

1-1-1967

## Book Review Articles

William A. Kramer

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Ronald L. Johnstone

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kramer, William A. and Johnstone, Ronald L. (1967) "Book Review Articles," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 38, Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol38/iss1/6>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

## BOOK REVIEW ARTICLES

### THE JOHNSTONE STUDY OF LUTHERAN SCHOOLS

*What Does It Say? What Does It Mean?*

WILLIAM A. KRAMER

*In September of 1966 the School for Graduate Studies of Concordia Seminary published Ronald L. Johnstone's study titled The Effectiveness of Lutheran Elementary and Secondary Schools as Agencies of Christian Education. On the basis of surveys which he conducted in St. Louis and Detroit, Dr. Johnstone offers in this book an evaluation of the effectiveness of Lutheran parochial school education on the elementary and the high school level. A preliminary report on the survey results, published early in 1966, aroused much interest and criticism, especially within The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, with its long tradition of encouraging and maintaining parochial schools. The appearance of the book has now made possible a more accurate assessment of the survey findings and of the evaluations and conclusions arrived at by Mr. Johnstone.*

*Mr. William A. Kramer, who has served since 1961 as Secretary of Schools of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod's Board of Parish Education, was requested by that board to prepare a review of Dr. Johnstone's book. Through the courtesy of Dr. Kramer and the Board of Parish Education his review appears on these pages. It is followed by comments by Dr. Johnstone, who kindly accepted the invitation to submit a response to Dr. Kramer's review.*

*Mr. Kramer's affiliation with the "School Staff" of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod dates back to 1940. He is the author and editor of schoolbooks and curriculum materials as well as other books and tracts. Until recently, Dr. Johnstone was the Director of Concordia Seminary's Research Center. On January 1, 1967, he formally assumed his new duties as Director of Research in the Office of Research, Statistics, and Archives of the newly-formed Lutheran Council in the United States of America.*

#### THE STUDY

On January 29, 1966, Ronald L. Johnstone, Director of Research for Concordia Seminary Research Center, St. Louis, Mo., released a report to the press titled "Empirical Evaluation Study of Lutheran Parochial School Education." He has now provided a detailed report on his study in a book titled *The Effectiveness of Lutheran Elementary and Secondary Schools as Agencies of Christian Education*. School for Graduate Studies, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., 1966, 188 pages. \$3.75. The Johnstone study is intended to answer the question: "What differences do varying amounts of such full-time Christian education make in the beliefs, attitudes, and behavior patterns of Lutheran youth?" Areas of study included Biblical knowledge, Lutheran doctrinal knowledge, social concerns, and participation in Christian fellowship.

The study covered 548 young high school people selected at random in St. Louis, Mo., and Detroit, Mich., of whom, up to the time of the study, 112 had received a 100-percent parochial school education; 109 a 65- to 99-percent parochial school education; 66 a 30- to 64-percent parochial school education; 67 a 1- to 29-percent parochial school education; and 193 no parochial school education.

The participants were grouped as coming from three types of families: *Ideal families* (15.7 percent) — both parents members of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, regular church attendance, some family worship, the family still a unit; *Modal families* (47.2 percent) — both parents living, at least one parent present in the home and a member of the Synod, church attendance at least every other Sunday, no family worship; *Marginal families* (37.1 percent) — at least one parent



a member of the Synod, or only one parent or no parent present in the home, infrequent church attendance, no family devotions.

#### THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The author reports his findings in eight chapters, II to IX, and also provides an introduction and a conclusion. A chapter-by-chapter summary follows. The reader is referred to the book itself for more than 100 tables and for additional information not included in this summary.

#### Chapter II: *Lutheran Youth as Persons*

This chapter lists some items on which Dr. Johnstone found no differences traceable to parochial school education and on which he did not expect to find any: the degree of activity at school, desired image at school, aspirations for a college education, number of organizational memberships, and the like. No differences were evident in other categories designated as "out for a good time," "dating frequency," "unhappy," "rebellious," "religious," and "ambitious." However, the author states that this cannot be interpreted as an indictment of the parochial school.

