Question twenty-three was worded differently. Peterson reported that in one survey eighteen of the fifty-three respondents or thirty-three percent misunderstood the question.³ The question was re-worded, "Would release time

³Peterson, op. cit., p. 70.

classes, Sunday School, and Vacation Bible School have meant as much?" In question thirty the word "secular" was changed to "general" because the Lutheran Schools should not divorce the religious aspects of education from the secular, but should strive to weave Christianity throughout the entire training.⁴ To question forty-nine was added the word "approximately". It was hoped that by the addition of the word "approximately" a better percentage of returns on this question would be gained. The percentage of returns on this question was twenty-seven percent above the highest percentage which Peterson recorded in his two surveys.⁵

The following two questions were added to the questionnaire:

Do you think that you experienced some advantages in attending a Lutheran Day School? "

If yes, what were they?

Those two questions were added as a means of confirming the answers to questions number three and four in that section. Those questions asked if the graduates experienced an advantage after transferring to a public school. The questions were also added to find out what the graduates

⁴"Religion," General Course of Study for Lutheran Elementary Schools, edited by Wm. A. Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), p. 4.

⁵Peterson, op. cit., p. 712. Emil F. Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," (Unpublished Manuscript, n.d.), p. 6.

considered a distinct advantage of their parochial school education beyond the religious training.

Copies of Peterson's questionnaire and of the questionnaire used in this survey together with the letter and post-card sent out are in the appendices to this study.

A total of ninety-four questionnaires were sent out. Sixty-four replies were received. The percentage of returns was sixty-eight percent. No definite reasons could be found as to why the other thirty-two percent did not answer the questionnaire. Talking with the graduates over the telephone brought out a few of the reasons why they did not answer the questionnaires. A few were tied up with certain personal matters which made it almost impossible to answer the questionnaire. Some seemed to show a lack of interest. Perhaps some were fearful of any consequences which might arise from their answers. This last reason was a conjecture of the writer. Just what effect the answers which were not returned would have on the general overview of the study was difficult to decide. There was a sufficient number of graduates who did not respond in this study and in the two studies by Peterson so that the results could be radically changed had a greater number of graduates responded to the questionnaires.

This questionnaire did not aim at getting merely facts, but rather sought to gather facts and opinions. The facts dealt with the graduates of the parochial school. The

PRITZL AEF MEMORIAL LIBRARY
CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

opinions gathered were those of the graduates regarding their parochial school training. The various backgrounds of the individuals no doubt affected the answers. Some of the replies to the questionnaire considered individually were more valid than others. This study could not take the validity of the individual replies into account, because insufficient material was gathered which concerned itself about the background of the individual respondent. Such information would have carried this paper beyond the scope originally intended.

For the sake of objectivity the names of persons and places have been omitted or made fictitious.

CHAPTER II

GENERAL STUDY OF THE SCHOOL

"St. Thomas" School was opened in September, 1923, with the pastor as the teacher. At the end of the first school term the congregation felt that it would be better to relieve the pastor of teaching. During the summer of 1924 the call for a teacher was issued four times, but each time it was returned. Finally arrangements were made to engage a temporary instructor for the school year of 1924-1925.

In 1925 Mr. "J. E. Smith" was engaged as teacher. He began his work in September, 1925. Immediately he began to work for the accreditation of the school. By 1927 the graduates of "St. Thomas" were received into the public schools of "Metropolis" on the same terms as the graduates of other parochial schools.

The enrollment of "St. Thomas" at the time of its opening was twenty-two. During the years that Mr. "J. E. Smith" taught at "St. Thomas" School the enrollment increased from twenty-eight to one hundred and forty. Most of the growth took place after 1931. A new school building was dedicated that year. Many parents before that time hesitated to send their children to a school conducted in a portable chapel. In 1931 a member of the congregation volunteered to teach the primary grades. The school's enrollment kept growing at a steady pace, necessitating the open-

ing of a third room in 1935, a fourth room in 1939, and a fifth room a year later in 1940.

In the spring of 1941 Mr. "J. E. Smith", the first teacher and principal resigned. The congregation called the present principal. Under his administration the enrollment increased from one hundred and forty to one hundred and ninety-three. In 1946 the school enrollment dropped by thirty-two children. This drop was caused by a neighboring Lutheran congregation establishing its own school. This establishment removed thirty-two children of that church from the rolls of "St. Thomas" School.

"St. Thomas" Lutheran School in its twenty-sixth year was an educational institution of almost two hundred pupils with five teachers. The teachers have tried to keep abreast with modern educational trends by attending colleges and universities regularly. Through financial support of the congregation and by many individual contributions the school has kept its equipment and text books up to date.

Together with the Men's Club of "St. Thomas" Lutheran Church the school owned a motion picture projector. The school also owned a slide-film projector and a large library of film strips and slides in practically every subject. The school operated two combination radio and automatic record players, a portable radio, a standard record player, and a three speed record player. The record library contained a complete set of records specifically prepared for use in

elementary music appreciation classes.

The school strived to carry the Lutheran aims of education into all realms of the children's living. Once a week one of the pastors of the congregation led the children in a worship service. The children had their own staff of ushers and their own finance committee, which opened the envelopes and recorded the individual contribution of every child. Twice a week joint assemblies were conducted. In these meetings announcements were made, projects were initiated, and general information was announced to the entire school.

The school carried on a regular physical education program and maintained basketball and softball teams.

Regular educational trips were conducted to various industrial establishments throughout the school year. Once a year an extended educational tour was conducted.

The aims of the school were those expressed in The General Course of Study For Lutheran Elementary Schools, which are as follows:

1. Diligent teaching of God's Word in obedience to divine command. Deut. 6:6,7.
2. Provisions for both the temporal and eternal welfare of the child by means of an integrated Christian education in a single environment, which is substituted for the combination of the public school and part-time agencies of religious instruction.
3. Thorough indoctrination of the pupil in the fundamentals of Christianity.
4. Protection of the pupil against the dangers of a purely secular schooling.
5. Daily Christian pupil-fellowship as one of the most powerful factors in building character and training in Christian living.

6. Support of parenthood and home life for the purpose of strengthening the very base of human society.
7. Stabilization and strengthening of the congregation and the Church generally through the training of a well-grounded, discerning laity and youth.
8. The maintenance of a single-minded, faithful ministry and teaching profession within the Church.
9. Christian citizenship grounded in obedience to God and His Word.¹

The principles or philosophy which underlie the aims of education for "St. Thomas" School is best summarized in the following truths:

1. there is not only a here, but also a hereafter; youth needs to be prepared, above all, for the life which is to come;
2. man and the universe are the product not of an evolutionary process or of an emergent creation, but the handiwork of Almighty God;
3. man possesses a soul and this soul is immortal;
4. all men are hopelessly lost in sin and are saved only by faith in the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;
5. the norms of conduct laid down in the Bible are absolute and applicable to all times and all conditions of men.²

Since the school has been in a constant state of expansion and improvement, an over view of the school's results achieved in its twenty-sixth year would be different from the results recorded in answer to the questionnaire sent out to the graduates.

¹"Distinctive Objectives of the Lutheran Elementary School," General Course of Study for Lutheran Elementary Schools, edited by Wm. A. Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), p. 4.

²Paul Bretscher, The Lutheran Elementary School: An Interpretation (Published by the Board of Christian Education of the Northern Illinois District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, n.p., 1940), p. 11.

Five of those who answered the questionnaire attended the school before 1931 when the school was a one room school conducted in a portable chapel. Twenty-seven of those who answered the questionnaire graduated on or before 1941, the year when the present principal became the administrator of the school. Of those who answered the questionnaire and graduated after June, 1941, only three did not attend the school before June, 1941. The results of these facts had some bearing on the answers which the graduates recorded in answer to the questionnaire which was sent to them.

