8-1959

The Development Of Driver Education In the High Schools Of Texas

Herman Elton Williams
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DRIVER EDUCATION IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF TEXAS

HERMAN ELTON WILLIAMS

1959

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DRIVER EDUCATION IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF TEXAS

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate Division
of Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Degree of
Master of Science

By

Herman Elton Williams

August, 1959

APPROVAL SHEET

Approved by:

[redacted]
(Advisor)

Director, Division of Industrial Education

August 11, 1959
(Date)

DEDICATED--

To my wife, Mrs. Estherlene Williams whose prayers, words of encouragement, and assistance made is possible for me to conduct this study, this paper is dedicated as a token to thanks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Thomas Miller and Mr. Eugene Jackson for their valuable suggestions and constructive criticisms, during the development of this thesis. The writer also wishes to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation of the Texas Education Agency, the Texas Department of Public Safety, and the Texas Safety Association who contributed much valuable information.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Today, man probably travels more than a hundred times as far during his life time as did the man of fifty years ago. This change took place primarily because of the invention of the automobile. This invention has proved to be one of man's greates pieces of work. It has brought us mobility and all but freed us from the limitations of time and place.

Many problems have arisen since the invention of the first American Automobile. We are faced with the problem of moving traffic efficiently and confronted with a more serious problem, that of moving traffic safely. These problems affect the life of every modern family.[1]

Not enough citizens of this country have been disturbed by the hazards caused by the increased use of the automobile. As a result of this negligence, many hundreds of people are losing their lives annually. Texas alone has more than twenty-three hundred deaths each year caused by auto-accidents.[2]

The writer feels that each community has the responsibility of teaching its citizens those fundamental principles which are essential

---

[1] Albert W. Whitney, Man and The Motor Car, (New York: J. J. Little and Ives Company, 1936), pp. xi-xvi.

[2] Texas and the Action Program for Traffic Control 1958, (Texas Safety Association, Inc.), p. 1.

to good driving if they are to survive and be safe in our modern high speed automobile age. Out of this assumption comes the purpose of this study.

This study is primarily an investigation of the development of driver education in the high schools of Texas from 1937 to 1959. In addition, it is a study of the factors which led to the recognition and acceptance of driver education as a phase of general education, the major factors which cause automotive accidents in Texas, and the requirements for an approved driver education program.

In order to conduct this study, the investigation was centered around the following questions:

1. How does driver education support general education?
2. What was the nature of the initial high school driver education programs in Texas?
3. What is the status of the present driver education programs in the high schools of Texas?

Definition of Terms

An accident hazard is a situation, place, or object, that is considered most likely to cause physical and/or property damage.

Automobiles are all self-propelled vehicles legally authorized to operate on streets and roadways.

An auto-trainer is an indoor-training aid used to supplement practice driving in the classroom by teaching such operations as gear shifting, accelerating, braking, clutching and steering.

Classroom instruction in driver education programs refers to those learning experiences which are provided elsewhere than in the motor vehicle.[3]

---

[3]National Conference on Driver Education, Policies and Practices for Driver Education, (Michigan: National Commission on Safety Education, 1954), p. 7.

Driver education refers to all those learning experiences provided by the school for the purpose of helping students learn to use motor vehicles safely and efficiently.[4]

A drivers license is a permit issued to an individual by a state granting him the privilege to operate an automobile on the streets and roadways of that particular state.

A dual-control car is an automobile used in driver education, that is equipped with additional auxiliary units such as, steering wheel, gear shift lever or selector, brake, clutch, and accelerator.[5]

Minimum legal driving age refers to the lowest chronological age of a person permitted to operate a vehicle in a particular state.

Practice driving instruction refers to learning experiences in driver education provided for the student-driver in motor vehicle.[6]

A traffic accident is a collision involving an automobile with another automobile, a pedestrian or other objects.

Traffic violation means to break one of the state laws governing the operation and movement of automobiles on streets and roadways.

The Uniform Vehicle Code is a suggested standard for driving regulations written by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety for the states to use as a guide in developing their codes.[7]

Sources of Data and Method of Study

Data pertinent to this study were collected from the following sources:

1. Responses to questionnaires mailed to secondary schools in Texas which have programs of driver education.

---

[4] Ibid., p. 7.