A disturbing factor in this section is that no measurable difference was found in the incidence of cheating on exams. A positive factor is that young people with all parochial school education are more likely to have Lutheran friends (75 percent as compared with only 3.1 percent of the "all public" group). Though one would expect this, since friendship develops between people who are in close association, the findings still present a favorable aspect. A second favorable factor is that greater amounts of parochial school education increase the likelihood for young people to choose a church vocation as a life's work. Just how much the school and how much the family affects this choice, Johnstone finds impossible to say.

#### Chapter III: *Lutheran Youth in Families*

Here, in 12 categories, the author had the young people describe their family relations as they saw them. He found a "fairly good" rapport between the young persons and their parents generally, though he did not trace

any differences to parochial school education. Johnstone himself states: "Our investigation in this area is exploratory and quite limited," "we have worked with very few measures," and "whether the relationships are of even higher quality in families whose children attend parochial schools we cannot determine." Adequate exploration of family relationships "would involve a separate study—one that would involve equal time with parents and youth." Therefore he also states that "no criticism of parochial education ought to evolve from discovering a lack of relevance or impact of the parochial school."

The author reports an encouraging conclusion in this chapter in that he states, "Although the peer group has a strong influence on youth, 'when the chips are down,' parents remain the most important reference point for most youth." What this says to all parents, congregations, pastors, and teachers is that they ought to hold high the Scriptural view of parents and parental influence, recognize that the church's educational efforts are likely to succeed in direct proportion to the involvement of parents in the process, accept the challenge of parent involvement in the church's educational efforts, and make adequate provisions for such involvement.

#### Chapter IV: *Lutheran Youth View Social and Political Problems*

Chapter IV contains information on responses of young people to a number of social and political problems facing our society. Questions deal with allowing books by communists in public libraries, the racial issue, views of the honesty of Jewish businessmen, quality of service from fellow Lutherans in business, whether belief in God is crucial to good American citizenship or political leadership, outlawing prayer in public schools, governmental involvement in attacking social problems, governmental control of the free enterprise system, constitutional guarantee of free speech, the United Nations, the morality of engaging in nuclear war, dealing with Castro, political preferences of parents and young people, and knowledge of specified political figures (mayor of city and governor of state). No attempt was made to



indicate any social or political view that a Lutheran school ought to inculcate with respect to these issues.

Lutheran young people generally gave a rather good account of themselves. However, they aligned themselves against "some traditional conservative points of view." The study indicated no substantial differences between those who had received a parochial school education and those who had not. We must remember, of course, that views of social and political issues are more likely to be determined by the family and society than by schools. The finding may be interpreted to mean that the parochial school has not created the divisiveness from the social and political scene of which it is sometimes accused and that, academically, the parochial school has at least not provided an education inferior to that of the public schools.

The only surprising finding in this section is that "the more of one's education that has been gained in parochial schools, the less likely the youth is to assert that a good leader of this country must be a professing Christian." The author muses that one might have "expected an opposite relationship, since Lutheran youth in public schools have more contact with non-Christians," but that contact of the "all public" group with more non-Christians may have led them to a "personal conviction of the importance and relevance of Christianity in helping a political leader reach proper decisions."

#### Chapter V: *Lutheran Youth Participate in the Congregational Life*

Here the author reports his findings on behavior in areas of worship, reception of the Holy Communion, witnessing to the faith, prayer, and stewardship. Training in these areas is among the objectives of the parochial school. The tables in this section show a strong positive relationship between the amount of parochial school education and frequency of church attendance, frequency of personal prayer, attendance at a youth Bible class, membership in a youth group, attendance of meetings, and holding office. However, Johnstone states that when the control for family background is applied, a positive

relationship between parochial school education and participation in congregational life remains only for youth from "marginal" families.

This finding is at variance with findings of most other known research in this area. For example, Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi recently show their study titled *The Education of Catholic Americans*, in which they report their research in behalf of the National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Ill. They found that "the association is strongest among those who come from very religious family backgrounds. Apparently the religiousness of the family of origin predisposes a child to influence by the religious education he receives in school."

Under the heading of participation in congregational life, the Johnstone research indicates little difference traceable to parochial school attendance in frequency of reception of the Holy Communion. On the positive side he finds that the parochial school "does not appear to be particularly divisive within the congregation" in youth work, a charge which has sometimes been made.

There is little difference in stewardship of income between those who received a parochial school education and those who did not. Nearly half the young people in both groups select one or both parents as most influential in their lives rather than their teachers. Parochial school students are no more inclined to talk of their faith or of religious questions than are others who did not attend a parochial school. Parochial school education does foster an increased ability to identify important church leaders.