The physical education program was initiated about 1943. Only twenty-three of the respondents had the opportunity to make use of the program. The limited playground facilities of the school were increased with the purchase of property a block away from the school for supervised group activities.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS

The first section of the questionnaire concerned itself about the general information concerning the respondents. This information consisted of the age, the sex, the occupation, and education of the graduates who answered the questionnaire. The average age of the group was nineteen years. The median age was twenty-one. The age of the group ranged from eighteen to twenty-eight years. The number of respondents in each age group is found in Table 1. Thirty-two who responded were males and thirty-two were females. Fourteen were married. Twelve married Lutherans, two did not. The average length of time they were married was 2.42 years. The median length of marriage was two years. The length of the marriages ranged from eight months to eight years. The length of each of the marriages of those who replied to the questionnaire is found in Table 2. Of those who were married seven reported that they had children. Five reported that they had one child, and two reported that they had two children. The number of children compared with the length of the marriage is shown in Table 3.

Seventeen of the respondents were students. Nine replied that they were office workers, two were bookkeepers, seven were clerks, six were stenographers, and three were secretaries. One reported that he was employed in sales

Table 1

Number of Respondents in Each Group

Age (in years)	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Number of Respondents	10	13	7	6	7	3	4	5	3	4	1

Table 2

Length of Marriage of Respondents

Length of Marriages	8 mo.	9 mo.	10 mo.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ yr.	2 yr.
Number of Respondents	1	1	1	3	3

Length of Marriages	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ yr.	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ yr.	6 yr.	8 yr.
Number of Respondents	1	1	1	1

Table 3

Number of Children Compared with the Length of Marriage

Number of Children	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Length of Marriage (in years)	1	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	8

work and one was a stock clerk. Two reported that they were appliance repairmen, one was a maintenance man, three were mechanics, and one reported that he worked for the railroad. One was a teacher. Two were graduate nurses, and one was a laboratory technician. Six were housewives. One did not answer the question.

The average length of enrollment was 7.13 years. The median was eight years. The length of time that the respondents attended the parochial school ranged from two years to nine years. The number of years that each of the respondents attended is found in Table 4. All sixty-four of the respondents graduated from the parochial school. The number of respondents that graduated in each year is found in Table 5.

Fifty-nine of the graduates who answered the questionnaire graduated from high school. One did not enroll in high school. One attended for four years, but lacked one-fourth credit to graduate. One attended for two years, and one attended for two and a half years. One did not answer the question. Thirty-six attended school after high school. Twenty-eight did not attend school after high school. Nine attended business school. Three attended night school. Seventeen attended a university or college. Two were in nurses' training. Five had a bachelor's degree. One had a master's degree. Two were graduate nurses. Four planned to do post-graduate work after they finished their undergradu-

the work at college or the university. Four planned to work for a bachelor's degree. No doubt there were others who planned to finish the university work, but

Table 4

Number of Years Each Respondent Attended Parochial School

Number of Years in Attendance	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of Respondents	3	4	4	3	4	3	25	18

Table 5

Number of Respondents Graduated in the Years 1936 to 1945

Number of Respondents Graduated	Year
4	1936
4	1937
5	1938
5	1939
1	1940
8	1941
6	1942
8	1943
11	1944
12	1945

ate work at college or the university. Four planned to work for a bachelor's degree. No doubt there were others who planned to finish their college or university work, but did not indicate their intentions on the questionnaire.

religious training of a personal social training.

The first question asked, "What does the religious training which you received in the Lutheran Day School mean to you?" You did not give an answer to this question. The answers given by the other fifty-four have been divided into these five categories:

1. A better foundation for later life.
2. A basis for present Christian philosophy of life.
3. A better understanding of Christian doctrine.
4. An experience in Christian fellowship.
5. A stronger faith.

Those who reported that their Christian Day School training prepared for later life stressed the fact that their early training laid a deep foundation on their which will carry throughout their life.

Those who reported that their day school training gave them a Christian philosophy of life wrote that they attributed to their schooling happiness and success in life, correct moral and ethical standards, reverence of God, a correct evaluation of life, and help in times of tribulation. One expressed regret that he did not attend a Lutheran School for all eight years.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The second section of the questionnaire covered the religious aspects of a parochial school training.

The first question asked, "What does the religious training which you received in the Lutheran Day School mean to you?" Ten did not give an answer to this question. The answers given by the other fifty-four have been divided into these five categories:

1. A basic foundation for later life.
2. A basis for present Christian philosophy of life.
3. A better understanding of Christian doctrine.
4. An experience in Christian fellowship.
5. A stronger faith.

Those who reported that their Christian Day School training prepared for them a basic foundation for life stressed the fact that their early training left a deep impression on them which will carry throughout their life.

Those who reported that their day school training gave them a Christian philosophy of life wrote that they attributed to their schooling happiness and success in life, correct moral and ethical standards, certainty of belief, a correct evaluation of life, and help in times of tribulation. One expressed regret that he did not attend a Lutheran School for all eight years.

Those who replied that their parochial school training gave them a better understanding of Christian doctrine wrote that the knowledge and understanding carried forth into life. One reported:

I was taught something about my religion everyday. I was able to associate with children just like myself. It is more difficult to pick up bad habits from a parochial school than from a public school.

Another said, "It gave me a better understanding of the Bible, and a guide for everyday living than I could have gained elsewhere."

A number expressed the opinion that attendance at a Lutheran elementary school made them aware and appreciative of Christian fellowship and companionship. One wrote, "It made one cognizant of the principles of Christian Brotherhood." Another reported, "By attending a Lutheran school I was constantly in the company of Christian Children." Another wrote, "It has kept me in close union with other members of my own faith, and thereby with my God and Savior."

Faith, according to the opinions of some, was strengthened, and as a result they were brought closer to their Savior, felt a sense of security in time of trial and despair, had a better understanding of prayer, and a more thorough dependence on God.

Other values attributed to Lutheran school training by the graduates were: better Christian citizenship, loyalty to the Lutheran Church, and guidance through the critical stages of youth.

Fifty-four of the graduates thought that the religious training was adequate. Eight thought that it was not. One did not answer the question, and one answered both in the negative and the affirmative.

One offered no explanation for the negative answer. One gave as the reason for his negative answer, "I don't think we ever know enough." Another opinion offered was that the religious training did not sufficiently apply to life. Another thought that the instruction did not contain sufficient explanation of the Bible. One thought that the training lacked "proper methods of teaching and interesting children." Two persons felt that the religious training failed to give a "general overview of religion in regard to history after Biblical days," and that it lacked "much of the detail which would help hold the Bible as a whole together." There was also expressed a regret that the differences between the various American Lutheran Church bodies were not explained. One answered, "For the spiritual well-being yes, temporal, no." In explanation of his answer this same person wrote:

Too conspicuously few people practice them [he is referring to 'An outward expression of Christian Brotherhood as related in the Sermon on the Mount'] and it has been difficult for me to accept them, yet should they -- these principles of Christian ethics and morality -- have been inculcated in me from my earliest schooling, just as nationalism and patriotism were developed in me by saluting the flag, singing state songs, and reading "national hero" stories, things would not be so difficult.

Two persons who gave no answer, offered as an explana-

tion that the religious training was adequate at the time and served as a foundation for future training, but the elementary school training was not enough to carry through life.

Three who answered yes to the question regarding the adequacy of the religious training, expressed the opinion that the religious training was adequate at the time, but that the knowledge and understanding must continue to grow. One expressed the desire for more knowledge of church history. Another said that often non-church members would confront him with questions which he could not answer. Another felt the need of a Lutheran High school to continue the religious training begun in grade school.

In answer to the question, "Do you feel that the religious training was effective?" sixty-three answered in the positive. One gave a negative answer.

The reason for the one negative answer was that the school lacked "Proper methods of teaching and interesting children."

Six thought that other educational agencies of the church would have meant as much as the Lutheran Day School. Fifty-five thought that other educational agencies would not mean as much as the Lutheran Day School. Three did not answer the question.

Three offered no explanation for their negative answers. One wrote, "I could not answer this for I never was in the position to experience a benefit from such a possible situ-

ation."

Two thought that other agencies would serve as supplementary training. One thought that sufficient training is provided in Bible class. Another thought confirmation instruction was sufficient. One expressed the opinion that all the other educational agencies as a whole would take the place of the parochial school training. One misunderstood the question.