[5] Earnest B. White, The Road to Better Driving, (New York: Cambridge Book Company, 1955), p. 366.

[6] National Conference on Driver Education, loc. cit.

[7] White, loc. cit., p. 369.

2. Books treating the subject of driver education.

3. Literature provided by the Texas Safety Association.

4. Literature provided by the Texas Department of Public Safety.

5. Literature provided by the Texas Education Agency.

The writer constructed a questionnaire[8] which was mailed to the principals of ninety secondary schools of Texas. Of these, thirty-six (forty per cent) were returned and useable. Responses to the items on this questionnaire formed the basis for determining the present and past status of driver education in the high schools of Texas.

Books that treated the subject "safety education" were used to determine the historical development of safety education in America. Other books that treated the subject "driver education" supplied information concerning the early development of driver education in America.

Literature received from the state level organizations supplied information concerning the driver education movement in Texas, Texas accidents, and the requirements for an approved driver education course in Texas.

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to a survey of the development of driver education in the high schools of Texas. Data involved include information available from 1937 to the year 1959.

A random sample of high schools offering approved driver education programs located in all sections of Texas were the subjects for

---

[8]See Appendix for copy of questionnaire.

this study, providing a crosscut view of the over-all driver educational set up in Texas. No attempt was made to study the driver education programs in private schools, or schools above the secondary level.

Review of Related Studies

Before proceeding with this study, it was considered advisable to review and analyze all available similar and related studies.

Dr. Charles Peter Yost[9] conducted a study which was based on a review of 266 graduate theses in school safety which came from all parts of the United States.

Dr. Yost's conclusions are as follows:

> No one time or place can be designated as the beginning of school safety. Limited evidence in the area of "Traffic Safety" indicates that instruction in driving a car began in the early 1930's. Early safety instruction in the schools was received as relatively unimportant subject matter until the public realized the fact that accidents were taking the lives of numerous school-age children.
>
> Accidents have become the leading cause of death as well as an important cause of disability to school-age boys and girls. This does not primarily state the cause for school safety. On the contrary, school safety is necessary because safety is a fundamental life condition and therefore has a place in the school curriculum.[10]

---

[9] Charles Peter Yost, "An Analysis of Graduate Theses in School Safety in the United States from 1925 to 1950" (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg: 1956), p. 1.

[10] Ibid., p. 3.

Dr. Yost's study also revealed that the organization and administration of school safety varied. It was taught as a separate course in some cases and integrated with many different courses in many other cases. This was logical because it was concluded that a high degree of compatibility exists between the objectives of safety education and the objectives of general education.

Dr. Yost pointed out some very interesting facts concerning his findings of graduate theses classified under the topic of "Traffic Safety." They are as follows:

> Although early research studies emphasized the importance of faculty attitudes as a major underlying cause of traffic accidents, it was not until the 1940's that much needed research in measuring driver attitudes was reported. It is difficult to attribute traffic accidents to one specific circumstance or cause. The human factor (the inability of individuals to exert self-control and follow safe practices) is undoubtedly the major cause of traffic accidents.
>
> Traffic Courts which hand down punishment in forms of fines or short-term confinements do very little to correct faulty driving attitudes. Of more importance are traffic violator schools which aim at the correction of faulty attitudes.
>
> In driver education courses, those items pertaining to drivers attitude should receive the most emphasis that time and circumstances allow. Whenever possible, both classroom and practice driving instruction should be offered in accordance with state department of education rulings.
>
> Programs of high school driver education have gained public support. In some states students completing a high school driver education course are excused from all or part of the state examination for an operator's license.[11]

In order to improve all areas of safety education the following recommendations were made by Dr. Yost:

---

[11] Ibid., p. 7.

1. It is recommended that all prospective teachers receive a general course in safety education.

2. It is recommended that each school system appoint one individual who: (a) coordinates safety activities within the school; and (b) coordinates the efforts of community organizations and agencies interested in promoting school safety.

3. It is recommended that safety instruction be a part of all academic subjects in which there is evident relationship. It is further recommended that specific courses in driver education be included in the curricula of all secondary schools.