#### Chapter VI: *Lutheran Youth Evaluate Congregation, Pastor, and School*

This chapter reports student evaluation of their church membership. Only 6 percent of all young people feel that their pastor does not understand the problems and concerns of young persons, with no difference relative to this feeling traceable to the kind of school they attend. Likewise educational background makes no difference in the student's inclination to consult his pastor in the case of problems. Over 26 percent of the total



sample have actually gone to their pastor with problems. But we must keep in mind that both public and Lutheran high schools have counselors, and Lutheran high schools have Christian teachers and counselors to whom students may go, and so the high school age may not present a good level for an accurate exploration of the question.

The chapter also reports the young people's evaluation of the Sunday church service, the pastor's sermon, the liturgical parts of the service, Walther League or other youth activities, and contacts with other Christian people. Apparently only one of these variables indicates a significant relationship traceable to education. The liturgy is less appreciated by those with a parochial school education. The young people were given five choices in each category: "very helpful," "quite helpful," "somewhat helpful," "not very helpful," "not at all helpful." In totaling the last three categories, all of which indicate less than full assent, the study reports some disenchantment with the congregation's formal program in these percentages: Sunday services in general, 30.7; pastor's sermon, 31.4; liturgical parts of the service, 64.5; Walther League, 51.6; contacts with other Christian people, 43.1. Some of this criticism, Johnstone observes, may be related to adolescence. But he also reminds us not to forget the many who are highly appreciative of their relationship to the congregation. Yet congregations need still to evaluate carefully what they are doing for their younger members, how to improve their services, and above all, how to involve young people to a greater degree in the church's mission.

In investigating the students' opinion of their school, 10.8 percent of public school young people were found to regard the public school as having a weakening influence on their faith, while 65.2 percent judged their faith unaffected. Among Lutheran high school students, 1.5 percent found their faith weakened and 18 percent found it unaffected. Of public school young people, 23.9 percent felt their faith was strengthened by their school attendance, while 80.5 percent of Lutheran high school students reported a strengthening of their faith through their

school attendance. Assuming these judgments to be correct, students attending a Lutheran high school came away with a substantial benefit.

The study showed some evidence of cliques in the congregations but no evidence that cliques are due to parochial school education. Apparently any clannishness is due to different circles of acquaintances or to the attendance at different schools of any kind. In short, we associate with people whom we know.

#### Chapter VII: *Lutheran Youth and Biblical Knowledge*

In identifying four lesser known Biblical personalities as well as the Pentateuch, in placing correctly two items of Biblical chronology (Abraham—Moses; Joshua—David), and in naming the century in which Martin Luther lived, the scores generally are quite low. Parochial school education made a substantial difference in items indicating Biblical knowledge, but no difference in time sense. Those with the most parochial school education scored the highest on Biblical information. Other studies have also shown a positive influence of the parochial school on Biblical knowledge.

The Johnstone study covered only a very small sampling of Biblical knowledge, and one might question if the sampling was sufficient for the purpose.

#### Chapter VIII: *Lutheran Youth and Lutheran Doctrine*

In eleven questions dealing with doctrine, without probing scope or depth of knowledge, Dr. Johnstone finds the concept of justification by grace through faith not clear in the minds of two-fifths of Lutheran young people. Dr. Merton Strommen reported similar results in a youth survey several years ago.

This finding points to a special need to emphasize this Scriptural doctrine in our teaching and preaching, both the doctrine itself and its implications for the Christian. The greatest joy comes to the Christian when he realizes that he is saved in spite of himself and that God loves him and has redeemed him as he is. Believing this, he has



the Christian faith. But we must also keep in mind that natural man is legalistic in outlook and that sin easily robs Christians of their joy of faith for a time; also that normally the Christian faith matures and that these same young people may 10 or 20 years later feel more sure of God's grace and their own salvation. Obviously this is a difficult area to explore, and it may call for research over a longer period of time.

A strong positive factor was revealed in the fact that 65 percent of those with "all parochial" school education understood that being sincere about what one believes is insufficient, while only 26 percent of "all public" students understood this. Even 65 percent leaves much to be desired.