The reasons stated why other agencies would not mean as much are:

1. They would not allow sufficient time for adequate teaching.
2. The part time agencies would not be able to show Christianity in all realms of living.
3. Children would not take the part time agencies as seriously as they would the religious education received in a parochial school.
4. The part time agencies would have inexperienced teachers and poorer teaching methods.
5. The part time agencies would not overcome the negative results of public school training.
6. The part time agencies would not provide sufficient Christian companionship.

The person who would not send his children to a parochial school wrote as a reason, "Poor teaching and improperly trained upper grade teacher." One who gave no definite ans-

wer offered the following explanation, "It would depend on what the school has to offer in gymnastics, social and scholastic activities." Another qualifying his positive answer wrote, "But the answer to number ten would depend somewhat on future wife. The Lutheran Day School was beneficial to me, and probably would be to my children."

Those who would want to send their children to a parochial school gave as their reasons the following:

1. The parochial school offered the children a sound religious and educational background.
2. They would want their children to profit from the Lutheran School the same advantages that they profited from their training.
3. They would want their children to enjoy the Christian companionship which the parochial school offered.

Fifty-nine thought that the Lutheran Day School had a place in the present day educational system. Two thought that it does not have a place. Three did not answer the question.

Those who thought that it did not have a place gave the following as reasons: "It is outmoded," and "You are not prepared for the working world."

The reasons offered as an explanation for the affirmative answers were:

1. Parochial schools offer sound religious background.
2. The educational standards are equal if not better

than those of the public school.

3. Parochial schools offer a solution to a need in present day America.

4. Parochial schools train for future Christian citizenship.

5. The parochial school builds Christian characters.

It was difficult to evaluate the opinions and answers in this section of the questionnaire. The answers might have been the result of a constant indoctrination in the congregation on the part of the administrators as to why the parochial school is necessary. The answers on the other hand, might have been the sincere desire of the graduates to give as an objective opinion that was possible on the basis of their experience as pupils at the parochial school.

There was no way in which the opinions could be measured.

Judging from the replies given in the questionnaire it would appear that the religious training received in the parochial school was worthwhile. The answers also seemed to have indicated that the school achieved the stated aims.

No reason was found why one person reported that he thought the methods of teaching were poor. None of the graduates expressly stated that the methods were good, but because the school apparently achieved its aims, and because only one expressed the opinion that the teaching methods were poor, it would seem that the educational methods of the school were good. The person who stated that the methods

were poor, merely stated the opinion, but offered no explanation for the answer.

The fact that all but nine thought that no other educational agency could take the place of their parochial school training indicated that the majority of the graduates were of the opinion that the parochial school was the best educational agency of the church. The fact that fifty-nine of the graduates thought that the parochial school has a place in the present day American educational system also indicated that they thought that the parochial school was the best educational agency of the church.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF GENERAL EDUCATION

Those who answered the questionnaire were asked to rate their general elementary education into one of four categories. Twenty-eight thought their education excellent, thirty thought it good, four thought it fair, one thought it poor, and none thought it very poor. One gave no answer.

The next question asked the reason which prompted the rating. Six did not give any reason for the rating. Of these six, three rated the day school education as good, and three rated it as excellent.

The person who did not rate the education into one of the four categories wrote:

The general education as far as scholastic subjects are concerned touches every point. A wide education is acquired which enables you to converse on any subject, Civil Government, World History, Religion, etc.

Those who rated their day school education as excellent based their opinion on the following reasons:

1. The record set by themselves and their classmates at public high school appeared outstanding.
2. The graduates of the Lutheran Parochial School entered high school much further advanced in their subjects than did those who graduated from a public elementary school.
3. Many thought that the small classes in the Lutheran School gave the teacher more chance to deal with students as

individuals.

A typical explanation of those who thought the record of parochial school graduates was outstanding was:

In high the boy that ranked first in our class of practically 300 graduated with me from the parochial school. There were also 3 others who ranked in the first ten with highest averages. I believe that the teachers were capable and gave us the background that we needed to do the best work in high school.

One who thought that the parochial school graduates were further advanced wrote:

Upon entrance of high school, I sort of made a comparison between what I had learned in grade school and what others had been taught in Public School. I think in all cases I had been taught as much and often advanced further into a subject than they had a Public School.

A typical answer of those who thought that the Lutheran School offered more individual instruction was:

As before, I stated, there was a great deal of individual instruction, more time to ask questions. You knew your teacher better and could discuss your problems with him.

Those who rate the education as good gave the following reasons as explanations of their ratings:

1. The education was not excellent, because anything can be improved.

2. The scholarship of the Lutheran Day School graduates was outstanding at high school.

3. The graduates received a good general background at the Lutheran Elementary School.

Some offered reasons why they did not rate the education as excellent. The reasons offered were:

1. The teacher had too many grades to instruct.

2. The school did not offer all of the subjects that the public school system offered.

The four who rated their education as fair gave the following reasons for their rating: "I had a very hard time in memorizing Bible passages, Bible history, and Bible names, because I was not trained from the lower grades on." "Grammar and Science were difficult subjects for me in High School." "Too many children in one room, not enough time for details. Books not up to date -- (when I attended)." "Well I knew my lessons but well. In the reports and test, well I was fair, but in memory work I believe it would rate a good."

The one who rated the education as poor gave as an explanation, "My training in such, which was poor."

Twenty-six thought that the parochial school offered them an advantage which they experienced after transferring to a public high school, thirty did not, and eight did not answer the question. However, it appeared that five misunderstood the question as it was stated and thought that the question referred to an advantage in transferring.

Those who did experience an advantage gave the following reasons for their opinion:

1. The parochial school offered better discipline in study habits.

2. The parochial school graduates were further advanced

in the subjects than the public school graduates.

5. The parochial school training offered a better religious and ethical basis.

Sixteen of the graduates experienced difficulty upon transferring to public schools. Forty-two did not, and six did not answer the question.

The majority of those who did experience a difficulty explained it as a difficulty of fitting into the social life of the high school. They attributed the cause to various factors. These factors were: the failure on the part of the parochial school to offer enough social affairs, a different type of environment in the public schools, and individual shyness and social backwardness. A number expressed difficulties in general subjects. One had trouble with science, history, and English. The reason given by that person was "because at 'St. Thomas' we didn't stress these subjects." Another had difficulty in algebra. One had trouble with grammar and science. This person thought that the training in grade school was not sufficient. One had trouble in English. This person attributed the cause of the trouble to his own lack of interest.

The scholarship of these graduates at high school was rated as good by twenty-nine, fair by nineteen, and average by fourteen. Nobody rated the scholarship as poor. Two did not answer the question.

Three of the graduates thought that the public schools

would have offered better opportunities than the Lutheran school, fifty-eight thought that the public schools did not offer more, and three did not answer the question. One who did not answer the question thought that he was not qualified to answer it. The three who thought that the public schools would offer better opportunities gave as a reason for their answers the following: "Would of have better training in English, composition, and science." "Properly trained teachers. Adequate materials." "A public school offers manual training which broadens education in a sense of doing something constructive with your hands."

A few who thought that the public schools did not offer more opportunities than the parochial school qualified their answer by stating that the parochial school lacked, or was weak in, the following subjects: science, physical education, orchestra, and manual training.

Forty-one of the graduates thought that the public schools offered activities of which they were deprived in the Lutheran School. Twenty-two did not think that the public schools offered any activities of which they were deprived in the Lutheran School. One did not answer the question.

They listed the following activities which they thought they were deprived of by attending a parochial school as:

1. Social activities, such as band, orchestra, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, and student government.

2. Recreation and physical educational activities.

3. Sewing, cooking, and manual training.

One thought that the public schools were better equipped.

Seven thought that their later life was affected by being deprived of these activities. Forty did not think that being deprived of the activities had any effect on their life. Seventeen did not answer the question.

The general effect was described as lacking confidence in meeting people, and a lack of confidence in high school in regard to athletic ability. One reported that she "became somewhat of a bookworm." Another wrote:

My ambition in life was music. I believe that orchestra in grade school would have filled in the missing link. By the time I was an average player, it was time to set a place in life [for] which I was not quite ready in music.

