

Lesley University

DigitalCommons@Lesley

Educational Studies Dissertations

Graduate School of Education (GSOE)

Winter 11-25-2017

An Examination of the Instruction of Religion Clause Issues in Massachusetts Teacher Education Programs

Matthew E. Henry

Lesley University, mhenry7@lesley.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lesley.edu/education_dissertations



Part of the [Constitutional Law Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Education Law Commons](#), [First Amendment Commons](#), [Religion Commons](#), [Religion Law Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Henry, Matthew E., "An Examination of the Instruction of Religion Clause Issues in Massachusetts Teacher Education Programs" (2017). *Educational Studies Dissertations*. 128.

https://digitalcommons.lesley.edu/education_dissertations/128

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) at DigitalCommons@Lesley. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Studies Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Lesley. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@lesley.edu, cvrattos@lesley.edu.

An Examination of the Instruction of Religion Clause Issues in Massachusetts Teacher
Education Programs

A Dissertation Presented
By

Matthew E. Henry

Submitted to the Graduate School of Education

Lesley University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

October 2017

Ph.D. Educational Studies
Educational Leadership Specialization

An Examination of the Instruction of Religion Clause Issues in Massachusetts Teacher Education
Programs

Matthew E. Henry

Graduate School of Education
Lesley University

Ph.D. Educational Studies
Educational Leadership Specialization

Approvals

*In the judgment of the following signatories, this Dissertation meets the academic standards that
have been established for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.*

John H. Ciesluk, Ed. D. _____	_____
Senior Advisor	Date

Paul Naso, Ed. D. _____	_____
Committee Member	Date

Erik Owens, Ph.D. _____	_____
Committee Member	Date

Stephen Gould, Ed.D. _____	_____
Director, Ph.D. Educational Leadership	Date

Brenda Matthis, Ed.D. _____	_____
Director, Ph.D. Educational Studies	Date

Jonathon H. Gillette, Ph.D. _____	_____
Dean, Graduate School of Education	Date

© Matthew E. Henry
All rights reserved

Abstract

The prevailing research, as well as reported complaints of academic, civic, personal, and social harm, indicates that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. This study investigated how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. The institutional documents presented to preservice teachers were collected from four teacher education programs in the Commonwealth. An evaluation tool— synthesized from the leading scholarship and research on the relationship between the religion clauses, public education, and teacher education programs—proposes 24 competencies by which preservice teachers should be evaluated for proficiency in addressing religion clause issues. Using this evaluation tool, this study employs a methodology of qualitative document analysis. The documentation provided by the participating TEPs, as well as the Commonwealth’s Candidate Assessment of Performance’s Professional Standards for Teachers, functioned as the unit of analysis. These documents were analyzed to ascertain the degree to which religion clause issues are addressed within their contents. This study resulted in four major findings related to the prevalence of the proposed competencies’ Categories (Curriculum and Content, Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, Legal and Legislative Knowledge) and Domains (Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes) within the institutional documentation surveyed. Findings also address how the Commonwealth’s Professional Standards for Teachers could be aligned with the proposed religion clause competencies. The implications of this study are relevant for educational professionals, policy makers, and concerned community members. This study asserts that more must be done to move the professional practice of preservice teachers from mere concern and

self-reflection about the diversity of student worldviews, into measurable actions. It also presents a “bottom-up” proposal for how constituents most directly impacted by TEPs can advocate for such change to be implemented.

Keywords: Religion Clauses, First Amendment, teacher education, preservice teachers, student worldviews, bottom-up, professional competencies, professional standards

DEDICATION

To “my kids”: past, present, and future.

יְבָרְכֶךָ יְהוָה וַיְשַׁמְרֶךָ
יְאֵר יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ וַיַּחַנֶּךָ
יֵשָׂא יְהוָה פָּנָיו אֵלֶיךָ וַיִּשֶׂם לְךָ שְׁלוֹם

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many individuals who ushered my research to completion. It is with deepest gratitude that I acknowledge my doctoral committee for their patience, guidance, and unwavering support. First, I would like to thank my Senior Advisor, Dr. John Ciesluk, for shepherding this project and helping me to articulate my thoughts. Second, Dr. Paul Naso for always finding and asking the right question to challenge my thinking. Third, Dr. Erik Owens for his First Amendment expertise, and promise to join my doctoral committee two years before I entered a doctoral program. I also thank my professors at Lesley University for the insight their courses brought to my research, as well as my professional and personal growth. Similarly I thank my 2014 cohort for the familial encouragement and competition. Thank you to the faculty of the teacher education programs willing to take part in this study for their institutional documentation, conversations, and occasional emails of support. A special thank you goes to colleagues, past and present, for their encouragement and support over the last few years. I would especially like to thank and acknowledge my wife, who consistently supported and encouraged me through my doctoral process. And last, I acknowledge Tom Cat, Black Cat, and Juno: all mistakes herein are from one of you stepping on my keyboard.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iv
Dedication	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables and Figures	xi
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	 1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Religion Clause Issues in Public Schools	4
The Civic Need for Religion Clause Instruction in Teacher Education Programs	7
Where to Go From Here	9
Purpose of the Study	9
Research and Guiding Questions	10
Research Hypothesis	10
Definition of Terms	12
Significance of the Study	16
Method	17
Delimitations	19
Chapter Outlines	19
 CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	 21
Introduction	21
Part 1: Teacher Preparation from the American Colonial Era to the Present	22
The Birth of Teacher Preparation: Mid 1600s – 1800	23
The Formative Years: 1800 –1860	24
The second great awakening	25
The Sunday School movement	26
The common school and the shift to secularism	27
When “nonsectarian” means “pan-protestant” and “anti-Catholic”	32
An Awkward Adolescence: 1860- 1940	35
Secular Americanization in public schools	36
The secularist shift in school books	38
Catholics and the common school crisis	40
<i>Minor v Board of Education</i>	41
<i>The Blaine Amendment</i>	43
Secularism in progressive era educational theory	45
The legal climate	48
A Quarter-Life Crisis: Post-1940 litigation and the new culture war	49
1948-1987: The “separationist logic” of the supreme court	51
<i>Engel v. Vitale and the prayer cases</i>	52
<i>Abington School District v. Schempp and the bible cases</i>	53
1987-2001: The “equal access logic” of the supreme court	57

The Present Realities	60
The absence of federal mandates on public schools' religion clause issues	61
State mandates on public schools' religion clause issues	62
Part 2: Current Questions and Suggestions for Teacher Education for Religion Clause Instruction	65
Questions in School Policy and Practice	66
Suggestions for School Policy and Practice	69
Summary	83
 CHAPTER THREE: METHOD	85
Overview of Design	85
The Research and Guiding Questions	85
Rationale for Design	86
Instrumentation	91
The Administrative Page	93
Competencies, Domains and, Categories	93
Measurement	94
Participants	97
Delimitation and Limitations	99
Data Collection	100
Data Analysis	100
Role of Researcher	101
Summary	104
 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	106
Introduction	106
Analysis of Professional Standards for Teachers	109
Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment Standard	110
Teaching All Students Standard	113
Family and Community Engagement Standard	115
Professional Culture Standard	117
Discussion of Finding #1	119
Analysis of TEP A	119
Curriculum and Content	120
Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	121
Legal and Legislative Knowledge	122
Synthesis of TEP A Documentation	124
Analysis of TEP B	125
Curriculum and Content	125
Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	127
Legal and Legislative Knowledge	128
Synthesis of TEP B Documentation	129
Analysis of TEP C	130
Curriculum and Content	130

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	131
Legal and Legislative Knowledge	132
Synthesis of TEP C Documentation	132
Analysis of TEP D	133
Curriculum and Content	134
Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	134
Legal and Legislative Knowledge	135
Synthesis of TEP D Documentation	136
Synthesis of Data for TEPs A-D	137
Discussion of Findings # 2-4	141
Summary	144
 CHAPTER FIVE: STUDY SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, FUTURE RESEARCH, AND FINAL REFLECTIONS	 146
Introduction	146
Study Summary	148
Discussion	151
Implications of Finding #1	152
Implications of Finding #2	154
Implications of Finding #3	155
Implications of Finding #4	157
A Bottom-Up Proposal for Implementing Change in TEPs	159
Future Research	166
Final Reflections	168
“Where We Are Today”	169
“A Powerful Urge”	172
“A Radical Change”	173
 APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Religion Clause Competencies TEP Evaluation Tool	180
Appendix B: First Contact Email	185
Appendix C: Follow-up Email	186
Appendix D: Agreement to Participate in Research	187
Appendix E: Evaluation Tool Key	189
Appendix F: Proposed Imbedding of Religion Clause Competencies within the Professional Standards for Teachers	191
 References	 195

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 3.1 TEP Document Type and Number	100
Table 4.1 Proposed Competencies in the Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment Standard	111
Table 4.2 Proposed Competencies in the Teaching All Students Standard	113
Table 4.3 Proposed Competencies in the Family and Community Engagement Standard	115
Table 4.4 Proposed Competencies in the Professional Culture Standard	117
Table 4.5 TEP A Curriculum and Content Ratings	120
Table 4.6 TEP A Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Ratings	121
Table 4.7 TEP A Legal and Legislative Knowledge Ratings	123
Table 4.8 TEP B Curriculum and Content Ratings	126
Table 4.9 TEP B Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Ratings	127
Table 4.10 TEP B Legal and Legislative Knowledge Ratings	129
Table 4.11 TEP C Curriculum and Content Ratings	130
Table 4.12 TEP C Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Ratings	131
Table 4.13 TEP C Legal and Legislative Knowledge Ratings	132
Table 4.14 TEP D Curriculum and Content Ratings	134
Table 4.15 TEP D Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	135
Table 4.16 TEP D Legal and Legislative Knowledge	136
Table 4.17 Comparison of Curriculum and Content Competencies Across TEPs	138
Table 4.18 Comparison of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies Across TEPs	138
Table 4.19 Comparison of Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies Across TEPs	139
Table 4.20 Competency Presence in TEP Documentation	139
Table 4.21 Proposed Competencies Absent from TEP Documentation	141

Figure 5.1 A Bottom-Up Approach

161

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The religion clauses of the First Amendment state “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” These 16 words have profound significance to the maintenance of individual liberty and American democracy, but have also been a source of distrust and divisiveness within the public school setting.

As both student and teacher, I have lived with feet in both religious and secular education. I attended a private Christian school for Pre-K and kindergarten, before spending 1st through 12th grade in public schools. After high school, I attended a private Christian college where I obtained a degree in education. Upon graduation, I taught for seven years as a public school teacher— literature, creative writing, philosophy, ethics, sociology, comedy—while gaining a Masters of Fine Arts in Poetry from a religious university. The next six years were spent as a professor of education at my undergraduate alma mater (religious), during which time I completed a Masters of Arts in Theological Studies (religious) and began a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership (secular). During my time as a professor, I began to read in earnest about education law, especially the rights of public school students as well as the rights of teachers. Through personal study, professional workshops, seminary classes, and doctoral research, I began to reflect on my own career as a public school student, a public school teacher, and a preparer of future teachers. Specifically, I wondered how the worldviews of public school students are protected under the religion clauses.

Reflection brings clarity. I could pinpoint the numerous examples of religion clause violations by my public school teachers throughout my educative history. I could also enumerate when coworkers and administrators trampled the rights of public school students, and when my

own worldviews were unfairly hindered by administrators. I was also faced with my own unintentional failures in the face of the law, times when my knowledge, skills, or attitudes were lacking in regards to the worldview well-being of high school students. While I am only able to ascribe motivations for myself, being generous, I believe that these things happened because the educators involved had never been instructed in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to combat these types of failures.

I took these reflections into my life as a professor of education at a private Christian institution. My personal faith linked me to my college students, not because all students believed the same set of propositions or practiced the same religious rituals that I did. Rather, there was an underlying numinous worldview which functioned as a shared baseline. As a Christian who was a professor of education, one of my passions was to teach and model how to be a person of faith in a public school setting in light of the Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses of the Constitution— though I did not receive this sort of education, a fact that has impacted my career. As a result, I changed courses in our program of study to incorporate multiple aspects of education law in general, but also to provide a specific focus on the religion clauses, training preservice teachers to be religious reflective practitioners. Diagnostic assessments of undergraduate and graduate students' knowledge and perception of school-based legal and civic matters related to the religion clauses showed the need for such instruction, but also reflected violations of the law I had witnessed in my own past, and continued to observe in national media coverage of school controversies and lawsuits.

Recently, I returned to the public high school setting. My doctoral coursework has allowed me to conduct a small focus group with my current colleagues about their knowledge and perception of education law in the area of the religion clauses. To a person, they expressed

their utter lack of knowledge, faulting their teacher education programs for the gap. They also discussed their efforts to avoid situations which may lead them into the opaque waters of the religion clauses, and the fear of encountering an upset student, parent, community member, or school administrator because they unintentionally ran afoul of the law.

This study addressed the problem that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. Failures in these areas are myriad, resulting in not only the violation of student civil rights, leading to personal and academic harm for the individual public school student, but also resulting in social and civic harm in the local and national community. The results of this study argue that the primary cause of these failures is the lack of appropriate training from teacher education programs [TEPs], and posits recommendations for TEPs to rectify these deficits.

This study includes an illumination of the Statement of the Problem summarized above; an explanation of the Purpose of the Study, including Research Questions and a Research Hypothesis; a Definition of Terms; the Significance of Study; the Limitations and Delimitations of the Study, a Review of Literature, the Methods and Procedures of the study, and a Chapter Outline of the Dissertation.

Statement of the Problem

The following narrative exemplifies the problem that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. Failures in these areas are myriad, resulting in not only the violation of student civil rights (leading to personal and academic harm for the individual public school student), but also social and civic harm in the local and national community.

Religion Clause Issues in Public Schools

A Texan middle school social studies teacher receives national attention for teaching about the Islamic faith, discussing the difference between freedom fighters and terrorists, and most notably for allowing students to try on Middle Eastern clothing. Pictures of American students in Middle Eastern garb set off a media firestorm dubbed “burkagate.” The teacher was accused of indoctrinating students into Islamic worship, downplaying the violence supposedly inherent to Islam, and supporting the subjugation of women in Muslim countries. Though receiving support from many in the school community, the teacher— who was compared to Adolph Hitler and Mexican drug cartel leaders— took early retirement at the end of the year (Wertheimer, 2015).

During a Michigan high school's "Anti-Bullying Day," a teacher removed a student from class after the student repeatedly stated that he did not accept gays because of his religious faith. Before his removal from class, the student was told that he was entitled to his religious views, but that his current message was inappropriate for class. A federal district court held that the teacher had violated the student's First Amendment rights. The school district issued the teacher a reprimand, suspended him for one day, and required him to participate in First Amendment training ("Glowacki v. Howell Public School District," 2013).

A Tennessee high school teacher assigned a research paper to her English class wherein students could choose their own topic. One student submitted an outline for a paper entitled "The Life of Jesus," which the teacher rejected. The student subsequently handed in a final paper entitled, “A Scientific and Historical Approach to the Life of Jesus Christ,” however, the teacher refused to read the paper and gave it a zero. Among the reasons cited for the grade, the teacher included that (a) “the student’s personal views would hinder her from writing an objective paper

and would receive any criticism of the paper as an attack on her religion,” (b) “personal religion is not an appropriate thing to do in public school,” (c) the student’s “knowledge of Jesus would hinder deeper research on the topic,” (d) “it is illegal to talk about religious issues in the classroom,” and (e) the student “would only rely on the Bible for research and would not meet the four-source requirement of the assignment.” After exhausting the appeals process within the school system, the student’s father brought suit against the school, claiming that his daughter's free speech rights had been infringed ("Settle v. Dickson County School Board," 1995).

At a Louisiana high school, serving grades K through 12, teachers routinely ask students for professions of faith in class and lead students in Christian prayer. Explicitly Christian posters and paintings of Jesus Christ adorn the interior and exterior walls of the school building, as well as a scrolling electronic marquee displaying daily Bible verses. Within a particular science classroom, a Buddhist student felt uncomfortable because the teacher presented the Bible as a scientific resource. She told student that “the Big Bang never happened,” and that “evolution is a ‘stupid’ theory that ‘stupid people made up because they don’t want to believe in God.’” When challenged by the student, the teacher said that Buddhism was also “stupid,” and attempted to convert the student to Christianity. When the parents of the student brought their concerns to the superintendent of schools, no disciplinary or corrective actions were taken. Instead the superintendent explained that the family lives in the Bible belt and they “would simply have to accept that teachers would proselytize students.” She also proposed two alternatives to the family: they could either convert to Christianity, or transfer their child to district school, over 25 miles away, where “there are more Asians” ("Lane v. SABINE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD," 2014).

Journalists and scholars have documented the many examples of student, teacher, parent, and administrative confusion and discomfort in regard to how the Free Exercise and Establishment clauses of the U.S. Constitution should be enacted in the public school classroom, especially at the middle and secondary levels (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Bryant, 2012; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a; Kaiser, 2003; Marty & Moore, 2000; Militello, Schimmel, & Eberwein, 2009; Moore, 2007; Nash, 1999; Nord, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Patterson & Stewart-Wells, 2015; Sproul et al., 2012; Wertheimer, 2015). This is evidenced by in-school situations that regularly result in an apologetic conversation between various stakeholders (in the best cases), but have also led to prolonged legal battles, Supreme Court rulings, and intense media coverage of political posturing, rioting, and even murders— though this last has not been reported since the 19th century. The above examples demonstrate this reality as well.

In the first, misinformation and media hype aside, the legal question present is whether this teacher was sponsoring or indoctrinating religious belief in her students in violation of the Establishment Clause, or merely providing them with a contextual understanding of the culture being studied. The second and third cases dealt with a student's freedom of expression and free exercise of religion in the classroom ("Tinker v. Des Moines Sch. Dist.," 1969) when these rights appear to conflict with teachers' educational aims. The former raises concerns over how community cohesion, classroom management and organization is maintained, while the latter are focused on teacher decisions in regards to coursework, the bounds and rationale for teacher pedagogy, and a teacher's misunderstanding of the law. The final example deals with the establishment clause, as it is an example of the state (the school) enacting policies and procedures that aid and shows preference for one religion over another. No student, no family,

should have their religious worldviews impeded through tacit school actions and policies, to say nothing of being actively repressed by teachers who verbally disparage a students' religion or attempt to convert them. To this is added the concern of families and/or community members who feel the worldviews they would like to instill in their children are at odds with the education or policies of their school/district (S. L. Carter, 1993; Edlin, 1994; Greenawalt, 2005; Marty & Moore, 2000; Nash, 1999; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Randall, 2013).

These sorts of troubles are not new to the nation, as is shown in the Review of Literature which comprises Chapter Two of this study. Chapter Two presents the history and nature of teacher preparation from the American colonial era to the present, examining the sociological realities that shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed to address students' numinous and secular worldviews. It also examines recent arguments for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion the clause issues. In advance of this historical perspective, it is important at this juncture to examine the civic need for religion clause instruction in TEPs.

The Civic Need for Religion Clause Instruction in Teacher Education Programs

Part of the job of public school teachers is to teach their student how to be good local and global citizens: to combat the religiously-illiterate, intolerant, uneducated, anti-intellectual screeds which can tear communities and this nation apart (Bryant, 2012; S. L. Carter, 1993; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Macedo, 2000; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nash, 1999; Noddings, 1993; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; Wilson, 2011). Thus, American public schools should educate their students with the same ethos rooted in religion clause research and literature suggested for preservice teachers; that public school students should not only engage in the academic study of disparate worldviews, without an

imposition of specific devotional practices (Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998), but they should also, in appropriate content area classes, be taught methods of engaging their own worldviews, in addition to learning about and respectfully engaging the worldviews of others (Anderson, 2004; Greenawalt, 2005; Kunzman, 2006; Marty & Moore, 2000; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007). However this is accomplished, scholars and researchers widely agree that TEPs need to educate preservice teachers to respect the various issues that can arise from a discussion of students' worldviews, while also providing the pedagogical and legal foundations wherein they can best uphold the academic and Constitutional rights of public school students in this area (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; S. L. Carter, 1993; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Fraser, 1999; Garner, 2000; S. K. Green, 2012; Greenawalt, 2005; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a, 1997b; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Henderson, Gullatt, Hardin, Jannik, & Tollett, 1999; Hufford, 2010; Kaiser, 2003; Kunzman, 2006; Luke, 2004; Marks, Binkley, & Daly, 2014; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; Sears & Carper, 1998; Taft, 2011; Waggoner, 2013; Wertheimer, 2015; White, 2009, 2013).

Not only is there a need for TEPs to educate preservice teachers about religion clause issues, but there is also a need for the faculty in these programs to embrace a pedagogical ethos that includes the protection of public school students' worldviews for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001;

Kunzman, 2006; Marks et al., 2014; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; White, 2013).

Where to Go From Here

The preceding section argued that TEPs need to educate preservice teachers about religion clause issues, and that TEP faculty need to embrace a pedagogical ethos that includes the protection of public school students' worldviews for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons. Beyond the potential for litigation on the aforementioned grounds, there is the often-cited civic reality. When TEPs properly educate preservice teachers in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to addressing students' worldviews, those teachers are better prepared to stem the tide of the nation becoming more polarized and fractious.

It is clear to me that TEPs need to better equip their students with the skills and understandings that will enable them to handle the above realities in their professional lives. What follows is an explanation of my intent of the research I conducted into how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos, as well as the degree to which religion clause issues are addressed in TEPs, as measured by competencies drawn from available literature and research.

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos. In addition, it ascertained the degree to which religion clause issues are addressed in TEPs, as measured by competencies drawn from available literature and research compared to the documentation provide by TEPs.

Research and Guiding Questions

The primary research question of this study is

- How do TEPs in Massachusetts instruct preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos as codified in their institutional documentation?

The following additional questions were intended to guide this research study; the answers to which were primarily drawn from the relevant literature and TEP documentation:

1. With what knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues should preservice teachers enter their professional lives?
2. What are the issues related to the religion clauses which apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos?
3. How do TEPs in MA educate teachers in relevant constitutional law and jurisprudence on the religion clauses, and how is that documented?
4. How do TEPs in MA document the manner in which they instruct theories of pedagogical strategies for engaging students' worldviews?

Research Hypothesis

The research hypothesis this study addressed was that the targeted TEPs do not consistently and specifically address, instruct, and train preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. This claim was measured by the documents provided by the TEPs. The belief was held that the documentation and artifacts from TEPs, when touching upon education law, focus on areas other than the religion clauses, such as special education law, teacher conduct and liability, school

discipline, student health and well-being (Gajda, 2008; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a, 1997b; Militello et al., 2009; Wagner, 2007). If and when religion clause issues are present they are subsumed under the heading of “multiculturalism” (Anderson, 2008; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Moore, 2007; White, 2009, 2013), even though numinous worldviews are sometimes ignored in multiculturalism curriculum (Anderson, 2008; White, 2009).

It was also hypothesized that there are not required courses within TEPs where religion clause issues relevant to public school classrooms are documented as a regular component of the curriculum. That is, whole courses where religion clause issues are the specific focus. This deficiency is present in educational philosophy/history courses, curriculum courses, content area pedagogy courses, and/or classroom management courses. This hypothesis is consistent with the prevailing research (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Gajda, 2008; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a, 1997b; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Henderson et al., 1999; Luke, 2004; Marks et al., 2014; Marty & Moore, 2000; Militello et al., 2009; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Taft, 2011; Wagner, 2007, 2008).

The following Chapters will show that the research hypothesis as a whole, and in these individual parts, were all validated. The documentation of the TEPs in this study did not consistently or specifically display an adequate ability to address, instruct, and train preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. When touching upon education law, focus was on areas other than the religion clauses; when religion clause issues were present in TEP documentation, they were largely subsumed under some form of “multiculturalism” in the institution, not as a separate entity. In addition, there were no required courses within TEPs where specific religion clause

issues relevant to public school classrooms are documented as a regular component of the curriculum.

Definition of Terms

Professional Ethos

The term *professional ethos* is used almost synonymously with the term *attitudes* elsewhere in this paper, in the context of preservice teacher training. It refers to the beliefs which undergird the knowledge and skills exhibited by public school teachers, in this instance beliefs rooted in the religion clauses. These beliefs include seeing the value in public school teachers teaching their student how to be good local and global citizens, students engaging in the academic study of disparate worldviews, without an imposition of specific devotional practices (Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998), and teachers honoring and protecting the worldviews of public school students' for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Kunzman, 2006; Marks, et al., 2014; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; White, 2013). Professional ethos is also roughly synonymous with the term *dispositions* used in education literature. Use of that term was eschewed to distance this research project from the contention surrounding the use of that term, especially as this work argues for education of preservice teachers which stems from Constitutional considerations, that is professional responsibilities rooted in work as a public, government employee. The contention around the term dispositions can travel further afield than my narrow usage.

Numinous

Relying in part on the work of Rudolph Otto (1950) *numinous* is defined here as the apprehension of otherness in an object or experience, exposing a distinction between the experiencer and the thing perceived. It is most often connected with what is considered the divine or sacred, as opposed to the ordinary or secular (Rowe, Wainwright, & Ferm, 1998; Wainwright, 1999). As significance beyond the normal categories of experience are created, the numinous object or experience the individual is “confronted with something alive, vital, and active” (Rowe et al., 1998, p. 356). The numinous is “the sense that gives its emotional depth and life to the experience of worship in all religions” (Hick, 1990, p. 514). In this paper, the term numinous encompasses the categories of *religious* and *spiritual* beliefs.

Religion Clauses

The religion clauses of the Constitution—the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause—state “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” In part, the *Establishment Clause* prohibits schools from enacting policies and procedures that aid or shows preference for one religion over another, unduly aids or shows preference for religion over nonreligion, or unduly aids or shows preference for nonreligion over religion. In part, the *Free Exercise Clause* protects the religious beliefs and actions of students from undue intrusion from school personnel.

Religion

Anderson (2004) outlined a three-part definition for religion based on a set of beliefs, actions (“doing”), and moral/ethical character (“being”) (pp. 32-33). Greenawalt’s (2005) triumvirate is stated as “claims,” “practices,” and “secondary religious propositions” detailing how individuals should live (pp. 67-77). Nord and Haynes (1998) took a different path, defining

religion as three generalizations: that (a) “ultimate reality” is beyond the normal bounds of scientific categories, (b) religion has an effect on all areas of the practitioner’s life, and (c) religion holds fundamental importance for all, not just scholars and practitioners in the field (p. 4). They go further to list Smart’s seven dimensions of religion: doctrines, sacred narratives, ethics, ritual, religious experience, social institutions, and art/material culture (Nord & Haynes, 1998, p. 49). Similarly, Marty (2000) included “ultimate concern,” “community,” “myth and symbol,” “rite and ceremony,” and “behavioral correlates” to his definition (pp. 8-11), while Carter (1993) explained religion as “a traditional group of worship (as against individual metaphysics) that presupposes the existence of a sentience beyond the human and capable of acting outside of the observed principals and limits of natural science, and, further, a tradition that makes demands of some kind on its adherents” (p. 17). All of these definitions are useful as I will not be delving deeply into what is or is not religion, as the larger category of *worldview* is the main concern of this paper.

Secular

The word *secular* means “‘of the world’... as opposed to ‘of the church,’ ‘of the spiritual world,’ or ‘of eternity’” (James C. Carper, Hunt, & Praeger (Westport Conn.), 2009, p. 407). From this foundation, Anderson (2004) differentiates between *secularization* and *secularism*, defining the former as the cultural process wherein a shift toward the secular takes place, and the latter as “a worldview that is contending with various theistic worldviews” (p. 108). In philosophical, theological and civic debate, secularism comes in two forms: *philosophical secularism* and *institutional or constitutional secularism*. *Philosophical secularism* is “a worldview, a philosophical or ideological system within which it is unreasonable to believe in God” (James C. Carper et al., 2009, p. 407), while *institutional or constitutional secularism* is the

belief that institutions like government— and by extension public education— should be free from religious authority, without making a claim about the existence of god(s).

Spiritual

Kessler (2000) defined *spiritual* in a way not linked to particular religions or worldviews, in the hopes of circumventing debates about Establishment Clause violations. She discussed the “inner life” of the student, the nonphysical “longing for something more,” but does not provide “a metaphysical definition of soul or spirit” (p. x). Agreeing with Anderson (2004), I reject this definition as not accomplishing its aims for, as Kessler admits, the spirituality of many is “inextricably linked to their particular faiths and doctrines”(Kessler, 2000, p. xiv). However, Kessler also speaks of the “inner life” of students which is “intimately bound up with matters of meaning, purpose, and connection, with creative expression and moments of joy and transcendence,” which applies to all students, whether or not they self-identify as “religious” or “spiritual” (p. xvii). Though the distinction between this term and *religion* is important many, the broader concept of *worldview* is of primary significance in this paper.

Teacher Education Program

For the majority of this paper the term *teacher education program* refers to all programs that lead toward the licensure of public classroom teachers. This ranges from traditional higher education programs to alternative/practice/district based initiatives, and includes undergraduate and graduate, baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate, K-12 licensure routes across core content areas (e.g. English, math, social studies, sciences, etc.).

Worldview

Following Nord (2010), this paper uses the term *worldview* to describe a comprehensive interpretation of the world, of reality— and its categories provide a contrasting view to that of

other worldviews. A worldview isn't simply a collection of beliefs; it is more or less systematically structured. It possesses a measure of coherence; its elements are mutually reinforcing. Worldviews cohere intellectually, culturally, institutionally, and emotionally. They are entangled with how we experience the world and how we make sense of our lives. They orient us in life. They make sense of the world for us. They tell us who we are; they give us identity (p. 89). Nord goes on to list Christianity, Marxism, and modern science as examples of worldviews.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because previous studies have not addressed the problem of public school teachers lacking the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes in religion clause issues by investigating TEPs curriculum directly. Previous studies have focused on the attitudes and legal knowledge of in-service teachers (Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; Davis & Williams, 1992; Littleton, 2008; Luke, 2004; Maclin, 2012; Taft, 2011; Wilson, 2011), the legal knowledge and attitudes of preservice teachers (Eckes, 2008; Garner, 2000; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Wagner, 2007, 2008), as well as other research into the attitudes and legal knowledge of other stakeholders in the educational community (e.g. principals, superintendents, school board members), as well as perceptions of religion clause issues in public schools (McAvoy, 2010; Militello et al., 2009; Swick, 2009). Previous studies have not addressed what is documented in TEPs' curriculum itself. This is the first investigation into how TEPs codify the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues that preservice teachers should possess as they enter their professional lives. And it is the first investigation into the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues possessed by TEPs' teaching faculty. This study addresses these two gaps in the research, though it primarily focuses on the former.

This study is designed to provide important information to a host of overlapping stakeholders. Teacher education program personnel in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will directly benefit, as this research is geared toward their professional practice in training preservice teachers. As a result, this information also has significance for TEP personnel nationwide. Similarly, public school policymakers on the local, state, and federal levels will also benefit from this research. This includes principals, teachers, superintendents, and school boards of middle and secondary schools in districts hiring from teacher education programs—who are already concerned about religion clause issues in the public schools, as well as those for whom it is an unknown unknown—and first Amendment scholars and researchers. These individuals directly benefit from the research for Gajda's (2008) previous presented reasons: "If school law is to be addressed in any substantial way by state standards and mandated assessments, professors of education law and lawyers must work collaboratively with professors of education, curriculum developers, practicing professionals, test developers, and licensure personnel" (2008, p. 23).

Method

The design of this study entailed a collective case study approach. It evolved as a multisite case study (Creswell, 2013) conducted at a sample of four TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts offering undergraduate baccalaureate programs in middle (grade 5-8) and/or secondary (grade 8-12) toward an Initial License. These programs are located in the "Greater Boston area" as defined by Metropolitan Area Planning Council. These programs offer one or more of the following Initial License paths: biology, (8-12), chemistry (8-12), English (5-8), English (8-12), history (5-8), history (8-12), middle school humanities (5-8), physics (8-12). This study compared the documentation collected from different TEPs. As such, the unit of analysis for this study is the documentation provided by the participating TEPs to determine if and how

religion clause issues are presented to preservice teacher in these institutions. Documentation was collected through Dropbox and email.

As qualitative document analysis methodology advocates the use of a protocol for the systematic analysis of documents “to clarify themes, frames, and discourse” (Altheide, Coyle, DeVriese, & Schneider, 2008, p. 130), an evaluation tool was created based on the research and literature on TEPs’ inclusion of religion clause issues in curriculum (see Appendix A). The evaluation tool was created from the review of the research and literature on TEPs’ inclusion of religion clause issues in their curriculum, followed by a compilation of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes on religion clause issues recommended by scholars/researchers for implementation in TEPs; the evaluation tool is a synthesis of those knowledge, skills, and attitudes. As described above, the composition and implementation of the evaluation tool serve to address the guiding research questions of this study. This evaluation tool was used to systematically analyze the collected materials to ascertain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes on religion clause issues included in the TEP documentation.

A content analysis of each artifact provided by the TEPs was conducted using the evaluation tool, according to each of the competencies drawn from the available research and literature. The degree to which the artifact included or omitted each competency, as well as the degree to which a competency was promoted as important within the TEP, was assessed for each document on the four-point scale. A thematic analysis was conducted for each institution by aggregating the results of the individual documents in each competency, presenting percentages of how institutional documentation displays the competencies. This provides an overall picture of how each TEP codifies their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos in their

institutional documentation. A detailed reporting of this thematic analysis is presented in Chapter Four.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to include a sample of TEPs in MA. A full explanation of the process of this delimitation is addressed in the Design of the Study, but suffice to say that my original aim to research all TEPs within MA proved to be infeasible. Also, to be explained in greater depth in the Design of the Study, my research used an evaluation tool to analyze the collected documentation from the targeted TEPs to ascertain to what degree religion clause issues are addressed in instructing preservice teachers. By design this study did not account for the perspectives of TEP personnel, nor does it account for the perspectives of preservice teachers enrolled in targeted TEPs. However, researcher bias within the creation and implementation of the evaluation tool was recognized, and attempts were made to bracket those biases.

Chapter Outlines

Chapter One presents the argument that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the Religion Clauses of the U.S. Constitution. It provides my personal background and interest in the topic. It also presents the importance and Purpose of the Study, Definition of Terms, the Significance of the study, and the Design of the Study, including the limitation and delimitations.

Chapter Two provides a review of the literature relevant that examines the relationship between TEPs and the worldviews of public school students, specifically how preservice teachers are prepared to navigate issues related to the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. This chapter is divided into two main section. The first presents the history and nature of teacher preparation from the American colonial era to the present, examining the sociological realities that shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed to address students' numinous

and secular worldviews. The second section examines recent arguments for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion the clause issues. It is from this literature and research that this dissertation's evaluation tool finds the measures for it competencies. Commonalities between these approaches are highlighted, but preference is not shown for certain models. It is the contention of this study that there are multiple highly competent manners in which TEPs can instruct preservice teachers in religion clause issues: that a one-size-fits-all model is not necessarily.

Chapter Three describes how the study was conducted, including the rationale for the design. It details the interactions with the study's participants and their settings, the collection of data, the analysis of data, as well as the methods of evaluating the collected data.

Chapter Four presents the results of the study, organizing and summarizing my findings for each of the researched TEPs. This information is presented with minimal interpretation. The relevant codes and themes from the data are presented in narrative form, but also as graphs and tables with accompanying narrative explanations.