On creation, the Bible, the real presence of our Lord's body and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, the "unity of Jesus Christ within the Trinity," and non-Christians entering heaven, the large majority of young people interviewed agreed with the understanding of these doctrines customarily held in the parent church body. Particularly the doctrine of the Real Presence has been "communicated within the church with a high degree of effectiveness," the author states.

But Johnstone concludes that any apparent differences in favor of parochial school education are traceable only to the family, except in the case of "marginal" families.

#### Chapter IX: *Lutheran Youth View Religious Questions*

Under this heading the author presents a variety of questions. About 80 percent of the young people reserve the right to question the doctrines of their church, but only 20.8 percent feel that The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod is too narrow in its views.

About two-thirds call for active church involvement in pressing social issues, and 61.6 percent feel that The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod is beginning to work effectively in this area. Only 16.8 percent believe that other churches have done better than their own in facing up to current social issues. There are questions on disarmament and world peace, the moral right to use hydrogen bombs in warfare, the church's in-

fluence in the world, church union, and other issues. In all these the research uncovered no substantial differences between those having received a parochial school education and others.

The vast majority agreed that one need not be a professional church worker, like a pastor, to be a good Christian and to serve God adequately in one's vocation. This portrays a wholesome Lutheran view. About two-thirds feel that serious disagreements exist between the Bible and science, indicating that many Lutheran youth will be under some strain to resolve the issue in their own minds.

In the exploration on dating and marriage, a significant difference showed up on interfaith dating and marriage. "Generally speaking, the more parochial school training youth have received, the less likely they are to approve of interfaith dating and marriage." This is a finding which was to be expected because young people date and marry people whom they know and with whom they meet socially. While this result may not be a planned effect of the parochial school, it is still a happy one because a common religious heritage is known to contribute to marital stability.

#### INTERPRETATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Dr. Johnstone's study has evoked and may continue to evoke extreme reactions. The person who has been opposed to Lutheran schools might be tempted to say "I told you so" without taking the trouble to look deeper. The person committed to the Christian day school might dismiss the study as just another case of opposition to such schools or even to Christian education.

In fairness to the author we must say that he does not consider Christian education lightly. In fact, he accepts "education to be the core of the church's task." We need not try to determine what his personal feelings are with respect to Lutheran parochial schools. We address ourselves only to the report. We have dealt somewhat extensively with the factual data of the report. We have occasionally touched on interpretations and implications, but more needs to be said regarding these.



The question is not if parochial schools have weaknesses. Any human institution has them, and the church school is no exception. Actually congregations, the Synod, and its Districts are devoting a great deal of effort to overcome the weaknesses and to accentuate the strengths. Moreover, a church school is likely to have the same weaknesses that the supporting church has, and any strengthening of the school requires strengthening of the church. Certainly the theory underlying the parochial school is sound from the theological and educational viewpoints. Dr. Johnstone states this in saying that "it is difficult to argue against the philosophy of the full-time Christian school on the basis of theological or theological grounds."

The question of how scientifically the study was designed and carried out we leave to the professional statisticians. However, whether attitudes, beliefs, and behavior can be determined with such scientific precision that reliable conclusions can be reached is an open question on which sociologists, theologians, and educators may disagree.

In considering the author's conclusions, it is essential to keep in mind that this is the first study of this magnitude to be made of Lutheran parochial schools but that even this study covered only 548 cases in two cities (St. Louis and Detroit). It was a small study compared with two recent Roman Catholic studies, and the small base may have affected the findings. The two cities may also have been too similar to tell the whole story. Both cities are large and both have many congregations maintaining Lutheran elementary schools and many congregations without schools. The congregations in each city maintain two Lutheran high schools. It is easily possible that a much larger study including a large sampling of Lutheran schools might show somewhat different results. It is also possible that in a city that has about an equal number of congregations with and without schools, the educational program in congregations without schools profits through close association with sister congregations that maintain schools. Benefits can come to non-school congregations through transfer of

members and purely through the example of high standards in neighboring congregations. It is possible that a study of schools in an area where nearly all Lutheran congregations provide school services, or in an area where no congregation provides these services, the results could have been different. The Johnstone study could not deal with this situation. On this and on other points more research is needed.