Forty-seven of the graduates thought that they experienced an advantage beyond the religious education by attending the Lutheran School. Fourteen did not think that they experienced an advantage. Three did not answer the question.

One who did not think that he experienced any advantage beyond the religious instruction, wrote: "Or possibly -- I repeat, I think I had exceptional instructors -- but the same teachers could have taught me as much in a public school as far as general education is concerned."

The advantages which the graduates experienced were described as:

1. More individual attention by the teacher.
2. Christian attitude towards moral and ethical problems.
3. A high standard of education.
4. Lasting friendship among people of their own faith.

The last question in the questionnaire asked for additional remarks that any of the respondents wished to make. Since all the remarks concerned themselves about the general education of the school the results were put in this chapter.

Thirty-one of the respondents offered suggestions for the improvement of the school or their opinion of the school's training now as it compared with the training when they attended.

Three remarked that they thought the school had improved and that they did not see any room for more improvement. One of the three added that perhaps the school could offer more in audio-visual aids. Another of the respondents thought that the school should offer a better foundation in reading. Another thought that the school should offer more adequate a background in science and grammar. Two thought that partiality should not be shown to any one child in the class. It was claimed that the parent's financial status and prominence in church affairs influenced the teacher's dealings with the child. One person remarked:

One of the things I did not approve of is a speech that was made on the night of my graduation. The speaker stated in so many words that most children that went to public schools weren't very smart and did not come up

to the standards of the children that attended a Lutheran School.

Another person offered a suggestion for a complete revision of the Lutheran parochial school system:

Proper adequate training in teacher's colleges of a high caliber, with preparation which will prepare them to take charge of the situation in which they find themselves. Provide adequate staffs of proper training to teach, with others to be administrators so they do not have too great a load, with some time to relax so that they can direct their attention to their job of teaching. Provide adequate facilities for recreation and necessary materials in the classroom to stimulate and help increase children's interest in the classroom. To provide proper salaries for the teachers with raises based on training and professional zeal, not based on the same scale. To have a system in cities in which there are several schools, in which one person is responsible to see that all things are done uniformly, to set up a school system, which is large enough to purchase in quantity and lower costs of supplies. This person in charge should be properly trained and up to date in the field of education and be an administrator who is only responsible to a board representing the various congregations, with the principles [sic] responsible to him only. He (central office) should be in charge and have control in the system without interference from anyone of group or congregation.

One thought that the school needed better teachers.

Qualifying the remarks, the person added in parenthesis

"More experienced."

The rest of the respondents who made additional remarks thought that the school needed more financial support so that the physical plant of the school could be improved and more teachers be provided for the school. The physical improvements suggested were: improvement of playground facilities both as to size and equipment, the addition of craft shops, training in home economics, orchestra, a library for

after school use, a hot lunch program, and bus transportation. Suggestions were made that the teacher's salary be raised. One suggested that the teacher be given less responsibility. Explaining the remark, this person added the following: ". . . I mean that a teacher should be able to go home at the end of a day and not have to go to two or three meetings every night in the week."

Suggestions were also made that the school should offer more opportunities in extra-curricular and in social activities.

The classifications by the respondents of their parochial school education were relative. Judging from the reasons given why the education was classified as excellent or good, the only real difference why some rated it as good and not excellent was that nothing is excellent, because there is always room for improvement. The outstanding record in high school was stated by the graduates as reason for rating the education either excellent or good. Graduates from every class except the class of 1940 thought that the record of the parochial school graduates in high school was one of the reasons for rating the elementary school education as either good or excellent. The one respondent of the class of 1940 thought that his parochial school education was good, but did not offer a reason for the classification. It would seem on the basis of this study that the graduates of the parochial school had as good if not a better elemen-

tary school education as the graduates of the public schools of the same city. Evidently the fact that the teachers of the parochial school had more than one grade to teach did not affect the scholarship. Judging from the answers to other questions in the questionnaire it would seem that the subjects which were lacking, and which caused the respondents not to rate their education as excellent were: physical education, sewing, cooking, and manual training.

There was not enough material on the background of the respondents who rated the education as poor or fair to judge whether the training was poor or if they were poor students. They all graduated from high school, and one was attending a teacher's college when he replied to the questionnaire. The one who thought that the books were not up to date graduated in 1943. This person's background would need further investigation before any conclusion could be made regarding his objections.

It would appear from the advantages which the respondents attributed to their parochial school education that the parochial school graduates were better disciplined in study habits and that they had a better basis for Christian living. The difficulty of most of the graduates was fitting into the social life of high school. Again it is difficult to attribute the source of this problem solely to the parochial school. One of the graduates attributed as part of the source of the difficulty to his parents. That person's

answer was a clue that the source of difficulty was not only the parochial school. It would be necessary to discover how legitimate the replies were by comparing the social activities of the parochial school with the activities of the public school system of that city.

It would appear from the replies that the graduates added as remarks to the end of the questionnaire that they had sufficient interest in the school to offer suggestions for the improvement of the school which would entail large sums of money. It would appear that they would be willing to support the school.

Not enough background of the individual graduates was known to judge the legitimacy of the complaint that partiality was shown by the teachers. This complaint would have to be further investigated before any conclusions could be drawn concerning it. The person who offered a suggestion for a complete revision of the Lutheran Parochial School System was a student at a teacher's training college. His answers regarding the general education in the parochial school were negative. To keep the study as objective as possible his suggestions for improvements were included in this paper in their entirety.

Some of the answers showed that the graduates have not been sufficiently informed regarding the improvements that the school has made.

CHAPTER VI

EFFECT ON SUBSEQUENT CHURCH LIFE

The last section of the questionnaire tried to gain an impression of the church life of the graduates of the parochial school.

The first question asked about church attendance. Four Sundays a month was used as the maximum number of times that a person could attend church in an average month. Three replied that they attended on an average of once a month, eight attended on an average of twice a month, fifteen attended on an average of three times a month, and thirty-eight attended on an average of four times a month. The average attendance of the respondents was 3.3 times per month, or 40.4 times per year.

The next question dealt with the average communion attendance per year. One did not answer the question. Of those who answered the question the average attendance per year was 5.4 times. A summary of the average communion attendance per year of the respondents is found in Table 6.

Eleven answered that they held church offices, and fifty-three did not. The eleven held thirteen offices, eleven of which were in the Walther League, one was a finance board office, and one was a Sunday School teaching position.

Thirty-four replied that they were active in church organizations. Thirty replied that they were not. A summary

Table 6

Average Communion Attendance Per Year of Respondents

Average Communion Attendance per Year	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	12
Number of Respondents	1	4	12	7	18	2	3	4	1
Average Communion Attendance per Year	3-4	4-5	4-6	5-6	6-7	6-8			
Number of Respondents	3	2	1	1	1	3			

Table 7

Summary of Church Activities of Respondents

Organization	No.
Walther League	12
Church Choir	1
Usher's Staff	1
Gamma Delta	5
Married Couple's Club	2
Sunday School Teacher	3
Church Orchestra	1
Choir and Usher's Staff	1
Walther League and Usher's Staff	1
Walther League and Gamma Delta	1
Walther League and Church Choir	4

of the church activities of the respondents is found in Table 7.

Thirty-three did not reveal what percentage of their income was contributed. One reported that he contributed one dollar a week, but did not give the percentage. One who did not report what percentage he contributed wrote that he gave "whatever I can spare." A summary of the income reported by the respondents is found in Table 8.

Fifteen who did not report what percentage of their income they contributed to the church were students who evidently did not have a regular income. Four who did not report the percentage of income were housewives who had no personal income. One, who did not report, wrote that he did not answer because he felt that what he contributed was strictly a personal matter between himself and God.

The last question asked, "How do you divide your contributions?" This question could not be answered for the church divided the contributions in the congregational budget.