Chapter Five presents a discussion, an interpretation of the findings of the study. This includes both practical & theoretical implications of the study upon TEPs in MA and nationwide, as well as stating the relationship with the study's initial research hypothesis. Recommendations for TEPs in MA and nationwide are also presented in this chapter. Finally, areas of future research, based on delimitations & limitations of the study and the conclusions of this study, are presented before concluding with my own personal reflection on the study.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

As this dissertation seeks to ascertain the degree to which religion clause issues are addressed in teacher education programs, the literature reviewed in this chapter examines the relationship between TEPs and the worldviews of public school students, specifically how preservice teachers are prepared to navigate issues related to the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first presents the history and nature of teacher preparation from the American colonial era to the present, examining the sociological realities that shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed to address students' numinous and secular worldviews. For the majority of the eras covered, there is scant direct research and literature on the relationship between religion clause issues and the history of teacher education programs in the United States, in large part because of the relative legal insignificance of the federal First Amendment until the mid-twentieth century. However, this chapter shows that the directives towards preservice teachers can be adduced from the contemporaneous socio-political and religious climate, and that the two topics are intrinsically linked.

The second section examines recent arguments for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues. It is from this literature and research that this dissertation's evaluation tool finds the measures for its competencies. Commonalities between these approaches are highlighted, but preference is not shown for certain models. It is the contention of this study that there are multiple highly competent manners in which TEPs can instruct preservice teachers in religion clause issues: that a one-size-fits-all model is not necessarily.

Part 1: Teacher Preparation from the American Colonial Era to the Present

This section reviews the nature of teacher preparation from the American colonial era to the present as it relates to students' worldviews, as well as how the country has wrestled the relationship between church and state, worldviews and education. This review is primarily divided into four historical eras: (a) the 1650s-1800, (b) 1800-1850, (c) 1850-1940, and (d) 1940 to the present. An additional section details current federal and state mandates, including the sociological realities that have shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed on addressing students' worldviews. It argues that the sociological realities outlined below created the social setting in which teacher preparation took form, especially in regards to religion clause issues.

Growth and change in national identity drives growth and change in concepts of teacher preparation around student worldviews. As the nation changed its view of itself -- its values, its priorities, and its composition -- its view on who should be educated and how also changed, directly impacting the view of how teachers should be educated to form and inform the nation. These sociological realities were not a monolithic set of principles guiding the progress of the nation in one direction. There was never one unifying narrative underlying the changing landscape. Rather, the landscape of ideas created conflicts in the national consciousness, many of which continue into the present. The nation and preservice teachers were shaped by competing views on the place of religion(s), pluralism, and secularism in public schools, and the nation as a whole. Disputes over immigration and what it means to be an American were often a topic of debate, as were heated discussions over national identity in the face of armed conflicts, at home and abroad. Part 1 of this chapter argues that these sociological realities, the practice of teacher preparation, and the treatment of student worldviews cannot be easily separated, as all of the

participants were engaged in the same national struggle of self-definition. We now turn to the American colonial era and the infancy of teacher preparation in this country.

The Birth of Teacher Preparation: Mid 1600s – 1800

From the colonial era through the founding of the United States, there was no formal process of teacher training, nor were there any religion clauses to consider. Families fashioned an education for their children in line with their religious beliefs, often in their homes or churches (Bankston & Caldas, 2009; James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999, 2007; Herbst, 1989; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Sears & Carper, 1998). Often this work was carried out by young, unmarried women who received no formal training in curriculum or pedagogy, but were deemed to be literate and of upstanding moral character (Fraser, 2007; Herbst, 1989; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Sears & Carper, 1998). Most men who taught children were college graduates who overwhelmingly viewed teaching not as a lifelong profession, but as a transitional waystation between further studies or their chosen professions (Fraser, 2007; Glenn, 1988; Herbst, 1989; Kaestle & Foner, 1983). Fraser (1999) records that between its founding in 1636 and the American Revolution in 1776, 40% of Harvard graduates taught in such a manner at some point in their lives. For Yale graduates this number was 20%. According to Fraser (1999), in both cases, these teachers only served for one or two years before moving on, and like their female counterparts, male teachers were to be in possession of a sincere faith and civic virtue. They also received no formal training in teaching methodology or pedagogy, but they did possess a broad base in the liberal arts from their collegiate studies.

On top of passing along a wide breadth of knowledge, teachers were expected to teach children to read the King James Version of the Bible (as well as other Christian works), to possess basic proficiency with writing, and to embody the values of a good citizenship, which

went hand-in-hand with being of sober mind and faith (Fraser, 1999, 2007; Glenn, 1988; Greenawalt, 2005; Ogren, 2005; Tyack, 1974, 2003; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Thus, “the church sexton, a disabled veteran, even a literate tradesman might be the teacher; even better, it could be an aspirant to the ministry” (Glenn, 1988, p. 134).

Teachers were expected to possess and instruct students with a certain level of religious competence specific to the community that they served. Such beliefs were a part of the national identity, as illustrated by Article 3 of the *Northwest Ordinance of 1787*, ostensibly linking church and state within educational settings and the health of the new nation (Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Macedo, 2000; Marty & Moore, 2000; Nord, 1995): “Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged” (“Northwest Ordinance,” 1787). In the centuries to come, these words appeared in state constitutions, local, state, and federal legislation, and legal battles over the role of religion in the public schools (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; S. K. Green, 2012; Macedo, 2000). They would also undergird much of formalized teacher preparation in the 1800s. Thus, the following era was a watershed moment in the intersection between teacher preparation and the societal realities around religion clause issues: a period marked by both the founding of the first institutions for teacher education, and turbulent national changes which set the stage for the “culture wars” that continue into the present (Fraser, 1999; S. K. Green, 2012; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sears & Carper, 1998; Tyack, 2003).

The Formative Years: 1800 –1860

This era saw the rise of more formalized teacher education programs including the Tory Female Seminary, Normal Schools, High Schools, Teacher Institutes, as well as colleges and universities beginning teacher education programs of their own (Committee on the Study of

Teacher Preparation Programs in the United & National Research, 2010; Fraser, 2007; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Labaree, 2004; Ogren, 2005; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). While a religious foundation remained in the consciousness of teacher education programs during this era (Fraser, 1999, 2007; Kunzman, 2006; Macedo, 2000; Ogren, 2005; Tyack & Hansot, 1982), over time the curriculum became more secular (Greenawalt, 2005), evolving to specifically include content knowledge, pedagogy, school governance—which included being a moral force in the school community—and the observation and practice of teaching (Fraser, 2007; Ogren, 2005). However these gradual changes were not the only, or even the primary social factors impacting the preparation of teachers. Throughout this era the dramatic shifts in the national religious and social landscape governed the implicit and explicit messages given to teachers.

The second great awakening. As the country was in the midst of the Second Great Awakening (1790-1850), education reform often mirrored the religious shifts. Teacher Institutes were led like the great tent revival meetings of the religious day. Teachers gathered to find their calling or to rededicate themselves to the profession with an almost religious fervor. They were also expected to lead moral and academic “awakenings” in their students (Fraser, 2007; Mattingly, 1975). Lynn (1964) wrote that parents of this era sent their children to schools expecting the instruction they received would impart “the inherent and inevitable harmony of public education and the Protestant cause” (p. 57). Teachers were taught that they were an integral part of the civic, moral, and religious upbringing of their students, and that they must uphold societal norms. Teachers were directly instructed not to honor, but rather to shape the worldviews of their students into conformity with broad social norms (Bankston & Caldas, 2009; Fraser, 1999, 2007; S. K. Green, 2012; Kunzman, 2006; Ogren, 2005; Sears & Carper, 1998; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Another result of the Second Great Awakening, which undoubtedly had

tremendous cultural influence on the training of teachers during this time period, was the rise of the Sunday School Movement.

The Sunday School movement. In 1824 the American Sunday School Union (ASSU) was founded with a mission both overlapping and in contrast to the common school movement. While public schools were called “weekday school,” in opposition to Sunday schools, both were often taught in the same spaces, by the same teachers, and using the same curriculum. While it sought to spread pan-Protestant religious faith and morality across the nation, the ASSU also saw its role as supplementing the work of the public school (S. K. Green, 2012; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Its mission was to reach those it felt were neglected in religious revelation, academic acumen, and Sabbath sanctity:

Protestant Sunday-school workers looked upon illiterate, churchless, street children as waifs who needed help and sympathy, who needed to be rescued from their parents’ ignorance and immorality, and who at the same time were offending God by profaning the Sabbath. Sunday schools thus attacked vice and sin by keeping children off the streets on Sunday while teaching them literacy and morality. (Kaestle & Foner, 1983, p. 46)

The ASSU felt that its purpose was to reach out to “the unchurched and untaught wherever they may be found, in city slum or in the open countryside” (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 35). True to this creed, by 1828 the ASSU had branches in almost all of the twenty-four states, enrolling “about one-seventh of all children aged five to fifteen,” and “in 1829 the ASSU vowed to place a Sunday School ‘in every destitute place’ in the Mississippi Valley from Michigan to Louisiana, from the Alleghenies to the Rockies” (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 35).

During the late 1800s, Sunday Schools evolved into the more sectarian religious establishments that are known today (S. K. Green, 2012; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Sears & Carper,

1998). However, the ASSU's impact on public education and teacher preparation cannot be understated. Much of the ASSU's materials found their way into the public school settings where reading materials were scarce. Francis Scott Key praised the ASSU, saying it was a bargain if it "gives a child a testament and teaches him to read it for 37 cents." In 1859, 30,000 of the 50,000 "public" libraries in the country were located in Sunday Schools. As such, the increase in public literacy and the improved access to literature are partially indebted to the Sunday School movement (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 38). Despite its successes, the religious content of their school materials brought the ASSU in conflict with common school leader Horace Mann (S. K. Green, 2012). Mann believed in the foundational ideology that common schools should use education as a tool to shape children in the country and as a result, shape the country itself, but was critical of the role religion played in schooling described above (Fraser, 1999, 2007; S. K. Green, 2012; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Ogren, 2005; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). The common school movement began the shift toward secularization and a change in how teacher preparation addressed students' worldviews.

The common school and the shift to secularism. Mann's goal was to standardize education so as to create model citizens through a process of "systemization": the creation of state boards of education would standardize schools, the creation of Normal Schools would standardize teachers, and the creation of common schools would standardize the citizenry (Fraser, 2007). In hyperbolic terms, Mann expressed the national and metaphysical importance of the Normal School training of teachers, saying

Neither the art of printing, nor the trial by jury, nor a free press, nor free suffrage, can long exist, to any beneficial and salutary purpose, without school for the training of teachers. ...nay, the universal diffusion and ultimate triumph of all-glorious Christianity

itself must await the time when knowledge shall be diffused among men through the instrumentality of good schools. Coiled up in this institution, as in a spring, there is a vigor whose uncoiling may wheel the spheres. (Glenn, 1988, p. 138)

The underpinnings of this standardization led to the “culture war” of its time (Fraser, 1999; S. K. Green, 2012; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sears & Carper, 1998; Tyack, 2003), the socio-political background of which must be understood before proceeding further with this historical investigation.

The religion clauses of the Constitution state that *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof*. However, the First Amendment was ratified in 1791 with the understanding that the religion clauses applied only to the Federal government, not to the state or local governments. Thus, the emphasis was on the initial words “*Congress shall make no law.*” Just as the Founding Fathers were unable to agree on conceptions of faith, practice, and belief (or the lack thereof), each state was free to regulate its local governments and private enterprises by whatever religious or areligious standards they saw fit, which is exactly how they proceeded (DeFattore, 2004; Fraser, 1999; Kunzman, 2006; Laycock, 1991; Macedo, 2000; Strasser, 2011). For example, the Congregational Church was the official state religion in Connecticut until 1818 and in Massachusetts until 1833 (Fraser, 1999).

As a result, the variety of state-sponsored religions in the 19th century (all prior to the incorporation of the religious expression clauses in the 1940s), as well as the societal norms that preferred and proffered sectarian religious beliefs, came into conflict with the numinous worldviews of the increasing immigrant population of the United States. This impacted how children were educated in state run classrooms, and how preservice teachers were instructed in their institutions.

Mann's plan was to use education as a means to "Americanize" immigrants, especially those who did not fit the mold of white Protestants. While morality was the first step, total assimilation was the goal (Fraser, 1999; Glenn, 1988; Greenawalt, 2005; Herbst, 1989; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Mondale & Patton, 2001), and it was the role of teachers to foster this assimilation in the schoolhouse (Bankston & Caldas, 2009; James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999, 2007; Glenn, 1988; Herbst, 1989; Tyack, 1974, 2003; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Thus, preservice teachers needed to be instructed to do so. Mann believed in a form of religious education that enabled students to be widely informed free thinkers, enabled to become intelligent citizens who could make rational decisions based on civic values (Fraser, 1999; S. K. Green, 2012). He argued against "sectarian" religious indoctrination, but advocated a nonsectarian religious ethos to be practiced within schools (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999; Glenn, 1988; S. K. Green, 2012). While this included the continued use of the Bible as the primary source of civic mores, Mann advocated that the Bible should be "read without comment," allowing the Bible to "speak for itself": a principle acceptable to many Protestants, but anathema to Catholic families (Fraser, 1999; Glenn, 1988; S. K. Green, 2012; Macedo, 2000; Nord, 1995, 2010; Sears & Carper, 1998). In Mann's own words:

Our system earnestly inculcates all Christian morals; it founds its morals on the basis of religion; it welcomes the religion of the Bible; and, in receiving the Bible, it allows it to do what it is allowed to do in no other system, — *to speak for itself*. But here it stops, not because it claims to have compassed all truth, but because it disclaims to act as an umpire between hostile religious opinion. (Mann, 1848, pp. 116-117)

Glenn's (1988) analysis of denomination growth in Massachusetts from 1785 to 1858 gives credence to Mann's worry about the potential for civic disunity spurred by religious

diversity. While the number of Congregationalist churches (the predominate denomination) grew from 330 to 490 during this period, Baptists grew from 68 to 287, Episcopalian 11 to 65, Roman Catholic 1 to 64, and Unitarian, Universalist, and Methodists from 0 each to 170, 135, and 310 respectively, while another 130 churches labeled “other” also sprung up (p. 156). This explosion of differing numinous perspectives was another factor in Mann’s desire for a nonsectarian religious ethos to dominate the common school. Nevertheless, Mann was insistent that the teacher’s role was

To train them [children] up to the love of God and the love of man; to make the perfect example of Jesus Christ lovely in their eyes; and to give to all so much of religious instruction as is compatible with the rights of others and with the genius of government.

(As cited in Glenn, 1988, p. 164)

In this view, Mann was not alone. Other prominent political, education, and religious leaders also professed that the education of the common school was never intended to promote Protestantism over and against Catholicism or Judaism, but rather “religious” ideologies over either “sectarian” or “infidel” ones (Glenn, 1988; S. K. Green, 2012; Macedo, 2000). In the words of Daniel Webster, all Americans

Believe in the existence of God. All believe in the immortality of the soul. All believe in the responsibility in another world for our conduct in this . . . And cannot all these great truths be taught to children without their minds being perplexed with clashing doctrines and sectarian controversies? (As cited in Macedo, 2000, pp. 57-58)

The expectation on teacher education programs is reflected in this 1825 statement from educational reformer and teacher preparer James Carter, who felt that “the character of the

schools, and . . . their political, moral and religious influence, depends almost solely, upon the character of the teachers” (J. G. Carter, 1826, p. 43). Thus, he argued that

An institution for the education of teachers, as has been before intimated, would form a part, and a very important part, of the free-school system. It would be, moreover, precisely that portion of the system, which should be under the direction of the State, whether, the others are or not. Because we should thus secure at once, a uniform, intelligent, and independent tribunal for decisions on the qualifications of teachers... *An institution for this propose would become by its influence on society, and particularly on the young, an engine to sway public sentiment, the public morals, and the public religion, more powerful than any other in the possession of government.* (pp. 49-50 emphasis added)

Other leaders in education shared these sentiments, including Methodist minister and school reformer Samuel Lewis:

It cannot be too deeply impressed on all minds, that we are a Christian, as well as a republican people; and the utmost care should be taken to inculcate sound principles of Christian morality. No creed or catechism of any sect should be introduced into our schools; there is a broad, common ground, where all Christians and lovers of virtue meet. (Fraser, 1999, p. 38)

Catherine Beecher, a pioneer in the foundation of teacher preparation programs (Fraser, 1999, 2007; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Tyack & Hansot, 1982), and the individual credited with having the greatest impact on changing education into a female-dominated profession (Fraser, 2007), stated that “the principles of democracy are identical with the principles of Christianity”

(Beecher, 1848, p. 25). Unitarian minister Charles Brooks who travelled internationally in support of teacher training, wrote that

Competent teachers, whose learning is sanctified by piety, and whose characters are all radiant with love, will assuredly impart their nobility of soul to their pupils. Their spiritual magnetism will go out from them whenever innocent childhood presents itself as a conductor. Such teachers will unconsciously throw into the daily lessons some moral suggestion, moral hint, moral maxim, or moral query; thus giving moral polarity to everything. (Brooks, 1856, p. 86)

Elsewhere he answered the question “how can religion be introduced into our schools?” by stating that “the technicalities of Christian sects are not taught . . . But those great and eternal principals of moral truth, which all sects allow to be indispensable in the grown-up Christian, are the principles which they carefully imbed in every youthful heart” (As cited in Glenn, 1988, p. 149).

Many have argued that Mann’s Unitarian values guided and perhaps blinded him to the religious perspectives of others (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999; Glenn, 1988; S. K. Green, 2012; Herbst, 1989; Kaestle & Foner, 1983; Laycock, 1991; Macedo, 2000; Nord, 2010). Nevertheless, despite these seemingly ecumenical visions of nonsectarianism, there was an ever-present disunity between the majority of Protestant sects and the rest of the nation. These views helped fuel anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish, anti-immigrant sentiments in the society at large, the halls of teacher education programs, and within the classrooms of public school educators.

When “nonsectarian” means “pan-protestant” and “anti-Catholic.” As the common school movement grew so did the explicit expectation for teachers to instill the white, Protestant, nonsectarian values on the community (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; DeFattore, 2004;

Greenawalt, 2005; Herbst, 1989; Macedo, 2000; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Tyack, 2003; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Teachers of the era were trained in an atmosphere where they heard speeches from the National Education Association (NEA), and its predecessor the National Teachers Association (NTA), declaring support for versions of Mann's nonsectarian, but pan-Protestant common school ideology, alongside scathing attacks of Catholicism and more liturgical branches of Protestantism (Fraser, 1999; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). These religious values spilled over into other areas.

Tyack and Hansot (1982) and Herbst (1989) document how socioeconomic division were bridged by Protestant values. The upper-class members of the Whig party, who were often from prominent Protestant families, pushed for common schools as a way of not only Americanizing immigrants, but also for guaranteeing "that only the deserving ambitious poor would rise to fame and wealth and that those less well trained would keep their place in the supporting, lower ranks of the economic hierarchy" (Herbst, 1989, p. 14). Members of the burgeoning middle class saw public education as a means of socially elevating their children. Both groups saw common schools as an extension of the civic morality rooted in a Protestant work ethic.

According to Tyack (1974):

Amid the pluralistic politics of interest groups, the cultural conflicts of Catholic and Protestant, immigrant and nativist, black and white, the position of schoolmen was an anomalous one. For the most part, they held a common set of WASP values, professed a common-core (that is, pan-Protestant) Christianity, were ethnocentric, and tended to glorify the sturdy virtues of a departed rural tradition. They took their values for granted as self-evidently true— not subject to legitimate debate. At the same time they normally shared Horace Mann's dislike for partisan controversy in either politics or religion; the

common school, after all, should rest on consensus. The battles of cultural interest groups to influence schools simply disrupted that consensus and interfered with the task of building the one best system. (p. 109)

This desire to stem the tide of conflict within the nation, and specifically within the public school system where the proxy cultural war was being fought, brought about significant changes in the successive decades. Two cases of the era display these changes.

In *Donahoe v. Richards* (1854), Maine's Supreme Court upheld the suspension from school – for refusing to read the King James Version of the Bible in class— of a fifteen-year-old Catholic girl. In 1859 Thomas Wall, a Catholic Boston Public School student, refused to recite the Protestant version of the Ten Commandments and was subsequently caned by the school master, McLaurin F. Cooke. Wall's father ordered Cooke arrested. In the subsequent trial, *Commonwealth v Cooke* (1859), Cooke was vindicated as his actions were ruled appropriate given state educational law. In both cases, the arguing lawyers and judges fought over the definition and constitutionality of “nonsectarian” Bible reading. Though the pan-Protestant establishment won the day in both cases, the rulings further exacerbated civic tensions between Protestants and Catholics (S. K. Green, 2012). To this point Glenn (1988) argues that Mann's efforts to unite the country under his nonsectarian system led to the subsequent disunity around the interaction between numinous belief systems and public school life which reverberates into the present:

The reformers attempted to deal with the real (though exaggerated) threat of social disunity, to which they themselves were contributing through their abandonment of the religious convictions of previous generations, by acting as though a newly defined “religion” rooted in no community of faith could serve to reintegrate the society. They

attempted to apply to a period of intense religious competition a program appropriate to periods of unity. As a result, the common school was never truly common in the sense of enjoying the support of all parents and—despite the tremendous achievement of the next hundred years—public education in the United States has continued to promise more social integration than it has been able to deliver. The present crisis of confidence in public education reflects flaws in the foundation that Mann and others laid. (pp. 151-152)

The truth of this statement was seen in the nation's continued upheaval of the years to follow and its impact on the intersection between teacher preparation and student worldviews.

An Awkward Adolescence: 1860-1940

If there was an overriding purpose to American Colonial education it was to nurture and sustain a Christian civilization, but between the time of the American Revolution and the end of the nineteenth century an educational revolution took place: religion dropped by the wayside as America marched into the modern world. The mantle of high purpose in the schools was passed on to democracy and Americanism, the new faiths of the new nation... by the year 1900, forty years before the Supreme Court began to apply the First Amendment to public education, there was littler religion left in schools or universities. True, some prayer and Bible reading took place in many public schools, and chapel was required in a few state colleges. Religion continued to inform the ceremony and rhetoric of education. But it was no longer to be found in the heart of education, in curriculum or textbooks. The governing purposes of education had changed. (Nord, 1995, p. 63)

This quote describes the shift toward secularism in education caused by the increasing focus on nonsectarian and assimilation of the era (Fraser, 1999; Marty & Moore, 2000; Nord, 1995, 2010; Sproul et al., 2012; Tyack, 2003), and as a result of what Neuhaus (1984) and Macedo (2000)

refer to as “the rise of pluralism.” While Setran (2012) argues that more research is needed into the abiding relationship between religious sentiment and educational policy in this era—citing the post-WW1 “kingdom of God”/ “democracy of God” social and educational model advocated by a partnership between liberal progressives educators and theologians at Teachers College and Union Theological Seminary at the end of this era as evidence—it is apparent that the country’s educational system began a gradual shift away from the explicitly religious, and the explicitly sectarian, in favor of a more secular pedagogical underpinning. This is not to say that this shift took place everywhere immediately, but evidence of this shift toward secularism took many forms, the first being nationalistic patriotism.

Secular Americanization in public schools. Bankston and Caldas (2009) contend that patriotism replaced the nonsectarian pan-Protestantism of the initial common school movement as the civil religion of the country in the aftermath of the American Civil War. Green (2012) echoes this analysis that while nativism and anti-Catholic sentiment did not disappear after the Civil War, it “subsided as a national issue” (p. 91). Green was also careful to stress the nonreligious factors of nativism and the desire to “Americanize” the vast number of immigrants arriving on the shores of the nation: Unification under republican values and institutions were best instilled through public schooling. While difficult to always separate from the pan-Protestant ethos of the day, such a distinction existed. Working class nativists aligned themselves with causes that distinguished them from immigrants. However, one of these causes was nonsectarian pan-protestant public education, complicating the matter further.

After the division of Civil War, public schools became a unifying factor for the country. Bankston & Caldas (2009) argue that during this era “public schooling became nearly universal in character, so that it could reach regions and elements of the population that had previously

enjoyed relatively limited exposure to formal education” (p. 40). They go on to explain how public schools became “identified as the means of fulfilling the new promises of American life in the late 19th and early 20th centuries,” and “institutionalized temples of American civic faith, containing and expressing beliefs that drew on earlier politico-theological traditions and reshaped those traditions in response to historical experiences of the nation” (p. 40).

This new “civic faith” needed new priests and new rites within the temple of schools. Examples abound throughout the era: the advent of Decoration Day (1868, the precursor to Memorial Day), Flag Day (1916), and other local patriotic ceremonies were celebrated in public schools; the decision for all public schools to fly an American flag; the crafting and recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance (1887) which, despite the “under God” controversy generations later, was written as “a statement of commitment to the unity of the state, rather than an invocation of divinity” (Bankston & Caldas, 2009, p. 52). Furthermore, the veneration of George Washington during this era allowed for a war-tired people to focus on a unifying figure. As a result, Washington’s birthday was commissioned as the first federal holiday in 1885 to memorialize an American citizen, and public schools took up championing his veneration through tributes and patriotic songs (Bankston & Caldas, 2009). Words in Mary Antin’s autobiography, *The Promised Land* (1912), display how this elevation of patriotism over religion felt by some students: “Never had I prayed, never had I chanted the songs of David, never had I called upon the Most Holy, in such utter reverence and worship as I repeated the simple sentences of my child’s story of the patriot” (p. 151).

In like manner NEA reports also changed. Their explicitly religious, anti-Catholic tracts and pamphlets were replaced with the Americanizing reports focused on the moral growth of students, and molding good citizens, including the *Tentative Report of the Committee on a*

System of Teaching Morals in the Public Schools of the United States of 1911, and the *Seven Cardinal Principles* of 1918 (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009). While this was not an immediate, homogenous, nationwide change, the message to preservice and in-teachers, as to the nation, was changing in regards to the role of religion in the public schools. One potent example of this shift is the change that took place in classroom textbook, where throughout the nineteenth century, religious themes declined.

The secularist shift in school books. By the end of the nineteenth century the use of theological doctrine as an epistemological underpinning or as curricula in its own right, had disappeared altogether from most textbooks (Bankston & Caldas, 2009; Glenn, 1988; Nord, 1995). This trend is seen through a brief examination of the differences between two foundational classroom texts, the *New England Primer* and the *McGuffey Reader*.

From colonial times, education and faith were inextricably tied together. The Puritans used the *New England Primer*— also known as “The Little Bible of New England” (Kaestle & Foner, 1983)— to teach the alphabet and reading through stories of biblical characters and theological lessons (Fraser, 1999; Kunzman, 2006; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Sproul et al., 2012). *The Primer* also included a list of the books of the Bible, The Lord’s Prayer, the Apostle’s Creed, the Ten Commandments, and other short religious tracts like the “Duty of Children Towards Their Parents,” and the Westminster Assembly’s Shorter Catechism (Nord, 1995, 2010). The religious messages of the *Primer* continued with the advent of the *McGuffey Reader*; however the latter saw an evolution in its content.

In 1836 the *McGuffey Reader* was introduced to the common school system. Nord’s (1995) review of the literature on the *Reader* attest that they were more theology textbook than schoolbook, as themes of holiness, sin, salvation, and damnation were commonplace. For

example, all natural phenomena were presented as a cosmological or teleological argument for God's existence and divine planning. The study of geography was for the purpose of bringing a student to pious reflection on the "power, wisdom, and goodness of God" over all of creation. When Darwinian evolution first appeared within its pages, it was presented as what would be called theistic-evolution today, where mutations are not random or undirected, but a part of the divine order. The *Reader* reflected white, middle class, Protestant beliefs by which the nation's children were linked to a common morality, history, and faith (Fraser, 1999). Toward the end of the century such moralizing and the conferring of spiritual importance to natural phenomena began to wane. As time wore on, the *Reader* grew more nonsectarian, nonpartisan, and sought to be less controversial for different regions of the country, while remaining a basis of morality and civic religion for public schools (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999; Kunzman, 2006; Sears & Carper, 1998; Sproul et al., 2012; Tyack, 2003). Thus, while its pages referenced the Bible more than any other document, the number of biblical references declined (Nord, 1995, 2010). Patriotic figures like George Washington were compared to Moses, furthering the shift from a national identity based on religious conformity to one based on patriotic social order (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Kaestle & Foner, 1983).

This change was also seen in social studies curriculum as well, which Nord discusses:

In her study of twentieth-century American history textbook, Frances Fitzgerald claims that religion virtually disappeared from textbooks by the 1890s. Before this time, most of the authors were ministers or teachers in religious schools, "and for them American civilization was...an arm of Christian civilization extending into the new continent." By the 1890s public high schools became more common than church-related private schools, and for "the new generation of teachers, who were servants of various bits of the state,

the proper subject of American history was politics and the activities of government. The texts of the eighteen-nineties are silent on religious matters... and highly articulate on the subject of the nation-state.” By the turn of the century, social scientist, not clergymen, were writing the texts. (Nord, 1995, p. 70)

These changes in textbooks, schooling options, and the professional ethos of public school teachers, as well as the general decline in the quantity of religious teaching in public schools, was much more the result of the national struggle over how to address religious sectarianism, than it was hostility or indifference to religious principles in the country (Glenn, 1988; S. K. Green, 2012; Nord, 1995; Setran, 2012). These changes were most strongly illustrated in the clash over the birth and funding of religious, especially Catholic, private schools.

Catholics and the common school crisis. The increased shift toward secularization and Americanism came into conflict with the continued religious and ethnic diversity and disunity in the country (Bankston & Caldas, 2009; James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999; S. K. Green, 2012; Macedo, 2000; Marty & Moore, 2000; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Nord, 1995; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). This was most starkly seen in the national response to Catholics starting their own system of schooling. Common school advocates attempted to block establishment, public funding, and civic support for such schools, while pushing for less religion in the public schools, not merely pan-Protestant ideologies. This was largely for the purpose of bringing Catholic students under the public schools’ ideological control (Fraser, 1999; Glenn, 1988; S. K. Green, 2012; Macedo, 2000; Mondale & Patton, 2001; Nord, 1995; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Or as bluntly stated in a 1844 editorial in the *New Englander*, Catholic immigrants were “incomparably the most ignorant class of our population...[and] it is better that Roman Catholic children should be educated in public schools in which the Bible is not read, than that they

should not be educated at all, or educated in schools under the absolute control of their priesthood” (Glenn, 1988, p. 230). Thus, it was more important to educate them within a secular common school setting, than to allow them to continue in civic and academic ignorance. The tension surrounding nonsectarianism in common schools received national focus in the Ohio Supreme Court case *Minor v Board of Education*, a key element in the Cincinnati “Bible War” of 1869-1873 (S. K. Green, 2012; Merriman, 2007; Waggoner, 2013).

Minor v Board of Education. *Minor* centered on the Cincinnati school board’s decision to remove the Bible and other explicitly religious reading materials and exercises from their curriculum. By 1869 parochial schools in Cincinnati educated “between 12,000 and 15,000 [Catholic students], while the public schools enrolled only 19,000.” Thus, the Cincinnati school board proposed a merger between Catholic and public schools, “with the former restricting themselves to teaching only secular subject, with no teaching of religious subjects or from religious texts” (Green, 2012, 9. 97). A separate resolution was proposed to prohibit all religious instruction, the use of the Bible, and other religious books from public schools. Amid public outcry from many factions, the proposed merger was abandoned. However, the prohibition on religious materials passed the school board 22 to 15 launching the lawsuit and rapt national attention (Green, 2012).

The proposal passed the school board for many of the reasons discussed above in regards to the trouble of nonsectarian ideologies in the common school, but also, as a lawyer in the case reasoned, public school teachers “are not abstract, non-denominational Christians . . . each has religious bias, of which he will find it difficult to divest himself when he comes to read the Bible” (S. K. Green, 2012, p. 109). How and what teachers were expected to teach stood in concert with or opposed to the views teachers held in their hearts, heard on Sunday morning,

read in the newspaper, or discussed with neighbors. After four years of legal, civic, and religious battles, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that “Bible reading . . . even when conducted without note or comment and conducted for the purpose of instilling morality rather than religious devotion, was a religious exercise and inconsistent with [state] constitutional principles” (S. K. Green, 2012, p. 93). Green (2012) argues that this is the most important church-state decision prior to the incorporation of the First Amendment against the states.

The Ohio Supreme Court resolved that “religious instruction and the reading of religious books, including the Holy Bible, are prohibited in the common schools of Cincinnati, it being the true object and intent of this rule to allow the children of the parents of all sects and opinions, in matters of faith and worship, to enjoy alike the benefits of the common-school fund” (“Board of Education v. Minor,” 1872). Furthermore, they resolved that “neither Christianity nor any other system of religion is a part of the law of this state,” and “the state is, in Ohio, forbidden to interfere with, or exercise the office of the church. Religious instruction and the reading of religious books, including the Holy Bible cannot be prosecuted in schools supported by the taxation of men of all religious opinions, without the violations . . . of the [Ohio] constitution” (“Board of Education v. Minor,” 1872). Beyond the Bible reading for devotional purposes, textbooks and curriculum seen as overtly religious were also ruled illegal. The *McGuffey’s Reader* was specifically named as an illegal text. This ruling also included a dismissal of plaintiffs’ arguments which were based on the Ohio Constitution’s incorporation of words from the *Northwest Ordinance* quoted above (“Board of Education v. Minor,” 1872).

As Green (2012) summarizes, this case led to related battles in school districts across the nation. Preceding, during, and directly following the case, Protestants were greatly divided among those who wanted pan-Protestant devotional practices and Bible reading in schools, but

were against accommodating the views of Catholics, those who advocated non-sectarian devotional practices and Bible readings amenable to Catholics, as they would instill civic morals in all children, those who would do away with devotional practices and Bible reading altogether to end the bitter confrontations, and those who wanted to remove such practices on grounds of constitutional and civic equality. Catholics were united in their disdain for Protestant devotional practices in public schools, but like Protestants, were equally not united in their solution to the problem.

Beyond the Protestant and Catholic rift, some citizens, of various religions and secular worldviews, opposed the common school model itself, along with the prevailing use of the Bible and religious exercises that accompanied it. Others were concerned that state coffers being used for religious purposes are an example of state-funded religion. Still others sought to avoid returning to a model where the mass of Catholic students would be educated in parochial schools separate from the Americanizing influence of the public school. All of these national concerns led to the eventual drafting of the Blaine Amendment of 1876 (S. K. Green, 2012; Waggoner, 2013).

The Blaine Amendment. In part, this proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution sought to prohibit any public funds from going to religious or anti-religious schools, while not prohibiting the reading of the Bible in schools. The Senate Judiciary Committee's version of the amendment held that (a) "no State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" (b) "no public property and no public revenue . . . shall be appropriated to or made or used for the support of any school, educational or other institution under the control of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or de-nomination, or wherein the particular creeds or tenets shall be taught;" (c) "no such particular creeds or tenets

shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue or loan of credit;” and (d) “this article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution” (4 Cong. Rec. 5453 (Aug. 11, 1876)).