4. It is recommended that directors of educational research at our colleges and universities encourage graduate students to do research in the field of school safety. Actually one must consider this field as still in its infancy especially in comparison to the number of graduate theses produced in other fields.[12]

Dr. Bernard I. Loft,[13] Associate Professor of the Department of Health and Safety School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, conducted a study concerning the effects of driver education on driver knowledge and attitudes.

The purpose of this study was to consider the effects of a driver education course on driving knowledge and attitudes of high school seniors. The subjects for this study were 1,607 students who possessed a valid driver's license.

Dr. Loft concluded that:

1. Boys and girls having completed a two-part course in driver education possess desirable attitudes toward driving and adequate traffic and driving knowledge.

---

[12] Ibid., p. 7.

[13] Bernard I. Loft, "The Effects of Driver Education on Driver Knowledge and Attitudes in Selected Public Secondary Schools of Indianapolis and Marion Counties" (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington: 1956), p. 1.

2. Driver education is particularly advantageous to girls in their acquisition of traffic and driving knowledge.

3. Boys and girls without training in driver education have a similar understanding of traffic and driving knowledge.

4. Attitudes related to driving responsibility are not materially affected by a driver education course for girls.

5. Girls without training in driver education have established a relatively safe driving record.

6. Driver education courses should consist of specific learning experiences for boys so that attitudes and adequate knowledge will be a realistic outcome of such a course.

7. Driver education is influential in reducing accidents and traffic violations for teen-age drivers.

8. Students in driver education should be required to take a screening test at the beginning of the course as a means of determining their needs.[14]

Some of Dr. Loft's recommendations are listed below:

1. The administrators and a faculty committee periodically evaluate the driver education program to ascertain the quality of instruction in all phases of the program.

2. The evaluation of the driver education program be based on the objectives listed by the National Commission on Safety Education.

3. Driver education instruction place more emphasis on the development of desirable attitudes through both classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction.

4. High School students possessing a driver's license but who have not completed a driver education course be encouraged to enroll in such a course.

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

5. Greater emphasis be placed on proper reaction when confronted with an emergency driving situation.

6. Additional behind-the-wheel instruction period be scheduled for boys.

7. The result of this investigation be compared with the report of the American Automobile Association in Chapter I concerning the effectiveness of driver education in various locations throughout the United States.

8. The findings of this study be used in teacher preparation courses to familiarize prospective driver education instructors concerning the significance of traffic and driving knowledge and desirable attitudes, as related to driving frequency, traffic violations, and traffic accidents.

9. A study be made to determine if driver education courses should have any different content and/or methodology for girls and/or boys.

10. A study be conducted to provide data as to course content and procedure for high school students who have previously mastered some of the driving fundamentals.

11. A study be made to show how driver education courses may be organized and presented to provide adequate attention to developing desirable attitudes.

12. The findings in this study along with further research be directed at determining the extent to which responses on attitude tests are reflected in actual driving practices.

13. A study be made to determine the extent to which undesirable attitudes may be the direct cause of automobile accidents.

14. A study be made to determine the effectiveness of driver education by means of a pretest and posttest of driver attitudes and driving knowledge.

15. A study be made to determine the special problems of teen-age drivers as indicated by traffic violations and accidents.[15]

---

[15] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

The importance of providing for our youth, the correct training and instruction in driver education should not be over-looked by any school administrator. Amos E. Neyhart[16] conducted a study in 1934, in an attempt to decide what methods of teaching could be suggested as most satisfactory for the instructing of driver education, and to prepare simple instructions and recommendations for the persons who have to teach other people the use of motor vehicles.

Mr. Neyhart used accumulated records of unselected drivers for this study. He stated that:

> This investigation bears evidence that our present method of teaching learners to drive could be improved.
>
> There is every indication that the influence of the teacher is noticeable in the later driving experiences of the learner. The teachers who held responsible positions, who knew the highway rules and regulations, who were cautious and careful while instructing the learners, who did not have accident records themselves, made by far the best teachers.[17]

Mr. Neyhart discovered from his study that of all the drivers who had accidents, a higher percentage were committed during the first year of driving. In order to eliminate this Mr. Neyhart made the following suggestions:

> As an aid to reduction of the percentage of accidents for the first year of driving experience the establishment of a one year probation period might be suggested. The new

---

[16] Amos E. Neyhart, "The Relation of the Training and Other Characteristics of Automobile Drivers to Their Proness to Accidents" (Unpublished Master's thesis, The Pennsylvania State College, Philadelphia: 1934), p. 8.