A possible correlation was studied to discover whether church attendance had any kind of a relation to the part taken by the graduates in church activities. Seventy-four percent of those who attended church on an average of four Sundays a month were active in at least one church activity. Sixty-six percent of those who attended church on an average of three Sundays a month were active in at least one

church activities. Fifty percent of those who attended church on an average of two Sundays a month were active in at least one church activity. Thirty-three percent of those who attended church one Sunday a month were active in at least one church activity.

It must be kept in mind, however, that not all such replies can be put on any statistics that might be drawn from the survey data. Only those reported that they attended church on an average of one or more times a month reported that they engaged in church activities on an average of one or more times a month. The survey is not a study of church members but of church members who reported that they attended church on an average of one or more times a month.

Table 8

Summary of Percentage of Income Contributed by Respondents

Percentage of Income Contributed	2	3	4	5	8	10	1½	2½
Number of Respondents Reporting	6	6	2	5	1	4	1	1

It is worth emphasizing that the survey is not a study of church members who reported that they attended church on an average of one or more times a month.

A possible correlation was studied in the survey between the length of attendance of the graduate at a parochial school and the amount of income contributed to the church. The investigation of the replies revealed that no significant correlation could be made between the length of attendance at a parochial school and the subsequent church life of the graduate.

The average urban adult of the Catholic Church in the United States, according to the latest figures available,

church activity. Fifty percent of those who attended church on an average of two Sundays a month were active in at least one church activity. Thirty-three percent of those who attended church one Sunday a month were active in at least one church activity.

It must be kept in mind, however, that not too much weight can be put on any conclusion that might be drawn from the above facts. Only three reported that they attended church on an average of once a month and eight reported that they attended church on an average of twice a month. Keeping in mind that the above facts could have been changed by just one or two replies, it can be said that on the information of this study there was a relation between church attendance and church activity. It appeared that a greater percentage of those who attended church regularly were active in church organizations than those who did not attend church regularly.

A possible correlation was studied to see whether the length of attendance of the graduates at a parochial school was in any way correlated to the subsequent church life. An investigation of the replies revealed that no possible correlation could be made between the length of attendance at a parochial school and the subsequent church life of the graduates.

The average urban adult of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, according to the latest figures available,

attended church thirty-seven times a year.¹ The average attendance of those who answered the questionnaire was for-40.4 times per year. The average communion attendance in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Syond in 1948 was 2.91 times per year.² The average communion attendance of those answering the questionnaire was 5.4 times per year. No information could be secured about the average church or communion attendance of "St. Thomas" Lutheran Church. It would appear from this study that the graduates of this parochial school did have a better church and communion attendance than the average adult in the Lutheran Church-Missouri S. nod. On the basis of the information culled from the replies of the graduates it would seem that there was a definite result from the effect of the parochial school training on the later church and communion attendance of these graduates. However, this study did not take into account the other factors in the lives of those who answered the questionnaire. Those other factors perhaps might have had just as great if not an even greater influence on the subsequent church and communion attendance of the graduates as the parochial school training did. This study did not try to study the influence of those other factors in the

¹Armin Schroeder, statistician, Statistical Yearbook of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1949), p. 148.

²Ibid.

lives of the graduates.

It would appear from the information secured from these questionnaires that those who did attend a parochial school did have a better church and communion attendance than the average member of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. It seemed on the basis of a correlation between church attendance and church activity of those who did attend the parochial school that the parochial school graduates were more active members of the church. This last statement was not meant to be conclusive, because there were many other factors which would have to be studied before a more conclusive statement could be made.

The average age of the graduates of the urban school was 18.2 years, and the median age was nineteen years. The age of those respondents ranged from thirteen to twenty-seven

¹Paul P. Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," *Commodore Theological Monthly*, XVII (September, 1935), 702-705.

²Paul P. Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," (Unpublished Manuscript, n.d.), p. 1.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF PETERSON'S TWO STUDIES

Peterson made two studies of parochial school graduates' evaluation of their elementary school training. One survey was conducted among graduates of an urban community with a population of about twenty-thousand. The school had an average enrollment of 135 pupils per year. The faculty of the school numbered three, but for about three or four years prior to the time the survey was made the faculty was increased to four teachers. Of 160 graduates, 144 were sent questionnaires, and fifty-three responded.¹ The second survey was made in a rural community having a population of five hundred. The school was a one room school with an average enrollment of twenty pupils per year. Fifty-four graduates responded to the questionnaire. No information was given as to how many of the graduates were sent a questionnaire.²

The average age of the graduates of the urban school was 19.1 years, and the median age was nineteen years. The age of those respondents ranged from thirteen to twenty-seven

¹Emil F. Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (September, 1946), 704-705.

²Emil F. Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," (Unpublished Manuscript, n.d.), p. 1.

years of age.³ The average age of the respondents of the rural school was 27.2 years. The median ages of this group was 27.5 years, and the ages ranged from fifteen to forty-eight years.⁴

The occupations of both groups are summarized in Tables 9 and 10.

The urban group was composed of fourteen males and thirty-nine females. Fifteen of the group were married and thirty-eight were not. The average length of the marriage was 5.1 years. Those married had an average of one child. Eleven of the group married Lutherans and four did not.⁵

The respondents of the rural school was made up of twenty-five males and twenty-nine females. Thirty-one of the group were married and twenty-three were not. The married persons were married on an average of 9.1 years and had an average of two children. Of those married, twenty married Lutherans and eleven did not.⁶

The graduates of the urban school attended the Lutheran school on an average of 6.5 years during the years 1925 to

³Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 705.

⁴Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 1.

⁵Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 705.

⁶Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 1.

Table 9

Summary of Occupations of Urban School Graduates⁷

Occupation	No.
Students	21
Housewife	12
Armed Service of the Country	5
Secretary	4
Teacher	2
Machine Operator	2
Farmer	1
Mechanic	1
Domestic Work	1
Checker	1
Bookkeeper	1
Clerical Worker	1
Truck Driver	1

⁷Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 705.

Table 10

Summary of Occupations of Rural School Graduates⁸

Occupation	No.
Housewife	20
Farmer	13
Student	9
Secretarial work	2
Domestic work	1
Pastor	1
Armed Service of the Country	3
Clerical work	1
Mechanic	1
Not given	3

⁸Peterson, "Rural Education of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 1.

1945. All entered a public junior high school. Forty-five completed junior high school. Three did not finish junior high school, and five were still enrolled at the time they filled in the questionnaire. Thirty-seven went on to a senior high school, seven did not, and nine had not at that time yet enrolled, but intended to enroll in a senior high school. Thirty-two finished senior high school, eight did not, and thirteen were enrolled but had at that time not yet graduated. Twenty-four of the group continued their education beyond high school.⁹ A summary of their schooling beyond high school is found in Table 11.

The graduates of the rural school attended a Lutheran school on an average of 4.6 years between 1920 to 1944. Thirty-four of these graduates finished junior high school and twenty did not. Thirty-nine entered high school and fifteen did not. Of those thirty-nine, thirty-one graduated from a senior high school. Seven of the graduates continued their education beyond high school. The seven who continued beyond high school entered "various types of colleges and vocational schools."¹⁰

Of the graduates of the urban school, forty-nine were active church members of the Lutheran Church. Two of the

⁹Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 705.

¹⁰Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 20.

Table 11

Summary of Urban School Graduates Education
Beyond High School¹¹

Degrees Received or Education	No.
Bachelor of Science degree	2
Bachelor of Arts degree	4
Associate of Arts degree	3
Junior College work	1
Some normal school training	3
Commercial College	6
Junior and normal college	1
Normal and commercial college	1
Music conservatory	1
Nurses training	2

¹¹Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," pp. 705-706.

group gave no church affiliation, one was affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church, and one gave no answer to the question. The person who joined the Roman Catholic Church replied that she felt something missing in the Lutheran Church which led her to study Roman Catholicism which she was convinced was the true religion. Another stated that she was not an active member because of failure to transfer her membership.¹²

Of the graduates of the rural school, fifty-one listed themselves as active members of the Lutheran Church. One was affiliated with the Presbyterian Church, one with the Methodist church, and one did not list himself as an active member because he was in the armed services of his country.¹³

In reply to the first question of the questionnaire, "What does the religious training which you received in a Lutheran Day School mean to you?" the replies which Peterson recorded of the urban school graduates were divided into the following three categories:

1. Their faith was strengthened.
2. Christianity became a basic philosophy for life.
3. They had a source of comfort and help in times of

¹²Ibid., p. 706.