Senator Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, in his defense of the Senate version of the Blaine Amendment, argued that Protestant, Catholics, and even “Israelites” could join together in affirming that the religious teachings in school are

The pure and undefiled religion which appertains to the relationship and responsibility of man to God, and is reality distinguishable from the creeds of sects; that religion which permeates all our laws, which is recognized on every sentence against crime and immorality, which is invoked in every oath . . . that religion . . . which sustains the pillars of our liberty, is a very, very different thing from the particular creeds of tenets of either religionists or infidels. (Macedo, 2000, p. 78)

While the Blaine Amendment was rejected by the U.S. Senate, many states passed their own versions, which helped further shape the manner in which public school teachers interacted with the numinous and secular worldviews of their students (Fraser, 1999; Macedo, 2000; Nord, 1995, 2010; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Waggoner, 2013). As a result, over forty years before the application of the Establishment clause to the states, many states prohibited the use of public funds for sectarian purposes, and many prohibited religious institutions from functioning in the public schools (Fraser, 1999; Nord, 1995). Carper and Hunt (2009) report that between 1848 and 1921, 33 state constitutions prohibited state and local public funds being used for aiding religious schools.

To this end, even the Reverend Josiah Strong — whose best-selling book *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (1885) listed immigration, the Catholic church, wealth,

urban living, and the debate over the purposes of public schools as among the “eight great perils facing the nation” in 1885 (S. K. Green, 2012, p. 175)—advocated the teaching of “undenominational” ideals, that is nonsectarian, religious doctrines in public schools. He argued that the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and accountability after death are fundamental doctrines common to all monotheistic religions and are “essential to the perpetuity of free institutions, while the inculcation of sectarian dogmas is not” (Strong, 1885). For this reason public schools should not teach sectarian doctrines because such action gives supporters of religious schools political and moral ground to demand public funds (Macedo, 2000).

It should be remembered that this view of nonsectarianism is not wholly outside the vision originally crafted by Horace Mann. Mann argued in his *Twelfth Report* (1848) that a nonsectarian system taught moral virtue, but not religious doctrine, because it was unconstitutional and unconscionable to force dissenters, including Catholics, to pay taxes to support religious indoctrination in public schools. As immigration continued to increase during this era (Bankston & Caldas, 2009), teacher education in regards to students’ worldviews slowly changed. These changes moved the dialogue in public education from nonsectarianism to secularism.

Secularism in progressive era educational theory. In her autobiography *The Promised Land* (1912), Mary Antin illustrates the changing attitudes of her teachers. The young Jewish immigrant from Russian arrived in Chelsea, Massachusetts in the 1890s. While discussing her atheism on the playground, a verbal fight broke out between her and Protestant students. When the conversation spilled over into the classroom, instead of rebuking her and praising the proselytizing students, her teacher explained “that it was proper American conduct to avoid

religious arguments on school territory” (p. 242). Changes of this kind were seen beyond the experience of students.

In 1873 an article in *The Massachusetts Teacher* complained about how professional development opportunities at the meeting of the state teachers’ association had changed, drawing a parallel to the state of religious uniformity:

Time was when the theology of Christendom was settled. To doubt was heresy, and, literally, a *burning* shame. How is it now? Does the diversity of belief show that the present generation know [*sic*] less of our relations to God, to duty, to humanity, than our ancestors? (Association, 1873)

Changes in how teachers perceived their roles in regards to students’ worldviews was in part due to the effort of leaders like John Dewey, the “father of progressive education” (Mondale & Patton, 2001; Sproul et al., 2012). Dewey felt that public school teachers in the country would have to move beyond nonsectarianism in their separation between religions and public schools. Despite this view, Dewey used religious language when discussing education.

In *My Pedagogic Creed*, Dewey (1897) stated that “the teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God” (Reed & Johnson, 1996). However, his conception of divinity was far different from many of his contemporaries (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; Fraser, 1999; Sears & Carper, 1998). The kingdom of which he spoke was an industrial democracy built on scientific epistemologies rather than organized religion of any kind. His view of a “common faith” rejected all traditional forms of religious faith, and moved toward the secular ethics and intellectual values of industrial democracy (Fraser, 1999; Macedo, 2000). In signing the *Humanist Manifesto* (1933), Dewey and others stood against the “bootlegging of religion into the public arena, especially into government schools” (Neuhaus,

1984, p. 23). Thus, he called for a temporary moratorium on the teaching of religion in public schools until the supernatural elements of religion could be stripped away from the curriculum (Macedo, 2000; Nord, 1995).

In *Religion and Our Schools* (1908) Dewey found arguments to keep the teaching of religious dogmas in public schools ironic and straining credulity. He advocated the denial of the supernatural elements of religion for the betterment of all aspects of society, and proposed agencies like the church and the school must be “thoroughly reconstructed” so they can nurture “the types of religious feeling and thought which are consistent with modern democracy and modern science” (p. 798). Schools should not talk about religion until they are able to remove the supernatural, adopting “*laissez-faire* policies”(p. 799). Like Mann before him, Dewey argues that the separation between religious education and the civic ends of public schools are conflicts over religious factions, unassimilated immigrants, and the economic stratification between previous and contemporary generations, all of which foster disunity in the country. Furthermore, teaching nonsectarian Christianity is no solution, as non-Christians also “pay taxes, vote, and serve on school boards” (p. 803). However, Dewey was against sending students to religious schools for their education, as it furthered the disunity of the nation, and raised an issue at the heart of teacher education for public schools: can the responsibility of teaching divergent religious doctrines be placed upon regular classroom teachers? This concern continues into the current day, and will be explored below. Dewey, however, was against such responsibility being placed on public school teachers. In addition to national leaders pushing public schooling and teacher education away from addressing religion directly, the legal climate of the day showed the growing societal angst surrounding matters of church and state. A brief survey of this reality follows.

The legal climate. The number of cases that gained national attention in regards to how public schools address students' worldviews increased during this era. On the state level this era saw Darwin's 1859 *Origin of the Species*, and the resulting *Scopes* "monkey trial" on the instruction of evolution in Tennessee public schools in 1926. The Edgerton Bible case ("State ex rel. Weiss v. District Board 76," 1890) resulted in the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruling that the town of Edgerton's program of devotional Bible reading was unconstitutional: a ruling that would later be cited by United States Supreme Court Justice William Brennan in *Abington School District v. Schempp*'s (1963) decision on compulsory school prayer (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009).

On the Federal level, in 1923 SCOTUS decided *Meyer v. Nebraska* (1923) which, under the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause, found unconstitutional state laws prohibiting instructing children subject matter in foreign languages or prohibiting the teaching of foreign languages as content in elementary schools. Two years later the Court referred back to *Meyer* when deciding in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* (1925) that "the child is not merely the creature of the State," and parents have the right to send their children to private religious schools for their education. The state's mandate of compulsory education could not mean compulsory public schools. On the other hand, in 1940 SCOTUS ruled that public schools could compel all students, including religious objectors like Jehovah Witnesses, to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance ("Minersville School Dist. v. Gobitis," 1940).

In a series of landmark decisions beginning with *Gitlow v. New York* (1925), the U.S. Supreme Court [SCOTUS] ruled that the fundamental protections in the federal Bill of Rights are and ought to be "incorporated" into the Fourteenth Amendment's promise that states cannot deprive "any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Various rights were

selectively incorporated against the states over a forty-year period, with the free exercise clause incorporated against the states by *Cantwell v. Connecticut* in 1940, and the establishment clause by *Everson v. Board of Education* in 1947 (James C Carper & Hunt, 2009; DelFattore, 2004; Essex, 2002; Fraser, 1999; Greenawalt, 2005; Strasser, 2011). These examples are in addition to civic unrest and a host of state-level courtroom battles that did not reach the Supreme Court that centered around the relationship between religion and the public schools that (DelFattore, 2004; Fraser, 1999). All matters undoubtedly ever-present in the minds of those shaping teacher education during this time.

The above has detailed the sociological realities that directly impacted teacher preparation and shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed on addressing students' worldviews. It has reviewed the nature of teacher preparation from colonial America to 1940. While I have not located any previous studies that focus specifically on the role of teacher education programs and their relationship to students' worldviews, the foregoing has shown the shifting national landscape life that impacted the messages implicitly and explicitly given to teachers, including the views of the educational leaders who helped determine the course of TEPs around the country. The next we will explore the current state of how TEPs address students' worldviews, beginning with the drastic increase in First Amendment case law in the 1940s. The current legal climate is discussed in relation to the current knowledge of students' worldviews pedagogy and theory TEPs provide in-service teachers.

A Quarter-Life Crisis: Post-1940 litigation and the new culture war.

The date of 1940 was chosen as the beginning of a new era (and therefore a new section in this chapter) for two reasons. First, by the beginning of the 1940s, most states had adopted a policy requiring the completion of a college degree as the norm for entering the teaching

profession. All states had such a policy by 1950 (Fraser, 2007). Second, the ongoing discordant relationship between public education and religious expression was upended due to the SCOTUS decision that the Free Exercise Clause of the Constitution applied to the states, not only the Federal government ("Cantwell v. Connecticut," 1940). This ruling directly impacted the religious expression rights of public school students, as they are constitutionally free from undue government intrusion into their religious beliefs and actions. A few years later *Minersville* was reversed and students allowed to opt-out of saying the Pledge of Allegiance based on their personal worldviews ("West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnette," 1943), and by the end of the decade the Establishment Clause of the Constitution was ruled applicable to the states, not only the Federal government, thereby requiring all school districts to refrain from any practices or policies that aid or show preference for one religion over another, unduly aid or show preference for religion over nonreligion, or unduly aid or show preference for nonreligion over religion ("Everson v. Board of Ed. of Ewing," 1947).

These rulings meant that for the first time teacher education programs had something akin to explicit federal guidelines in terms of how preservice teachers should operate nationwide in regards to students' worldviews. It also resulted in multiple legal battles and drastic changes were present in the country over the next few years (DeFattore, 2004; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001). While all three branches of the federal government contributed to this era's conversation about religion clause issues and public schooling, and there are numerous state cases involving public education and religion of note (DeFattore, 2004), this section will highlight the SCOTUS decisions of this era, as they had the most direct impact on TEPs and the instruction of preservice teachers. The following sections employs Witte's (2011)

two phase characterization of SCOTUS rulings as of two eras and two types: the “separationist logic” largely of 1948 to 1987, and the “equal access logic” largely of 1987 to 2001.

1948-1987: The “separationist logic” of the supreme court. Separationist logic is the establishment clause principle of keeping church and state separate. During this era, it manifests itself in SCOTUS rulings that used “the establishment clause to ban religious teachers, texts, teachings, prayers, ceremonies, and symbols from public grade schools and high schools. Young, impressionable students who are required by law to attend school cannot risk being coerced by religion...students and teachers could pursue their private religious exercises away from the school and could be released to do so” (Witte & Nichols, 2011, p. 191). As a consequence, preservice teachers of this era were, for the first time, forced to consider how their actions in the classroom could run afoul of the religion clauses in light of these SCOTUS rulings.

In *McCollum v. Board of Education*, the court ruled that the establishment clause was violated when Illinois students were released from class to receive devotional religious instruction from religious leaders on school grounds, even though the participation was voluntary and with parental consent. Writing for the majority, Justice Black declared that “this is beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school to aid religious groups to spread their faith. And it falls squarely under the ban of the First Amendment” (“*McCollum v. Board of Education*,” 1948). Four years later, in *Zorach v. Clauson*, the court upheld a New York school district’s practice of allowing students to be released from class early to receive devotional religious instruction from religious leaders off school grounds. The court ruled that neither of the religion clauses were violated as the students were not coerced to participate, parental consent was given, no public funds were utilized in the program, and it took place off school grounds (“*Zorach v. Clauson*,” 1952). Two additional cases in the 1960s

dramatically changed the conversation on public schools and religion: the prayer in schools case ("Engel v. Vitale," 1962), and the Bible in schools case ("Abington School District v. Schempp," 1963).

Engel v. Vitale and the prayer cases. DelFattore (2004) does not overstate the importance of this case as a watershed moment in the intersection between government, religion, and public education:

For the first time in American history, the Supreme Court told state officials what they could and could not do with regard to prayer in the public schools, and from that time on the federal government has been a major player in the development of policies regarding religious expression in public schools. (p. 61)

At issue was a prayer the New York State Board of Regents [hereafter: the Regents' Prayer] composed for use in public schools. It read "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence on Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our Country" ("Engel v. Vitale," 1962). The prayer was meant to combat the public's fears of the decline of American values, morality, and patriotism, as well as the rise of communism, atheism, and social unrest (DelFattore, 2004). It was intended to be nondenominational, nonsectarian, and inoffensive to the diverse population of the state (DelFattore, 2004; Witte & Nichols, 2011), and was accompanied by instructions exhorting educators to be vigilant against possible violations of the establishment clause (DelFattore, 2004). However, "the Regents' Prayer conflicts with deistic, polytheistic, nontheistic, and atheistic beliefs even more directly than the [King James Bible] differs from Catholicism" (DelFattore, 2004, p. 70), a statement harkening back to the battles of previous eras.

While students who did not want to participate could remain silent or be excused from the room during the prayer, Justice Black, writing for the majority, rejected such arguments and the prayer on its face, holding that

It is no part of the business of the government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by government . . . When the power, prestige, and financial support of government is placed behind a particular religious belief, the indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform to the prevailing officially approved religion is plain. ("Engel v. Vitale," 1962)

This ruling did not, as some affirm, remove prayer from public schools; rather it removed the state's imposition of a specific religious practice on students of all worldviews. This ruling also impacted future school prayer cases.

In *Wallace v Jaffree* (1985) the court held moments of silence in public schools to be a legislative attempt to restore prayer to schools after *Engel*. Currently some school districts wrestle with how to include moments of silence without running afoul of this ruling (James C. Carper et al., 2009; DelFattore, 2004; Greenawalt, 2005). Separationist logic also prevailed in the later prayer cases of *Lee v Weisman* (1991) and *Santa Fe Independent School District v Doe* (2000) where the court held that prayer at public school graduations and football games, respectively, violate the establishment clause. These rulings impact how preservice and in-service teachers should be instructed to conduct themselves within various public school settings, because teachers interact with the diverse worldviews of their students in all aspects of students' school life.

Abington School District v. Schempp and the bible cases. A 1949 Pennsylvania statute required that at least ten verses from the Bible would be read at the beginning of the school day.

This was done by a teacher, student, or administrator, and was either read in individual classrooms or broadcast across the school. The statute held that the teacher responsible for the Bible passage to be read, who failed to do so, could be fired. After a slight battle with administrators, Ellory Schempp, a junior at Abington High School, was allowed to spend homeroom in the guidance counselor's office while this practice was observed in his classroom. When a new principal entered the school building and revoked Ellory's arrangement, the Schempp family filed a lawsuit with the ACLU.

In an 8 -1 decision, the court's separationist logic was applied once again. Here they found that compulsory Bible reading was a violation of both religion clauses. The school practice ran afoul of the establishment clause as the school imposed a religious exercise on public school students. However, the court was clear in expressing that it was not opposed to the Bible being used as an instructional tool within public schools. The decision, in part, reads:

It might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistently with the First Amendment. But the exercises here do not fall into those categories. They are religious exercises, required by the States in violation of the command of the First Amendment that the Government maintain strict neutrality, neither aiding nor opposing religion. ("Abington School District v. Schempp," 1963)

The Bible reading in the Abington School District was not undertaken as objective instruction of religion, or employing the Bible as literature within the curriculum, rather it was a

devotional practice. This was made more apparent as the practice of Bible reading was often accompanied by the recitation of The Lord's Prayer. The decision further reads, "to withstand the strictures of the Establishment Clause there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion" ("Abington School District v. Schempp," 1963). The Abington Bible reading failed both of these requirements.

The religious freedom of religious minorities was also impeded by this devotional Bible reading. The Schempp family, who were Unitarian, retained Dr. Solomon Grayzel, a Jewish rabbi and scholar as an expert witness. His testimony highlighted multiple ways that this practice infringed upon the religious liberty of students. He repudiated the school board's assertion that Bible reading took place "without comment" by pointing out that the King James Bible "contains Christocentric chapter headings, epigraphs, and other explanatory materials suggesting, among other things, that the primary purpose of the Hebrew scriptures/Old Testament is to foretell the coming of Jesus" (DeFattore, 2004). This is a viewpoint rejected by a host of worldviews, not only Jewish ones. However, thinking specifically of Jewish students, two other statements of Dr. Grayzel are of note: "I don't want to step on anybody's toes, but the idea of God having a son is, from the viewpoint of Jewish faith, practically blasphemous"; and when talking about Matthew 27:25— wherein the Jewish people at the trial of Jesus are recorded as telling Pontius Pilate "His blood be on us, and on our children"—

And I submit to you that this verse, this exclamation has been the cause of more anti-Jewish riots throughout the ages than anything else in history. And if you subject a Jewish child to listening to this sort of reading ... I think he is being subjected to little short of torture ("Abington School District v. Schempp," 1963).

These examples highlight the impact on religious minorities forced to remain in a classroom where such devotional practices are taking place. Addressing this aspect of the case, the majority opinion cites *Board of Education v. Minor* when asserting that religious freedom in the country means “absolute equality before the law, of all religious opinions and sects” and that “the government is neutral, and, while protecting all, it prefers none, and it disparages none” (“Board of Education v. Minor,” 1872).

The prohibition against devotional Bible reading and religious practices in public schools continued after *Abington*. In *Epperson v. Arkansas* (1968) the court held an Arkansas law that banned the teaching of evolution in schools violated the establishment clause. The court held that the law was founded on the belief that the teaching of evolution ran counter to an interpretation of a creation story in the biblical *Book of Genesis*. In *Edwards v. Aguillard* (1987) the court held invalid a Louisiana law that required public schools to promote a “balanced treatment” approach to the teaching of evolution and creation science. The court reasoned that, as the law had no secular aim, and that “the primary purpose of the Creationism Act is to advance a particular religious belief,” it was “in violation of the First Amendment” (“Edwards v. Aguillard,” 1987). The impact of these rulings on preservice and in-service teachers is apparent, both in terms of practices that are banned, but also the type of content that is presents in classrooms: from the science classroom’s stance on human origins, to the humanities teacher making biblical allusions, or discussing the role of religion in history. TEPs have a responsibility to instruct preserve teachers in the managing these potential controversies.

These two rulings banned compulsory school-sponsored prayer of all kinds, and compulsory school-sponsored devotional Bible reading from public schools as violations of both the Establishment and Free Exercise clauses. These two cases were a driving force behind the

escalation of the “culture war” mentioned above, which many argue has been fought the hardest and loudest in public schools (DeFattore, 2004; Fraser, 1999; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Laycock, 1991; Macedo, 2000; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sears & Carper, 1998; Wertheimer, 2015).

1987-2001: The “equal access logic” of the supreme court. Witte’s (2011) second division of SCOTUS rulings is based on critics of separationist logic and rulings. Critics argue that public schools are “establishing secularism in the public school under the guise of neutrality” and that “secular, rational, and scientific instruction of the public school is just as loaded with values and just as dependent on myths and metaphors as traditional forms of religion” (p. 199). This perspective has been noted by multiple authors who employ the terms “secular,” “secularism,” and/or “secular humanism” when discussing this alternative worldview (Anderson, 2004; S. L. Carter, 1993; Edlin, 1994; Greenawalt, 2005; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sproul et al., 2012). Witte argues that another critique of separationist logic is that removing religion from the public schools “harms rather than helps in cultivating the very democratic values and abilities the Court is trying to protect,” that “religion is not like alcohol that is to be avoided until adulthood ... but is a powerful and perennial force in society, for good or ill, and every budding democratic citizen needs to learn to deal with it responsibly (Witte & Nichols, 2011, p. 199). A third critique is that separationist logic has valued the establishment clause over the free exercise and free speech clauses. That public school students and teachers often have these personal rights abridged in favor of the government not being perceived as being unduly entangled with religion. As a response, equal access logic holds that

Religious students and other parties must be given equal access to facilities, forums, and even funds that the public school makes available to similarly positioned nonreligious

parties...[and] have allowed for private religious exercises on school grounds outside of formal instructional time, as well as for extracurricular education on school premises even if it is religiously motivated and inspired. (Witte & Nichols, 2011, p. 199)

A series of SCOTUS cases and Congressional action codified equal access logic in the American education system, first in higher education and then primary and secondary schools.

In *Widmar v. Vincent* (1981) the University of Missouri was sued when Cornerstone, a Christian student group, was not permitted to meet on campus. The university maintained that its restriction was to prevent the institution from running afoul of the establishment clause, as publically funded educational settings should not be used “for purposes of religious worship or religious teaching” (“Widmar v. Vincent,” 1981). However, the court decided that the central matter was “not whether the creation of a religious forum would violate the Establishment Clause. The University has opened its facilities for use by student groups, and the question is whether it can now exclude groups because of the content of their speech” (“Widmar v. Vincent,” 1981). To this point, the students argued, and the court agreed, that the university had created a limited public forum in that it allowed a wide range of secular worldviews to be proclaimed on campus. Thus, to limit the speech of only religious students was unconstitutional. The institution would have to provide “equal treatment and access” to all groups or none at all.

In this decision, the court expressly limited this application to public colleges and universities, and specified that it did not apply to public elementary, middle, and secondary schools. Furthermore, the court declined to hear *Brandon v. Board of Education of Guilderland*, letting stand a lower court opinion which refused to extend *Widmar* to public schools. As a result, Congress passed the *Equal Access Act [EAA]*, which extended *Widmar* to public schools.

The *EAA* states

It shall be unlawful for any public secondary school which receives Federal financial assistance and which has a limited open forum to deny equal access or a fair opportunity to, or discriminate against, any students who wish to conduct a meeting within that limited open forum on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings. ("Equal Access Act," 1984)

The Act's meaning is best illustrated by the resulting case law.

In 1990, the court upheld the *EAA*, in *Board of Education v. Mergens*. Justice O'Connor wrote that the court held that the *EAA* passed the Lemon test

Even if some legislators were motivated by a conviction that religious speech in particular was valuable and worthy of protection ... what is relevant is the legislative purpose of the statute, not the possibly religious motives of the legislators who enacted the law. Because the Act on its face grants equal access to both secular and religious speech, we think it clear that the Act's purpose was not to "endorse or disapprove of religion." ("Board of Ed. of Westside Community Schools (Dist. 66) v. Mergens," 1990)

The *EAA* set the stage for other SCOTUS decisions.

In 1993 *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School District* the court extended equal access principles in public schools to religious groups other than students. The court held that a school district cannot use the establishment clause to deny religious groups equal access to their facilities if they have created a limited public forum for other groups: this sort of religious viewpoint discrimination was a violation of the First Amendment. In *Good News Club v. Milford Central School* (2001) the court similarly held that once a school has created a limited public forum it could not block The Good News Club—a private Christian organization—from using

the school cafeteria for religious instruction after-school after offering the space to be used by local organizations. Writing for the majority, Justice Thomas penned:

By denying the Club access to the school's limited public forum on the ground that the Club was religious in nature, Milford discriminated against the Club because of its religious viewpoint in violation of the Free Speech Clause. That exclusion is indistinguishable from the exclusions held violative of the Clause in *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School Dist.*, 508 U. S. 384, where a school district precluded a private group from presenting films at the school based solely on the religious perspective of the films. ("Good News Club v. Milford Central School," 2001)

The majority went further to say "permitting the Club to meet on the school's premises would not have violated the Establishment Clause" despite the district's separationist concerns ("Good News Club v. Milford Central School," 2001). Up until the present, LGBTQ groups, Young Atheists clubs, and other multicultural or worldview specific clubs have petitioned schools and/or sued for equal access under the *EAA*, showing that it is important for preservice and in-service teachers to receive instruction in equal access logic as it relates to their professional interactions with public school students.

The Present Realities

Despite the many professional concerns public school teachers face in light of the religion clauses, the research on how TEPs in the United States currently address issues related to the religion clauses and education law as a whole is consistent: classroom teachers do not know educational law because they are not being taught about it in TEPs (Eckes, 2008; Gajda, 2008; Garner, 2000; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a, 1997b; Henderson et al., 1999; Littleton, 2008; Marks et al., 2014; Wagner, 2007, 2008). Wertheimer (2015) charts a rise in calls for education

about religion(s) in public schools, and appropriate preservice teacher training which began in the late 1960s, declined during the culture wars of the 1970s and 1980s, but has seen some resurgence in light of increased globalization and major events like 9/11. Despite this, federal and state entities have not made such educative experiences for preservice teachers a priority in educational mandates.

The absence of federal mandates on public schools' religion clause issues. The Federal government gives no guidance to TEPs for how they should instruct preservice teachers in regards to religion clause issues. It is sometimes argued that the Federal government should cede all control of education policy to state and local authorities; however this belief is called into question when one considers the numerous examples of troubles that have resulted in the aforementioned legislation and cases. Clarity from above could help curb the increase of litigation and lapses in teacher/administrator judgment. Furthermore, none of the guidelines or suggestions from the Federal government takes into account incidents of student-on-student harassment. Keller (2003) notes that this area is a "statutory void" (p. 3) when it comes to how Federal law enacts the religion clause in a public school setting. The only substantive document on this matter was the Clinton administration's 1995 "Memorandum on Religious Expression in Public Schools." However, this document merely clarifies "situations where the protections accorded by the First Amendment are not recognized or understood" (Clinton & William, 1995) as they apply to public schools. It does not create any explicit mandates for TEPs instruction of preservice teachers. Beyond this, there is very little that directly impacts religion clause issues in the public schools.

While the United States Department of Justice asserts that "Title IV [of the Civil Rights Act of 1964] may be violated when teachers harass students because of their faith, *or, in some*

cases, when schools are deliberately indifferent to pervasive student-on-student-harassment” (emphasis added, *Religious Discrimination in Education*, 2015), and the United States Department of Education states that Title VI can be used to cover religious protection of students “when the discrimination is based on the religious group's actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics,” (Duncan & King Jr., 2015). Keller (2003) advocates “the adoption of a federal statute expressly prohibiting religious harassment in education” (p. 3) because in lieu of one, the federal courts have “reject[ed] the victims' constitutional arguments and refus[ed] to impose a constitutional duty upon the school to intervene and stop the known acts of religious harassment” (p. 3), finding that the religion clauses protect students from government speech and action, but not those of other students (*"Lindsley ex rel. Kolodziejczack v. Girard School," 2002; "Smith v. Lincoln Park Public Schools, 2004 WL 1124467 (Mich. App. May 20, 2004)," 2004*). Currently the religion clauses protect students against government action, but not that of private citizens such as other students. There have yet to be any cases argued under the religion clauses about student-on-student harassment where the student won; however in a related effort, the United States Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights is for the first time compiling “the number of incidents of religious-based bullying or harassment” (Lhamon, 2016) in public schools for the 2015-2016 school year.

As the research presented below will show, very little is being done by TEPs to equip preservice teachers to address these concerns. This is in part due to a lack of federal mandates, but also because there is a dearth of guidelines for TEPs at the state level.

State mandates on public schools' religion clause issues. Gullatt and Tollett (1997a) surveyed all 50 state departments of education to ascertain their TEPs requirements to instruct on education law. They found that only two states (Washington and Nevada) mandated a specific

course in education law. Twenty-five states mandated that legal issues relevant to the classroom are addressed somewhere in the program, while 23 states have no mandate at all with regard to education law. Littleton (2008) found similar results, noting that while older teachers seemed more knowledgeable about education law, that this was a result of experience on the job, not formal training. Younger teachers knew very little about education law and were more susceptible to errors in this arena. Both of these studies dealt with the broad category of education law, not the narrow field of religious expression within education law. There are no current mandates from state departments of education regarding the inclusion of religious expression law within TEPs, though the research has shown that preservice and in-service teachers are specifically lacking this training and are in need of it (Anderson, 2004; Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Greenawalt, 2005; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Luke, 2004; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Taft, 2011). Gajda's (2008) survey of state education licensing divisions found that only six states have standards that "explicitly address and articulate knowledge and skills that teachers must have" with regard to "religion and education" (p. 22). None of those states, however, require a course in education law, nor were they certain of the information assessed in their state's teacher certification exam.

Gullatt and Tollett (1997b) conducted additional research resulting in a list of four reasons for why TEPs should be invested in instruction on educational law: (a) teachers are subject to lawsuits and knowledge of the law is a proactive element; (b) very few undergraduate TEPs include any formal courses about the legal rights and professional responsibilities of teachers; (c) jurisprudence considerably changes the teaching profession in regards to the rights of students and school district obligations; and (d) Congress and state legislatures enact laws that affect education, resulting in administrative rules and regulations being generated by federal and

state agencies. Other researchers have noted the trend of increasing litigation against schools and teachers (Davis & Williams, 1992; Dunn, 2009; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a; Littleton, 2008; Militello et al., 2009; Wagner, 2008). Wagner (2007) noted that there has been an increase in teachers buying liability insurance in case they are brought to court.

Given this reality it is unsurprising that unintentional breeches of the law happen frequently (Gullatt & Tollett, 1997b; Kaiser, 2003; Littleton, 2008). Kaiser argued that “teachers don’t know what they don’t know” (2003, p. 338), and gives the example of whether a teacher should be held liable for using a textbook or other school district approved materials which are in violation of the religion clauses if the teacher is unaware that the material is inappropriate. Teacher ignorance of both students’ worldviews and the law is a problem for both teachers and students (Taft, 2011). Gullatt & Tollett (1997b) asked if students in the medical and business professions are instructed in relevant law courses, why is the same not true for education? To this is added Campbell’s (2002) findings: his sample of teacher respondents knew of their legal ignorance, were eager for more learning in these areas, but needed more opportunities to receive such instruction. In Gajda’s estimation, “if school law is to be addressed in any substantial way by state standards and mandated assessments, professors of education law and lawyers must work collaboratively with professors of education, curriculum developers, practicing professionals, test developers, and licensure personnel” (2008, p. 23).

The above presented the history and nature of teacher preparation from the American colonial era to the present, and examined the sociological realities that shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed to address students’ numinous and secular worldviews. For the majority of the eras covered, there is scant direct research and literature on the relationship between religion clause issues and the history of teacher education programs in the

United States. However, directives towards preservice teachers were adduced from the contemporary socio-political and religious climate, as that the two topics are intrinsically linked. The above also presented the history of the SCOTUS decisions, as well as the federal and state mandates, that directly impact how TEPs should instruction preservice teachers to address religion clause issues. In response the historic and current realities, scholars have proposed pedagogies and theories of how TEPs in the country should operate in regards to students' worldviews. The next section examines the work of these scholars.

Part 2: Current Questions and Suggestions for Teacher Education for Religion Clause Instruction

This section investigates current suggestions for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion the clause issues. Commonalities between these approaches are highlighted, but preference is not shown for certain models. It is the contention of this study that there are multiple manners in which TEPs can competently instruct preservice teachers in religion clause issues: that a one-size-fits-all model is not necessary for TEPs.

Scholars and researchers widely agree that TEPs need to provide preservice teachers instruction on how to navigate educational law; specifically religion clause issues that interact with students' worldviews (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; S. L. Carter, 1993; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Fraser, 1999; Garner, 2000; S. K. Green, 2012; Greenawalt, 2005; Gullatt & Tollett, 1997a, 1997b; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Henderson et al., 1999; Hufford, 2010; Kaiser, 2003; Kunzman, 2006; Luke, 2004; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; Sears & Carper, 1998; Taft, 2011; Waggoner, 2013; Wertheimer, 2015; White, 2009,

2013). This section first outlines the questions related to school policies and practice around the religion clauses, and then presents an examination of the answers to these questions, proposed by scholars in the field.

It should be noted at this juncture that the literature does not privilege numinous worldviews over secular worldviews. Although a reader could potentially draw that conclusion from what follows, it would be an error to do so. The suggestions from the scholars below are within the context(s) of discussions about constitutional concerns such as establishment, endorsement, coercion, neutrality, viewpoint discrimination, and secularization within the public school classroom, as these have a potential impact on curriculum and pedagogy, as well as teacher ethos and action as discussed in Chapter One of this dissertation. These suggestions for TEPs religion clause instruction operate within broader arguments for how education in the United States should operate. While there is no consensus on how TEPs should provide preservice teachers instruction to navigate religion clause issues, patterns in the literature are apparent and presented below. These patterns are rooted in a respect for the academic, civic, and personal rights of students that are a primary protection of the religion clauses. We turn first to the questions related to school policies and practice around the religion clauses.

Questions in School Policy and Practice

Public school administrators and policy makers, as well as preservice and in-service teachers are confronted with a host of questions that impact public school students' worldviews, beyond the explicit teaching of devotional religion or compulsory prayer. Scholars invested in the relationship between public schools and First Amendment law regularly write about questions such as: Can students be censored or punished for promoting their worldviews through verbal speech, clothing, or the distribution of physical and/or digital materials on public school

grounds, including if those worldviews are at odds with implicit or explicit school values (S. L. Carter, 1993; DelFattore, 2004; Dunn, 2009; Epley, 2007; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Hamilton, 2014; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sears & Carper, 1998)? Can students express those worldviews in their academic assignments, through extra-curricular groups, or other avenues on school grounds (Darden, 2006; DelFattore, 2004; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Hamilton, 2014; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Moore, 2007; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Randall, 2013)? Can a student's proselytization of another student be a form of harassment (Darden, 2006; Dunn, 2009; Keller, 2003; Randall, 2013; Wertheimer, 2015; Zirkel, 2009)? Can teachers explain their worldviews outside of class or in response to student questions in class (Bryant, 2012; Darden, 2006; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Nash, 1999; Sears & Carper, 1998; Wertheimer, 2015)? Is a teacher's comment, or school curriculum that offends a student's worldview a violation of the religion clauses? Can students opt-out of and/or receive alternate assignments when their worldview is in conflict with the approved school curriculum (Anderson, 2004; Bryant, 2012; S. L. Carter, 1993; Darden, 2006; Edlin, 1994; Epley, 2007; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Hamilton, 2014; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nash, 1999; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Randall, 2013; Sears & Carper, 1998; Sproul et al., 2012; Wertheimer, 2015)? Can teachers have personal religious literature in their classroom, even if that material is not shared with students? Can teachers wear religious clothing or jewelry in the classroom (S. L. Carter, 1993; DelFattore, 2004; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III,

1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Wertheimer, 2015)? Can teachers participate in student-initiated and student-led prayer activities such as “See You At the Pole” or student Bible clubs (DelFattore, 2004; Epley, 2007; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Russo, 2013; Sears & Carper, 1998; Wertheimer, 2015)? Can schools sponsor prayer at graduation ceremonies, assemblies, sporting events, or other gatherings (Darden, 2006; DelFattore, 2004; Epley, 2007; Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Russo, 2013; Sears & Carper, 1998; Wertheimer, 2015)? Can schools force students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance or stand silently during its recitation (Greenawalt, 2005; Marty & Moore, 2000)? Similarly, can they force students to observe moments of silence (James C. Carper et al., 2009; DelFattore, 2004; Greenawalt, 2005), or participate in school-sponsored meditation or mindfulness activities (C. Haynes, 2009; “Malnak v. Yogi,” 1979; Masters, 2014; “Sedlock v. Baird,” 2015)?

Every winter public school personnel weather the “December dilemma” storm (Nord & Haynes, 1998, p. 69) of how to handle religious holidays in an appropriate manner. This one example is instructive. Teachers need instruction on the treatment of religious holidays, not only in terms of which holidays are discussed, but also the manner in which they are taught, whether or not they are celebrated in the school, the manner in which the school presents physical displays (Darden, 2006; Epley, 2007; Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Nord & Haynes, 1998) — for “no holiday season is complete... without one of more First Amendment challenges to public holiday displays” (Epley, 2007, p. 191)—as well as whether school personnel incorrectly equate the same cultural or religious significance to all the observances that fall during what many schools call “winter break.” Chanukah, Christmas,

Kwanzaa, *Milad un Nabi* (when it falls late in the calendar year), and Winter Solstice do not have the same equivalent significance to the people of faith who observe them. Teachers should be aware of the religious and secular significance a holiday holds for different students (c.f. St. Valentine's Day, Halloween, and Christmas) (Gibbs Jr. & Gibbs III, 1998; Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Nord & Haynes, 1998). Knowledge of this kind is also important in terms of policies around student observances, including how teachers and administrators handle student absences (S. L. Carter, 1993). The above examples of religion clause issues that arise within the public school require a certain set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to safeguard students and the community. The suggestions of scholars to provide that certain set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes are numerous. The next section presents an examination of the answers to the above questions, proposed by scholars in the field.