In many cases where parochial school education seemed to make a significant difference, Johnstone concludes that "the family experience, example, and instruction that were both prior to and contemporaneous with the parochial school experience were the crucial variables, not the parochial elementary or secondary school. Except for youth from families defined as 'marginal,' parochial education added nothing measurable to the extent of a youth's congregational involvement that he did not bring to the situation from his family background. For 'marginal' youth, on the other hand, parochial education showed significant positive effects." Since this finding is at variance with those of several other studies, including two recent larger Roman Catholic studies, we should hold judgment in abeyance until further research throws more light on the subject.

It may be difficult under any circumstances to determine which is family influence and which is school influence. Perhaps we have done a better job in the training of lay people than we thought, and perhaps our schools during the past have helped to produce better families, who in turn have tried to do a good job in child rearing at home. The author himself states: "The possibility that there is impact from the youth on the family is granted but not adequately tested." Certainly Scripture stresses the importance of family responsibility and family influence, and those who have followed Missouri Synod educational literature will know that educational leaders in the Synod and in the congregations have emphasized the importance of the family in Christian nurture. The church must continue to contend for a home-school partnership in all its educational agencies for children and young people in



order to aid both family and church educational efforts.

An issue with which the Johnstone study fails to deal satisfactorily is the cumulative effect of parochial school education. While there was some differentiation on time spent in the parochial school, there is no report of an exploration quite comparable to the Greeley-Rossi study (*The Education of Catholic Americans*), which shows a definite relationship between the results of a parochial school education and the length of time spent in Roman Catholic schools. Johnstone sees a "potentially great value in a public school education for our youth, particularly in the upper grades and at the high school level." This would, however, limit parochial school education too severely. Our effort should rather be to carry the Christian day school education as far as possible for all our young people in order to profit from the cumulative effects of parochial school education.

Some other suggestions are in order, and Johnstone calls attention to some of these: We must ask ourselves whom we are serving with our Lutheran schools. If a Lutheran education has a significant effect on children from "marginal" families, we should (without denying its help to those from more stable homes) make a much greater effort to enroll the children from "marginal" families. We should also make every effort to understand the needs of the inner city, to spend money for schools here, and to train personnel who can serve inner city congregations successfully, both in parochial schools and in other agencies of Christian education. At the same time we would do well to extend ourselves much more than we have ever done to enroll more unchurched children in our schools in order to serve the unchurched community.

Dr. Johnstone reminds us that in many congregations the percentage of children enrolled in the parochial school is small, and that often the children from "marginal" families are among those not attending. This suggests the need for every congregation to study its parish school enrollment situation and to bring this enrollment to the highest

possible point. But even after the most intensive effort to increase the enrollment in its school, nearly every congregation will have a sizable number of children who, for one reason or another, do not attend the school. What about these? Johnstone seems to feel that maintaining a school will cause many a congregation to neglect the children who do not attend the school. While some congregations may do this, it is not necessary for them to neglect anyone. There are many ways in which teachers in Lutheran schools can serve not only the pupils enrolled in their schools but other children and young people as well, and frequently they do serve them. The educational programs of Protestant denominations with few schools or none do not provide an answer for us, for generally speaking, they do not, in the absence of a school, make a comparatively greater impact with their part-time agencies. In fact, The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, in spite of the money its congregations spend on schools, compares rather favorably with other denominations in its emphasis on and use of the so-called part-time agencies (Sunday school, vacation Bible school, weekday school). In other words, emphasis on the school seems to be accompanied by an emphasis on other agencies of Christian education. A high commitment to Christian education by means of the Lutheran school, if the school is properly integrated with the congregation's overall objective, can help to strengthen the entire program of Christian education.

Dr. Johnstone raises a good point when he asks if the school is using basically the same format and content in religious instruction as the other agencies. His point is that the parochial school, to prove itself, must provide something distinctive and more significant than other agencies. He raises a similar question in the matter of educational method and philosophy. Truly, the Word does not "return void," but philosophy, method, and other externals can help to provide a favorable setting for the Word to be understood and lived by, and therefore we must be deeply concerned about them.