¹³Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 2.

trouble.¹⁴

An answer which Peterson recorded of a rural school graduate, but not of any of the urban school graduates was that the parochial school training taught a proper moral and ethical standard.¹⁵

Fifty of the graduates of the urban school thought that their faith was strengthened. Three did not answer the question. Forty-two thought that the religious training was adequate, nine thought that it was not adequate, and two did not answer the question. Forty-nine of the urban school graduates thought that the religious training was effective, two thought that it was not, and two did not answer.¹⁶

Fifty-three of the rural school graduates thought their faith was strengthened by the religious training. One did not think that his faith was strengthened. Forty-seven thought that the religious knowledge was adequate, one was doubtful, and six thought that it was not. All of the rural school graduates thought that the religious teaching was effective.¹⁷

¹⁴Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 705.

¹⁵Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 2.

¹⁶Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," pp. 706-707.

¹⁷Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 3.

Peterson recorded the following as to what was thought as lacking by the graduates of the urban school:¹⁸

1. The religious training was not adequate for life.
2. The religious training was not integrated with life.
3. The religious training was based partially on the same Bible History text from the sixth to the eighth grade.

Of the replies recorded of the graduates of the rural school the following were thought to be lacking:

1. More time devoted to Bible study.
2. Basic teachings of other churches.¹⁹

The reason thought by two graduates of the urban school as to why the religious training was not effective was that the religion was not integrated with the daily life of the pupil.²⁰

The question as to whether any other religious training would have meant the same was misunderstood by eighteen of the graduates of the urban school. Of the remaining twenty-nine, twenty-four thought that no other religious training would mean the same. Five thought that the Sunday School or some other religious educational agency would have meant the

¹⁸Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 707.

¹⁹Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 3.

²⁰Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 707.

same.²¹ Fifty-three of the graduates of the rural school thought that no other type of religious education could take the place of the parochial school. One did not answer the question.²²

Thirty-nine of the graduates of the urban school indicated that they would send their children to a parochial school. Seven replied that they would not, one reported that he would send his children for a few years. Four did not answer the question. The reasons given why they would send their children to a parochial school were:

1. The children need daily religious instruction.
2. Religion should be integrated with the general subjects.
3. The religious training at home and Sunday School would not be sufficient.
4. The religious training would be a basis for future life.²³

The reason reported as to why some would not send their children to a parochial school was that the standards of the parochial school did not meet the standards of the public

²¹Ibid.

²²Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 3.

²³Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 707.

school.²⁴

Fifty of the graduates of the rural school indicated that they would send their children to a parochial school, one would not, and three did not answer the question. The reasons reported as to why they would send their children to a parochial school were:

1. The parochial school offers a better discipline in study habits.
2. The parochial school offers a better environment for the child.
3. The parochial school gives the children a thorough understanding of their faith.

The one who would not send his child to a parochial school was a Methodist and would want him to be raised in the Methodist faith, to be taught by college educated teachers, and where there was no partiality shown to certain pupils.²⁵

Forty three of the graduates of the urban school thought that the Lutheran day school has a place in the present day educational system. Six thought that it did not. One replied both yes and no, and one thought that it did have a place if a few improvements were added. The reasons recorded why it was thought that the parochial school has a place in the present day educational system were:

²⁴Ibid., pp. 707-708.

²⁵Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 3.

1. Religion has a place in education.

2. The scholarship of the parochial school was equal to that of the public school.

3. The parochial school builds Christian characters.

The reasons recorded why it was thought the parochial school has not a place in the present day educational system were:

1. The parochial school has poor equipment.

2. The parochial school does not allow sufficient time for each subject.

3. The parochial school does not teach any physical education.²⁶

Fifty-two of the graduates of the rural school thought that the parochial school has a place in the present day educational system, one thought that it did not, and one did not give an answer. The reasons recorded as to why it was thought by the graduates of the rural school that the parochial school has a place in the present day education system were:

1. The parochial schools offer the Christian religion which the world needs.

2. The parochial schools train for Christian citizenship.

3. The standards of the parochial schools are equal to

²⁶Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 708.

those of the public school.²⁷

Ten graduates of the urban school rated their secular education as excellent, twenty-six rated it as good, eleven rated it as fair, two rated it as poor, and four gave no answer. The reported reasons offered by the urban school graduates for rating the education as excellent were:

1. The parochial school offered a solid factual background.
2. The graduates of the parochial school were more advanced than the graduates of the public school.
3. The record of the graduates of the parochial school was outstanding.

The reported reasons offered by the urban school graduates for rating the education as good were:

1. The parochial school lacked certain subjects.
2. The teaching methods used in the public school were poor.²⁸

Twenty-four of the graduates of the rural school rated their secular education as excellent, twenty-two rated it as good, three rated it as fair, one rated it very poor, and four did not answer the question. No reasons were reported

²⁷Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 4.

²⁸Peterson, "An evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 709.

for the ratings.²⁹

Seventeen of the graduates of the urban school reported that the parochial school offered them an advantage which they experienced after transferring to a public high school. Sixteen did not have an advantage, six made no transfer, and fourteen gave no answer. Nineteen experienced a difficulty, fourteen did not, and fourteen did not transfer. The reported reasons for the advantage were:

1. Ability to memorize easily.
2. Better basic background.
3. Standard of right and wrong.³⁰

The reported reasons for the difficulty were:

1. Adjusting to a different school environment.
2. Subjects were much more difficult.
3. Poor study habits.
4. Lacking specific knowledge in science and grammar.

The reported reasons for the difficulties were:

1. Standard subject matter lower in the Parochial school.
2. In parochial school problems in mathematics were not always fully explained.
3. The difficulty was a result of a change of schools

²⁹Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 4.

³⁰Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 710.

and a different school environment.³¹

Twenty of the graduates of the rural school experienced an advantage in attending a Lutheran day school, twelve did not, and twenty-two did not answer the question. Six reported that they experienced a difficulty, sixteen reported that they did not experience a difficulty, and thirty-two did not answer the question. The reported advantages were:

1. Ability to study.
2. A sound basic education.

The reported difficulties were:

1. Lack of physical education.
2. Difficulty in grammar.
3. Difficulty in group participation.³²

Sixteen of the graduates of the urban school rated their high school scholarship as good, twelve rated it as fair, sixteen rated it as average, and one rated it as poor. Eight did not answer the question.³³

Thirteen of the graduates of the rural school rated their high school scholarship as good, twelve rated it as fair, twenty-one rated it as average, and thirteen did not

³¹Ibid.

³²Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 5.

³³Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 710.

answer the question.³⁴

Forty of the graduates of the urban school thought that public school would not have offered better opportunities than a parochial school, nine thought that a public school would offer better opportunities. The opportunities listed were shop, mechanical drawing, agricultural classes, better opportunity for personality development, more social activities, physical education, and a science laboratory.³⁵

Forty-six of the graduates of the rural school thought that public school did not offer better opportunities than the parochial school. Three thought that the public school would offer better opportunities than the parochial school, and three did not answer the question. The opportunities that were thought that the public school would offer were: social activities and a better opportunity to choose subjects which would serve better in one's profession.³⁶

Thirty-four of the graduates of the urban school thought that additional activities were offered by the public school. Sixteen thought that there were not any additional activities offered by the public school. Three did not answer the question. The activities which were thought to be lacking

³⁴Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 5.

³⁵Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," pp. 710-711.

³⁶Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 5.

in the parochial school were athletics, home economics, physical education, manual training, regular study periods, assemblies, music, drama, use of visual aids, lyceum speakers, social activities, and public speakers.³⁷

Thirty-four of the graduates of the rural school thought that the public schools did not offer activities of which they were deprived of in the parochial school. Fourteen thought that there were activities which the public school offered and which they were deprived of in the parochial school. Six did not answer the question. The activities which the graduates of the rural school listed as lacking were: athletics, music, manual training, and educational tours and lectures.³⁸

Ten of the graduates of the urban parochial school thought that being deprived of certain activities had an effect on their later life. Twenty-seven thought that being deprived of certain activities did not have an effect on their later life. Sixteen of the graduates of the urban school did not answer the question. The effect of being deprived of certain activities was described as affecting the later education, hampering the opportunity for advancement,

³⁷Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 711.