Suggestions for School Policy and Practice

When speaking of the level of training needed for public school teachers, Marty and Moore (2000) do not advocate "doctorate-level critical approaches but simpler ones intended to reach the minds of children aged six to eighteen," stating that TEPs should enable teachers to "recognize and understand spiritual nuances, religious commitments, and practices with the same competence required of them in other disciplines" (p. 49). Davis and Williams (1992) advocate that TEPs should include specific instruction on the Establishment Clause, including the *Lemon Test*, the judicial criteria used to determine if a government action is in violation of the Establishment Clause. They also propose that preservice teachers should take educational law courses, with issues of religious expression included throughout their liberal arts course work, and/or covered in their foundational education courses. Eckes (2008), while critiquing the

methodology of previous research efforts, showed the dearth of teacher knowledge of educational law. It was also shown that stakeholders—including classroom teachers, school administrators, legal scholars, and educational researchers—advocate for specific instruction in matters of educational law in teacher preparation programs and feel that it should be required for teacher licensure. Within the recommendations for teacher preparation programs, Eckes argued that “preservice teachers should be aware of First Amendment issues related to religion in schools” specifically the tension between the religious expression clauses (p. 30). Furthermore, Eckes suggested that preservice teachers should be knowledgeable of cases evoking these clauses, specifically recommending the SCOTUS cases *Abington Township v. Schempp* (1963), *Wallace v. Jaffree* (1985), *Lee v. Weisman* (1992), and *Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe* (2000), all discussed in Part One of this Chapter. Other scholars give more in-depth treatment to these matters of teacher preparation.

Noddings (1993) advocates for “an education for intelligent belief or unbelief [that] puts great emphasis on self-knowledge, and that knowledge must come to grips with the emotional and spiritual as well as the intellectual and psychological” (p. xiv). In defining intelligent belief/unbelief, she goes further to say that

To believe without either the evidence required by scientists or the logic promoted by scholastics is not irrational. But to believe without thinking through the questions that arise regularly in life—to merely accept or reject—is surely not intelligent. It is also unintelligent to ignore either the positive or negative side of religion. Education for intelligent belief or unbelief is as much education of the heart as it is education of the mind. (p. xiv)

She argues that public schools “should play a major role in educating for intelligent belief or unbelief. There is nothing in the establishment clause of the first amendment that prevents classroom instruction *about* religion” (p. xv).

While Noddings (1993) details at length how intelligent belief and unbelief can be achieved in the specific content area classes of public schools in nonsectarian, constitutionally appropriate manners, she notes that it is “morally reprehensible” to ignore how sectarian worldviews are influential in the life of students, thus schools have a duty to discuss them. Furthermore, to limit such conversations to college is also problematic as “some students never get to college, and those who do, having had no previous preparation, are in no better position to choose critically than their slightly younger peers. All students deserve an opportunity to engage matters central to life in an environment that is noncoercive and supportive” (p. 133). Noddings states that it is the job of classroom teachers “committed to pedagogical neutrality” (p. 133) to aid students in “the free exchange of human concerns— a way in which people striving for intelligent belief or unbelief share their awe, doubts, fears, hopes, knowledge, and ignorance” (p. 133).

The only way that the level of inquiry, intellectual rigor, and civic respect can take place in the classroom, is if teachers have a “broad academic background” (Noddings, 1993, p. 135) in the liberal arts. Preservice teacher must learn the totality of high school curriculum in greater depth, not only their specific content areas. For, “if all high school students must take a prescribed set of subjects, then surely it is not unreasonable to insist that all high school teachers should know this material quite well” (p. 136). Nodding admits that training teachers in this way will largely remove the masters-level content area work being done in many TEPs, however, she reminds that most teachers do not often use masters-level work when instructing in grade 6-12

classrooms, and that the teachers who would like higher education of that sort, can and should further their education. As Noddings has serious doubts that this pedagogical change will take hold in TEPs, she encourages the implementation of school-based professional development initiatives and the encouragement of personal growth among individual teachers.

Marks, Binkley, and Daly (2014) conducted research into whether their elementary and secondary social studies preservice teachers had enough knowledge about religions to be both competent in their content areas, and “culturally responsive in a classroom” (p. 245). As a result of their research, they instituted multiple adjustments to their courses and curriculum. These include a focus on “correcting misinformation and countering ignorance... rather than just presenting information about religions” (p.254), “discussing the diversity of beliefs and practices that may exist, even within religions” (p.254), hosting panel discussions with community members “from various non-majority religions...[to] disclose their religious identities and share stories about their experiences around religion as students in public schools” (p. 255), facilitating discussions on the impact of religion(s) on society (p.254), explicitly “discussing the legality of religion in schools” (p.254), modeling methods of “using religion and the Constitution as the content, including mock court cases, using written debates, and using document-based questions” (p. 254), and encouraging preservice teachers’ commitment to “ongoing reflection on religion throughout their year or semester-long courses” (p.254).

Grelle’s essay (2013), which appears in an edited book of scholars wrestling with issues related to religion and the public school system in the United States, examines the benefits public school districts have experienced working with the 3 Rs Project, a collaboration between “citizens, educators, and scholars who are dedicated to the idea that the religion clauses of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution provide the guiding principles for citizenship

in American's pluralistic democracy. Foremost among these principles are the "3 Rs" of religious liberty – rights, responsibilities, and respect (p. 92). Recognizing how "the role of religions in public education [has] figured prominently in [the] culture wars" of the country (p. 92), the 3 Rs Project seeks to create a "'civic public school' which respects the religious liberty of students and includes religious perspectives in the curriculum while simultaneously rejecting government endorsement or promotion of religion" (p. 100). A "civic public school" model stands in opposition to those who advocate for a "sacred public school" promoting sectarian, religious beliefs on the one hand, and those who advocate for a "naked public school" promoting the exclusion of religion(s) from public discourse altogether on the other hand (p. 100). While the 3 Rs Project mainly targets public school "teachers, administrators, school board members, and community representatives" (p. 98), the content of their presentations and workshops are instructive for TEPs, as they mirror what scholars advocate for preservice teacher in regards to the religion clauses.

3 Rs Project participants learn about the difference between school-sponsored devotional instruction of religion(s), and the academic study of religion(s) through *Abington v. Schempp* (1963), principles of governmental neutrality through *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971), and about protected student speech and practice through the *Equal Access Act* (1984). In addition, "through the use of case studies, participants learn how to use constitutional principles to negotiate conflicts and to work towards consensus on issues of religions and ethnic diversity confronting schools and local communities" (p. 98). The 3 R Project urges that "teachers must also be prepared to understand and cope with the religious diversity that typically exists in their own classrooms" (p. 99). Thus, the workshops and follow-up meetings provide curriculum and pedagogical tools to aid classroom teachers to best accomplish these goals. Haynes and Thomas

(2001) suggest that TEPs should study the 3Rs Project as a guide for the instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues.

White's essay (2013), which is found in the same collection as Grelle's, aligns students' numinous worldviews with multiculturalism. White argued that most discussions and research on multicultural education leave out the element of religion. Citing studies done by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life in America, White highlights the changes in demographics, as well as "dramatic shifts on the religious landscape in the United States" (p. 162), and proposed "that religion should no longer be marginalized but brought into the discussion of multiculturalism" (p. 165-166). Furthermore, "culturally relevant teachers strive to meet three criteria: develop students academically, nurture and support cultural competence, and develop a critical consciousness . . . [that] they not only organize and deliver the overt curriculum that may minimize or equalize issues of race and power but also impact the hidden curriculum" (p. 164-165). To this end, White presents four vignettes as case studies from her experiences as a parent, a classroom teacher, a researcher, and a teacher educator that "speak to the complex interactions between religious observance, religious literacy, teaching, and learning" (p. 167).

White (2013) reframed the 2001 Multicultural Education Consensus Panel's 12 principles and argued that "to develop students' religious literacy, we must incorporate religion into the multicultural framework" (p. 173). Of important note is her statement about teacher preparation and professional development. Quoted in full:

Religion matters and it should be incorporated into the professional development of teachers. Pre-service teachers need to understand how their religious beliefs and experiences may influence how they learn to teach. Practicing teachers need to explore how their religious orientations impact their thinking and enactment in the classroom. All

teachers need to develop their knowledge of religious group to inform how to appropriately infuse religious content into the curriculum, as well as how to support positive social relationships with and between students. (p. 173)

Other scholars echo parts of this perspective.

Anderson (2004) stated that

Success in the educational pursuits advocated here demands that teachers develop relationships with students in which they honor their students' varied perspectives about integrating their understandings from the different academic fields, as well as varied worldviews with which they enter the classroom. (p. 131)

He advocated that preservice teachers need not only to be trained in appropriate pedagogical strategies, but also be placed in practicum settings where they see those strategies being enacted well by in-service professionals. In addition, in-service professional development should be regularly provided for classroom teachers; there is a responsibility on classroom teachers, however, to stay abreast of the curricular, pedagogical, and legal concerns of their own content areas, the specific concerns of a biology teacher will differ from that of a world history teacher, and school-wide professional developments cannot appropriately address all of their specific content area needs.

Anderson (2004) said that fostering *currere* is an integral part of student's educational experience: that it is the teacher's job to create space wherein students can create their identity through personal reflection. Teachers should encourage students to shape their understanding of content materials through their worldviews, which includes the numinous expressions relevant to that student. Teachers must therefore be trained to handle the deeply held beliefs of students with care (Anderson, 2004, 2008). In changing TEPs, Anderson advocates (a) for a required religious

studies course, (b) that the multicultural requirements in education courses include discussions and activities addressing religion, spirituality, and/or student worldviews, and (c) the inclusion of curriculum and pedagogy courses that directly address religion, spirituality, and/or student worldviews, with appropriate pre-practicum and practicum placements reinforcing course materials. To this point, Anderson quotes a graduate student re-evaluating her TEP: “In my teacher education program almost nothing was said about religion, yet every time I turned around I was hearing about multiculturalism. My religion is a more important part of who I am than my ethnicity. How could they have ignored it?” (p. 149). To aid this endeavor, Anderson crafted a workbook of case studies that can be used in both TEPs, for general in-service training, and personal professional development entitled *Religion and Teaching as a part of the Reflective Teaching and the Social Conditions of Schooling* series (Anderson, 2008). Other scholars addressed the need for change within TEPs in regards to students’ numinous worldviews from more civic perspectives.

Citing Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development’s report on *Religion in the Curriculum*, Nord and Haynes (1998) addressed the “New Consensus” that “teacher educators much ensure that teachers acquire the ‘substantive knowledge required to teach about religion in society,’ and all educators ‘should explore ways to foster public support for the teaching of rigorous, intellectually demanding accounts of religion in society’” (pp. 36-37). Teacher education must prepare teachers to “naturally include” (p. 37) religion and student worldviews into their curriculum, as well as to deal with their own biases; to combat teachers who “may use their position to promote their own faith or to be hostile to religion,” (p. 63) teacher education must be rooted in First Amendment case law as well as the study of religion.

Thus, attention must also be paid to age appropriate lessons, conversations, and activities in classrooms, as well as accommodating the religious expression of students.

Nord and Haynes (1998) recommend a near complete overhaul of the teacher education system. These changes include (a) fundamental changes to foundational philosophy of education and curriculum courses to address relevant civic and religious frameworks; (b) the addition of religious studies courses, as well as courses designed for content areas with “religiously contested materials” (p. 56) (e.g. religion and science, religion and American history, religion and literature); (c) training in the adoption of appropriate textbooks and materials for public school classrooms; and (d) changes in state-level certifications for preservice teachers to assure these types of competencies have been met. Nord and Haynes also comment on the need for public schools to offer on-going professional development for faculty, but extend this need to building-level administration, as well as school board members and superintendents. Their aim is to show that fundamental changes are required in both the preparation of preservice teachers and efforts to promote and sustain life-long learning in areas related to religion clauses issues.

These are sentiments Nord expressed in other works (1995, 2010) going further to explain that TEPs must present pedagogy and curriculum which explore (a) varying interpretations and worldviews; (b) reading cultural primary sources with empathy; (c) exploring contemporary religions as living options for exploring the world, (d) the complexity of religions through critical conversations; and (e) models for teaching. This last point includes teachers displaying appropriate neutrality, a practiced understanding of the difference between relativism and pluralism, and what Nord calls the “The Principle of Cultural Location and Weight,” that is providing students with the appropriate context for the ideas being presented, so students understand not only the beliefs held by a group, but also the setting of that belief (both time in

history and physical location), as well as the importance of the belief within that group. This principle is important as it combats the tendency for teachers to present religious groups monolithically.

In *Finding Common Ground: A First Amendment Guide to Religion and Public Schools* (2001), a resource designed to aid public school stakeholders with navigating First Amendment concerns, Haynes (now writing with Oliver Thomas) echoes all of the ideas above and advocates for TEPs to study the First Amendment Center's sponsorship of the 3Rs Project around the country. In addition, they put forth master's level programs and in-service trainings through colleges and universities like Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, and California State University – Chico. The New Consensus is taken up by other scholars as well.

Greenawalt (2005) argues that public schools need to teach “about religion” and how “individuals and societies” use religion to make meaning, without promoting religions or teaching content that relies on religious opinions or propositions in order to be true (pp. 186-187). However, he is deeply suspicious of the proficiency level of teacher training in the art and science of addressing religion in public school without proselytizing or denigrating worldviews. He argues against the notion that secular humanism is being actively taught as an ideology in the public schools, claiming instead that the lack of teacher training in methods for appropriately addressing students' worldviews causes a deficit in meeting the demands of the New Consensus; however, he finds this to be a pedagogical problem, not a constitutional one. Similarly, Prothero (2007) also speaks of the importance of teacher training in light of the New Consensus. Claiming his goal is “civic rather than theological” (p. 178), Prothero explains that his “brief on religious liberty proceeds on secular grounds, on the theory that Americans are not equipped or citizenship (or, for that matter, cocktail party conversations) without a basic understanding of Christianity

and the world's religions" (p. 179). To remedy this defect, he advocates for a mandatory Bible as literature class in all public schools. This class would focus on the structures, genres, stories, and characters that make the text a historical, social, and artistic catalysis in the world, Western culture, and the United States in particular. In addition, he advocates for a mandatory world religions class which covers the "seven great religious traditions of the world," but leaves room for the local community of the school to supplement religious perspectives appropriate for them (e.g. Native American religions, Santeria, and Hmong animism) (p. 169).

In order to accomplish this work, Prothero (2007) advances three ground rules: (a) teacher need to be properly trained, (b) parents should have opt-out provisions for courses they find objectionable based on religion or conscience and, as wrestled with throughout the historical review above, and (c) classes must be strictly academic, not devotional in nature. For preservice teachers he asserts that "given proper training and certification ... public school teachers are more than up to the task" (p. 170), and teachers currently in the classroom can receive proper remediation through weekend workshops and classes provided by religious studies and First Amendment professors and scholars. He also holds up California State University- Chino's *Religion and Public Education Project* and Harvard's *Religious Studies and Education Certificate* as examples of programs that prepare teachers to do this work (p. 163). The latter we turn to now.

Moore, the founder of the Program in Religion and Secondary Education (PRSE) at Harvard Divinity School—widely cited by other scholars in the field of religion and education—gives one of the most thorough treatments of the changes needs in teacher preparation. Moore (2007) explains the working of her program, which is predicated on three goals: (a) to present a strong argument in support of including the academic study of religion in public schools from a

comparative and multicultural lens that emphasizes diversity; (b) to construct methodologies and resources for secondary schools teachers and teacher educators to gain the knowledge base and skills necessary to creatively teach about religion in constitutionally sound, intellectually responsible, and educationally innovative ways; and (c) to link theory with practice by illustrating some of the common mistakes and best practices of teachers who incorporate the academic study of religion in secondary school classrooms (p. 5).

Moore (2007) argued that schools should provide students with the skills and experiences that enable them to “(a) function as active citizens who promote the ideals of democracy, (b) act as thoughtful and informed moral agents, and (c) lead fulfilling lives” (p. 89). However, these are values teachers must share before they are trained to accomplish these goals. In addition, Moore details how teachers must be “treated as professionals, supported as scholars, recognized as moral agents, and given voice as public intellectuals” (p. 90). He reasons that

Programs that recognize and value teachers as professionals, scholars, moral agents, and public intellectuals will fashion their teacher training initiatives in ways that support, strengthen, and develop these dimensions of teacher identity in the methods employed in the training program or initiative itself. (p. 91)

To help foster a recognition of teachers in the above manners, teacher training programs should include knowledge of (a) the historical and contemporary context of religion, democracy and public education, (b) the personal assumptions of teachers and the context of their community, (c) multiple methods of studying religion, primarily the cultural studies framework of studying religion, and (d) the appropriate methods to integrate religious perspectives within academic content. Programs should also include observations and practicums with mentor teachers and peer scholars who have shown mastery of the above (pp. 92-94).

Moore (2007) outlines the PRSE (now defunct but succeeded by the Religious Literacy Project that she leads at Harvard), wherein students earned either a Master of Theological Studies (MTS) or a Master of Divinity (M.Div.), and a content specific middle or secondary teaching license. In addition to the MTS or M.Div. courses taken, requirements of this program included four education courses: (a) Religion, Democracy and Public Education; (b) Colloquium in Religion and Secondary Education; (c) PRSE Teaching Practicum; and (d) PRSE Research Seminar, a course in adolescent psychology. Passing the appropriate content specific Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure (MTEL) was also a requirement for PRSE students. The highlight of this praised program (Nord, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; Wertheimer, 2015) is found in what is missing from the vast majority of TEPs in the United States:

In the context of their education towards licensure, students are specifically prepared to teach about religion from a nonsectarian perspective and to develop curriculum resources that incorporate religion and religious worldviews within their field(s) of expertise. They also learn about constitutional and public policy issues that arise when considering the complex relationships between religion and public education. (pp. 94-95)

Teachers were specifically taught to engage students' numinous worldviews with an eye to appropriate pedagogy and constitutional law.

For TEPs in general, Moore (2007) advocated that (a) their multicultural curriculum consistently include religion as a category of analysis, (b) they partner with the religion/religious studies programs on campus to prepare appropriate course work for education majors, and (c) preservice teachers demonstrate competence in nonsectarian approaches to teaching religion in their contexts. To this end Moore suggested that all "preservice educators be required to take a

minimum of two religious studies classes: one that would address the social context of education and religion in America and a second that would focus on a cultural studies approach to particular traditions” (p. 97).

Despite the above research, Kunzman (2006) argued that traditional 1-2 year graduate programs and 4-year undergraduate programs are not sufficient to prepare a teacher to know and demonstrate mastery of ethical education, the law, practices, and attitudes, though he still advocates that they must be taught. Kunzman proposed that TEPs should work to “instill in prospective teachers a *vision* of teaching that may extend beyond their current capacity to implement it, a vision that places great importance on helping students learn to engage respectfully with ethical diversity” (p. 128). TEPs should foster an ethos which recognized how positionality and bias affect teaching, as well as lifelong learning in regards to students’ numinous worldviews. Furthermore, TEPs should provide collaborative professional developments with school systems to support it.

In addition to the above, many scholars devote whole chapters to outline their specific vision how preservice and in-service teachers should conduct their classrooms the specific content areas of English/language arts (Anderson, 2004; Greenawalt, 2005; Moore, 2007; Noddings, 1993; Nord & Haynes, 1998), social studies (Anderson, 2004; Greenawalt, 2005; Moore, 2007; Noddings, 1993; Nord & Haynes, 1998), and the sciences (Anderson, 2004; Greenawalt, 2005; Moore, 2007; Noddings, 1993; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sears & Carper, 1998). Suggestions are also made for the instruction about religion in content classroom, as well as religion(s) courses (Feinberg & Layton, 2014; Greenawalt, 2005; Nash, 1999; Noddings, 1993; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; Sears & Carper, 1998), and character education classes and lessons (Anderson, 2004; S. L. Carter, 1993; Greenawalt, 2005; Hardin, 2012; Kessler, 2000;

Kunzman, 2006; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Sears & Carper, 1998;Sizer & Sizer, 1999), for those to be created, as well as the support those that already exist. Nord (1998) goes further, making suggestions for elementary education and the arts. Unsurprisingly, suggestions for mathematics was not mentioned in the literature, which is most likely the result of there not being any “natural inclusion” of religion(s), or discussion of competing worldviews. Noddings (1993) makes some mention of mathematics in her chapter on “Essential and Metaphysical Questions in the Classroom,” but these are not as in-depth as the suggestions for curriculum and pedagogy presented for other content areas.

Summary

The literature reviewed herein examined two distinct spheres of religion clause issues in public schools. The first sphere examined nature of teacher preparation from the American colonial era to the present as it relates to the worldviews of public school students, detailing the sociological realities that shaped how preservice and in-service teachers were instructed on addressing students’ numinous and secular worldviews. It showed that the directives towards preservice teachers can be adduced from the contemporary sociopolitical and religious climate despite the dearth of direct scholarship in this area. It also presented the history of the SCOTUS decisions, as well as the federal and state mandates, that directly impact how TEPs should instruction preservice teachers to address religion clause issues.

The second sphere examined the present state of teacher education programs in relation to the instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues. After positing the questions relevant to the topic, this chapter presented the answers proposed by scholars in the field for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion the clause issues. Commonalities between these approaches were

highlighted, though preferences were not shown for certain models, as it is the contention of this study that there are multiple highly competent manners in which TEPs can instruct preservice teachers in religion clause issues.

This literature shows the need for TEPs to not only educate preservice teachers in professional areas related to the religion clauses of the Constitution, but that they should also embrace a pedagogical ethos that includes the protection of students' numinous worldviews for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons. Beyond the potential for litigation on the aforementioned grounds, there is the often-cited civic reality. Preservice teachers who are properly trained to address students' numinous worldviews could help stem the tide of the nation becoming more polarized and fractious. Part of the job of public school teachers is to teach their student how to be local and global citizens: to combat the religiously-illiterate, intolerant, uneducated, anti-intellectual screeds which can tear communities and this nation apart (Bryant, 2012; S. L. Carter, 1993; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Macedo, 2000; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nash, 1999; Noddings, 1993; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; Wilson, 2011).

Based on the preceding examination of the literature, it is clear to me that TEPs need to equip their students with the skills and understandings that will enable them to handle the above realities in their professional lives. As this dissertation seeks to ascertain the degree to which religion clause issues are addressed in teacher education programs, it conducts a multisite case study, sampling documentation collected from four TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. An evaluation tool, based on the above research and literature on teacher education programs' inclusion of religion clause issues in their curriculum, is used for the systematic qualitative document analysis.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

Overview of Design

As identified in the Statement of the Problem, my research centered on the belief that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. My literature review argued that TEPs need to better equip their preservice teachers with the skills and understandings to prepare them to handle religion clause issues. The literature review covered the historical realities, as well as current theories and practices in teacher preparation. It showed that little attention is paid to the knowledge, skills, and attitudes preservice teachers need to adequately address religion clause issues as they arise within the public school arena. The resulting study examined how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos. The design of this study entailed a collective case study methodology. This evolved as a multisite case study (Creswell, 2013) conducted at a sample of four TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Qualitative document analysis methodology was used on the data collected. This chapter discusses the Rationale for the Design, explains the development of the Instrumentation, explains the selection of Participants for this research project, and delineates the methods of Data Collection and Analysis used in this study.

The Research and Guiding Questions

The primary research question of this study was

- How do TEPs in Massachusetts instruct preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos as codified in their institutional documentation?

In addition, the following questions guided this study, and the answers to which were drawn from the Review of Literature, but also the documentation provided by the TEPs:

1. With what knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues should preservice teachers enter their professional lives?
2. What are the issues related to the religion clauses which apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos?
3. How do TEPs in MA educate teachers in relevant constitutional law and jurisprudence on the religion clauses, and how is that documented?
4. How do TEPs in MA document the manner in which they instruct theories of pedagogical strategies for engaging students' worldviews?

The composition of the Review of Literature provided information vital in answering the primary research question, as well as the first two additional guiding questions. These answers were then used in the creation of the evaluation tool for this research study (described below). The answers to the final two guiding questions were obtained through the use of the evaluation tool on the documents provided by the TEPs, whose findings are presented in Chapter Four of this dissertation. This section will explain the Rationale for Design, Instrumentation, and Participants of this study. It will then present the methods of Data Collection and Data Analysis, before explain the Role of Researcher in this study.

Rationale for Design

Case study research involves the study of a case within a real-life, contemporary context or setting (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 1994). It allows for the flexibility of looking at one site in depth or at multiple sites in depth (Creswell, 2013). The advantages to the case study method of qualitative research lie in the ability to gather information on an on-going program, initiative, or

event, which is bounded by space and/or time (Creswell, 2013; Neale, Thapa, & Boyce, 2006). Thus, a study allows a researcher to detail something unique or novel in a case, or to highlight precedent that has been set for further cases (Creswell, 2013; Neale et al., 2006). In education, this can be beneficial in comparing different programs or methodologies being used in a school, or comparing programs between different schools. This study compared the documentation collected from different TEPs. As such, the unit of analysis for this study was the documentation provided by the participating TEPs to determine if and how religion clause issues are presented to preservice teacher in these institutions.

The description of the case allows the researcher to identify the particular themes or situations that have been uncovered during the study. It also “often end[s] with conclusions formed by the researcher about the overall meaning derived from the case(s)” (Creswell, 2013, p. 99). This entails what Stake (2013) calls “assertions” and Yin (1994) calls “patterns” or “explanations.” My research was a collective case study (multiple case study) (Creswell, 2013), as one problem was addressed at multiple sites, allowing for different perspectives on how TEPs document their handling of religion clause issues in the instruction of preservice teachers. While data collection is normally done from multiple sources, including documents, observations, interviews, review of records, and other physical artifacts (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 1994), my research was based solely on documents from the TEPs for the reasons explained below.

Qualitative document analysis (QDA) is “a process of evaluating documents in such a way that empirical knowledge is produced and understanding is developed” (Bowen, 2009, pp. 33-34), “locating, identifying, retrieving, and analyzing documents for their relevance, significance, and meaning” (Altheide et al., 2008, p. 128). Furthermore, “the emphasis is on discovery and description, including searching for contexts, underlying meanings, patterns, and

processes, rather than on mere quantity or numerical relationships between two or more variables, which is emphasized in traditional quantitative content analysis” (Altheide et al., 2008, p. 128). Document analysis is particularly suited to qualitative case studies, as they are focused on investigating and describing singular phenomenon, events, organizations, or programs (Bowen, 2009; Stake, 2013; Yin, 1994). In the case of my research, QDA was useful as

documents provide background information as well as historical insight. Such information and insight can help researchers understand the historical roots of specific issues and can indicate the conditions that impinge upon the phenomena currently under investigation. The researcher can use data drawn from documents, for example, to contextualise [*sic*] data collected during interviews. (Bowen, 2009, pp. 28-29)

While qualitative document analysis is often used with other sources to triangulate the efficacy of the data analysis (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Bowen, 2009; Maxwell, 2013):

it has also been used as a stand-alone method. Indeed, there are some specialized forms of qualitative research that rely solely on the analysis of documents. For example, Wild, McMahon, Darlington, Liu, & Culley (2009) did a “diary study” that examined engineers’ information needs and document usage. They used the data to generate new “document use” scenarios and a “proof of concept” test of a related software system. (Bowen, 2009, p. 29)

Indeed, “documents may be the only necessary data source for studies designed within an interpretive paradigm” (Bowen, 2009, p. 29).

Altheide et al. (2008) list six “basic steps” in conducting qualitative document analysis, which serve not as a rigid system, “but rather, like Kant’s famous ‘categories of the mind,’ the

steps should be considered ‘regulative’ but not ‘constitutive,’ or operational defined as ‘the precision and limit of the research act’” (p. 130). These steps include (a) identifying and pursuing a specific problem, (b) becoming familiar with the types of documents and their contexts, (c) becoming familiar with several examples of relevant documents and select a unit of analysis, (d) creating a categories list to guide data collection and draft a protocol, (e) testing protocol on collected data from several documents, (f) revising protocol and “select[ing] several additional cases to further refine the protocol” (p. 130).

As stated above, the unit of analysis for this study was the institutional documentation of TEPs. This approach was chosen instead of using the TEPs themselves as the unit of analysis, which would have entailed conducting interviews with TEP personnel, surveying preservice teachers, and/or conducting observations of classrooms and practicum settings. This decision was consistent with qualitative document analysis methodology as seen through the discussion above. However, as befitting the subject matter, it is perhaps more clearly expressed by borrowing theological terminology, showing that *orthodoxy* is being placed over *orthopraxy*.

Orthodoxy is “that which is considered correct or proper belief,” while orthopraxy is defined as “right practice” (McKim, 2014, p. 223). Orthodoxy is doctrine while orthopraxy is deeds. Orthodoxy speaks to what is codified in writing, while orthopraxy speaks to what is conducted in waking life. The TEPs’ documentation contains the orthodoxy of the institution, the codified standards for action. These remain consistent through the life of the PSTs’ training, despite the changes in faculty/staff, the use and training of adjunct professors, and other changes which could materialize within a program. For this reason, interviews were not a source of data as these are subject to the bias and positionality of the various faculty and staff members. The

specific actions and attitudes of individuals in the TEPs (orthopraxy) are not being studied, rather the focus is on what the institutions have recorded as what should be taught to its preservice teachers in regards to religion clause matters (orthodoxy).

In the terms of qualitative document analysis, Bowen (2009) states documents are “unobtrusive” and “nonreactive” —that is, they are unaffected by the research process... Therefore, document analysis counters the concerns related to reflexivity (or the lack of it) inherent in other qualitative research methods. With regard to observation, for instance, an event may proceed differently because it is being observed. (p. 31)

Similarly, the presence of a researcher does not impact documents as it does in observations (Bowen, 2009; Merriam, 1988), and the documents are more readily available for unimpeded repeated review in a way human subjects are not (Bowen, 2009). Bowen (2009) further states that

documents should not be treated as necessarily precise, accurate, or complete recordings of events that have occurred. Researchers should not simply “lift” words and passages from available documents to be thrown into their research report. Rather, they should establish the meaning of the document and its contribution to the issues being explored. The researcher as analyst should determine the relevance of documents to the research problem and purpose. Also, the researcher should ascertain whether the content of the documents fits the conceptual framework of the study. It is necessary, as well, to determine the authenticity, credibility, accuracy, and representativeness of the selected documents. (p. 33)

In light of this warning, as well as my orthodoxy and orthopraxy dynamic, TEP documents were my unit of analysis in this study. Only they were investigated as they represent the public declarations of the TEP's guiding ideas for its program and courses. Furthermore, I only requested documents that were used by TEP personnel, students, and co-operating in-service teachers in the education of preservice teachers. That is, only documents preservice teachers, their professors, and cooperating in-service teachers encounter during preservice teachers' program of study. To this end, the institutional documentation requested included TEP course syllabi, program-wide and course specific benchmark assignments and evaluation tools, as well as all handbooks/manuals for TEP faculty, TEP staff, preservice teachers, and co-operating institution personnel. These TEP documents were selected as my unit of analysis in this study as they are generated by the TEP itself and are the location wherein religion clause issues, if present, should be visible. However, a recognized limitation of the study was the possibility that TEP personnel act in spite of, or beyond what the documentation prescribes or describes. For example, the documentation could call for instruction in religion clause issues, but the professor's personal ethos is opposed to such instruction. Similarly, a professor could go beyond what is stated in the documentation if, say, the document called for instruction on multiculturalism, not specifying student worldviews, but the professor recognizes such as important. Such concerns, while relevant to the field, are outside the scope of this study.

Instrumentation

As qualitative document analysis methodology advocates the use of a protocol for the systematic analysis of documents "to clarify themes, frames, and discourse" (Altheide et al., 2008, p. 130), an evaluation tool was created based on the research and literature on TEPs' inclusion of religion clause issues in curriculum (see Appendix A).

Part 2 of Chapter Two presented the current suggestions for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues. While commonalities between the various approaches were highlighted, preference was not shown for certain models. It remains the contention of this study that a one-size-fits-all model is not necessary for TEPs to competently instruct preservice teachers in religion clause issues.

Drawing from the Literature Review, the evaluation tool synthesized the areas of broad agreement between the scholars and researchers who investigate the relationship between the religion clauses, public education, and TEPs. The categories, domains, and competencies which comprise the evaluation tool were created from the review of the research and literature on TEPs' inclusion of religion clause issues in their curriculum. The proposed competencies are a compilation of the broad scope of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes on religion clause recommended by scholars/researchers for implementation in TEPs. Footnotes in the evaluation tool are presented only for statement where a direct quote from a source best captured the content of the competency. These footnotes should not be taken to indicate that competencies without footnotes are not drawn directly from the relevant literature.

As described above, the composition and implementation of the evaluation tool served to address the guiding research questions of this study. Furthermore, this evaluation tool was the protocol used "to clarify themes, frames, and discourse" (Altheide et al., 2008, p. 130): to systematically analyze the collected materials to ascertain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes on religion clause issues included in the TEP documentation. This section outlines the components of the evaluation tool: the Administrative Page, the individual Competencies, the three Domains,

and the broad Categories. In addition, this section explains the measurement system of the evaluation tool.

The Administrative Page

The Administrative Page was used for each document provided by a TEP. It recorded the institution and/or author, the document title, type (e.g. Benchmark assessment, course syllabus, and handbooks), purpose (e.g. assessment, informational, or evaluative), and audience (e.g. faculty, staff, or student).

Competencies, Domains and, Categories

The bulk of the evaluation tool was comprised of competencies drawn from the literature review, against which the documents provided by TEPs were measured. There are total of 24 competencies on the evaluation tool: six in Curriculum and Content, ten in Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, and eight in Legal and Legislative Knowledge. Each competency is an indicator of what a preservice teacher should be able to believe, know, or do in order to more effectively navigate the variety of religion clause issues that arise within a public school setting. The competencies were written to be encompassing of all 6th-12th grade preservice teachers, regardless of their specific content area.

Each competency is nested within one of three domains of teacher mental and physical activity: (a) the Attitude Domain, the personal beliefs which undergird the knowledge and skills exhibited by public school teachers; (b) the Knowledge Domain, the discrete facts, concepts, and procedures a public school teacher possess; and (c) the Skill Domain, the physical abilities and cognitive processes demonstrated by public school teachers as result of their attitudes and knowledge. Furthermore, these domains are in turn held within three larger categories: (a) Curriculum and Content, the course of study presented within content area classrooms; (b)

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, the methodology and motivations for the instruction which takes place within content area classrooms; and (c) Legal and Legislative Knowledge, the laws, policies, and legal guidelines impacting content area classrooms.