The author calls for more community in-



volvement. The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod recognized this need and spoke to it in a resolution at the 1965 Detroit convention. This resolution envisions broadening the enrollment base to provide for a greater non-Lutheran enrollment, using school facilities more extensively for part-time educational efforts and community services, and greater participation in community affairs. (Resolution 7-14)

The author appropriately calls for a much greater effort in adult education than most congregations put forth, particularly parent education. He asks: "Are we helping them (the parents) to help their children?" We cannot overemphasize the importance of this searching question. Deuteronomy 6 calls for a total commitment of parents in laying the responsibility of child training upon them. Therefore the church that contents itself with merely admonishing parents has carried out only half of its responsibility toward them. The church must teach parents, provide the opportunities for them to teach one another, and seek full involvement of parents and teachers in a common endeavor. A parent-teachers organization which often involves principally the parents with more than average commitment and competence, and too frequently only parents whose children attend the Lutheran school, is only a partial answer. What prevents congregations from setting up parent classes during the Sunday morning Bible class period? What prevents them from letting parents go on their own in these sessions, using volumes such as those provided in the "Parent Guidance Series" or other good materials? If there is a shortage of Bible class teachers, as is often the case, groups of parents can use these materials effectively with one parent designated to lead the discussion on a given Sunday. By such study parents can grow together in the Word of God and in their competence in child training. Congregations can guide parents and provide opportunities for them to study their problems and needs together and to grow together. Thereby the school and all agencies of Christian education will gain strength, and grace will flourish.

Dr. Johnstone discusses the possibility that

our schools have not sufficiently responded to changed circumstances and needs. This may be a sore point. Certainly we must adapt to changing situations, risk innovations, and stay abreast of current needs. The schools are always to serve the church's needs; the Word of God does not change, but certain specific needs of the church do. The Mission Affirmations adopted by the 1965 convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod point the way toward a fuller commitment. Lutheran school staffs throughout the Synod are being encouraged to study these affirmations during the current school year on the basis of guidelines provided by the Board of Parish Education. This is at least an effort to relate the school to the church's purpose.

In general, Dr. Johnstone feels that "it is difficult to see the Lutheran parochial school accomplishing a great deal today that is particularly outstanding." Many who have seen the benefits of the school in their own lives and in their own congregations would take sharp issue with this statement. Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi, researchers directing the National Opinion Center study of Roman Catholic schools, state that their study did not determine whether Catholic schools have been worth the tremendous effort in time and money that have gone into them, but they suggest as a more relevant question "whether there exists at the present time an alternative institution which would accomplish the same goals with less expenditure." Their implied answer is No.

One is reminded of testimonials like that of Adalbert R. Kretzmann in the *Lutheran Witness* (August 1966): "The witnessing power of the congregation is multiplied immeasurably by the ministry of our day school and the teachers of both the day school and the Sunday school. Without them the continued existence of the congregation could hardly be imagined. The school is a stabilizing influence, also because of the desires people have for the safety and health of their children." This school, St. Luke's of Chicago, Ill., was established in 1884 and has served the congregation notably for more than 80 years.



But what should impress us even more are the commands and promises of God—the commands for high standards in Christian education and God's promises to bless our honest efforts. Here we find our guidance, our encouragement, and our strength.

Overall, how shall one react to the Johnstone school study? Read it, make one's own judgment of the data presented, learn from it—yes! But let no one think that a small study of Lutheran schools provides all the answers. The Board of Parish Education of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in 1965 proposed a study of parish life and parish education that would include a study of the schools. Such a study might provide additional answers.

And what will be the future of our schools? We may expect that Lutheran con-

gregations will continue to support Christian day schools and that many individuals will make great sacrifices to maintain them. We may expect that no school will be perfect and that schools will vary in accomplishment, depending not only on God's blessing, but also on the quality of congregational support and the quality of teachers. But we may also expect that our schools will improve and that, to achieve this improvement, more congregations will engage in inter-parish efforts to provide stronger schools for neighboring congregations, circuits, or other units within the synodical organization.

In short, we may expect that our schools will continue to play an important part in helping our church fulfill its mission.

St. Louis



## A RESPONSE TO THE KRAMER REVIEW

RONALD L. JOHNSTONE

I was highly gratified to read William Kramer's sober analysis and sympathetic reaction to my study. If his reaction reflects the grappling of people in the church at all levels with the data, then a great deal of good can result. Dr. Kramer has read the report carefully and has accurately summarized the data in each chapter. In a most creditable way he has presented objectively both the data that might chide as well as the findings that might commend Lutheran parochial schools.