³⁸Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 5.

and a social backwardness.³⁹

Twenty-nine of the graduates of the rural parochial school thought that being deprived of certain activities did not have an effect on their later life. Three thought that being deprived of certain activities did have an effect on their later life. Twenty-two did not answer the question. The effect was described as a social backwardness.⁴⁰

The average church attendance of the graduates of the urban parochial school was 3.2 times per month. The average communion attendance of the graduates of the urban parochial school graduates was 4.3 times a year.⁴¹ The average church attendance of the graduates of the rural parochial school was 3.4 times a month. The average communion attendance of the graduates of the rural parochial school was 5.9 times per year.⁴²

Thirty-seven of the graduates of the urban parochial school indicated that they did not hold any office in a Lutheran congregation. Two indicated that they did. Fourteen did not answer the question. The two graduates of the urban

³⁹Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 711.

⁴⁰Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 5.

⁴¹Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 711.

⁴²Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 6.

parochial school who did hold office served as an organist, the other served as a teacher.⁴³

Forty of the graduates of the rural parochial school indicated that they did not hold any office in a Lutheran congregation. Seven indicated that they did. Six did not answer the question. Of the seven graduates who did hold an office in a Lutheran congregation, four were Sunday School teachers, one was a parochial school teacher, one was a member of the church council, and one was the treasurer of the congregation.⁴⁴

The activities of the graduates of the urban parochial school were as follows: seventeen were active in young people's organizations; five were active in Sunday School work; seven were in the church choir; and two were active in women's organizations.⁴⁵ Twenty-seven of the graduates of the rural parochial school were active in congregational activities. Twenty-one were not. Six did not answer the question. "Among the organizations in which they are active were listed Ladies Aids, Lutheran Laymen Leagues, Mission Societies, Walther Leagues, Men's Clubs, Choirs, and Luther-

⁴³Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 711.

⁴⁴Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 6.

⁴⁵Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," pp. 711-712.

an Women Missionary Leagues."⁴⁶

Forty-one of the graduates of the urban parochial school did not indicate what portion of their income was contributed to the church. The eleven, who did indicate, contributed on an average of five percent. One indicated that he contributed twenty dollars a year. Twenty did indicate how the income was apportioned.⁴⁷ A summary of the apportionment of the contributions is found in Table 12.

Thirty-nine of the graduates of the rural parochial school did not indicate what part of their income was contributed to the church. The fifteen who indicated what they contributed, contributed on an average of six percent. Twenty-one did indicate how the income was apportioned.⁴⁸ A summary of the apportionment of the contributions is found in Table 13.

The additional remarks made by the graduates of the urban parochial school offered the following suggestions: greater variety of subjects, extra-curricular activities, enlargement of teaching staff new physical plant, physical education, new text books, and extra study room for classes containing more than one class, improvement of science

⁴⁶Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 6.

⁴⁷Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 712.

⁴⁸Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 6.

Table 12

Summary of Urban School Graduates' Apportionment of
Church Contributions.⁴⁹

Number of respondents	14	2	2	2
Percentage apportioned for local congregation	50	60	75	66 2/3
Percentage apportioned for missions	50	40	25	33 1/3

Table 13

Summary of Rural School Graduates' Apportionment of
Church Contributions.⁵⁰

Number of Respondents	2	2	1	4	1	2	1	8
Percentage apportioned for local congregation	100	90	80	75	70	66 2/3	60	50
Percentage apportioned for missions		10	20	25	30	33 1/3	40	50

⁴⁹Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 712.

⁵⁰Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 6.

course, more discipline, improvement of library.⁵¹

The additional remarks made by the graduates of the rural parochial school besides the suggestion that there be better cooperation from the pastors was best summarized by one as:

- (1) Better transportation facilities
- (2) More activities, such as physical education
- (3) Better equipped libraries
- (4) Improvement in playground equipment
- (5) Higher wages offered for teachers.⁵²

⁵¹Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 712.

⁵²Peterson, "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," p. 6.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

It would appear on the basis of the three surveys that the three parochial schools did achieve the aims which were stated in The General Course of Study for Lutheran Schools.¹ This conclusion is based on the following facts:

1. That the majority of the graduates thought that their faith was strengthened.
2. That the majority of the graduates thought that the religious education was adequate and effective.
3. That the majority of the graduates thought that no other religious educational agency could take the place of the parochial school training.
4. That the majority of the graduates thought that the parochial school agency has a place in the present day educational system.

It would appear that the three parochial schools did offer a basic foundation in the fields of general education. However it did appear that the one urban school in which Peterson made a survey was ". . . weak in the general educa-

¹"Distinctive Objectives of the Lutheran Elementary School," General Course of Study for Lutheran Elementary Schools, edited by Wm. A. Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1943), p. 4.

tion which was offered."²

It would appear that the three parochial schools were lacking the following subjects: manual training, physical education, home economics, and group participation in music. It appeared that the schools were weak in science, grammar, and mathematics. To what extent the schools were weak in those subjects could not be determined.

It appeared that the problem of social adjustment from the elementary school to high school was a problem that all three of the schools failed to solve. It appeared that the graduates were not prepared to make the social adjustment which was necessary when transferring from an elementary school to a high school.

It appeared that the schools were not offering sufficient extra-curricular activities. Peterson reported that this problem is a problem of the junior high school age.³

It would appear on the basis of the three studies that the average church and communion attendance of the graduates were above the average of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod.

These surveys were based on subjective reports of the graduates. Such reports have their limitations. As Peterson

²Emil F. Peterson, "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (September, 1946), 713.

³Ibid., p. 712.

pointed out,⁴ other objective methods should be developed and used before a more complete picture can be had of the education which the Lutheran day school can offer. Also a more intensive study should be made into the backgrounds of the respondents of the questionnaire. Lack of material regarding the background of the graduates of "St. Thomas" was felt by the writer to be the biggest deficiency of the study.

⁴Ibid.

APPENDIX A

COPY OF PETERSON'S QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONAL EVALUATION OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION

Name _____ Address _____
(If you prefer, you need not fill in this space)

City _____ State _____ Date _____

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is your age? _____ years.
2. What is your occupation? _____
3. Are you male? _____ female?
Married? Yes _____ No _____ How long? _____ years.
4. How many children? _____
Did you marry a Lutheran? Yes _____ No _____
5. How many years did you attend a Lutheran Day School?
_____ years. When? _____
6. Did you receive a diploma from our school?
Yes _____ No _____ When? _____
7. Did you enroll in a Junior High School? Yes _____ No _____
8. Did you finish Junior High School? Yes _____ No _____
9. Did you enroll in a Senior High School? Yes _____ No _____
10. Did you finish Senior High School? Yes _____ No _____
11. Did you receive a High School diploma? Yes _____ No _____
12. Did you continue with your education in other schools?
Yes _____ No _____
13. If yes, indicate the schools and diplomas received:

14. Are you an active member of the Lutheran Church?
Yes _____ No _____
15. If no, of what church are you an active member? _____

16. If no, why are you not an active member of the Lutheran Church?

II. RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION

17. What does the religious training which you received in the Lutheran Day School mean to you?
18. Was your faith strengthened? Yes _____ No _____
19. Was the religious knowledge which you received adequate?
Yes _____ No _____
20. If not, what in your opinion was lacking?
21. Do you feel that the religious teaching was effective?
Yes _____ No _____
22. If no, what suggestion for improvement can you offer:
23. Would any other type of religious training have meant the same? Yes _____ No _____
24. Give reasons why it would or would not:

25. If your answer to question #23 is yes, what other type would have meant the same?
26. If possible, would you send your children to a Lutheran Day School such as you attended? Yes _____ No _____
27. Give reasons why you would or would not:
28. Do you believe that the Lutheran Day School as you knew it has a place in our present day educational system? Yes _____ No _____
29. Give reasons for believing that it has or has not:

III. SECULAR ASPECTS OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION

30. How would you rate the secular education received in the Lutheran Day School?
Excellent _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor _____ Very Poor _____
31. State reasons which prompted your rating in the previous question:
32. Did you experience any advantage or any difficulty when you transferred to public schools?
Advantage: Yes _____ No _____ Difficulty: Yes _____ No _____
33. If you had an advantage, what was your advantage?