Measurement

A spreadsheet was created for each TEP, where ratings for each competency were recorded for each document provided. When recording the competency ratings on the spreadsheet, each document was assigned a designation, removing institutional identifiers, but leaving the document type, purpose, and audience apparent. Each document was carefully read and digitally annotated, noting any elements that fell within the scope of this study. After this initial reading, each document was evaluated for each of the 24 competencies using the following scale:

1. Competency not present in artifact. No mention of related/tangential concerns.
2. Competency not explicitly mentioned in artifact, but elements show awareness of related/tangential concerns.
3. Competency explicitly mentioned in artifact, but is not a/the focal point. Competency is subsumed under related/tangential concerns.
4. Competency is a/the focal point of artifact. Explicit discussion is highlighted above other related/tangential concerns.

It is acknowledged that this form of measurement contains elements of subjectivity. How this was accounted for is explained below.

A rating of 1 meant that the competency was neither addressed, nor was there anything in the document which indicated an awareness of the competency at all. This stood in contrast to a rating of 2 which meant that the competency was not mentioned in the document; however,

there was language that suggested that the competency could potentially be touched upon, or brought up organically, during class conversation. This rating is the most subjective of the four, in that it required me to intuit possible classroom interactions that may arise from the stated information in the document. The following illustration seeks to capture the difference between the ratings.

A TEP syllabus is evaluated for whether, as a result of course instruction and materials, “preservice teachers can critically assess textbooks, supplemental materials, resources, and activities as they touch upon numinous worldviews” (Curriculum and Content, Knowledge Domain competency #1). The syllabus presents content showing that the course will provide guidelines for choosing age and content appropriate materials to meet the learning goals of the school, appropriate textbook, internet, or multimedia usage in the classroom, and avoiding and/or dealing with controversial topics that arise in the classroom. However, nothing in the syllabus explicitly mentions how numinous worldviews impact these classroom realities. For example, the syllabus does not directly address the needs of preservice social studies teachers unclear on appropriate boundaries when discussing world religions as they impact historical events; the syllabus does not explicitly advise preservice science teachers attempting to navigate students’ beliefs on evolution and intelligent design; the syllabus does not provide answers for preservice English/language arts teachers who question when it is appropriate to use the Bible as a class text, or how to address students whose worldviews do not include the Bible as a significant text. As the syllabus does not address specific concerns like these, it would receive a 1-rating for the competency on the critical assessment of school materials as they touch upon numinous worldviews. However, if the syllabus contained language about the use of multicultural texts in the classroom, or the need to appropriately evaluate texts for a diverse school population, the

document would receive a 2-rating for this competency. If this additional language was present, the 2-rating would be appropriate for two reasons. First, research has shown that this additional language presents tangential topics where conversations about numinous worldviews have arisen (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Kunzman, 2006; Moore, 2007; White, 2009, 2013). Second, and related to the first, there is a high likelihood that the specific numinous concerns that arise within the public school classroom will be raised by preservice teachers during their instruction.

Throughout this study, and the use of the evaluation tool, the validity of the 2-rating was balanced against the research compiled during the Review of Literature, and the researcher's 15 years in the field of education: six of which were spent reading and composing the types of documents being evaluated, as well as instructing preservice and in-service teachers, the rest personally wrestling with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes relevant to religion clause issues. This experience has granted insight into the questions that preservice and in-service teachers ask given certain topics of consideration. Furthermore, communication with personnel at the participating TEPs, upon viewing my list of competencies, indicated that they did not expect to see many explicit mentions of the competencies in their documents, but asserted that they could see discussions of them arising during the normal flow of class.

Ratings of 3 and 4 return to more objective grounds, as they indicate that the competency is clearly present in the document. These two ratings only differ in degree of the competency's importance within the document. A rating of 3 indicates that the competency is present in the document, but it is not a primary focus of the document's purpose. A rating of 4 indicates that the competency is present in the document, but that it is a primary focus of the document. Examples from my own past as a college professor illustrate the difference.

A TEP document may be evaluated for whether “preservice teachers can identify legal and ethical issues related to the religion clauses of the US Constitution that may surface when working with students” (Legal and Legislative Knowledge, Knowledge Domain competency #1). The syllabus for an introductory course in special education I taught would receive a rating of 3 for this competency, because it explicitly mentions class conversations about the legal and ethical issues that arise in this area. However, this mention is slight and only covered a segment of a few class sessions. Discussion of this competency, important as it is, was not a focal point of the course. On the other hand, my syllabus for a course on classroom management would receive a rating of 4 for this competency as it was a highlighted concern, which we spent multiple class sessions discussing directly, and it was a theme that undergirded the course as a whole.

Participants

I conducted a multisite, collective case study (Creswell 2013) of the documentation of local TEPs. My sample consists of TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts offering undergraduate baccalaureate programs in middle (grade 5-8) and/or secondary (grade 8-12) toward an Initial License. These programs are located in the “Greater Boston area” as defined by *Metropolitan Area Planning Council*. These programs offer one or more of the following Initial License paths: biology, (8-12), chemistry (8-12), English (5-8), English (8-12), history (5-8), history (8-12), middle school humanities (5-8), physics (8-12).

A request for participation was sent to each TEP by phone and email (see Appendix B & C). This was followed up by an in-person visit to three of the participating institutions. An agreement to participate letter was hand delivered and/or emailed to each of the TEPs, detailing the purpose of study, subjects, procedures, potential risks and benefits, and standard concerns about confidentiality, data storage, and access (see Appendix D). Over the course of the study,

nine TEPs were contacted and their participation requested. Initially five TEPs were contacted, but negative responses and delays in response resulted in an expanded search. Multiple emails, phone calls, and in-person visits were conducted with their sites. Of the nine contacted, one never replied, two ceremoniously declined, two intimated that they would like to participate, but then never followed through, while the other four agreed to participate.

As mentioned in Chapter One, participation in the study met with the limitation of documentation ownership. Some of the documents, such as prepracticum/practicum, handbooks, informational guidelines, and survey instruments, were maintained by the TEP at the departmental level. Course syllabi, on the other hand, were maintained by the individual faculty members. While all four TEPs in this study agreed to participate, each honored faculty ownership of syllabi, sending only institutional documents, and allowing individual faculty members to decide whether they wished to participate in the study. Thus, the number and type of documents from each institution varied.

When selecting the research sites, I was hoping to achieve an institutionally diverse sample in terms of location (i.e. urban and suburban), type (i.e. public and private), worldview affiliation (i.e. religious and secular), and location (i.e. Middlesex, Norfolk, and Suffolk Counties). This study largely achieved the intended institutional diversity, gaining participation from three urban institutions and one suburban institution, two private religious institutions and two public secular institutions, as well as two institutions in both Middlesex and Suffolk Counties. To maintain confidentiality, TEPs were randomly assigned designations A, B, C, and D.

An additional, tangential participant was the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). All of the TEPs within this study, as well as most others

across the Commonwealth, are currently employing the Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) as a means of assessing preservice teachers' readiness to enter the classroom. Because of this, the present study evaluates the Professional Standards for Teachers (PSTs) at the heart of the CAP. This study argues the Religion Clause Competencies proposed for TEPs are necessary for preservice teacher to possess. Thus, the PSTs are assessed to determine if the proposed competencies are currently, silently, subsumed within the current indicators.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study was delimited to include a sample of TEPs in the "Greater Boston Area" as defined by Metropolitan Area Planning Council. Furthermore, this study only focused on TEPs offering undergraduate baccalaureate programs in middle (grade 5-8) and/or secondary (grade 8-12) toward an Initial License. Another delimitation of this study involved the evaluation tool, which was used to analyze the collected documentation from the targeted TEPs to ascertain to what degree religion clause issues are addressed in instructing preservice teachers. By design this study did not account for the perspectives of TEP personnel, nor does it account for the perspectives of preservice teachers enrolled in targeted TEPs.

This study was limited by a number of factors over which I had little control. The scope of the study only covers a sample of MA TEPs, so the ability to generalize findings to all MA TEPs and/or TEPs nationwide was limited. Another limitation was the number of respondent TEPs who promised aid and then never followed through, further reducing the number of potential research sites. A final limitation of concern was the amount of intra-institution consistency, namely, whether some documentation is maintained by the TEP or the individual faculty members. The same course could be taught by multiple professors over the course of year, and their syllabi were not standardized. Furthermore, this limitation was compounded as,

during the course of conducting my research, I learned that syllabi are the property of the individual professor, not the institution. Thus, even though a TEP may collect all syllabi by department, each individual professor had to agree for their material to be used.

Data Collection

Data collection was facilitated through Dropbox and personal email, with some material gathered from TEP websites. CAP documentation was gained through DESE's website. The types and number of documents collected on participating TEPs are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

TEP Document Type and Number

TEP	Benchmark assessment s	Course syllabi	Evaluation tools	Faculty handbook/ manuals	Preservice teachers handbooks / manuals	PrePracticum/ Practicum handbooks	Other	Total
A	0	1	1	0	0	4	1	7
B	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	10
C	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
D	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

Data Analysis

An evaluation tool (see Appendix A) was created from a synthesis of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes the available research and literature suggest for preservice teachers regarding religion clause issues. As the focus on institutional documentation over interviews with TEP personnel is in line with qualitative document analysis methodology, the evaluation tool was used to analyze the collected documentation from the targeted TEPs to ascertain to what degree religion clause issues were addressed in instructing preservice teachers.

The evaluation tool records the specifics of the document, including the originating institution, authors, original purpose of the document, reason it was produced, and target

audience as available (Bowen, 2009). After this a content analysis of each artifact provided by the TEPs was conducted using the evaluation tool, according to each of the competencies drawn from the available research and literature. The degree to which the artifact included or omitted each competency, as well as the degree to which a competency was promoted as important within the TEP, was assessed for each document on the four-point scale detailed above in Instrumentation.

A thematic analysis was conducted for each institution by aggregating the results of the individual documents in each competency, presenting percentages of how institutional documentation displays the competencies. This provides an overall picture of how each TEP codifies their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos in their institutional documentation. A detailed reporting of this thematic analysis is presented in the following chapter. In addition, the CAP's PSTs are also analyzed. Though the Religion Clause Competencies proposed for TEPs are not explicitly stated within the PST, this study argues for where the proposed competencies should/could be imbedded within the current professional indicators.

Role of Researcher

As discussed above, qualitative document analysis methodology does not have the triangulation methods that other methodologies possess. Thus, recognizing and combating bias requires an exploration of the researcher and the evaluation tool. While the former was discussed at length in Chapter One, and the latter above, this section distills that information directly in regards to this study.

As discussed in Chapter One, my sociocultural perspective and positionality brings bias to this study. As both student and teacher, I have lived with feet in both religious and secular education. I can enumerate myriad examples of religion clause violations by my public school teachers, my colleagues, and myself. None of us were immune from unintentional failures in the face of the law, often due lacking the knowledge, skills, and attitudes in regards to the worldview well-being of public school students. During my tenure as a professor of education at a Christian college, I focused on teaching and modelling how to be a person of faith in a public school setting in light of the religion clauses. I was personally invested in the importance of preservice and in-service teachers honoring the worldviews of their students. During that time, I adjusted courses in my TEP to incorporate multiple aspects of education law in general, but specifically focus on the religion clause issues.

In some ways, conducting the research for my Review of Literature increased my bias as the overwhelming consensus of the authorities is that preservice teachers do not possess the adequate knowledge, skills, and attitudes in relation to religion clause issues. As a result, the authorities argue that academic, civic, moral, and (potentially) spiritual harm is realized within communities. I attempted to address this bias throughout the study. Both in the choice of scholarship for my Review of Literature, as well as during the creation of the evaluation tool, I relied on the works of authors and scholars with diverse worldviews, numinous and secular. While authors differed in their worldviews, they shared a call for a decided change in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes possessed by preservice and in-service teachers. Regardless of what scholars believe cause the dearth of religion clause issues knowledge, skills, and attitudes in preservice and in-service (as well as administrators), and regardless of whether they see the primary effect to be academic, civic, moral, and or spiritual harm to students, these scholars

agree that something must change in how preservice teachers are educated. Thus, my bias reflected a mandate within the scholarly community. In the same way, the evaluation tool drew from diverse sources and voices, but maintained the common mandate for reform in preservice teacher education in regards to religion clause issues. The competencies created are a compilation of those diverse voices, capturing what can be expected from preservice teachers if appropriately educated by their TEPs in religion clause issues.

The evaluation tool was reviewed and revised by my dissertation committee. One member in particular is an educator and scholar in the practice of theology, public policy, and international studies. He leads and/or is involved in multiple national and international initiatives focused on the intersections between religion and public life, especially religion and public schools. This individual was instrumental in providing comment on previous drafts of the evaluation tool, and ushering it into its current form. He also connected me with other scholars and researchers who added to my knowledge base, and/or reviewed my evaluation tool. The tool was also reviewed by a small group of in-service middle and high school teachers for their comment. These actions were taken to aid in addressing my biases. In addition, personnel at the TEPs in my study were provided with a copy of my evaluation tool. It was met with positive reviews, coupled with impromptu comments about how they felt their programs rated for different competencies, especially in regards to 2-ratings.

The research hypothesis for this study was that the targeted TEPs would show that they do not consistently and specifically address, instruct, and train preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. Because of this, and despite the scholarly mandate discussed above, the researcher had to be aware of confirmation bias when using the evaluation tool on the TEP documents.

Confirmation bias is “the seeking or interpreting of evidence in ways that are partial to existing beliefs, expectations, or a hypothesis in hand” (Nickerson, 1998). The methodology for this study does not have the normal means of safeguarding against such bias. In qualitative document analysis methodology there are no interviews, observation, surveys, or questionnaires. Thus, the evaluation tool’s rating system was designed to address bias. In answering the final two research questions, the rating system of the evaluation tool was designed to document presence of the competencies in the document. Despite the nuance of the rating scale (discussed above), the tool is asking one question: is the competency being measured present in the document or not? This is straightforward and binary, eliminating the worry of confirmation bias. In Chapter Four of this study, the binary of whether the competencies are present or not will be the guiding factor of analysis, as that is tied to the research questions.

Summary

The above introduced the methodology for a study examining how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos. This chapter reviewed rationale for the collective (multisite) case study, employing qualitative document analysis methodology, and the creation, description, and use of the evaluation tool to carry out that methodology. It also detailed methods of collecting participants and data for this research project.

The next chapter of this dissertation presents the detailed reporting of the thematic analysis conducted for each institution, by aggregating the results of the individual documents in each competency, presenting percentages of how institutional documentation displays the competencies. This provides an overall picture of how each TEP codifies their instruction of

preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos in their institutional documentation. In addition, it argues for where the proposed competencies should/could be imbedded within the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance documentation, specifically the Professional Standards for Teachers.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study centered on the view that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. My literature review in Chapter Two argued TEPs need to better equip their preservice teachers with the skills and understandings to prepare them to handle religion clause issues. This study examined how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos. The design of this study used collective case study methodology. This entailed a multisite case study (Creswell, 2013) conducted at a sample of TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, where qualitative document analysis was used on the data collected.

The primary research question of this study asked how TEPs in Massachusetts instruct preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos as codified in their institutional documentation. Two of the four additional questions that guided this study were answered through the documents provided by the TEPs:

- How do TEPs in MA educate teachers in relevant constitutional law and jurisprudence on the religion clauses, and how is that documented?
- How do TEPs in MA document the manner in which they instruct theories of pedagogical strategies for engaging students' worldviews?

As discussed in Chapter Three, the evaluation tool was comprised of competencies drawn from Chapter Two's review of the literature: the knowledge, skills, and attitudes scholars in the

field advocate for preservice teachers to learn in regards to religion clause issues. The documents provided by the TEPs were measured against these competencies. There are total of 24 competencies on the evaluation tool: six in Curriculum and Content, ten in Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, and eight in Legal and Legislative Knowledge. Each competency is an indicator of what a preservice teacher should be able to believe, know, or do in order to more effectively navigate the variety of religion clause issues that most educators can expect to encounter within a public school setting. The competencies were written to be encompassing of all 6th-12th grade preservice teachers, regardless of their specific content area.

Each competency is nested within one of three domains of teacher mental and physical activity: (a) the Attitude Domain, the personal beliefs which undergird the knowledge and skills exhibited by public school teachers; (b) the Knowledge Domain, the discrete facts, concepts, and procedures a public school teacher possess; and (c) the Skill Domain, the behaviors and cognitive processes demonstrated by public school teachers as result of their attitudes and knowledge. Furthermore, these domains are in turn held within three larger categories: (a) Curriculum and Content, the course of study presented within content area classrooms; (b) Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, the methodology and motivations for the instruction which takes place within content area classrooms; and (c) Legal and Legislative Knowledge, the laws, policies, and legal guidelines impacting content area classrooms.

In terms of measurement, each document was evaluated for each of the 24 competencies using the following 4-point scale:

1. Competency not present in artifact. No mention of related/tangential concerns.
2. Competency not explicitly mentioned in artifact, but elements show awareness of related/tangential concerns.

3. Competency explicitly mentioned in artifact, but is not a/the focal point. Competency is subsumed under related/tangential concerns.
4. Competency is a/the focal point of artifact. Explicit discussion is highlighted above other related/tangential concerns.

A 1-rating means that the competency was neither addressed, nor was there anything in the document which indicated an awareness of the competency at all. A 2-rating means that the competency was not mentioned in the document, but there is language which suggests that the competency could potentially be touched upon, or brought up organically, during class conversation. These two ratings denote that a competency is not present within the document being evaluated. Ratings of 3 and 4 indicate that a competency is clearly present in the document. These two ratings only differ in degree of the competency's importance within the document. A 3-rating indicates that the competency is present in the document, but it is not a primary focus of the document's purpose. A 4-rating indicates that the competency is present in the document, and that it is a primary focus of the document.

This chapter presents a detailed reporting of the thematic analysis conducted for each of four institutions (TEP A-D) by aggregating the results of the individual documents in each competency, and presenting percentages of how institutional documentation displays the competencies. A synthesis of the TEP documentation is provided for how each TEP codifies their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos in their institutional documentation. Another section presents findings for the study as a whole.

In addition to presenting data from the researched TEPs, this chapter begins with analysis of the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) documentation,

specifically the Professional Standards for Teachers (PST). As all of the TEPs within this study employ the CAP's PSTs as a means of assessing preservice teachers' readiness to enter the classroom, this study assessed them to determine if the proposed religion clause competencies are currently subsumed within the current indicators. Analysis of this document was another avenue to answer the primary research question of how TEPs in Massachusetts instruct preservice teachers on issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos.

Professional Standards for Teachers

Beginning in 2016, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) requires all TEPs across the Commonwealth to successfully implement the Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) as a means of assessing preservice teachers' readiness to enter the classroom. This includes all the TEPs within this study. A key component of the CAP is the Professional Standards for Teachers (PSTs), which are the criteria by which preservice teachers evaluated. As all TEPs within this study employ the CAP, this section assesses the PSTs using the Religion Clause Competencies of the Evaluation Tool. As this study argues that the Religion Clause Competencies proposed for TEPs are necessary for preservice teacher to possess, the PSTs were assessed to determine if the proposed competencies are currently subsumed within the current indicators, or lacking entirely.

The scholarly consensus elucidated in Chapter Two (which was the groundwork for the evaluation tool of this study) would support the notion that, in order for the spirit of the PST's indicators to be met, in order to "ensure that new teachers enter classrooms prepared to make an impact with their students on day one" (2016, p. 2), preservice teachers would need to be in possession of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes detailed in the evaluation tool's competencies.

Though the Religion Clause Competencies proposed for TEPs are not explicitly stated within CAP, it is my belief that they are potentially imbedded within the current indicators of the PST.

Appendix F displays where I believe the proposed religion clause competencies are potentially imbedded within the current PST. As the chart in Appendix F displays, all of the proposed religion clause competencies potentially have a conceptual home within the PST. However, they are not explicitly stated as such. In this way, the PST indicators would receive 2-ratings as they touch upon the religion clause competencies, and 1-ratings otherwise. This is largely in line with what has been observed with the TEPs evaluated for this study (discussed below), and the review of literature presented in Chapter Two: TEPs often address matters relating to religion clauses issues, without directly and explicitly tackling them.

The PST consists of four standards—Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment, Teaching All Students, Family and Community Engagement, and Professional Culture—each detailed with a set of indicators. Appendix F presents how the religion clause competencies, organized by category, align with each indicator. The following discusses each of the four standards in turn, detailing the relationship between the proposed competencies and the PST indicators, providing support for this finding.

Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment Standard

Table 4.1 presents the embedding of the proposed religion clause competencies in the PST's Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment Standard. This information is drawn from Appendix F.

Table 4.1

Proposed Competencies in the Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment Standard

<p>(1) Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students by providing high quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an on-going basis, and continuously refining learning objectives.</p>	<p>Proposed Competencies</p>		
	<p>Curriculum & Content</p>	<p>Pedagogy & Professional Ethos</p>	<p>Legal & Legislative Knowledge</p>
(a) Curriculum and Planning indicator: Knows the subject matter well, has a good grasp of child development and how students learn, and designs effective and rigorous standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons with measurable outcomes.	K1-4; S1		
(b) Assessment indicator: Uses a variety of informal and formal methods of assessment to measure student learning, growth, and understanding, develop differentiated and enhanced learning experiences, and improve future instruction.			
(c) Analysis indicator: Analyzes data from assessments, draws conclusions, and shares them appropriately.			
SEI Indicator (a) Uses instructional planning, materials, and student engagement approaches that support students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, strengths, and challenges.	K3-4; S1	A1-2; S1-5	A1; S1
SEI Indicator (c) Demonstrates knowledge of the difference between social and academic language and the importance of this difference in planning, differentiating and delivering effective instruction for English language learners at various levels of English language proficiency and literacy.			

The Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment Standard states that it is concerned with promoting the

learning and growth of all students by providing high quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an on-going basis, and continuously refining learning objectives. (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016)

As such, the indicators for this standard included specific foci on assessment and analysis of data, which do not directly relate to the proposed competencies. However, two of the indicators in this standard were relevant to the study at hand: the Curriculum and Planning indicator, and SEI Indicator (a).

The Curriculum and Planning indicator is concerned with a teacher's knowledge of subject matter, child development, and student learning, for the purpose designing classroom instruction. Unsurprisingly, five proposed competencies from the Curriculum and Content category aligned with this indicator, four of those from the knowledge domain, and the last from the skill domain. Of greater import is SEI Indicator (a) for this standard, which is concerned with the use of "instructional planning, materials, and student engagement approaches that support students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, strengths, and challenges" (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016). While SEI stands for Sheltered English Immersion, if the description of this indicator is taken literally, it would include the diversity of worldviews students bring into the classroom. It would not only be limited to student worldview differences related only to English language needs. Read in this way, 12 of the 24 proposed competencies would be related to this indicator, stretching across all categories and domains.

Teaching All Students Standard

Table 4.2 presents the embedding of the proposed religion clause competencies in the PST's Teaching All Students Standard. This information is drawn from Appendix F.

Table 4.2

Proposed Competencies in the Teaching All Students Standard

(2) Teaching All Students standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Instruction indicator: Uses instructional practices that reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work, engage all students, and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness.	<i>ALL</i>	A1-2; S1; S3-5	A1-2; S2
(b) Learning Environment indicator: Creates and maintains a safe and collaborative learning environment that values diversity and motivates students to take academic risks, challenge themselves, and claim ownership of their learning.	A1	A1-2; K1-3; S3-5	A1-2; K1-4; S2
(c) Cultural Proficiency indicator: Actively creates and maintains an environment in which students' diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected.	<i>ALL</i>	<i>ALL</i>	<i>ALL</i>
(d) Expectations indicator: Plans and implements lessons that set clear and high expectations and make knowledge accessible for all students.			
(e) Social and Emotional Learning Indicator: Employs a variety of strategies to assist students to develop social emotional-competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.		S5	

(f) Classroom Management Indicator: Employs a variety of classroom management strategies, and establishes and maintains effective routines and procedures that promote positive student behavior.	A1	A1-2; K1-3; S3-5	A1-2; K1-4; S2
SEI Indicator (b) Uses effective strategies and techniques for making content accessible to English language learners.			
SEI Indicator (d) Creates and maintains a safe and collaborative learning environment that values diversity and motivates students to meet high standards of conduct, effort and performance.	A1	A1-2; K1-3; S3-5	A1-2; K1-4; S2

This standard is aimed at promoting “the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016). It is the contention of this study that “cultural proficiency” must include and understanding of attitudes, knowledge, and skills related to student worldviews. Thus, as Appendix F shows, all of the proposed competencies find alignment with the indicators of this standard, often multiple times. In fact, only two indicators— the Expectations indicator and SEI Indicator (b) — do not align with the proposed competencies. The first because it is modal, that is the indicator is concerned with the methods of how lessons are planned for in terms of establishing expectations for learning, the second is concerned only with “making content accessible to English language learners” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016). Beyond these two outliers, the proposed competencies are highly aligned with the other indicators in this standard. For instance, while the Social and Emotional Learning Indicator only aligns with one competency, indicators b, f, and SEI (d) all align with the same 16 competencies. Of greatest import is the Cultural Proficiency Indicator.

The Cultural Proficiency indicator states that a teacher “actively creates and maintains an environment in which students' diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected.” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016) Taken on its face as an accurate representation of what all preservice and in-service teacher should be able to accomplish, all 24 proposed religion clause competencies align with this statement.

Family and Community Engagement Standard

Table 4.3 presents the embedding of the proposed religion clause competencies in the PST’s Family and Community Engagement Standard. This information is drawn from Appendix F.

Table 4.3

Proposed Competencies in the Family and Community Engagement Standard

(3) Family and Community Engagement standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Engagement indicator: Welcomes and encourages every family to become active participants in the classroom and school community.			
(b) Collaboration indicator: Collaborates with families and communities to create and implement strategies for supporting student learning and development both at home and at school.	S1	A1-2; K2; S1; S4	K1-2; K4; S1-2
(c) Communication indicator: Engages in regular, two-way, and culturally proficient communication with families about student learning and performance.			
SEI Indicator (e) Collaborates with families, recognizing the significance of native language and			

culture to create and implement strategies for supporting student learning and development both at home and at school.			
--	--	--	--

Three of the four indicators in Table 4.3 were aligned with 11 of the proposed competencies, only one in Curriculum and Content, but five apiece in Pedagogy and Professional Ethos and Legal and Legislative Knowledge. As this standard calls for teachers to promote “the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016) this distribution of alignment is not surprising. The former two categories contain competencies that require preservice teachers to be mindful of the backgrounds of their students, which is directly related to the families and communities from which they hail. The only indicator in this standard not directly aligned with a competency is the Engagement indicator, which is focused on teachers welcoming and encouraging families to “become active participants in the classroom and school community.” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016) This indicator could be aligned if Curriculum and Content’s competency S1 was broadened to include family members as a part of this process of bridging educational gaps. It entails the need for preservice teachers to

recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numinous domains, and when appropriate

- a. seek consultation from and collaborate with qualified scholars and/or numinous leaders (e.g. priests, pastors, rabbis, imam, spiritual teachers, etc.),
- b. utilize appropriate supplemental materials, resources, and enrichment activities (e.g. field trips, guest speakers), and
- c. seek further training and education to bridge their knowledge gaps

while being professionally conscious of the positionality and bias of the above sources, materials, experiences.

Professional Culture Standard

Table 4.4 presents the embedding of the proposed religion clause competencies in the PST's Professional Culture Standard. This information is drawn from Appendix F.

Table 4.4

Proposed Competencies in the Professional Culture Standard

(4) Professional Culture standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students through ethical, culturally proficient, skilled, and collaborative practice.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Reflection indicator: Demonstrates the capacity to reflect on and improve the educator's own practice, using informal means as well as meetings with teams and work groups to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning.	S1	K1; S2; S5	S1
(b) Professional Growth indicator: Actively pursues professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional and leadership roles.	S1	K1; S2; S5	S1
(c) Collaboration indicator: Collaborates effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks.			
(d) Decision-making indicator: Becomes involved in school-wide decision-making, and takes an active role in school improvement planning.			
(e) Shared Responsibility indicator: Shares responsibility for the performance of all students within the school.			
(f) Professional Responsibilities indicator: Is ethical	<i>All</i>		

and reliable, and meets routine responsibilities consistently.	
--	--

This final standard “promotes the learning and growth of all students through ethical, culturally proficient, skilled, and collaborative practice” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016). Again, cultural proficiency is mentioned in the PST. In this standard, both the Reflection and Professional Growth indicators are aligned with the same five competencies, the majority of which are in the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Category. It is also noteworthy that four out of the five competencies are within the Skill domain, as a demonstration of said professional cultural proficient is at issue. While indicators c, d, and e— the Collaboration, Decision-making, and Shared Responsibility indicators— do not align with any of the proposed competencies, this is not because they are not relevant to those competencies. Each of these indicators can be seen as supporting the others in meeting the goals of the competencies. For example, the Collaboration indicator measures a teacher’s ability to collaborate “effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016). These tasks could be the implementation of curriculum, personal professional development, or efforts to change schoolwide culture in regards to addressing student worldviews. However, there is not a proposed competency that is directly speaking to this important area of school culture.

On the other hand, the Professional Responsibilities indicator, like the Cultural Proficiency indicator in the Teaching All Students Standard, aligned with all of the proposed competencies. This indicator measures if a teacher “is ethical and reliable, and meets routine responsibilities consistently.” (M. D. o. E. a. S. Education, 2016) The research behind this study and the proposed religion clause competencies argues that to be an “ethical and reliable” professional means that the teacher will accept the proposed competencies as “routine

responsibilities” they should “consistently” meet. In combination with the other three standards, the analysis of this document leads to the first of four findings.

Finding #1: All of the study’s proposed religion clause competencies currently have a potential conceptual home within the PST as they are aligned with various, often multiple, standard indicators.

The PST indicators receive 1 and 2-ratings as they touch upon the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by preservice teachers in relation to the religion clauses, because they are not directly and explicitly discussed. However, the language that is employed within these indicators, if taken to their logical extent, would embrace religion clause issues.

As Tables 4.1-4.4 and their subsequent narratives display, all of the proposed religion clause competencies are potentially imbedded within the PST’s indicators throughout the document if the language of the indicators is interpreted more broadly, if the implications of the words in the document more fully embraced the diversity of student worldviews.

As all of the TEPs discussed below employ this document in certifying their preservice teachers, the PST serves as this study’s first indication that TEPs’ documentation does not codify the instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. The following sections present a detailed reporting of the thematic analysis conducted for each of four institutions (TEP A-D) using the evaluation tool.

TEP A

TEP A is a private religious institution in an urban section of the greater Boston area. This institution provided nine documents to the study. Only seven were within the parameters of the study, as the other two were for use in their graduate education program. The seven usable

documents consisted of four prepracticum/practicum syllabi, the partnership guidelines between the TEP and local schools, the exit survey given to all graduating preservice teachers, and a history course syllabus. Below are the results and analysis of the documents provided as they display the religion clause competencies for each category (see Appendix E for the Evaluation Tool Key for codes used below).

Curriculum and Content

Table 4.5 presents the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP A for the competencies within the category of Curriculum and Content.

Table 4.5

TEP A Curriculum and Content Ratings

Document	Curriculum and Content Competencies					
	A1	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1
PrePrac 3 Syllabus	1	1	1	2	1	1
PrePrac 2 Syllabus	1	1	1	2	1	1
PrePrac 1 Syllabus	1	1	1	2	1	1
Full Prac Syllabus	3	1	1	2	1	1
Partnership Guidelines	1	1	1	1	1	1
Exit Survey	2	2	2	2	2	1
History Course Syllabus	3	2	2	1	2	2
Means	1.72	1.29	1.29	1.72	1.29	1.15

The results of this table show that the highest competency rating in Curriculum and Content was 1.72. This rating was shared by the attitude domain competency addressing preservice teachers' ability to recognize the benefits of educating students "in the full range of human experiences," and that "ignorance, apathy, and avoidance [of same] are dangerous for civil society and liberal democracy" (A1), and the knowledge domain competency calling for preservice teachers to be "conversant with the diversity of beliefs & practices that exist between

and within religions as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum” (K3).

The majority of competencies in this category received the same average rating of 1.29, as none of the competencies in this category, other than A1, were present in the documents reviewed.

A1 was the only competency in this category with ratings of 3. Two documents, a course syllabus and the practicum handbook, contained direct language about the civil and social ends of educating all students in the diversity of worldviews. By contrast, the skill domain competency regarding preservice teachers’ ability to recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numinous domains, and to seek appropriate personnel, materials, resources, activities, and training to bridge their knowledge gaps (S1), received the lowest rating in this category, 1.15. Compared to the other two categories for this TEP, the average competencies ratings were in the middle, with Pedagogy and Professional Ethos being higher, and Legal and Legislative Knowledge being lower.

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos

Table 4.6 presents the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP A for the competencies within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos.

Table 4.6

TEP A Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Ratings

Document	Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies									
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
PrePrac 3 Syllabus	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	2
PrePrac 2 Syllabus	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	2
PrePrac 1 Syllabus	2	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	2
Full Prac Syllabus	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	2	2
Partnership Guidelines	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Exit Survey	3	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	3	2
History Course Syllabus	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	2

Means	2.29	2.15	2.58	1.58	1.0	2.29	2.43	1.15	2	1.86
-------	------	------	------	------	-----	------	------	------	---	------

This table displays that TEP A saw the highest and lowest average rating in the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, 2.85 and 1 respectively. Though this category had the highest competency ratings overall, with the majority being a 2.0 or higher, neither of the other two categories received average ratings this high. This category had multiple 3-ratings in all three domains, explicitly stating the competencies within their documentation, a result unseen in the other categories. Of particular note is the fact that the competencies in all three domains with the highest ratings for TEP A, were in areas related to how preservice teachers think about and interact with their students' worldviews. TEP A's materials, which were intended for preservice teachers, explicitly mention the need for preservice teachers to not only be mentally cognizant of the worldviews of their students, but also to be mentally aware of their own positionalities, and to utilize those mental states when interacting with their students, instructing in manners that respect that dialogue of ideas. As four of the documents evaluated are prepracticum/practicum guidelines, and another is a survey given to graduating preservice teachers, these results suggest that these principles of honoring the diverse worldviews of student populations is an idea deeply imbedded throughout the course of study. While only one content area syllabus was provided by the institution, this one also rated 3s in competencies related to respecting students' worldviews.

Legal and Legislative Knowledge

Table 4.7 proffers the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP A for the competencies within the category of Legal and Legislative Knowledge.

Table 4.7

TEP A Legal and Legislative Knowledge Ratings

Document	Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies							
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	S2
PrePrac 3 Syllabus	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
PrePrac 2 Syllabus	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
PrePrac 1 Syllabus	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
Full Prac Syllabus	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
Partnership Guidelines	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Exit Survey	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3
History Course Syllabus	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Means	1.86	1.58	1.29	1.29	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.86

In Legal and Legislative Knowledge, Table 4.7 shows that TEP A saw its highest ratings in competencies related to preservice teachers' attitudes and abilities around safeguarding the rights of students. Both A1 and S2—competencies that respectively measure preservice teachers' belief that neutrality in the classroom means no religion is “advantaged or disadvantaged,” and how preservice teachers aid students to balance “their rights and responsibilities”—received a rating of 1.86. The next highest rating was a 1.58 for the competency measuring whether preservice teachers believe that students retain their constitutional rights within public schools (A2).