Further, I greatly appreciate his second section entitled: "Interpretations and Implications." Here he agrees with the necessity of asking seriously the questions that the survey suggests in Chapter X as necessary for Christian congregations to apply to their own situation as they engage in critical self-study. He also points out that "a church school is likely to have the same weaknesses that the supporting church has, and any strengthening of the school requires strengthening of the church." This touches on the underlying issue. I stated in the book that the issue is not a parochial school or no parochial school; rather it is Christian education itself—how best to do the most. Even more fundamental is the question of what the church is and what its tasks are today. Before we can go on supporting any form of ministry or any form of Christian education designed to achieve our goals, we have to know as clearly as we can where we are going, what we are doing, and why we are doing it. Dr. Kramer clearly subscribes to the importance of this point of view.

However, there remains the question of whether Dr. Kramer and I might possibly diverge even in the very asking of such questions as: What is the church? What are its purposes? How can the church best fulfill these purposes? Even to ask such questions implies—at least temporarily—that every liturgical form, every educational agency, every church structure is potentially expendable. Most understandably Kramer finds it

difficult to make the parochial school even potentially expendable. He is obviously absolutely convinced of its worth. However, as a researcher working with objective data I could not work from any such premise in my analysis. On the other hand, I have not suggested anything approaching a suspension of the parochial school system, even though a number of fundamental questions are raised by the study. My basic hope is that every congregation will look carefully to what it is doing as church, and that every Christian teacher will look carefully to what he is doing as educator. And here Kramer and I are clearly at one again.

But are there not always at least some points at which an author becomes unhappy with any review or any printed reaction to his work? Certainly. I find some too; but they are few.

Mr. Kramer refers several times to the Greeley and Rossi study of the impact of parochial schools within the Roman Catholic Church. At one point reference is made to the relatively small sample size of our study by comparison with theirs. At another point the issue of the cumulative effect of parochial school education is raised. Clarification is needed on both of these points and on a third as well.

(1) It is certainly true that our sample size is small by comparison with that of the Greeley and Rossi study. But this fact can be misleading. Our study is based on two cities; Greeley and Rossi drew a national sample. Therefore it needs to be pointed out that our sample of Lutheran youth is much larger proportionately than the Roman Catholic sample because our universe is much smaller. This also means of course that, strictly speaking, our data accurately represent only Detroit and St. Louis. Kramer points out that there may indeed be differences here or there in communities that differ in various ways from these two metropolitan centers. I would agree that there may be differences. But we can further hypothesize that the dif-



ferences would be neither great nor universal. Therefore, the burden of corroboration, refutation, or modification of either hypothesis rests with further research.

(2) I am not quite sure what Dr. Kramer is driving at in expressing his feeling that our study does not deal satisfactorily with the cumulative effect of parochial school education. It may be that he feels convinced that there is a cumulative effect that is not traceable in turn to the family and that because our study does not corroborate this it is inadequate. It should be pointed out that the primary independent variable in the study was inherently a measure of the cumulative effect of parochial school education. That is, those with little parochial school education should score lower than those with more. However, this often proved not to be the case. And when it did, the differences usually washed out for young people from "ideal" and modal families.

It should be noted further that the Greeley and Rossi study included Roman Catholic *college* education in reaching its conclusions regarding cumulative effect. Again, the Roman Catholic study drew primarily from an *adult* sample. These two points are potentially of great importance in adding qualifications to our data. But it must also be noted

that these very facts indicate that the Roman Catholic study and ours are not strictly comparable. Certainly, however, we are given direction for further intensive research. This, I think, is what Mr. Kramer is ultimately suggesting by pointing out the area of potential cumulative effect.

(3) I have earlier commended Dr. Kramer for his thoroughness and fairness in summarizing the findings. In calling for further research, however, and in noting that our study ought not be interpreted as the final word, he made no mention of my suggestions for further research briefly discussed in a Postscript to Chapter X. If my expression of the need for further research is not a clear trumpet call, then I hope Kramer's is. At least I want to join in that call as best I can. Certainly no one, least of all I, would suggest that this study is the final word. But it does provide a base line that we have not had before.

Therefore my hope is that further research on many of the questions raised by this study will be inaugurated soon. This is second only to the hope that this study will stimulate congregations to look carefully at how they are implementing the educational imperatives God has given them.

St. Louis