34. If you had any difficulty, what was your difficulty?

35. What do you think was the cause of your difficulty?

36. How would you rate your scholarship in High School?
 Good _____ Fair _____ Average _____ Poor _____

37. Do you believe that a public school education would have offered you better opportunities than your Lutheran Day School education? Yes _____ No _____

38. If better, in what ways would it have offered you better opportunities?

39. Do you believe that the public school offered activities of which you were deprived in the Lutheran School?
 Yes _____ No _____

40. If yes, what activities?

41. Did being deprived of those activities have any effect on your life? Yes _____ No _____

42. If yes, what effect?

IV. EFFECT OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION ON SUBSEQUENT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

43. How often do you attend church in an average month?
 _____ times.

44. How many times do you attend communion per year?
 _____ times.
45. Have you ever held any office in a Lutheran congregation?
 Yes _____ No _____
46. What offices?
47. Are you active in any church organizations?
 Yes _____ No _____
48. Which organizations?
49. What portion of your income is contributed to your church? _____% (Omit if you have no income)
50. How do you divide your contribution?
 _____% Local congregation,
 _____% Missions (Omit if you have no income)
51. Give any suggestions for improving the Lutheran Day School:

(Additional remarks may be made on the reverse side of this sheet)

APPENDIX B

COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT OUT

PERSONAL EVALUATION OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION

(Compiled by Rev. Emil F. Peterson)

Name _____ Address _____
City _____ State _____ Date _____

If you prefer, you may omit the above information.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is your age? _____ years.
2. What is your occupation? _____
3. Are you male? _____ female?
Married? Yes _____ No _____ How long? _____ years.
4. If married, how many children?
Did you marry a Lutheran? Yes _____ No _____
5. How many years did you attend a Lutheran Day School?
When? _____
6. Did you receive a diploma from a Lutheran Day School?
Yes _____ No _____ When? _____
7. Did you finish Senior High School? Yes _____ No _____
8. If the answer to number seven is no, how many years did
you attend High School? _____ years.
9. Did you continue with your education in other schools?
Yes _____ No _____
10. If yes, indicate the schools and diplomas received:

11. Are you a member of the Lutheran Church?
Yes _____ No _____
12. If no, of what church are you a member? _____
13. If no, why are you not a member of the Lutheran Church?

II. RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION

1. What does the religious training which you received in the Lutheran Day School mean to you?
2. Was your faith strengthened? Yes _____ No _____
3. Was the religious knowledge which you received adequate?
Yes _____ No _____
4. If not, what in your opinion was lacking?
5. Do you feel that the religious training was effective?
Yes _____ No _____
6. If no, what suggestions for improvement can you offer:
7. Would release time classes, Sunday School, and Vacation Bible School have meant as much? Yes _____ No _____
8. Give reasons why they would or would not:

9. If your answer to question number seven is yes, what other type (or types) would have meant the same?
10. If possible, would you send your children to a Lutheran Day School such as you attended? Yes _____ No _____
11. Give reasons why you would or would not:
12. Do you believe that the Lutheran Day School as you knew it has a place in our present day educational system? Yes _____ No _____
13. Give reasons for believing that it has or has not:

III. GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL

1. How would you rate the general education received in the Lutheran Day School?
Excellent _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor _____ Very Poor _____
2. State reasons which prompted your rating in the previous question:
3. Did you experience any advantage when you transferred to public schools? Yes _____ No _____
4. If you had an advantage, what was your advantage?
5. Did you experience any difficulty when you transferred to public school? Yes _____ No _____

6. If you had difficulty, what was your difficulty?
7. What do you think was the cause of your difficulty?
8. How would you rate your scholarship in High School?
Good _____ Fair _____ Average _____ Poor _____
9. Do you believe that a public school education would have offered you better opportunities than your Lutheran Day School education? Yes _____ No _____
10. If better, in what way would it have offered you better opportunities?
11. Do you believe that the public school offered activities of which you were deprived in the Lutheran School?
Yes _____ No _____
12. If yes, what activities?
13. Did being deprived of those activities have any effect on your life? Yes _____ No _____
14. If yes, what effect?
15. Do you think that you experienced some advantage in attending a Lutheran Day School, beyond the religious education you received? Yes _____ No _____

(Additional remarks may be made on the reverse side of this sheet)

THANK YOU

16. If yes, what were they?

IV. EFFECT OF A LUTHERAN DAY SCHOOL EDUCATION ON
SUBSEQUENT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

1. How often do you attend church in an average month (figuring four Sundays per month)? _____ times.
2. How many times do you attend communion per year?
_____ times.
3. Have you ever held any office in a Lutheran congregation?
Yes _____ No _____
4. What offices?

5. Are you active in any church organizations? Yes _____
No _____
6. Which organizations?

7. Approximately what portion of your income is contributed to your church? _____ percent
(Omit if you have no income)
8. How do you divide your contribution?
_____ percent to local congregation
_____ percent to missions
_____ percent for other purposes
9. Give any suggestions for improving the Lutheran Day School:

(Additional remarks may be made on the reverse side of this sheet)

THANK YOU

APPENDIX C

COPY OF THE LETTER SENT WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

St. Louis, Mo.
Feb. 1, 1950

Dear Friend,

With the permission of your pastor and under the supervision of Prof. Repp of Concordia Seminary, I am sending you this questionnaire.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to obtain material concerning the effectiveness of parochial schools. This information can only be had by means of a questionnaire. The information is going to be used for a study of the problem and will be written up.

No reference will be made to individuals or to the congregation in the written results. In order that the material really will give a true picture, I ask that:

All questions be answered.
All the answers be your own frank opinion.

I would appreciate receiving a reply on the questionnaire by March 1.

Thank you for your cooperation in answering the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

F. Rehwaldt
Concordia Seminary
801 De Mun Ave.
St. Louis 5, Mo.
Apt. 2 E

APPENDIX D

COPY OF THE POSTCARD SENT OUT

Feb. 22, 1950

Dear Friend,

About two weeks ago you received a questionnaire regarding your evaluation of your parochial school training. If you have mailed the reply, I want this card to be a "thank you".

If you have not mailed the reply, I would appreciate receiving it as soon as possible. In order that the results of this study may prove more beneficial to all, your reply to the questionnaire is necessary.

Thank you,

F. Rehwaldt
Concordia Seminary
St. Louis, Mo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bretscher, Paul. The Lutheran Elementary School: An Interpretation. Published by the Board of Christian Education of the Northern Illinois District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, n.p., 1940.
- Good, Carter V., A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: D. Appleton Century, 1940.
- Kramer, Wm. A., editor. General Course of Study for Lutheran Elementary Schools. Published under the auspices of the Board For Parish Education, Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Revised edition. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947.
- Peterson, Emil F. "An Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVII (September, 1946), pp. 704-713.
- "Rural Evaluation of a Lutheran Day School Education." Unpublished manuscript in the possession of the Rev. Emil F. Peterson, St. James, Minnesota, n.d.
- Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, VIII, No. 1, "The Questionnaire" (January, 1930).
- "St. Thomas" Ev. Lutheran School, "Metropolis", Being a Brief Record of God's Blessing Through Christian Education. "Metropolis"; Printed and distributed by "St. Thomas" Ev. Lutheran Church, 1948.
- Schroeder, Armin, statistician. Statistical Yearbook of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod for the Year 1948. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1949.
- Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of "St. Thomas" Evangelical Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod). "Metropolis"; Printed and distributed by "St. Thomas" Ev. Lutheran Church, 1940.