Of particular interest is the Exit Survey. This was the only document with any 3-ratings—there were three such ratings—and the remaining competencies all received 2-ratings. The only other 2-ratings in this category are in the three competencies mentioned above: A1, A2, and S2. There is no mention or implied attention to the knowledge and skills of competencies K1, K2, K3, K4, or S1 in any other document. This would strongly suggest that preservice teachers in this institution graduate not having been taught how to (a) “identify legal and ethical

issues related to the religion clauses of the US Constitution that may surface when working with students,” (b) express “the historic legal cases involving public schools,” (c) discuss the nuances of “student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters in both academic ... and social ...spheres,” (d) “know the legal and/or appropriate time, places, and manners to exercise their own numinous and secular beliefs within the school building/community,” and/or (e) “stay abreast of research and professional developments regarding the religion clauses specifically related to professional practice, and engage in ongoing assessment of their own legal and ethical competence.”

The content of the Exit Survey suggests that TEP A expects its preservice teachers to matriculate with these attitudes, knowledge, skills well in hand. Thus, there is a disconnect between the expectations of the Exit Survey and the content of the other evaluated documentation. It is possible that more TEP documentation would bear out the expectations contained in the TEP’s Exit Survey, that additional artifacts would contain explicit mentions of these competencies. However, it is also possible that this TEP’s expectations do not align with the reality of what happens in classrooms.

Synthesis of TEP A Documentation

Of the 24 competencies measured, only ten were present in the documents provided by TEP A. Removing the exit survey, this number drops to six. The category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos holds the highest ratings, mostly 2s and 3s. In this area there is explicit mention of the need for preservice teachers to not only be mentally cognizant of the worldviews of their students, but also mentally aware of their own positionalities, and how they instruct students given these realities. These are the most pronounced of the competencies in TEP A. Both the categories of Curriculum and Content and Legal and Legislative Knowledge show a

dearth of religion clause issue awareness. There are respectively, only 1 and 3 competencies explicitly addressed in these categories, both within the Exit Survey.

TEP B

TEP B is a private religious institution in an urban section of the greater Boston area. This institution provided 26 documents to the study. However, only 10 of them fit the study's criteria for document selection. Of the 26 documents, ten were duplicate syllabi for courses that run in both the fall and spring semesters, and six fell outside the parameters of the study as they were flyers and brochures for special events. The ten usable documents consisted of course syllabi, syllabi for end-of-program experiences (e.g. capstone seminar and student teaching practicum), and informational documents from the TEP. It is worth noting at the outset that the syllabus for a special education course was an outlier in the data: none of the competencies were mentioned within the document. This document received only 1-ratings. Similarly, the syllabus provided for a history course received all 1-ratings save for one 2-rating for the competency evaluating preservice teachers' ability to recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numinous domains, and to seek out the appropriate personnel, materials, and educative experiences to provide their students with a quality education. These two documents were significantly lower than the other documents evaluated from TEP B. Below are the results and analysis of the documents provided as they display the religion clause competencies for each category.

Curriculum and Content

Table 4.8 exhibits the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP B for the competencies within the category of Curriculum and Content ratings.

Table 4.8

TEP B Curriculum and Content Ratings

Document	Curriculum and Content Competencies					
	A1	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1
Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 1	4	1	1	2	2	1
Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 2	2	1	1	1	1	1
History Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	2
Capstone Seminar Syllabus	1	2	2	2	2	2
Special Education Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1
Classroom Management Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1
Curriculum and Methods Syllabus	1	2	2	2	2	2
Department Learning Goals	2	2	2	2	2	3
Professional Disposition Qualities Document	1	2	1	1	2	1
Practicum Syllabus	2	2	2	2	2	3
Means	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7

The results of this table show that the rating means for Curriculum and Content competencies are relatively uniform for TEP B. All means varied between 1.4 and 1.7. This is because, in this category, the competencies were largely absent from the documents evaluated. Two documents—the Department Learning Goals and the Practicum Syllabus—received a 3-rating for competency S1, as they explicitly referred to preservice teachers’ ability to recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numerous domains, and to seek out the appropriate personnel, materials, and educative experiences to provide their students with a quality education. Of individual note, one document received a 4-rating for competency A1: the ability of preservice teachers to recognize the civic and ethical benefits of educating “tomorrow’s citizens in the full range of human experiences” (Waggoner, 2013, p. 18). This document is from a course focused on the history of educational philosophy in the United States. This course addresses how changes in education policy has impacted society and has a focus on equity in the public school classroom. While the syllabus specifically mentions a host of demographic

concerns impacting public school students and classrooms, it does not specifically mention numinous and secular worldviews. This document also received two 3-ratings and one 4-rating in the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos.

It is noteworthy that the neither the Curriculum and Methods Syllabus nor the Capstone Seminar Syllabus contain any mention of the competencies in this category. Even though they are dominated by 2-ratings, signaling a potential for classroom conversation on these issues, the competencies are not a codified part of the curriculum in the documents evaluated.

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos

Table 4.9 presents the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP B for the competencies within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos ratings.

Table 4.9

TEP B Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Ratings

Document	Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies									
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 1	2	2	4	3	1	2	3	1	2	2
Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
History Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Capstone Seminar Syllabus	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2
Special Education Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Classroom Management Syllabus	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Curriculum and Methods Syllabus	4	2	4	2	1	3	4	2	2	3
Department Learning Goals	2	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1
Professional Disposition Qualities Document	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	2
Practicum Syllabus	2	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1
Means	2.0	1.6	1.9	1.9	1.2	2.1	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.5

The results of this category contained the highest displays of the competency for the TEP. The highest mean was for S1 (2.1), which was followed closely by A1 (2), K1 and K2 (1.9), and S2 (1.8). These competencies can be evenly divided into two topics: a preservice teacher's

respectful awareness of the diverse background of the student population, and a preservice teacher's professional awareness and action in combating their personal biases. The TEP documents evaluated largely display an awareness of the need for these practices in the lives of preservice teachers. Thus, they are included in program documentation. Only K3, S3, and S4 received no 3 or 4-ratings from any TEP document evaluated. This is ironic as these competencies are focused on actions that scholars argue are needed after teachers embrace an awareness of diverse student populations: recognizing the difference between "pluralism" and "relativism" when engaging student worldviews, teaching about numinous beliefs and practices in a non-devotional manner, and exhibiting "pedagogical neutrality" while instructing.

Of note is the Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 1 which, mentioned above, received two 3-ratings and one 4-rating in the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos. Similarly, the Curriculum and Methods Syllabus received three 4-ratings and two 3-ratings. Both documents, in courses taken by all students, display an example of where the TEP focuses on religion clause competencies in the area of pedagogy.

Legal and Legislative Knowledge

Table 4.10 promulgates the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP B for the competencies within the category of Legal and Legislative Knowledge. The results of this table present that the means for the category of Legal and Legislative Knowledge for TEP B are almost flat. The lowest mean was 1.0 for S1, but this was closely followed with 1.1 for K3, K4, and S2, and 1.3 for A2 and K2. None of these competencies have a 3 or 4-rating, meaning there is no appearance of the competencies within these TEP's documents. A1 and K1 have respective means of 1.5 and 1.4, and are the only competencies present in this category's competencies, as one 3-rating appears for each. The Curriculum and Methods Syllabus includes language helping

preservice teachers understand that “the basic idea behind the neutrality of the classroom is that no religion should be advantaged or disadvantaged, that each should be welcomed and none should be harmed” (Fiala, 2013, p. 28). The Capstone Seminar Syllabus includes language about helping preservice teachers to identify legal and ethical issues related to the religion clauses of the US Constitution that may surface when working with students.

Table 4.10

TEP B Legal and Legislative Knowledge Ratings

Document	Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies							
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	S2
Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Educational History and Philosophy Syllabus 2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
History Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Capstone Seminar Syllabus	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2
Special Education Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Classroom Management Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Curriculum and Methods Syllabus	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Department Learning Goals	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Professional Disposition Qualities Document	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Practicum Syllabus	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Means	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1

Synthesis of TEP B Documentation

Of the 24 competencies measured, only ten were present in the documents provided by TEP B. The category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos holds the highest ratings, mostly 2s and 3s, but also with a number of 4-ratings. The competencies focused on preservice teachers’ respectful awareness of the diverse background of the student population, and professional awareness and action in combating their personal biases were in evidence. Evident in TEP B’s documents was an awareness of the need for these practices in the lives of preservice teachers as measured by the competencies. Both the categories of Curriculum and Content and Legal and

Legislative Knowledge show a dearth of religion clause issue awareness. Only 2 competencies are explicitly addressed in each of these categories, and are largely dominated by 1-ratings.

TEP C

TEP C is a public, secular institution in a suburban section of the greater Boston area. This institution provided four documents to the study, all of which fit within the parameters of the study. However, despite repeated requests, no syllabi or other document types were provided by this institution. All four documents are informational texts: two procedural handbooks for preservice teachers' performance in public school classrooms, and two evaluation forms used to assess the performance of preservice teachers once they are in public school classrooms. Below are the results of the analysis of the documents provided as they display the religion clause competencies for each category.

Curriculum and Content

Table 4.11 expresses the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP C for the competencies within the category of Curriculum and Content ratings.

Table 4.11

TEP C Curriculum and Content Ratings

Document	Curriculum and Content Competencies					
	A1	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1
Field Placement Handbook	1	1	1	1	1	1
Field Study Evaluation Form	1	1	2	2	1	2
Professional Attributes Scale	1	1	1	1	1	1
Student Teaching Handbook	1	1	1	1	1	1
Means	1.0	1.0	1.25	1.25	1.0	1.25

Table 4.11 displays that TEP C's documents provide no evidence of the Curriculum and Content category's competencies. Only the Field Study Evaluation Form received 2-ratings for three competencies: 1-ratings are present for the rest.

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos

Table 4.12 shows the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP C for the competencies within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos.

Table 4.12

TEP C Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Ratings

Document	Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies									
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
Field Placement Handbook	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Field Study Evaluation Form	3	3	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	2
Professional Attributes Scale	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
Student Teaching Handbook	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Means	1.75	1.75	1.25	1.25	1.0	1.75	1.5	1.25	1.5	1.5

The results of this table communicate that 1.75 is the highest mean for this category. The Field Study Evaluation Form is the only document that was evaluated to have competencies in this category. Competencies A1, A2, and S1 all contain 3-ratings. Thus, TEP C personnel observing preservice teachers in a school setting have an expectation that preservice teachers are respecting the diverse worldviews of their students, and that preservice teachers view students' worldviews as just as an important aspect of human diversity, as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, gender, and age. TEP evaluators are also expecting preservice teachers to equitably instruct students from those diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement. These expectations are codified into their evaluation tool.

TEP C's Professional Attributes Scale was evaluated with almost all 2-ratings but, as discussed above, these are not explicit mentions of the competency's appearance in the document: they are only potential places they may arise. But as this is an informational document, not a course syllabus, it is not possible with this analysis to imagine where such conversations would organically arise between TEP personnel and preservice teachers. As with the previous category, the two handbooks have only 1-ratings.

Legal and Legislative Knowledge

Table 4.13 propounds the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP C for the competencies within the category of Legal and Legislative Knowledge.

Table 4.13

TEP C Legal and Legislative Knowledge Ratings

Document	Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies							
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	S2
Field Placement Handbook	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Field Study Evaluation Form	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2
Professional Attributes Scale	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Student Teaching Handbook	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Means	1.5	1.25	1.5	1.25	1.25	1.5	1.25	1.5

Following the trend of the two previous categories, the results of this table declare that the analysis of the Legal and Legislative Knowledge category reveals no explicit mentions of the relevant competencies. Once again, the Professional Attributes scale is evaluated with almost all 2-ratings, and the two handbooks have only 1-ratings.

Synthesis of TEP C Documentation

Of the 24 competencies measured, only three were present in the documents provided by TEP C. The Field Study Evaluation Form was the only document evaluated to have any

competencies present. Those were found within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos category. It seems that TEP C personnel observing preservice teachers in a school setting have an expectation that preservice teachers are respecting the diverse worldviews of their students, and that preservice teachers view students' worldviews as an aspect of human diversity that is just as important as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, gender, and age. TEP evaluators are also expecting preservice teachers to equitably instruct students from those diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement.

The documents from this TEP were both procedural handbooks for preservice teachers' performance in public school classrooms, and evaluation forms used to assess the performance of preservice teachers once they are in public school classrooms. While a small sample, the evaluation of them for this study's competencies are still informative. Neither the Field Placement Handbook, or the Student Teaching Handbook has any explicit mentions of any of the competencies. This is significant as the documents vital to a preservice teacher applying course work into practice in the classroom setting, show that the demonstration of the skills, knowledge, and attitudes related to religion clause issues are not codified into the TEP's documentation. However, TEP C's Student Teaching Handbook mentions that students will be held accountable for the materials in the Massachusetts Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) as they are aligned with the Professional Standards for Teachers (PST). The PST is also evaluated in this study as it is employed by many of the TEPs in MA, including all contained within this study.

TEP D

TEP D is a public, secular institution in an urban section of the greater Boston area. This institution provided five documents to the study, all of which were within the parameters of the

study. All the documents were course syllabi. Below is an analysis of the documents provided as they display the religion clause competencies for each category.

Curriculum and Content

Table 4.14 shows the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP D for the competencies within the category of Curriculum and Content.

Table 4.14

TEP D Curriculum and Content Ratings

Document	Curriculum and Content Competencies					
	A1	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1
Classroom Management Syllabus	1	2	2	2	2	2
Childhood Development Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1
Data for Curriculum and Instruction Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1
Literacies and Technology Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1
English Methods Syllabus	1	2	2	1	1	2
Means	1	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.4

This table displays that TEP D's documents provide no evidence of the Curriculum and Content category's competencies. The Classroom Management and English Methods syllabi received 2-ratings for multiple competencies (five and three respectively). However, 1-ratings are present for the rest.

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos

Table 4.15 puts forward the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP D for the competencies within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos.

Table 4.15

TEP D Pedagogy and Professional Ethos

Document	Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies									
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
Classroom Management Syllabus	3	2	1	2	1	3	2	2	2	3
Childhood Development Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Data for Curriculum and Instruction Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Literacies and Technology Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
English Methods Syllabus	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Means	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.2	1	1.8	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.4

The results of Table 4.15 express that the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos category had the highest means for TEP D: 1.8 for competencies A1 and S1. Both competencies received 3-ratings from the Classroom Management and English Methods syllabi. These competencies address preservice teachers respecting the diverse worldviews of their students, and the equitable instruction of students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement. In addition, the Classroom Management syllabus displayed the competency around preservice teachers fostering intelligent, informed, and respectful ongoing dialogue between students around differing worldviews (S5), and the English Methods syllabus had 3-ratings for preservice teachers both honoring the importance of students' worldviews, and recognizing how their own background and biases impact their perceptions and implementation of curriculum (A2, K1, and S2). The other documents received 1-ratings for all competencies.

Legal and Legislative Knowledge

Table 4.16 indicates the evaluation ratings for each document provided by TEP D for the competencies within the category of Legal and Legislative Knowledge.

Table 4.16

TEP D Legal and Legislative Knowledge

Document	Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies							
	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	S2
Classroom Management Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Childhood Development Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Data for Curriculum and Instruction Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Literacies and Technology Syllabus	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	3
English Methods Syllabus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Means	1	1.2	1	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.4

This table demonstrates that TEP D displayed the appearance of only three competencies within this category, all found within the Literacies and Technology Syllabus. This document contained language evaluated with 3-ratings which documented that preservice teacher are expected to be conversant with the historic legal cases involving public school, and know the legal and/or appropriate time, places, and manners for their own, and their students', exercise of numinous and secular beliefs within the school building/community (K2, K4, S2). This same document had 2-ratings for three other competencies, while all other documents displayed only 1-ratings for all competencies in this category.

Synthesis of TEP D Documentation

Of the 24 competencies measured, only nine were present in the documents provided by TEP D. The Classroom Management, English Methods, and Literacies and Technology syllabi were the documents where these nine competencies were evaluated as present. Preservice teachers are documented as receiving instruction about respecting the diverse worldviews of their

students, the equitable instruction of students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement, fostering intelligent, informed, and respectful ongoing dialogue between students around differing worldviews, recognizing how their own background and biases impact their perceptions and implementation of curriculum. In addition, preservice teachers are expected to be conversant with the historic legal cases involving public school, and know the legal and/or appropriate time, places, and manners for their own, and their students', exercise of numinous and secular beliefs within the school building/community. Neither the Childhood Development Syllabus nor the Data for Curriculum and Instruction Syllabus contained any of the competencies, never receiving higher than a 1-rating.

Synthesis of Data for TEPs A-D

The following section contains a composite of the above TEP data. The purpose of this section is to highlight the commonalities between how the researched TEPs document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos; to present a comparison between the TEPs in this study in relation to the proposed religion clause competencies in terms of both Category and Domain. This comparison is a composite of the information provided in the sections above, and introduces the Findings of this study.

Table 4.17 presents the mean ratings for the six competencies within the Curriculum and Content category for each TEP. This table compiles data from Tables 5, 8, 11, and 14.

Table 4.17

Comparison of Curriculum and Content Competencies Across TEPs

Curriculum and Content Competencies						
TEP	A1	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1
A	1.72	1.29	1.29	1.72	1.29	1.15
B	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7
C	1.72	1.29	1.29	1.72	1.29	1.15
D	1	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.4

The results of this table show that the average means for Curriculum and Content competencies were low, as neither the individual TEP means exceeded 1.72. In all of the TEPs surveyed, all competencies' averages for this category were below 2.0 out of the 4-point scale. As will be seen below, the average means for Curriculum and Content competencies numerically fell between the other two categories.

Table 4.18 presents the mean ratings for the 10 competencies within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos category for each TEP. This table compiles data from Tables 4.6, 4.9, 4.12, and 4.15.

Table 4.18

Comparison of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies Across TEPs

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Competencies										
TEP	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
A	2.29	2.15	2.58	1.58	1	2.29	2.43	1.15	2	1.86
B	2	1.6	1.9	1.9	1.2	2.1	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.5
C	2.29	2.15	2.58	1.58	1	2.29	2.43	1.15	2	1.86
D	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.2	1	1.8	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.4

As Table 4.18 display, the average means for this category's competencies often exceeded 2.0 out of the 4-point scale. This is significant as these were the highest ratings of competencies in all three categories, and throughout the proposed competencies.

Table 4.19 presents the mean ratings for the six competencies within the Legal and Legislative Knowledge category for each TEP. This table compiles data from Tables 4.7, 4.10, 4.13, and 4.16.

Table 4.19

Comparison of Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies Across TEPs

Legal and Legislative Knowledge Competencies								
TEP	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	S2
A	1.86	1.58	1.29	1.29	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.86
B	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.1	1	1.1
C	1.86	1.58	1.29	1.29	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.86
D	1	1.2	1	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.4

The results of this table show that the average means for the Legal and Legislative Knowledge competencies were the lowest compared to the other two categories.

Table 4.20 identifies which competencies received at least one 3 or 4-rating. Thus, it displays which competencies were explicitly contained within TEP documentation at least once.

Table 4.20

Competency Presence in TEP Documentation

	Curriculum and Content						Pedagogy and Professional Ethos									Legal and Legislative								
TEP	A1	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	A1	A2	K1	K2	K3	K4	S1	S2
A	Yes						Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes		Yes				Yes	Yes				Yes
B	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes		Yes					
C							Yes	Yes				Yes												
D							Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes			Yes				Yes		Yes		Yes

Interpreted in terms of competency Categories, the results of this table hold that Pedagogy and Professional Ethos competencies were the most prevalent in TEP documentation.

80% of the competencies in this Category were present in at least one TEP, compared to the categories of Legal and Legislative Knowledge and Curriculum and Content, whose competencies were present at percentages of 63% and 33% respectively. Furthermore, 30% of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos competencies appear in the documentation of all four TEPs, and another 20% appear in the documentation of three TEPs. None of the other Categories have competencies that appear more than in the documentation of two TEPs.

In terms of competency Domains, the results of this table show that the Attitude Domain competencies were the most prevalent in TEP documentation. 80% of the Attitude Domain competencies appear at least once in the TEPs' documentation, while 40% appear in documentation from all four of the TEPs. Both of these numbers are higher than the other two Domains. While 75% of Skills Domain competencies appear at least once in the TEPs' documentation, only one of competencies (Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, S1) appears in documentation from all four of the TEPs. This is only 13% of the Skill Domain competencies. Only 36% of the eleven Knowledge Domain competencies appear at least once in the TEPs' documentation, and none appear in the documentation of each TEP.

Of particular importance, Table 4.21 displays those competencies which do not appear in any of the TEP Documentation. This table is organized by the three categories, Curriculum & Content, Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, and Legal and Legislative Knowledge.

Table 4.21

Proposed Competencies Absent from TEP Documentation

Category	Competency
Curriculum & Content	K1-Preservice teachers can identify a variety of numinous texts, experiences, practices, and beliefs that directly intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.
	K2-Preservice teachers can critically assess textbooks, supplemental materials, resources, and activities as they touch upon numinous worldviews.
	K3-Preservice teachers are conversant with the diversity of beliefs & practices that exist between and within religions as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.
	K4-Preservice teachers are conversant with contextual nature of worldviews (i.e. that worldviews are not monolithic in time, place, or manner) as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.
Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	K3-Preservice teachers recognize the difference between <i>pluralism</i> and <i>relativism</i> in engaging student worldviews.
	S3-Preservice teacher are able to teach about numinous beliefs and practices relevant to their curriculum content areas in a non-devotional manner.
Legal and Legislative Knowledge	A2-Preservice teachers believe that “students don't shed their constitutional rights at the school house gates.”
	K3-Preservice teacher are conversant with student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters in both academic (e.g. censorship, opting out, accommodations) and social (e.g. holidays, clothing, prayer) spheres.
	S1-Preservice teachers stay abreast of research and professional developments regarding the religion clauses specifically related to professional practice, and engage in ongoing assessment of their own legal and ethical competence.

Discussion of Findings # 2-4

From the above discussion, and the tables presented in this section, three additional findings are explicated. These findings are organized along the same lines as the religion clause

competencies discussed above, presenting the most prevalent Category, Domain, and type of Competencies appearing in the documentation of the TEPs researched.

Finding #2: Competencies within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Category were most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

As seen in the thematic analysis of each TEP above, the competencies within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos occurred the most often and received the highest ratings of the three categories. A comparison of Tables 4.17, 4.18 and 4.19 shows that the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos has higher means across the TEPs than the other two categories. While the average means for Curriculum and Content and Legal and Legislative Knowledge competencies never exceeded 1.72 and 1.56 respectively, the average means for Pedagogy and Professional Ethos competencies often exceeded 2.0. In addition, Table 4.21 shows which competencies are present/missing overall: the competencies that were/were not present in any of the TEP documentation evaluated (received a 3 or 4-rating). In Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, 80% of the competencies in this category were present in at least one TEP. Furthermore, 30% of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos competencies appear in the documentation of all four TEPs, and another 20% appear in the documentation of three TEPs. None of the other Categories have competencies that appear more than in the documentation of two TEPs.

Finding #3: Competencies within the Attitudes Domain are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

As seen in Table 20, the Attitude Domain is more prevalent in TEP documentation when compared to the Skill and Knowledge Domain competencies. As discussed above, 80% of the Attitude Domain competencies appear at least once in the TEPs' documentation. The Skills and

Knowledge Domain competencies present 75% and 36% respectively. Furthermore, while 40% of Attitude Domain competencies appear in documentation from all four of the TEPs, the Skill Domain maintains only 13% and the Knowledge Domain none.

Finding # 4: Competencies addressing the attitudes, knowledge, and skills proposed for preservice teachers related to the diverse worldviews of themselves and their students are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

In concert with Finding #2, the most prevalent competencies were all found within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos. These were

- A1: Preservice teachers respect the diverse worldviews of their students.
- A2: Preservice teachers view students' worldviews as important aspects of human diversity, along with factors such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, gender, and age
- K1: Preservice teachers recognize how their own worldviews influence their professional ethos and practice, and their attitudes, perceptions, and assumptions about the nature of their curriculum and pedagogy.
- S1: Preservice teachers are able to equitably instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement.
- S2: Preservice teachers are able to recognize their own background, biases, and positionalities.

As seen in Table 4.20 and its discussion, these competencies are the most prevalent throughout the documents provided by the TEPs. Competencies A1, A2, and S1 were the only competencies which appeared in documents from all of TEP evaluated. Both competencies K1 and S1 are the only competencies which appeared in the documents of three of the four TEP

evaluated. Furthermore, these competencies had the highest means of all 24 competencies in all researched TEPs (Compare Tables 4.17-4.19). As discussed above, both when addressing the individual TEPs, as well as in discussing Finding #2, these competencies most often received 3 and 4-ratings when the evaluation tool was applied. Conversely, of the 24 proposed competencies, nine were never found explicitly mentioned within TEP documentation during this study (See Table 4.21). The competencies missing from TEP literature cannot be as easily connected thematically as those that are most prevalent.

Summary

This chapter presented a thematic analysis for the four institutions researched in the study, by aggregating the results of the individual documents in each competency, and presenting percentages of how institutional documentation displays the competencies. This provided an overall picture of how each TEP codifies their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos in their institutional documentation. Appendix E provided a key for the codes used for the religion clause competencies for each category.

As seen in the above, through a variety of evaluated documents, each TEP showed less than half of the 24 religion clauses competencies. Two TEPs displayed 10 competencies, one displayed nine, and another only three. In all four cases, competencies in the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos were the most in evidence. TEP documentation indicates that TEPs have an awareness of the need to educate preservice teachers to respect the diverse worldviews of their students, as they are an important aspect of human diversity, and teachers must equitably instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement. By comparison, both the categories of Curriculum and Content and

Legal and Legislative Knowledge show a dearth of religion clause issue awareness. This study led to four findings, one in relation to the Professional Standards for Teachers contained within the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance, and three based on an analysis of TEP documentation. In summary, the four findings include

Finding #1: All of the study's proposed religion clause competencies potentially have a conceptual home within the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) documentation, specifically the Professional Standards for Teachers, as they are aligned with various, often multiple, standard indicators,

Finding #2: Competencies within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Category are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated,

Finding #3: Competencies within the Attitudes Domain are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated, and

Finding #4: Competencies addressing the attitudes, knowledge, and skills proposed for preservice teachers related to the diverse worldviews of themselves and their students are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

Chapter Five presents a discussion of the findings of the study. This includes both practical and theoretical implications of the study upon TEPs in MA and nationwide, as well as stating the relationship with the study's initial research hypothesis. Recommendations for TEPs in MA and nationwide are also presented. Areas of future research, based on delimitations and limitations of the study and the conclusions of this study, are articulated. Finally, my own personal reflection on the study is delineated.

CHAPTER FIVE: STUDY SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, FUTURE RESEARCH, AND FINAL REFLECTIONS

Introduction

Sixteen years ago, I began my career as an educator: this after completing a teacher education program at a Christian college where the intersection of the religion clauses and public schools was never explicitly taught. When I reflect on my first year teaching, I am struck by how much damage this lack of instruction may have wrought. I am confronted with the moments I marginalized the rights of my students in favor of my own, the times I oversimplified a belief system robbing a conversation of important nuance, and positions I took based on my personal faith, rather than being constitutionally informed. I can also call to mind instances where an administrator was incorrect in his assessment of “the separation of church and state,” resulting in confrontations that were founded on his misunderstanding of jurisprudence. Both of us would claim we were doing what we thought was right for our students but, from a legal standpoint, we were both woefully incorrect.

Over the ensuing years teaching courses in ethics, philosophy, sociology, and world literature helped me grow in my ability to respect the diverse worldviews of my students. I decided to never tell students my personal beliefs about most topics, bracketing my own positionality, so they were not looking to me as an authority on what or how to believe. My classes were and are now structured to create an environment where students can express and refine their worldviews. While I contribute to the discussions, I argue for the variety of perspectives in most conversations. As a result, they never know if I am expressing personal views or playing devil’s advocate. Upon graduation, they are allowed to ask me anything they wanted to gain my personal opinion on God, ethical systems, politics, and a host of other topics.

Conversations with past students have continued into the present. In the classroom, however, students do not have to worry that their worldviews will be suppressed by the authority in the classroom.

The above examples are just a sample of the many ways that my professional life changed in regards to the worldviews of my students. But these changes, and many other that I adopted over the years, are contained in the literature examined in Chapter Two of this study. The problem with this is that I would not encounter this literature until after I initially left my position as a public school teacher and became a professor of education. I can only speculate on how the first seven years of my career might have proceeded had my TEP educated me differently. I can only wonder how my life, and the life of my students and their families, would have been impacted had my TEP instructed me with this knowledge, asked me to practice these skills, and presented me with these attitudes; if I began my career with at least an educated baseline of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to religion clause issues to refine, instead of learning through harsh school of raw trial and error.

When I became a professor of education, at my alma mater, I saw preservice teachers who were unaware of the struggle that was to come; unaware of the education they were not receiving, just as I had not received it a decade prior. I soon realized that it was my job to enlighten my college students to these realities. That the “multiculturalism” many of my preservice teachers said they cared about, did not only extend to a student’s ethnicity, gender, race, sexuality, or socioeconomic status, but also the diverse secular and numinous worldviews they may hold. That they as future teachers needed to understand how those worldviews, as well as the worldviews that the teacher holds, impact all classroom interaction, be they academic or social. To this end, I began my own journey of research and reflection, and slowly began to use

my position as a professor to change the knowledge, skill, and attitude base of my preservice teachers in relation to the religion clauses of the US Constitution. As the previous four chapters have shown, the present study is another leg in this ongoing journey.

This study's final chapter is divided into four sections. The first provides a summary of the study that highlights salient points of the previous chapters. The second provides a discussion of the implications of the study's findings for practitioners, educational leaders, and policy makers. Next, in light of the delimitations and limitations of this study, recommendations for future research and potential next steps for TEPs in the area of religion clause instruction are proposed. The chapter ends with the author's final reflections about the potential impact of this study on the field.

Study Summary

In concert with the above, Chapter One argued that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes rooted in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. I began this study providing evidence of the myriad failures in the demonstration of religion clause knowledge, skills, and attitudes by public school personnel, resulting in the violation of student civil rights; failures which lead to personal and academic harm for the individual public school student, as well as social and civic harm in the local and national community. I also showed that scholars and researchers widely agree that TEPs need to educate preservice teachers about the various issues that can arise from a discussion of students' worldviews, while also providing the pedagogical and legal foundations wherein they can best uphold the academic and Constitutional rights of public school students in this area. I argued that TEPs need to educate preservice teachers about religion clause issues, and that TEP faculty need to embrace a pedagogical ethos that includes the protection of public school students' worldviews for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons.

To these ends, the primary research question of this study inquired into how TEPs in Massachusetts instruct preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos as codified in their institutional documentation. More specifically, it asked with what knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues should preservice teachers enter their professional lives? What are the issues related to the religion clauses which apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos? How do TEPs in MA educate teachers in relevant constitutional law and jurisprudence on the religion clauses, and how is that documented? Finally, how do TEPs in MA document the manner in which they instruct theories of pedagogical strategies for engaging students' worldviews?

Chapter Two is the result of my review of literature that examines the relationship between TEPs and the worldviews of public school students, specifically how preservice teachers are prepared to navigate issues related to the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. My review focused both on the history and nature of teacher preparation, as well as contemporary models for how teacher education programs can provide preservice teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues. The importance of this research was in the highlighting of the academic, civic, and moral struggles over religion clause issues that have plagued the both the history of TEPs and the nation as a whole. It allowed for the presentation of the argument that TEPs must not only educate preservice teachers in professional areas related to the religion clauses of the Constitution, but that they should also embrace a pedagogical ethos that includes the protection of students' numinous worldviews for constitutional, academic, civic, and ethical reasons. Furthermore, it was from this literature and

research that this study's evaluation tool was created, both the overall concepts, as well as the individual religion clause competencies.

Knowing that I wanted to separate what TEP personnel might say when interviewed or observed, from the documentation that they produce, I decided the use of qualitative document analysis would be the appropriate methodology for this study. I used the evaluation tool to conduct a thematic analysis for each the documents provided by each TEP. This allowed me to construct a picture of how each TEP codifies their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clauses issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos in their institutional documentation. In the process of gathering TEP documentation I realized that an analysis of the Professional Standards for Teachers (PST) within the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) was warranted, as it was a document employed by all of the TEPs studied.

As discussed in Chapter Four, the thematic analysis conducted in this study resulted in four findings, one in relation to the PST, and three based on an analysis of TEP documentation. These four findings include

Finding #1: All of the proposed religion clause competencies potentially have a conceptual home within the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance documentation, specifically the Professional Standards for Teachers, as they are aligned with various, often multiple, standard indicators.

Finding #2: Competencies within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Category are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

Finding #3: Competencies within the Attitudes Domain are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

Finding #4: Competencies addressing the attitudes, knowledge, and skills proposed for preservice teachers related to the diverse worldviews of themselves and their students are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated.

The following section provides a discussion of the implications of these findings for educational professionals, policy makers, and concerned community members. It also presents a “bottom-up” proposal for how constituents most directly impacted by TEPs can advocate for such change to be implemented.

Discussion

This study has argued that public school teachers do not exhibit the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes grounded in the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution. It has further maintained that harm, personal and social, academic and civic, result from this professional lapse. The cause of this reality was laid at the feet of this nation’s TEPs. This study’s primary research hypothesis was that the targeted TEPs would not consistently and specifically address, instruct, and train preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. This hypothesis was validated in this study.

This study showed that each TEP displayed less than half of the 24 proposed religion clause competencies. Thus, the TEPs’ documentation did not consistently or specifically display an adequate ability to address, instruct, and train preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos. The following analysis provides implications for each of the study’s four major findings before proposing a solution in regards to these implications. These implications and solution are relevant for TEP practitioners, educational leaders, and policy makers.

Implications of Finding #1:

Finding #1 is that all of the study's proposed religion clause competencies potentially have a conceptual home within the Commonwealth's Candidate Assessment of Performance documentation, specifically the Professional Standards for Teachers, as they are aligned with various, often multiple, standard indicators.

As argued in Chapter Four, the indicators in the PST receive 1 and 2-ratings on the evaluation tool because they are not explicitly geared toward religion clause issues. However, the language that is employed within these indicators, if taken to their logical extent, embrace religion clause issues. Consider this example from U.S. history.

The Declaration of Independence states "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" (Congress, 1776). When these words were written they were not interpreted denotatively, as the equality of "all men" did not include humanity writ large. Lower socioeconomic classes, racial minorities, and women were not included in this declaration, as some were not considered human and/or worthy of civic consideration. However, these words persisted in the national ethos—in text if not in practice—allowing Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. to exhort the nation to "rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal'" (King Jr., 1963). While it can be argued that quite a bit of progress has been made to this end, I write this following a weekend where unhooded white supremacists chanted "Jews will not replace us," as well as other racial and religious epithets. They marched outside a church, through public parks, and on public streets in plain view, all while carrying torches, swords, shields, metal batons, and semi-automatic assault weapons intent on inflicting harm on the very people not included in the

original drafting of the above sentiment. They went so far as to plow a car into the peaceful counter-protesters marching in the street. It is difficult to say that the nation has moved into the epoch where Dr. King's Dream is fully realized.

This study utilized qualitative document analysis in the hopes of uncovering the codified beliefs within the study's TEPs: to delve into the institutions' orthodoxy about religion clause issues, rather than the orthopraxis stated by TEP faculty and staff. A benefit of having documents is the ability for members of an institution or community to be held accountable to the written word, even to the point of reaching for the better community beyond the contemporary interpretation of those words; living into the implications of the words beyond what was first imagined. This can and should impact the orthopraxis of the people within that institution/community.

The PST does not directly address or advocate for the varied proposed religion clause competencies, but it should. It should explicitly expect that preservice teachers more than respect the diverse worldviews of their students, but are also able to equitably instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement; it should expect that preservice teachers are conversant with the diversity of beliefs & practices that exist between and within religions, and the contextual nature of worldviews, as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum; it should require that preservice teachers recognize their own background, biases, and positionalities, as well as the legal and/or appropriate time, places, and manners to exercise their own numinous and secular beliefs within the school building/community; it should require that preservice teacher are conversant with both the historic legal cases involving public schools, including student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters in both academic and social spheres.

The spirit of the proposed religion clause competencies already inhabits the words of the PST's indicators. It is up to policy makers to place flesh upon that spirit. For as the Declaration of Independence goes on to state, "but when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security" (Congress, 1776). Now is the time for new guards of future security to be established. The PST offers the language and framework by which the Commonwealth can enable this to take place, and be a model for the nation. Otherwise the current language serves as another example of a missed opportunity to live into the fullest potential of words already penned.

Implications of Finding #2:

Finding #2 is that the competencies within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Category are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated. At this moment, a caveat is in order: being most prevalent in this study is not equated with adequate preparation for a preservice teacher in religion clause issues. Instead it merely means that the category appears in the TEP documentation more. This distinction is important. For example, a TEP mentioning a competency twice in its documentation is better than not mentioning it at all. However, those two mentions, in and of themselves, do not indicate sufficiency for a preservice teacher's education in religion clause knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Even in this category, the means for competency appearance in TEP documentation, at its highest was 2.58, but most were still under 2.0. With this said, the low means of the competencies within the Pedagogy and Professional Ethos Category were still higher than those of Curriculum and Content and Legal and Legislative Knowledge. This is in line with the research.

As detailed in Chapter Two, there is a nationwide lack of preservice teacher education in regarding the inclusion of religious expression law, as there are no current mandates from state departments of education, despite the fact that the research has shown that preservice and in-service teachers are specifically lacking this training and are in need of it (Anderson, 2004; Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Gajda, 2008; Greenawalt, 2005; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Luke, 2004; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Taft, 2011). Chapter 2 also presented the numerous suggestions made for specific content area changes in TEPs to aid grade 6-12 content area teachers deliver their curriculum.

This reality is resulting in the variety of personal and social harms to students and their families that have been highlighted in this study from its beginning pages. As has been discussed above, and shall be again below, the impact of this lack of religion clause education for preservice teachers, is most strongly felt in classrooms, principal's offices, school board meetings, and in bedrooms of hurting students. Preservice teachers who have not been educated in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes relevant to the religion clauses, become teachers who potentially inadvertently hurt students, cause conflict in districts, and contribute to a furthering of social divisions in this country. These findings illustrate the need for TEPs to make adjustments in the education of preservice teachers regarding religion clause issues, in particular pertaining to curricular and legal matters.

Implications of Finding #3:

The third finding is that competencies within the Attitudes Domain are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated. Thus, the attitudes preservice teachers should embody in relation to religion clause issues are codified in the documentation more than knowledge or skills. As discussed in Chapter 4, the highest average rating for Attitudes Domain competencies

was 2.29, with the lowest being a 1-rating where Attitudes Domain competencies were not found in TEP documentation at all. As with the preceding finding, one of the most serious implications is derived by negation. While the high prevalence of the Attitudes Domain competencies do not necessarily equate with adequate preparation for a preservice teacher in religion clause issues, it also signals that the Knowledge and Skills Domains are even more severely lacking.

As discussed in Chapter One the term “attitudes,” in the context of preservice teacher training, refers to the beliefs which undergird the knowledge and skills exhibited by public school teachers, in this instance beliefs rooted in the religion clauses. These beliefs include seeing the value in public school teachers teaching their student how to be good local and global citizens, students engaging in the academic study of disparate worldviews, without an imposition of specific devotional practices (Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998), and teachers honoring and protecting the worldviews of public school students’ for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons (Anderson, 2004, 2008; Greenawalt, 2005; Charles C. Haynes & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development., 2003; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Kunzman, 2006; Marks, et al., 2014; Marty & Moore, 2000; Moore, 2007; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Prothero, 2007; White, 2013). While these beliefs are important, they are not enough. As the beginning of this paragraph says, the beliefs must undergird the knowledge and skills exhibited by public school teachers, i.e. they must be acted upon. It is not enough for teachers to have a certain set of beliefs if their actions do not match. Again this is borne out by the research, as well-meaning teachers run afoul of the law all the time (Gullatt & Tollett, 1997b; Kaiser, 2003; Littleton, 2008). It is clear that “teachers don’t know what they don’t know” (Kaiser, 2003,

p. 338), and their ignorance of both students' worldviews and the law is a problem for both teachers and students (Taft, 2011). Furthermore, to employ a well-worn phrase, "the road to Hell is paved with good intentions." None of the teachers and administrators discussed in Chapter One, myself included, believed our actions were out of line with the law. If asked, all would undoubtedly claim that we held appropriate attitudes in regards to our dealings with students, and at the time, thought we were doing what was best for our students. Yet and still, all of us found ourselves embroiled in controversy.

There is an insufficient amount of education taking place in regards to the knowledge that preservice teachers receive about religion clause issues, and the skills they need to use that knowledge, in order to act upon the attitudes they have been presented with. It is not enough for TEPs to present preservice teachers with a set of attitudes within their documentation, and presumably within the classroom. The knowledge and skills must also be implemented.

Implications of Finding #4:

The implications of Finding #4 are closely related to those of Findings #2 and 3. This finding holds that competencies addressing the attitudes, knowledge, and skills proposed for preservice teachers related to the diverse worldviews of themselves and their students are most prevalent in the TEP documentation evaluated. In concert with Finding #2, the most prevalent competencies were all found within the category of Pedagogy and Professional Ethos. These were

- A1: Preservice teachers respect the diverse worldviews of their students.
- A2: Preservice teachers view students' worldviews as important aspects of human diversity, along with factors such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, gender, and age

- K1: Preservice teachers recognize how their own worldviews influence their professional ethos and practice, and their attitudes, perceptions, and assumptions about the nature of their curriculum and pedagogy.
- S1: Preservice teachers are able to equitably instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement.
- S2: Preservice teachers are able to recognize their own background, biases, and positionalities.

As these were discussed in detail in Chapter Four, I do not discuss them here. It bears repeating, however, that these competencies appeared most frequently in the evaluated TEPs' documents, and had the highest means of all 24 competencies. These competencies, in concert with those which were absent from all TEP documentation, illustrate a potential deficiency within TEPs.

TEP documentation shows that preservice teachers seem to have limited instruction in the practical aspects of grade 6-12 teaching as they relate to content area instruction around religion clause issues. Some of the proposed competencies that were completely absent from TEP documentation include the identification of numinous texts, experiences, practices, and beliefs that directly intersect with content age appropriate area curriculum; the assessment of textbooks, supplemental materials, resources, and activities as they touch upon numinous worldviews; the ability to teach about numinous beliefs and practices relevant to their curriculum content areas in a non-devotional manner; and being conversant with student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters in both academic and social. Preservice teachers staying abreast of research and professional developments regarding the religion clauses specifically related to professional practice, and engaging in ongoing assessment of their own legal and ethical competence, was also a missing competency. While I maintain that the

competencies highlighted in Finding #4 display the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that should be fostered and applied in the professional practice of preservice and in-service teachers.

However, the implication of these prevalent competencies, in the absence of the others, is a surplus of concern about self-reflection and positionality in preservice teachers, but not in their action.

While it appears preservice teachers are heavily steeped in instruction about their positionality in regards to diversity and multiculturalism, they are not receiving the tools to enact that instruction in their professional practice. This is borne out by the research discussed above, which finds that religion clause issues when present in preservice teacher literature, are subsumed under the heading of “multiculturalism” (Anderson, 2008; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Moore, 2007; White, 2009, 2013), and that numinous worldviews are sometimes ignored in multiculturalism curriculum altogether (Anderson, 2008; White, 2009). More must be done to move the professional practice of preservice (and in-service) teachers from mere concern and self-reflection about the diversity of student worldviews, into measurable actions that nurture the students holding those diverse worldviews. The above has shown that change is needed in how TEPs at least document how preservice teachers are instructed on religion clause issues. What follows is a bottom-up proposal for who that change could be implemented.

A Bottom-Up Proposal for Implementing Change in TEPs

By “bottom-up” I mean that the constituents most directly impacted by TEPs must begin to apply pressure on TEPs for instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues for change advocated above to take place. Waiting for such pressure to assert itself from within TEP, or come “from above” through Federal or state mandate, is a virtual chimera.

As discussed in Chapter Two, Keller (2003) notes that there is a “statutory void” (p. 3) when it comes to how Federal law enacts the religion clauses in public school settings. Furthermore, there is a decided lack of mandates from state departments of education regarding the inclusion of religious expression law within TEPs, though the research has shown that preservice and in-service teachers are specifically lacking this training and are in need of it (Anderson, 2004; Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Gajda, 2008); Greenawalt, 2005; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Luke, 2004; Moore, 2007; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; Taft, 2011). Given this reality and the current political climate, it seems unlikely that the Federal government, through Congress or the Department of Education, will place requirements on TEPs to mandate the inclusion of religion clause issues within their curriculum, or adopt anything similar to the competencies proposed in this study. Similarly, there does not seem to be any indication that this would stem from state legislators. For these reasons, a bottom-up approach to TEP change is needed.

Figure 5.1 shows five different community-based stakeholders who could exert influence over TEPs practices in an effort to address the instruction of preservice teachers in religion clause issues: Community Members, (e.g. parents, students, religious leaders, civic leaders, business people, etc.), Classroom Teachers, School Administrators (e.g. departments heads, vice principals, principals, etc.), District Administrators (e.g. curriculum directors, superintendents, school board members, etc.), and Local Government Officials (e.g. selectmen, mayors, etc.). The principle at work in this proposal is bottom-up, in that a demand is created by the groups on the left, so that TEPs will create a supply of preservice teachers able to meet those groups’ needs. In Figure 5.1, the trajectory of the approach moves from left to right, though influence could be

asserted anywhere along the chain advocating either directly to TEPs, or to those further to the right.

Figure 5.1

A Bottom-Up Approach



For example, and using the proposed competencies as a standard/model, parents and community leaders can be in conversation with school personnel about the type of educator that they want educating their children; classroom teachers and content area department heads could have the same conversations with principals, as well as principals expressing the same to district administrators. School and district administrators can express this desire to both local government and local TEPs through multiple avenues. These include

- Making it known through the application and hiring processes that they are looking for candidates in possession of said attitudes, knowledge and skills;
- Including language about religion clause issues within the school and/or district's mission statement, vision statement, goals, and/or other prescriptive and descriptive documents, alongside (the almost ubiquitous) language in regards to valuing diversity, multiculturalism, and being inclusive;
- Explicit conversations between district administration, local government officials, and the leadership at local TEPs in regards to the need of preservice teachers well versed in the said attitudes, knowledge and skills of religion clause issues; and

- The formation of direct partnership between school districts and local TEPs focused on the training of preservice teachers in the area of religion clause issues.

If the Federal government will not fill the void placing a mandate on TEP in relation to education about religion clauses issues, change must come from the bottom-up. Pressure from those more directly impacted by the realities of teachers' day to day interactions around student worldviews needs to be injected into the conversation.

The bottom-up approach comes with an important set of questions: how do those on the "bottom" know what to advocate for? How do those removed from the ivory towers of university funded research know the best knowledge, skills, and attitudes they should pressure TEPs to adopt and engender in their institutions? Phrased more religiously, if the proposed changes in TEPs can herald social salvation, how do its ministers know which gospel to preach? It is reminiscent of the questions asked in the Christian New Testament:

Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved. But how are they to call on one in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in one of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone to proclaim him? And how are they to proclaim him unless they are sent? (Romans 10:13-15a)

These questions in some way assume that the people on the "bottom" are completely ignorant of their own needs: that they lack an understanding of the very knowledge, skills, and attitudes that they want to see enacted in their communities. While there is some truth to this claim, it ignores the on-the-ground reality within these communities which acts as the catalyst for a "bottom-up" campaign of influence.

Those on the "bottom" have an understanding of what they need. They hear the insults, comfort crying children, have difficult conversations, field anxious phone calls, stumble through

classroom interactions, attend contentious meetings, file lawsuits, defend against lawsuits, suffer through professional developments, and otherwise engage with other community stakeholders around these very issues, often as a result of something unpleasant event. While communities may not have a specific proposal to present TEPs, advocating a system of preservice teacher education, they do recognize the problems of practice in their midst as they occur. They may not be in possession of a list of religion clause competencies for preservice teachers, but they do know they want changed.

It is not the job of those on the “bottom” to single-handedly change the system which oppresses them. The problem is theirs, but that does not mean the problem is solely theirs to solve. This is akin to a poorly facilitated Restorative Justice meeting at a school. A young, Black, female student was physically assaulted by a white male classmate. During the assault she was called a “slave” and was told to call him “master.” The victim was further assaulted when she was forced to explain to her assailant why his actions were racist, and was asked to posit a solution to the problem so they could be friends going forward. A sane observer would find this whole scenario, including the process of problem solving, ludicrous. She didn’t create the problem: she shouldn’t be held responsible for positing a solution.

The current state of public schools in relation to religion clause issues rests at the feet of TEPs due to their inability and/or unwillingness to educate preservice teachers appropriately. Educational professionals at TEPs should be solving the problem, as it is of their making, and it is their job. Ironically, I must paraphrase an echo of irate many parents from the anecdotes of parent/teacher interactions: it’s not the community’s job to teach preservice teachers how and what to teach, that’s the TEP’s job. That’s what we pay them for. The bottom-up approach is not primarily about proposing solutions; it is to spur those in academia to research the best practices

in regards to educating preservice teacher about the knowledge, skills, and attitudes on the intersection of religion clause issues and public education. The responsibility for a long-lasting solution does not shift to those on the “bottom.” The “bottom” can announce the need for change, but TEPs have the academic and financial resources, as well as the trained human capital, to identify and transmit the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion clause issues needed to effect change. This study, completed by one individual, is a small ripple in the stream of scholarship around these topics. While this tiny tome, with its proposed competencies, adds to the perspectives on this issue, how much more could the collected wisdom of a TEP’s faculty accomplish?

Preservice teachers should be equipped with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed in regards to religion clauses issues so they can properly interact with the students who will enter their classrooms. However, this education should not be relegated to a post-baccalaureate certificate, a graduate level set of courses or additional degree, or embedded solely within the professional development of in-service teachers. While these avenues of instruction are valuable, this proposal advocates that preservice teachers should be equipped with the proposed religion clauses competencies within the confines of the undergraduate education provided by TEPs for licensure, a position supported by scholars in the field (Anderson, 2008; Davis & Williams, 1992; Eckes, 2008; Charles C Haynes & Thomas, 2001; Marty & Moore, 2000; Nord, 1995, 2010; Nord & Haynes, 1998; White, 2013). Anderson (2004) even advocated that preservice teachers not only be trained in appropriate pedagogical strategies related to religion clause issues, but also be placed in practicum settings where they see those strategies being modelled by in-service professionals. This is in line with this study’s previous assertions that preservice teachers need to be empowered with the relevant knowledge and skills for professional practice in this

area, not only the relevant attitudes. TEPs could document and report proficiency in religion clause issues to the state's licensing agency for an endorsement in a manner similar to the Sheltered English Immersion Endorsements (SEI) currently required in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. However, unlike current SEI requirements, this proposal believes that for preservice teachers to be proficient in their professional practice in regards to religion clause issues, instruction on the relevant attitudes, knowledge, and skills need to be imparted in more than a single one semester course.

The research of this study, as well as its proposed competencies, shows how pervasive religion clause issues are in the daily life of school stakeholders. As such, relevant instruction needs to pervade virtually all areas of the preservice teachers' degree program. In addition to a single class dedicated to the categories of the proposed competencies—Curriculum & Content, Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, and Legal and Legislative Knowledge—, areas of particular note for increased religion clause issues focus include courses in the foundations of education/educational theory, classroom management, diversity/multicultural curriculum/engagement, and content area curriculum/methodology. The curriculum and assessments in these courses should explicitly address religion clause issues as they are most relevant to 6-12 grades content area teachers, as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum. Furthermore, something akin to the proposed competencies need to be utilized within the various evaluation tools implemented by TEPs to gauge the learning and growth of preservice teachers. These include course assessments, but also pre-practicum and practicum evaluations. In Massachusetts this is more easily accomplished the previous suggestion of broadening the meaning of the words in the PST. As argued above, the PST already offers Commonwealth TEPs the language and framework by which these changes could take place and

be a model for the nation. A chance to embrace the fullest potential of the words already penned for the purpose of reaching a better community. This bottom-up approach is a method for achieving this end. If it is successful, it could lead to changes on the national level. If TEPs embrace the call to produce preservice teachers with the religion clauses competencies knowledge, skills, and attitudes proposed, then Gajda's (2008) previously quoted statement holds true: "if school law is to be addressed in any substantial way by state standards and mandated assessments, professors of education law and lawyers must work collaboratively with professors of education, curriculum developers, practicing professionals, test developers, and licensure personnel" (p. 23). Based on delimitations and limitations of this study, the next section makes recommendations for educational research stemming from this study.

Future Research

This study was delimited to include a sample of TEPs in the "Greater Boston Area" as defined by Metropolitan Area Planning Council, as my original aim to research all TEPs within MA proved to be infeasible. It was further limited by the number of respondent TEPs who promised aid and then never followed through. These both amount to a limitation in this study's ability to generalize findings to all MA TEPs and/or TEPs nationwide. Future research could expand the reach of this study to encompass TEPs in other regions (within or without Massachusetts), entire states, or nationwide. An additional area of potential research expands qualitative document analysis beyond the documents of the TEP, but into the core classes the institution requires preservice teachers to take. It would be informative to see if religion clause issues are documented in other areas of the preservice teacher's matriculation outside of the TEP curriculum: if there are mandatory courses in government/civics, multiculturalism/diversity,

religion(s)/philosophy, and/or other humanities that focus on the religion clause issues as proposed in the evaluation tool's competencies.

As this study focused on TEPs offering undergraduate baccalaureate programs in middle (grade 5-8) and/or secondary (grade 8-12) toward an Initial License, an additional expansion of this study for future research questions if there is a difference between undergraduate preservice programs and graduate program granting an Initial License. The students in graduate school programs often have a more diverse personal background (e.g. career changers, undergraduates who changed direction before entering professional life, people teaching on preliminary licenses, etc.). As such initial license programs may offer different experiences than traditional undergraduate programs. A study could be conducted along similar lines to the present one to ascertain how graduate programs codify in their documentation the education of preservice teachers in the attitudes, knowledge, and skills related to religion clause issues. Similarly, this study could be conducted examining how alternative licensing programs do the same.

By design this study did not account for the perspectives of TEP personnel, nor does it account for the perspectives of preservice teachers enrolled in targeted TEPs. As discussed in Chapter One, while previous studies have focused on the attitudes and legal knowledge of in-service teachers (Call, 2008; Campbell, 2002; Davis & Williams, 1992; Littleton, 2008; Luke, 2004; Maclin, 2012; Taft, 2011; Wilson, 2011), the legal knowledge and attitudes of preservice teachers (Eckes, 2008; Garner, 2000; Harris-Ewing, 1999; Wagner, 2007, 2008), the attitudes and legal knowledge of other stakeholders in the educational community (e.g. principals, superintendents, school board members), as well as perceptions of religion clause issues in public schools (McAvoy, 2010; Militello, et al., 2009; Swick, 2009), studies have not investigated how TEPs codify in documents the knowledge, skills, and attitudes about religion

clause issues that preservice teachers should possess as they enter their professional lives. Further research could be conducted into the orthodoxy/orthopraxis divide, asking professors within this study's TEPs to compare how their intuition's documentation represents their instruction on religion clause issues to what takes place in their classrooms. Professors could be asked to use the evaluation tool to evaluate their TEP's documentation, commenting on what they feel their program does and does not address. Professors could also use their inside knowledge to express their reflections on the difference between 2 and 3-ratings, as well as 3 and 4-ratings based on what they feel is a focus of a document, something that may not have been clearly understood by me as a distanced reader. At the root of this study, through use of the proposed competencies, professors would be asked to distinguish how important they feel religion clause issues are to the professional life of preservice teachers. A corollary track to this proposed study would include interviews and surveys conducted with former preservice students who graduated from these TEPs. They would be asked to also evaluate their program documents with the evaluation tool, to compare their findings with their remembrances of course materials, and to reflect on how well they feel they were prepared to handle religion clause issues in their current teaching positions. The next section and final section articulates final reflections on this study and its relevance for the professional lives of in-service teachers, their students, and their communities.

Final Reflections

In 2014, Lucas Hnath debuted his award-winning play *The Christians*. In it, Pastor Paul delivers a sermon to his megachurch congregation wherein he reveals that they "no longer a congregation that believes in Hell" (Hnath, 2015, p. 32). The play explores the nature of faith/belief within a community when they are asked to change in a fundamental way. As Pastor

Paul believed this theological revelation came from God, this play is a prime example of “top-down” mandates: from God to Pastor Paul, from Pastor Paul to his congregants. As argued above, “top-down” mandates of this sort are currently lacking from Federal and state governments around religion clause issues. In light of the contemporary state of politics, this current lack of vision is possibly a boon for the students who would be impacted by our current administration proclamations in regards to religion clause issues, as will be elucidated below. The following section titles are taken from Pastor Paul’s aforementioned sermon in Hnath’s play.

“Where We Are Today”

The history of religion clause issues has not departed from our public conscious. While this was discussed in both Chapters One and Two, recent actions of the current administration, through the Department of Education, further highlight this fact. On June 26, 2017, the SCOTUS concluded a Blaine Amendment case in Missouri. The Court held that

the Missouri Department of Natural Resources' express policy of denying grants to any applicant owned or controlled by a church, sect or other religious entity violated the rights of Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc., under the free exercise clause of the First Amendment by denying the church an otherwise available public benefit on account of its religious status. ("TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH OF COLUMBIA, INC. v. Comer," 2017)

While this case involved the denial of public funds to a religious school to buy recycled tires to resurface their playgrounds, the nation watched as the debate over the intersection between Church and State in schools raged on. Following the ruling Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos released the following statement:

This decision marks a great day for the Constitution and sends a clear message that religious discrimination in any form cannot be tolerated in a society that values the First Amendment. We should all celebrate the fact that programs designed to help students will no longer be discriminated against by the government based solely on religious affiliation. (U. D. o. Education, 2017)

While she wrapped her words in the flag of religious liberty, it is widely speculated that her motivations are based in her support of school choice, which includes government vouchers for religious schools (Brown, 2017; E. L. Green, 2017; Totenberg, 2017). Harkening back to the very Blaine Amendment debates previously discussed.

In another further news, Secretary DeVos' Office of Civil Rights (OCR), "has closed more than 1,500 civil rights complaints at the nation's schools — including dismissing more than 900 outright — in the two months since her acting civil rights chief took steps to reduce a massive backlog" (Wermund, 2017). OCR investigators were told to "narrow their focus to the merits of a particular claim, rather than probing systemic issues, as they had done during the Obama administration. Jackson also gave regional civil rights offices more autonomy to close cases without approval from D.C" (Wermund, 2017). This is noteworthy for, as discussed in Chapter Two, under the previous administration, the OCR had just begun to compile "the number of incidents of religious-based bullying or harassment" (Lhamon, 2016) in public schools for the 2015-2016 school year. This was one of the only Federal actions being taken to address student-on-student harassment based on religion clause issues. While these political realities swirl in the news, small changes are beginning in academic circles.

While these two incidents may seem minor to some, they are potentially a bellwether of things to come from this administration. Today, we are in a state of turmoil. Since the election,

there has been a dramatic rise in ethnic, racial, and religiously motivated hate crimes in public schools across the nation. The latter includes anti-Semitic graffiti, the harassment of male Sikh students, and hijabs pulled off female, Muslim students. To this is added the harassment of LGTBQA+ students, often by those saying their identity is against God and/or nature (CBS/AP, 2016; Costello, 2016; "For the record ", 2017; North, 2017; Rios, 2016; Smith, 2017; Wallace & LaMotte, 2016). These actions have occurred here in Massachusetts. Including the school district where I am employed, on the very campus I work. Teachers and administrators here in Massachusetts lament that they have received no training to deal with the current state of affairs (Smith, 2017). As this study has argued, due to the lack of TEP coverage of these topics, this is a sentiment undoubtedly shared across the country. Despite this national crisis, Secretary DeVos has not spoken out about the increase of hate crimes in public schools since the election. Testifying before Congress she suggested that under her leadership, the Department of Education will not vigorously pursue an antidiscrimination agenda to protect public or private school students, leaving LGTBQA+ youth, religious minorities, and others to fend for themselves. It seems as if we are slowly creeping back toward a time described in Chapter Two, where the respect afforded students and their families is based on what type of a Christian you are: if you hold to a divergent faith or no faith at all, you are deemed morally and civilly deficient. For these reasons among others it is doubtful that those concerned with the future of students must vulnerable to abuses of religion clause issues can wait from the Federal government to advance positive guidance to stem the rising tide of intolerance within our nation's schools. Instead of waiting for SCOTUS to hold a policy from this administration as unconstitutional, or for Congress to pass legislation in response to something unethical from the White House, the bottom-up approach advocated above is an action currently resulting in more immediate change.

“A Powerful Urge”

This coming fall, The Religious Freedom Center of the Newseum Institute is preparing to pilot four courses for new educators. The Center “collaborated with leading schools of education to offer blended learning courses on religion and education” as well as working with “educational associations to offer staff development and continuing education opportunities to teachers and administrators.” Furthermore, “a comprehensive curriculum for the certificate program will be developed in collaboration with faculty from schools of education and other leading experts in the field of religion and education” (Freedom & Institute, 2017). The offered courses include *First Amendment Approaches to Religion & Public Schools*, *Histories of Religious Liberty in America*, *Teaching about Religious Liberty Across the Curriculum*, *Teaching about Religion in Public Schools*, and *Religions of the World* (Freedom & Institute, 2017). Similarly, on June 12, 2017 the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) added the “Religious Studies Companion Document” as a supplement to its *College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework*. The C3 is a “framework for the academic study of religion in K-12 social studies instruction,” and “is widely used by state and school district curriculum experts for social studies standards and curriculum development.” The new supplement “recognizes religious studies as an essential part of the social studies curriculum” (Castellano, 2017).

Both of these educative endeavors are examples of scholars in the field realizing the need for classroom teachers in public schools to have an education in religion clause issues sufficient to meet the diverse numinous and secular worldview needs of their students. But they also illustrate the potential power of the bottom-up principle at work. Professionals in both these organizations are drawn from the stakeholders on the left of Figure 5.1: “Community Members,” “Classroom Teachers,” and “School Administrators.” They are civic and educational leaders in

the community who have a powerful urge to see religion clause issues addressed in public schools, so they are providing a model for TEP instruction and content. While these do not guarantee immediate change in TEP instruction on religion clause issues, they do exert a measure of influence. For example, as more school district administration ask why they have to spend professional development money to organizations outside of TEPs to educate teachers in these topics, more TEPs will begin to address their concerns. This may begin for economic reasons, but it is a starting place.

This study has shown that the primary research hypothesis was true: the targeted TEPs do not consistently and specifically address, instruct, and train preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and professional ethos; based on this study and the available research it is further hypothesized that similar studies at institutions nationwide would likely bear the same results. It is maintained that something akin to the proposed competencies should be utilized in the education of preservice teachers in TEPs. Education in religion clause issues in the areas of Curriculum & Content, Pedagogy and Professional Ethos, and Legal and Legislative Knowledge should permeate the coursework, assessments, evaluations, and licensing of 6-12 grade content area preservice teachers, and should be supplemented by in-service professional development as it is relevant to their content age appropriate area curriculum.

“A Radical Change”

At the time of this writing a new school year is beginning and teachers are returning to school for professional development opportunities. In addition to new initiatives regarding curriculum, discipline plans, and changes in special education law, as well as heated debates

about class schedules, room assignments, and which bathrooms will be locked during the day, how many meetings will discuss the impact of religion clause issues on the school community?

Administrators in middle and high school settings will undoubtedly be having conversations discussing how teachers should talk to their students about the recent events in Charlottesville, VA and the aftermath should the topic arise in class. Conversations like those previously held around “Make America Great Again” stickers on laptops, transgender students access to bathrooms, and Muslim/travel bans. Conversations similar to older ones about 9/11 and the ensuing violence against Muslims, Sikhs, and anyone who looked too brown. Conversations about the first Gay-Straight Alliance in the school, and school integration through bussing. Conversations when the Regent’s Prayer was removed from the school’s daily routine. How many of these professional conversations were had fully recognizing the numinous and secular worldviews at play for all in the community? How many of the educators in the room had any background, training, or education in how to navigate the complex nuances of these constitutional, academic, and ethical issues, while bracketing out their own positionalities and biases?

As argued above, TEPs have an obligation to both their preservice teachers, as well as the communities they serve, to produce properly trained individuals who can help stem the tide of this nation becoming more polarized and fractious. If part of public school teachers job are to teach their students how to be local and global citizens—to combat the religiously-illiterate, intolerant, uneducated, anti-intellectual screeds which can tear communities and this nation apart—then it is TEPs’ job to provide the education in religion clause issues needed to fulfill this role.

The knowledge, skills, and attitudes around religion clause issues need to be thoroughly addressed in preservice teacher training. But, as discussed above, this is more than a mere curriculum change. It must be more than one course being added to the program of study, or a checklist of dos and don'ts handed out during a student teachers seminar. This must be seen as more than an additional mandate in a series of mandates. This is a call for institutional change, a paradigm shift in how TEPs operate. It requires a change in the pedagogical ethos of TEPs themselves. A radical change.

In order for TEPs to educate preservice teachers about religion clause issues effectively, TEP faculty need to embrace a pedagogical ethos that includes the protection of public school students' worldviews for constitutional, academic, and ethical reasons. And this ethos must permeate all facets of the institution's program. Drawing from my own experience, I found doing this work required more than adding activities and discussions about the application of the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to my Classroom Management course. While it began here, I realized discussion of religion clause issues extended beyond matters of classroom organization, systems, and discipline. Soon I added relevant activities and discussions to all of my curriculum and pedagogy courses. And then my Educational Assessment course. And then my Introduction to Special Education course. And the course on poetry instruction I taught through the English Department. As time went on I expected and witnessed the knowledge, skills, and attitudes surrounding religion clause issues begin to permeate my undergraduate and graduate students' in-class conversations, pre-practicum observation journals, and student teaching experiences.

Inside and outside of class, my interactions with students began addressing their concerns and attitudes about working with students, teachers, administrators, and parents with worldviews

different than their own. I also presented difficulties I knew were unknown to them. Students discussed their feelings about working with LGBTQA+ faculty and students; what to do when political issues arise revealing religious perspectives; their thoughts on student-led prayer in school; how to teach about intelligent design, climate change, and/or evolution; working with co-operating teachers who were very vocal about their atheistic or theistic worldviews in front of students; how to comfort students of different worldviews when tragedy struck; what to do when parents begin a discussion about losing or gaining their faith as a result of their child's serious physical and or mental disability. All of these examples are drawn from actual experiences of me or my students. These conversations became a regular part of discussion with my students in the classroom and my office. Of particular note is that the preliminary and ongoing work used to bring about these changes in my professional practice came prior to beginning the research for this dissertation. I engaged in this work because it was valuable and needed. It was my job as a professor of education to help them navigate these topics for themselves, and for their current and future students. I changed my pedagogical ethos and then changed my professional practice. More accurately, I finally put my resources and capital— financial, mental, social —where the mouth already was.

Teachers, preservice and in-service, are often social justice minded. They believe that all of their students deserve the right to a free and appropriate public education, without fear of bullying, harassment, or discrimination. Teachers are often on the front line protesting against prejudice in its myriad forms, and within the school walls, protect students from harm based on gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, and physical or mental differences. If this is more than political correct lip service, the only sacrifices made to the progressive pantheon of inclusivity, multiculturalism, and diversity, teachers should be the loudest advocates from the “bottom” to

the “top.” Public school personnel should be invested in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of their future colleagues, as it directly impacts their students and their communities.

The proposed competencies can be used as an honest checklist of professional willingness to engage in change. It seems that teachers say that they should recognize their own background, biases, and positionalities impact how they conduct themselves in the classroom; that they should respect the diverse worldviews of their students, and are happy to instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds; that they are willing to teach on topics relevant to the religion clauses as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum. But are they also willing and able to put the additional effort in to recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numinous domains, and when appropriate, (a) seek consultation from and collaborate with qualified scholars and/or numinous leaders; (b) utilize appropriate supplemental materials, resources, and enrichment; and (c) seek further training and education to bridge their knowledge gaps, while being professionally conscious of the positionality and bias of the above sources, materials, experiences? Will they stay abreast of research and professional developments regarding the religion clauses specifically related to professional practice, and engage in ongoing assessment of their own legal and ethical competence? Will they remain conversant with both the historic legal cases involving public schools, including student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters? Will they do all these things on their own, and expect teachers straight out of undergraduate programs to do the same without any instruction from a TEP on how to do this? I am grateful to my licensure program for teaching me how to conduct a jigsaw activity to facilitate student-centered instruction. However, guidance on how to handle a student stopping me after school to ask if I think she is going to Hell would have been appreciated as well. The

ability of in-service and preservice teachers to do so is greatly diminished without a TEP embedding such knowledge and skills within every aspect of their licensure program; without a TEP engendering the need for a professional ethos needed to exhibit a “commitment to pedagogical neutrality” (Noddings, 1993, p. 139) in their classrooms, because they believe that “the basic idea behind the neutrality of the classroom is that no religion should be advantaged or disadvantaged, that each should be welcomed and none should be harmed” (Fiala, 2013, p. 28).

As has been argued throughout, while the appropriate treatment of students from diverse worldviews is an academic and constitutional issue, it is also a civic issue, a moral issue, a core issue of social justice. For these reasons, if teachers should care about engendering these knowledge, skills, and attitudes, TEPs should care more. While Chapter Two of this study presented a historical case for the importance of TEPs acknowledging the impact of society on education, it also detailed the greater impact of educators on society.

During the fall semester of my second year as a professor of education, one of the undergraduate students in my class had an epiphany of the sort TEP faculty desire for all our students. She was studying to be an elementary school teacher and she confronted with the sobering reality of that calling: She felt the heft of the new hat she was placing on her head. The mantle of responsibility being placed on her shoulders suddenly chaffed a bit more. The heft of the young lives that would be, at times, literally held in her hands, made its presence known. She spoke to me about “the weight,” in her heart. A weight, not crushing down, but all-encompassing, like a light winter jacket in the late fall: not restrictive, not quite uncomfortable, but it something whose presence cannot simply be ignored. Her recognition of “the weight” remained with me. I wrote the phrase on a post-it note and affixed it to my office wall.

I have always referred to my students as “my kids,” keeping the metaphor of classroom as family—dysfunctional though it may be at times—steadfast in my mind. My new “kids” were adults, undergraduate and graduate students who would one day have “kids” of their own. A new weight, a heavier one, settled upon me. Not only was I responsible for the well-being of my current kids, but their future ones as well, my “grandkids.” This is the professional ethos needed by TEP personnel, to recognize that their work is a family business. And the most basic, primal, loving instinct we have is to safeguard the future of our families.

APPENDIX A**Religion Clause Competencies TEP Evaluation Tool**

1. Document Title: _____

2. Document Institution and/or Author: _____

3. Type of Document:

- ☐ Benchmark assessment
- ☐ Course syllabus
- ☐ Evaluation tool
- ☐ Faculty handbook/manual
- ☐ Preservice teachers handbook/manual
- ☐ PrePracticum/Practicum handbook
- ☐ Other _____

3. Document Purpose:

- ☐ Course assessment
- ☐ Informational
- ☐ Evaluation
- ☐ Other _____

4. Document Audience (Check all that apply)

- ☐ TEP Faculty
- ☐ TEP Staff
- ☐ TEP Student
- ☐ Public school personnel
- ☐ Other _____

Curriculum & Content

Competency		(1) Competency not present in artifact. No mention of related/tange ntial concerns.	(2) Competency not explicitly mentioned in artifact, but elements show awareness of related/tange ntial concerns.	(3) Competency explicitly mentioned in artifact, but is not a/the focal point. Competency is subsumed under related/tangenti al concerns.	(4) Competency is a/the focal point of artifact. Explicit discussion is highlighted above other related/tange ntial concerns.
<i>Attitude Domain</i>	1. Preservice teacher recognize that it is beneficial “to educate tomorrow’s citizens in the full range of human experiences,” ¹ and that “ignorance, apathy, and avoidance [of same] are dangerous for civil society and liberal democracy.” ²				
<i>Knowledge Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers can identify a variety of numinous texts, experiences, practices, and beliefs that directly intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.				
	2. Preservice teachers can critically assess textbooks, supplemental materials, resources, and activities as they touch upon numinous worldviews.				
	3. Preservice teachers are conversant with the diversity of beliefs & practices that exist between and within religions as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.				
	4. Preservice teachers are conversant with contextual nature of worldviews (i.e. that worldviews are not monolithic in time, place, or manner) as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.				
<i>Skill Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numinous domains, and when appropriate, a. seek consultation from and collaborate with qualified scholars and/or numinous leaders (e.g. priests, pastors, rabbis, imam, spiritual teachers, etc.), b. utilize appropriate supplemental materials, resources, and enrichment activities (e.g. field trips, guest speakers)& c. seek further training and				

¹ (Waggoner, 2013)² (Fiala, 2013)

	education to bridge their knowledge gaps				
	while being professionally conscious of the positionality and bias of the above sources, materials, experiences.				

Pedagogy and Professional Ethos

Competency		(1) Competency not present in artifact. No mention of related/tangential concerns.	(2) Competency not explicitly mentioned in artifact, but elements show awareness of related/tangential concerns.	(3) Competency explicitly mentioned in artifact, but is not a/the focal point. Competency is subsumed under related/tangential concerns.	(4) Competency is a/the focal point of artifact. Explicit discussion is highlighted above other related/tangential concerns.
<i>Attitude Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers respect the diverse worldviews of their students.				
	2. Preservice teachers view students' worldviews as important aspects of human diversity, along with factors such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, gender, and age				
<i>Knowledge Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers recognize how their own worldviews influence their professional ethos and practice, and their attitudes, perceptions, and assumptions about the nature of their curriculum and pedagogy.				
	2. Preservice teachers are knowledgeable about the family/community controversies directly tied to content area instruction regarding student worldviews and/or religion clause issues.				
	3. Preservice teachers recognize the difference between <i>pluralism</i> and <i>relativism</i> in engaging student worldviews.				
<i>Skill Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers are able to equitably instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement.				
	2. Preservice teachers are able to recognize their own background, biases, and positionalities.				
	3. Preservice teacher are able to teach about numinous beliefs and practices relevant to their curriculum content areas in a non-devotional manner.				
	4. Preservice teachers exhibit a "commitment to pedagogical				

	neutrality” in their classrooms.” ³				
	5. Preservice teacher foster intelligent, informed, and respectful ongoing dialogue between students around differing worldviews.				

Legal and Legislative Knowledge

Competency		(1) Competency not present in artifact. No mention of related/tangential concerns.	(2) Competency not explicitly mentioned in artifact, but elements show awareness of related/tangential concerns.	(3) Competency explicitly mentioned in artifact, but is not a/the focal point. Competency is subsumed under related/tangential concerns.	(4) Competency is a/the focal point of artifact. Explicit discussion is highlighted above other related/tangential concerns.
<i>Attitude Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers believe that “the basic idea behind the neutrality of the classroom is that no religion should be advantaged or disadvantaged, that each should be welcomed and none should be harmed.” ⁴				
	2. Preservice teachers believe that “students don’t shed their constitutional rights at the school house gates.” ⁵				
<i>Knowledge Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers can identify legal and ethical issues related to the religion clauses of the US Constitution that may surface when working with students.				
	2. Preservice teacher are conversant with the historic legal cases involving public schools.				
	3. Preservice teacher are conversant with student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters in both academic (e.g. censorship, opting out, accommodations) and social (e.g. holidays, clothing, prayer) spheres.				
	4. Preservice teachers know the				

³ (Noddings, 1993)

⁴ (Fiala, 2013)

⁵ *Tinker v. Des Moines Sch. Dist.*, 1969

	legal and/or appropriate time, places, and manners to exercise their own numinous and secular beliefs within the school building/community.				
<i>Skill Domain</i>	1. Preservice teachers stay abreast of research and professional developments regarding the religion clauses specifically related to professional practice, and engage in ongoing assessment of their own legal and ethical competence.				
	2. Preservice teachers must aid students in balancing their [students'] rights and responsibilities in the appropriate times, places, and manners.				

APPENDIX B**First Contact Email**

Hello _____,

My name is Matthew Henry and I am a Ph.D. candidate at Lesley University. I am investigating how teacher education programs in Massachusetts document their instruction of matters related to the First Amendment of the US Constitution, specifically the religion clauses as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos.

My research is purely qualitative document analysis, and I only need access to review certain materials given to faculty and preservice teachers, such as program handbooks/manuals, course syllabi, and benchmark assessments.

Could I please schedule some time to speak with you in person or over the phone about my study?

Thank you for your time and I hope to hear from you soon.

Matthew Henry
Tel: 617-922-5455

APPENDIX C**Follow-up Email**

Hello _____,

As mentioned in the *Agreement to Participate in Research* document I left with you, I am collecting institutional documentation to investigate how teacher prep programs document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos.

As such, I am requesting the following documents:

- Course syllabi (for classes taken by 6-12 education majors)
- Faculty handbook/manual
- Preservice teachers handbook/manual
- PrePracticum/Practicum handbook
- Benchmark assessment(s) and/or evaluation tools
- Any other document you feel would be appropriate to my research.

I will send a Dropbox file request momentarily where you can upload these documents.

Once again, thank you very much for your help

Matthew Henry

APPENDIX D

Agreement to Participate in Research

Dear Professor _____,

My name is Matthew Henry and I am a former professor of education. I am currently pursuing my Ph.D. in Education Leadership at Lesley University. Because you are a teacher educator, I am hoping that you will be interested in participating in my dissertation research, which examines instruction occurring in teacher education programs [TEPs] on issues related to the religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution.

Purpose of Study: This study investigate how TEPs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts document their instruction of preservice teachers on religion clause issues as they apply to grade 6-12 content area pedagogy, curriculum, and teacher ethos. In addition, it ascertains the degree to which religion clause issues are addressed in TEPs, as measured by competencies drawn from available literature and research compared to the documentation provide by TEPs.

Procedures: Participation in this study requires that you grant access to institutional documentation and artifacts (i.e. handbooks/manuals for faculty, staff, preservice teachers, and cooperating institution personnel, course syllabi, benchmark assignments, program-wide and course specific evaluation tools). Collection of those documents will be facilitated through email and/or Dropbox depending on your preference.

Risks and Discomforts: There are no known harms or discomforts associated with this study beyond those encountered in normal daily life. There are no costs for participation in this study.

Benefits: As a participant, you may or may not benefit from participation in this study. The possible benefits you may experience from participation in this study may include the implication of efforts to identify areas of strength and/or weakness in regards to instruction of religion clause issues. There are no additional compensations for participation in this research study.

Confidentiality: Names of participating TEPs, individuals TEP contacts or others associated with TEPs will not be reported. All research data will be stored on cloud-based systems and computers that are password protected. The research team is guided by all HHS and FDA regulations concerning confidentiality. No information derived from this research project that personally identifies an individual will be used for any purposes and will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without separate consent, except as specifically required by law. Publications and/or presentations that result from this study will not include identifiable information about participants.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and you are able to withdraw from the study at any time. Your responses will help better understand the ways in which teacher candidates are prepared to respond to issues based on student worldviews.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, I agree to participate in this study, and allow this data to be included in the researcher's dissertation and any publications resulting from this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Name of Subject _____

Signature of Subject _____ Date _____

Thank you for participating in this important research. Please direct any questions/concerns to one of the researchers listed below.

Research Team

Lead Researcher: Matthew Henry
Name and Title Doctoral Student, Lesley University
Department: Educational Leadership
Telephone Number: 617-922-5455
Email: MHenry7@lesley.edu

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. John Ciesluk
Name and Title: Dissertation Senior Advisor
Department: Educational Leadership
Email: JCiesluk@lesley.edu

Lesley IRB Contact: Terry Keeney (tkeeney@lesley.edu) & Robyn Cruz (rcruz@lesley.edu)

There is a Standing Committee for Human Subjects in Research at Lesley University to which complaints or problems concerning any research project may, and should, be reported if they arise. Contact the Committee Chairperson at irb@lesley.edu

APPENDIX E

Evaluation Tool Key

Category	Initial	Competency
Curriculum and Content	A1	2. Preservice teacher recognize that it is beneficial “to educate tomorrow’s citizens in the full range of human experiences,” and that “ignorance, apathy, and avoidance [of same] are dangerous for civil society and liberal democracy.”
	K1	5. Preservice teachers can identify a variety of numinous texts, experiences, practices, and beliefs that directly intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.
	K2	6. Preservice teachers can critically assess textbooks, supplemental materials, resources, and activities as they touch upon numinous worldviews.
	K3	7. Preservice teachers are conversant with the diversity of beliefs & practices that exist between and within religions as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.
	K4	8. Preservice teachers are conversant with contextual nature of worldviews (i.e. that worldviews are not monolithic in time, place, or manner) as they intersect with their content age appropriate area curriculum.
	S1	2. Preservice teachers recognize the limits of their qualifications and competence in numinous domains, and when appropriate, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. seek consultation from and collaborate with qualified scholars and/or numinous leaders (e.g. priests, pastors, rabbis, imam, spiritual teachers, etc.), b. utilize appropriate supplemental materials, resources, and enrichment activities (e.g. field trips, guest speakers)& c. seek further training and education to bridge their knowledge gaps while being professionally conscious of the positionality and bias of the above sources, materials, experiences.
Pedagogy and Professional Ethos	A1	3. Preservice teachers respect the diverse worldviews of their students.
	A2	4. Preservice teachers view students’ worldviews as important aspects of human diversity, along with factors such as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability, gender, and age
	K1	4. Preservice teachers recognize how their own worldviews influence their professional ethos and practice, and their attitudes, perceptions, and assumptions about the nature of their curriculum and pedagogy.
	K2	5. Preservice teachers are knowledgeable about the family/community controversies directly tied to content area

		instruction regarding student worldviews and/or RC issues.
	K3	6. Preservice teachers recognize the difference between <i>pluralism</i> and <i>relativism</i> in engaging student worldviews.
	S1	6. Preservice teachers are able to equitably instruct students from diverse numinous and secular backgrounds, affiliations, and levels of involvement.
	S2	7. Preservice teachers are able to recognize their own background, biases, and positionalities.
	S3	8. Preservice teacher are able to teach about numinous beliefs and practices relevant to their curriculum content areas in a non-devotional manner.
	S4	9. Preservice teachers exhibit a “commitment to pedagogical neutrality” in their classrooms.
	S5	10. Preservice teacher foster intelligent, informed, and respectful ongoing dialogue between students around differing worldviews.
Legal and Legislative Knowledge	A1	3. Preservice teachers believe that “the basic idea behind the neutrality of the classroom is that no religion should be advantaged or disadvantaged, that each should be welcomed and none should be harmed.”
	A2	4. Preservice teachers believe that “students don't shed their constitutional rights at the school house gates.”
	K1	5. Preservice teachers can identify legal and ethical issues related to the religion clauses of the US Constitution that may surface when working with students.
	K2	6. Preservice teacher are conversant with the historic legal cases involving public schools.
	K3	7. Preservice teacher are conversant with student rights to expression and free exercise as it relates to religion clause matters in both academic (e.g. censorship, opting out, accommodations) and social (e.g. holidays, clothing, prayer) spheres.
	K4	8. Preservice teachers know the legal and/or appropriate time, places, and manners to exercise their own numinous and secular beliefs within the school building/community.
	S1	3. Preservice teachers stay abreast of research and professional developments regarding the religion clauses specifically related to professional practice, and engage in ongoing assessment of their own legal and ethical competence.
	S2	4. Preservice teachers must aid students in balancing their [students'] rights and responsibilities in the appropriate times, places, and manners.

APPENDIX F**Proposed Imbedding of Religion Clause Competencies within the Professional Standards for Teachers**

(1) Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students by providing high quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an on-going basis, and continuously refining learning objectives.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Curriculum and Planning indicator: Knows the subject matter well, has a good grasp of child development and how students learn, and designs effective and rigorous standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons with measurable outcomes.	K1-4; S1		
(b) Assessment indicator: Uses a variety of informal and formal methods of assessment to measure student learning, growth, and understanding, develop differentiated and enhanced learning experiences, and improve future instruction.			
(c) Analysis indicator: Analyzes data from assessments, draws conclusions, and shares them appropriately.			
SEI Indicator (a) Uses instructional planning, materials, and student engagement approaches that support students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, strengths, and challenges.	K3-4; S1	A1-2; S1-5	A1; S1
SEI Indicator (c) Demonstrates knowledge of the difference between social and academic language and the importance of this difference in planning, differentiating and delivering effective instruction for English language learners at various levels of			

English language proficiency and literacy.			
(2) Teaching All Students standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Instruction indicator: Uses instructional practices that reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work, engage all students, and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness.	<i>ALL</i>	A1-2; S1; S3-5	A1-2; S2
(b) Learning Environment indicator: Creates and maintains a safe and collaborative learning environment that values diversity and motivates students to take academic risks, challenge themselves, and claim ownership of their learning.	A1	A1-2; K1-3; S3-5	A1-2; K1-4; S2
(c) Cultural Proficiency indicator: Actively creates and maintains an environment in which students' diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected.	<i>ALL</i>	<i>ALL</i>	<i>ALL</i>
(d) Expectations indicator: Plans and implements lessons that set clear and high expectations and make knowledge accessible for all students.			
(e) Social and Emotional Learning Indicator: Employs a variety of strategies to assist students to develop social emotional-competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.		S5	
(f) Classroom Management Indicator: Employs a variety of classroom management strategies, and establishes and maintains effective routines and procedures that promote positive student behavior.	A1	A1-2; K1-3; S3-5	A1-2; K1-4; S2

SEI Indicator (b) Uses effective strategies and techniques for making content accessible to English language learners.			
SEI Indicator (d) Creates and maintains a safe and collaborative learning environment that values diversity and motivates students to meet high standards of conduct, effort and performance.	A1	A1-2; K1-3; S3-5	A1-2; K1-4; S2
(3) Family and Community Engagement standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Engagement indicator: Welcomes and encourages every family to become active participants in the classroom and school community.			
(b) Collaboration indicator: Collaborates with families and communities to create and implement strategies for supporting student learning and development both at home and at school.	S1	A1-2; K2; S1; S4	K1-2; K4; S1-2
(c) Communication indicator: Engages in regular, two-way, and culturally proficient communication with families about student learning and performance.			
SEI Indicator (e) Collaborates with families, recognizing the significance of native language and culture to create and implement strategies for supporting student learning and development both at home and at school.			
(4) Professional Culture standard: Promotes the learning and growth of all students through ethical, culturally proficient, skilled, and collaborative practice.	Proposed Competencies		
	Curriculum & Content	Pedagogy & Professional Ethos	Legal & Legislative Knowledge
(a) Reflection indicator: Demonstrates the capacity to reflect on and improve the educator's own	S1	K1; S2; S5	S1

practice, using informal means as well as meetings with teams and work groups to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning.			
(b) Professional Growth indicator: Actively pursues professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional and leadership roles.	S1	K1; S2; S5	S1
(c) Collaboration indicator: Collaborates effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks.			
(d) Decision-making indicator: Becomes involved in school-wide decision-making, and takes an active role in school improvement planning.			
(e) Shared Responsibility indicator: Shares responsibility for the performance of all students within the school.			
(f) Professional Responsibilities indicator: Is ethical and reliable, and meets routine responsibilities consistently.	<i>All</i>		

References

- Abington School District v. Schempp, No. 374 U.S. 203 (1963).
- Altheide, D., Coyle, M., DeVriese, K., & Schneider, C. (2008). Emergent Qualitative Document Analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Anderson, R. D. (2004). *Religion & spirituality in the public school curriculum*. New York: P. Lang.
- Anderson, R. D. (2008). *Religion and teaching*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Antin, M. (1912). *The promised land*. Boston, New York,: Houghton Mifflin company.
- Association, M. T. (1873). *The Massachusetts teacher*. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son
- Bankston, C. L., & Caldas, S. J. (2009). *Public education, America's civil religion : a social history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Beecher, C. E. (1848). *A treatise on domestic economy, for the use of young ladies at home, and at school* (Rev. i.e. 3d ed.). New York,: Harper.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation : a road map from beginning to end* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Board of Ed. of Westside Community Schools (Dist. 66) v. Mergens, No. No. 88-1597, 496 226 (Supreme Court 1990).
- Board of Education v. Minor, No. 1872, 23 211 (1872).

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Brooks, C. (1856). Moral education: The best methods of teaching morality in the common schools. *American Journal of Education*(March), 83-91.
- Brown, E. (2017). Why Betsy DeVos is cheering the Supreme Court's church playground decision. *The Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/education/wp/2017/06/26/why-betsy-devos-is-cheering-the-supreme-courts-church-playground-decision/?utm_term=.499e0494ca09
- Bryant, J. L. (2012). Talking Religious, Superstitious Nonsense in the Classroom: When Do Teachers' Disparaging Comments about Religion Run Afoul of the Establishment Clause. *S. Cal. L. Rev.*, 86, 1343.
- Call, I. (2008). *Secondary pre-service teachers' knowledge and confidence in dealing with students' First Amendment rights in the classroom* (3326051 Ph.D.). University of South Florida, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.
- Campbell, J. R. (2002). *High school teachers' knowledge of legal parameters regarding church/state issues* (3061015 Ph.D.). The University of Arizona, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.
- Cantwell v. Connecticut, No. No. 632, 310 296 (Supreme Court 1940).
- Carper, J. C., & Hunt, T. C. (2009). *The Praeger Handbook of Religion and Education in the United States [2 Volumes]*: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Carper, J. C., Hunt, T. C., & Praeger (Westport Conn.). (2009). *The Praeger handbook of religion and education in the United States*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.

Carter, J. G. (1826). *Essays upon popular education : containing a particular examination of the schools of Massachusetts, and an outline of an institution for the education of teachers*. Boston: Bowles & Dearborn.

Carter, S. L. (1993). *The culture of disbelief : how American law and politics trivialize religious devotion*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Castellano, S. (2017). Religious studies recognized as essential part of K-12 Education.
<http://www.religiousfreedomcenter.org/ncss/>

Clinton, S., & William, J. (1995). Memorandum on Religious Expression in Public Schools.
Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 31(28), 1229-1230.

Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United, S., & National Research, C. (2010). *Preparing Teachers : Building Evidence for Sound Policy*. Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press.

Congress, U. (1776). Declaration of independence. Available in: <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage>.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design : choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Darden, E. (2006). Public Education, Private Faith: Religious sentiments intersect with virtually every area of school life. *AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL*, 193(11), 44.

Davis, B. M., & Williams, J. L. (1992). Integrating Legal Issues into Teacher Preparation Programs.

DelFattore, J. (2004). *The fourth R : conflicts over religion in America's public schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dewey, J. (1908). Religion and our schools. *The Hibbert Journal*, 6, 796-809.

Duncan, A., & King Jr., J. B. (2015). *Letters from the Education Secretary or Deputy Secretary*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/secletter/151231.html>.

Dunn, J. (2009). Almost Persuaded: Statutory Protections for Students' Religious Rights. *Journal of Law & Education*, 38(4), 627-636.

Eckes, S. E. (2008). Significant Legal Issues for Inclusion in Preservice Teacher Preparation. *Part of a special section entitled, Teacher Education and the Law*, 30(2), 25-35.

Edlin, R. J. (1994). *The cause of Christian education*. Northport, AL: Vision Press.

Education, M. D. o. E. a. S. (2016). *Guidelines for the Candidate Assessment of Performance: Assessment of Teacher Candidates*. Malden, MA.

Education, U. D. o. (2017). DeVos: Supreme Court Sends Clear Message that Religious Discrimination Cannot Be Tolerated Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/devos-supreme-court-sends-clear-message-religious-discrimination-cannot-be-tolerated>

Edwards v. Aguillard, No. 482 U.S. 578 (1987).

Engel v. Vitale, No. 370 U.S. 421 (1962).

Epley, B. G. (2007). The Establishment Clause and public schools in the 21st century. *NASSP Bulletin*, 91(3), 181-200.

Equal Access Act (1984).

Essex, N. L. (2002). *School law and the public schools : a practical guide for educational leaders* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Everson v. Board of Ed. of Ewing, No. No. 52, 330 1 (Supreme Court 1947).

Feinberg, W., & Layton, R. A. (2014). *For the civic good : the liberal case for teaching religion in the public schools*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fiala, A. (2013). Tolerance, civility, and cognitive development. In M. D. Waggoner (Ed.), *Religion in the Public Schools: Negotiating the New Commons*: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Fraser, J. W. (1999). *Between church and state : religion and public education in a multicultural America* (1st ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fraser, J. W. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers : a history*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Freedom, T. R., & Institute, C. o. t. N. (2017). Educators. Retrieved 8/18/2017, from

<http://www.religiousfreedomcenter.org/admissions/areas-of-study/educators/>

Gajda, R. (2008). States' Expectations for Teachers' Knowledge about School Law. *Action in Teacher Education*, 30(2), 15-24. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2008.10463488

Garner, D. R. M. (2000). The Knowledge of Legal Issues Needed by Teachers and Student Teachers Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.flo.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED451139&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Gibbs Jr., D. C., & Gibbs III, D. C. (1998). *Keeping Christ in America's public schools*: Christian Law Association.

Glenn, C. L. (1988). *The myth of the common school*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Glowacki v. Howell Public School District, No. LEXIS 85960 (E.D. Mich. 2013) (U.S. Dist. 2013).

Good News Club v. Milford Central School, No. No. 99-2036, 533 98 (Supreme Court 2001).

Green, E. L. (2017). *Supreme Court Ruling Could Shape Future of School Choice*. *The New York Times*

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/27/us/politics/supreme-court-school-choice-ruling.html?mcubz=1>

Green, S. K. (2012). *The Bible, the school, and the Constitution : the clash that shaped the modern church-state doctrine*. Oxford ; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Greenawalt, K. (2005). *Does God belong in public schools?* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Grelle, B. (2013). Promoting civic and religious literacy in public schools. In M. D. Waggoner (Ed.), *Religion in the Public Schools: Negotiating the New Commons* (pp. 91-110): Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Gullatt, D. E., & Tollett, J. R. (1997a). Educational law: a requisite course for preservice and inservice teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, 129+.
- Gullatt, D. E., & Tollett, J. R. (1997b). Study of legal issues recommended for teacher education programs. *Teacher Educator*, 33, 17-34. doi: 10.1080/08878739709555155
- Hamilton, M. (2014). *God vs. the gavel : the perils of extreme religious liberty* (Revised second edition. ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardin, C. J. (2012). *Effective classroom management : models and strategies for today's classrooms* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Harris-Ewing, S. M. (1999). *Religion, religious diversity and public education: Preservice teachers' attitudes, knowledge and preparation* (9931486 Ph.D.). State University of New York at Buffalo, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.
- Haynes, C. (2009). In public schools, religion by any other name is still religion. *First Amendment Center*. <http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/in-public-schools-religion-by-any-other-name-is-still-religion/>

- Haynes, C. C., & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2003). *The First Amendment in schools : a guide from the First Amendment Center*. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Haynes, C. C., & Thomas, O. S. (2001). *Finding common ground: A guide to religious liberty in public schools*: First Amendment Center.
- Henderson, M. V., Gullatt, D. E., Hardin, D. T., Jannik, C., & Tollett, J. R. (1999). *Preventive Law Curriculum Guide*.
- Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach : teacher education and professionalization in American culture*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hick, J. (1990). *Classical and contemporary readings in the philosophy of religion* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Hnath, L. (2015). *The Christians*. New York, NY: Dramatist Play Service, Inc.
- Hufford, D. (2010). Intellectual Agnostics: Preparing Public School Teachers to Be Open-Minded Interpreters in the Religion/Public School Debate. *Critical Questions in Education*, 1(1), 13-25.
- Kaestle, C. F., & Foner, E. (1983). *Pillars of the republic : common schools and American society, 1780-1860* (1st ed.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Kaiser, E. D. (2003). Jesus Heard the Word of God, but Mohammed had Convulsions: How Religion Clause Principles Should Be Applied to Religion in the Public School Social Studies Curriculum. *Journal of Law & Education*, 34(3), 321-356.

- Keller, E. L. (2003). I'm Telling-Who Cares-Student-on-Student Religious Harassment in Public Schools. *Wayne L. Rev.*, 49, 1071.
- Kessler, R. (2000). *The soul of education : helping students find connection, compassion, and character at school*. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- King Jr., M. L. (1963). I Have a Dream Retrieved from <https://www.archives.gov/files/press/exhibits/dream-speech.pdf>
- Kunzman, R. (2006). *Grappling with the good : talking about religion and morality in public schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Labaree, D. F. (2004). *Trouble with Ed Schools*. New Haven, CT, USA: Yale University Press.
- Lane v. SABINE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, No. No. 5: 14-cv-00100-EEF-KLH (Dist. Court, WD Louisiana 2014).
- Laycock, D. (1991). Noncoercive Support for Religion: Another False Claim about the Establishment Clause. *Val. UL Rev.*, 26, 37.
- Lhamon, C. E. (2016). Protecting Students of All Religious Backgrounds from Unlawful Discrimination. Retrieved from <http://blog.ed.gov/2016/07/protecting-students-religious-backgrounds-unlawful-discrimination/>
- Lindsley ex rel. Kolodziejczack v. Girard School, No. Civil Action No. 01-180 Erie, 213 523 (Dist. Court, WD Pennsylvania 2002).

- Littleton, M. (2008). Teachers' Knowledge of Education Law. *Part of a special section entitled, Teacher Education and the Law*, 30(2), 71-78.
- Luke, A. M. (2004). *Religious freedom in public education: The relationship between high school educators' First Amendment knowledge and their opinions about religion in public schools* (3144889 Ed.D.). University of Central Florida, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.
- Lynn, R. W. (1964). *Protestant strategies in education*: Association Press.
- Macedo, S. (2000). *Diversity and distrust : civic education in a multicultural democracy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Maclin, S. A. (2012). *Diversity preparedness: A reflection on pre-service teacher preparation in private, faith-based colleges* (3517171). Capella University, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database.
- Malnak v. Yogi, No. No. 78-1568, 592 197 (Court of Appeals, 3rd Circuit 1979).
- Mann, H. (1848). Twelfth Annual Report. Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Board of Education
- Marks, M. J., Binkley, R., & Daly, J. K. (2014). Preservice teachers and religion: Serious gaps in religious knowledge and the First Amendment. *The Social Studies*, 105(5), 245-256.

- Marty, M. E., & Moore, J. (2000). *Education, religion, and the common good : advancing a distinctly American conversation about religion's role in our shared life* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Masters, B. (2014). (F) law of Karma: In Light of Sedlock v. Baird, Would Meditation Classes in Public Schools Survive a First Amendment Establishment Clause Challenge, *The. Cal. Legal Hist.*, 9, 255.
- Mattingly, P. H. (1975). *The classless profession: American schoolmen in the nineteenth century*: NYU Press.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design : an interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- McAvoy, P. (2010). *Cultural accommodations in public schools: Weighing competing values* (3424247 Ph.D.). The University of Wisconsin - Madison, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.
- McCullum v. Board of Education, 333 203 (Supreme Court 1948).
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriman, S. A. (2007). *Religion and the law in America: an encyclopedia of personal belief and public policy* (Vol. 1): Abc-Clio.
- Militello, M., Schimmel, D., & Eberwein, H. J. (2009). If They Knew, They Would Change: How Legal Knowledge Impacts Principals' Practice. *NASSP Bulletin*, 93(1), 27-52. doi: 10.1177/0192636509332691

Minersville School Dist. v. Gobitis, No. No. 690, 310 586 (Supreme Court 1940).

Mondale, S., & Patton, S. B. (2001). *School, the story of American public education*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Moore, D. L. (2007). *Overcoming religious illiteracy : a cultural studies approach to the study of religion in secondary education* (1st ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nash, R. J. (1999). *Faith, hype, and clarity : teaching about religion in American schools and colleges*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Neale, P., Thapa, S., & Boyce, C. (2006). *Preparing a case study: A guide for designing and conducting a case study for evaluation input*: Pathfinder international Massachusetts.

Neuhaus, R. J. (1984). *The naked public square : religion and democracy in America*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of general psychology*, 2(2), 175.

Noddings, N. (1993). *Educating for intelligent belief or unbelief*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nord, W. A. (1995). *Religion & American education : rethinking a national dilemma*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Nord, W. A. (2010). *Does God make a difference? : taking religion seriously in our schools and universities*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Nord, W. A., & Haynes, C. C. (1998). *Taking religion seriously across the curriculum*. ASCD; First Amendment Center, Alexandria, Va. Nashville, Tenn.

Northwest Ordinance (1787).

Ogren, C. A. (2005). *American State Normal School : An Instrument of Great Good*. Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Otto, R. (1950). *The idea of the holy : an inquiry into the non-rational factor in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational* (2d ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Patterson, M., & Stewart-Wells, G. (2015). Ensuring legal boundaries with religiosity in public schools. *A Journal of the International Christian Community for Teacher Education*, 10(1).

Prothero, S. R. (2007). *Religious literacy : what every American needs to know--and doesn't* (1st ed.). San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Randall, B. (2013). The Day of Dialogue and the Golden Rule Pledge: Public Discussion, Religious Belief, and Mutual Respect. In M. D. Waggoner (Ed.), *Religion in the Public Schools: Negotiating the New Commons*: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Reed, R. F., & Johnson, T. W. (1996). *Philosophical documents in education*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman Publishers USA.

. *Religious Discrimination in Education*. (2015). Retrieved from

<https://www.justice.gov/crt/combating-religious-discrimination-and-protecting-religious-freedom-20>.

Rowe, W. L., Wainwright, W. J., & Ferm, R. L. (1998). *Philosophy of religion : selected readings* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Russo, C. (2013). Prayer and Student-Initiated Religious Activities in Public Schools. In M. D. Waggoner (Ed.), *Religion in the Public Schools: Negotiating the New Commons*: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Sears, J. T., & Carper, J. C. (1998). *Curriculum, religion, and public education : conversations for an enlarging public square*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sedlock v. Baird, No. No. D064888, 235 874 (Cal: Court of Appeal, 4th Appellate Dist., 1st Div. 2015).

Setran, D. (2012). " More Religion in Education and More Education in Religion": Liberal Progressivism and the Educational" Common Faith," 1917-1940. *Teachers College Record*, 114(1).

Settle v. Dickson County School Board, No. 53 F.3d 152 (6th Cir. 1995).

Sizer, T. R., & Sizer, N. F. (1999). *The students are watching : schools and the moral contract*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Smith v. Lincoln Park Public Schools, 2004 WL 1124467 (Mich. App. May 20, 2004) (2004).

Sproul, R. C., Ham, K., Phillips, D. W., Laverdiere, C., Gunn, C., & Fernandez, J. (2012). *Indoctrination : public schools and the decline of Christianity in America*. Green Forest, Ark.: Master Books.

Stake, R. E. (2013). *Multiple case study analysis*: Guilford Press.

State ex rel. Weiss v. District Board 76, No. 1390, 44 967 (Wis. 177 1890).

Strasser, M. (2011). *Law, Justice and Power : Religion, Education and the State : An Unprincipled Doctrine in Search of Moorings*. Farnham, Surrey, GBR: Ashgate Publishing Group.

Strong, J. (1885). *Our country: its possible future and its present crisis*. New York,: Pub. by the Baker & Taylor co.

Swick, M. W. (2009). *Has God been expelled from school: An investigation into the evolution of the church-state debate within the American public school system* (3415974 Ed.D.). Illinois State University, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.

Taft, G. L. (2011). *First amendment knowledge of classroom teachers* (3498068 Ed.D.). Lincoln Memorial University, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text database.

Tinker v. Des Moines Sch. Dist., No. 503 (393 U.S. 1969).

Totenberg, N. (2017). Supreme Court Rules Religious School Can Use Taxpayer Funds For Playground. *NPR*. <http://www.npr.org/2017/06/26/534084013/supreme-court-rules-religious-school-can-use-taxpayer-funds-for-playground>

TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH OF COLUMBIA, INC. v. Comer, No. No. 15-577 (Supreme Court 2017).

- Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system : a history of American urban education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Tyack, D. B. (2003). *Seeking common ground : public schools in a diverse society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Tyack, D. B., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue : public school leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Waggoner, M. D. (2013). Negotiating the New Commons in Religion and Education. In M. D. Waggoner (Ed.), *Religion in the Public Schools: Negotiating the New Commons*: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Wagner, P. H. (2007). An Evaluation of the Legal Literacy of Educators and the Implications for Teacher Preparation Programs. *Online Submission*.
- Wagner, P. H. (2008). The Legal Preparedness of Preservice Teachers. *Part of a special section entitled, Teacher Education and the Law*, 30(2), 4-14.
- Wainwright, W. J. (1999). *Philosophy of religion* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub.
- Wermund, B. (2017). DeVos closes civil rights complaints at faster clip than predecessor. *Politico*. Retrieved from Politico website:
<http://www.politico.com/story/2017/08/10/devos-closes-civil-rights-complaints-at-faster-clip-than-predecessors-241483?cmpid=sf>
- Wertheimer, L. K. (2015). *Faith Ed.: Teaching about religion in an age of intolerance*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.

West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnette, No. No. 591, 319 624 (Supreme Court 1943).

White, K. R. (2009). Connecting religion and teacher identity: The unexplored relationship between teachers and religion in public schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(6), 857-866. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.01.004>

White, K. R. (2013). Integrating religion into multicultural education. In M. D. Waggoner (Ed.), *Religion in the Public Schools: Negotiating the New Commons* (pp. 161-178): Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Widmar v. Vincent, No. No. 80-689, 454 263 (Supreme Court 1981).

Wilson, M. T. (2011). *The eye of the storm: The significance of diversity awareness and beliefs on culturally responsive practices of educators* (3482307). University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, Ann Arbor. Available from ProQuest Education Journals database.

Witte, J., & Nichols, J. A. (2011). *Religion and the American constitutional experiment* (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills: CA: Sage publishing

Zirkel, P. A. (2009). Protecting Religious Students in Public Schools: Whose Ox Is Being Gored? *Journal of Law & Education*, 38(4), 623-625.

Zorach v. Clauson, No. No. 431, 343 306 (Supreme Court 1952).