[17] Ibid., pp. 91.

driver would develop thoroughly established habits of caution out of the fear of losing his license, and these habits would become a part of his driving technique.

It would seem that the exercise of a little thoughtful courtesy and consideration for others on the part of the driver would also go a long way toward accidental preventions. The fact that the relatively young driver has the majority of the accidents seems to point to the fact that young drivers are throughtless in many cases of the rights of others on our roadways. Owning little property themselves they are not conscious of property values unless made so by training.

This element of courtesy and the ideal of safety were two fundamental principles of the investigator's teaching scheme.[18]

In the light of his findings Mr. Neyhart recommended that teachers of driver education do the following things:

1. Include in the first lesson and every lesson thereafter, the element of courtesy and the ideal of safety for every driver on our roadways.

2. As opportunities present themselves, impress the learner with the safest known method for that practical situation. These opportunities will be stopping for a stop sign or light, taking curves, passing cars, pulling out of parking spaces, safe practices on hills, driving in congested traffic, etc.

3. Teach the learner all rules and regulations for the safe operation of a motor vehicle, especially of hiw own community and particular state.

4. All early practice should be conducted on an isolated roadway free from traffic.

5. Every operation,such as clutch, shifting gears, etc., should be mastered thoroughly and practiced for perfection before presenting the next step or before appearing in traffic at all.

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 91-92.

6. The new driver should be able to stop skillfully and to start skillfully before going on a highway. In fact, he should stop at designated places without a single failure before teacher allows him to drive in traffic.

7. The teacher should impress the learner with the greatest importance of driving in the right lane of traffic. This is one place where the wrong habit when once formed will be very hard to change.

8. The learner should not be criticized severely for mistakes made while learning, but should always be praised for good effort.

9. The proper use of the brakes under all weather conditions, road conditions and unusual circumstances should be constantly brought to the learner's attention and correct habits formed.

10. It is good practice to explain and demonstrate the use of the gauges and inside mechanism during the first lesson for the learner, so that he will have some understanding of the tools he will work with. However, it is also important as the lessons progress to check upon each part taught to see if the information concerning it has been retained by the new driver. Changing tires, refueling, etc., are included in this recommendation.

11. Lastly, the learner should be made to realize that every careless and inattentive act on his part, not only endangers his life, but the lives of his passengers, pedestrians, and occupants of other cars.

12. As an added recommendation may it be stated that a driver who has had accidents should not undertake to teach new drivers.[19]

In an effort to gather data which could be made available to school administrators to guide them when they decided to start a safety education

---

[19] Ibid., pp. 93-95.

programs in their school systems, Webster M. Christman[20] conducted a study concerning administrative features of driver education programs. Questionnaires were sent to high schools in which driver education was offered in all states that had the program.

Some of Mr. Christman's findings are listed below:

1. The majority of teachers, 85.3 per cent, have had special training for conducting high school driving work.

2. In most cases industrial arts and vocational education teachers conduct the driver education and training classes. Science teachers are next, then social studies, mathematics, and physical education teachers came in the order named.

3. Ten per cent of the 173 instructors taking part in the investigation teach driver education and training full time.

4. The course is elective almost everywhere.

5. Credit is given in most of the schools. In half of these granting credit, a half-unit is awarded.

6. "Sportmanlike Driving" is the basic textbook in 123 of the 173 high schools.

7. Driver training instructors do not very often maintain a follow-up record of their students for traffic violations and accidents.

8. Property damage insurance of $5,000, public liability of $10,000-$20,000, and $50 deductible collision are the kinds and amounts of insurance generally carried. Fire and theft preventions are not carried very often.

9. In one-fourth of the cases a fee was charged of each student taking the course. This fee ranged from twenty cents to ten dollars.

---

[20] Webster M. Christman, "A Study of Certain Administrative Features of Driver "Education" and "Training" Courses in the High Schools of the United States in 1940" (Unpublished Master's thesis. The Graduate School Department of Industrial Education, The Pennsylvania State College, Philadelphia: 1940), p. 5.

10. More than three-fourths of the schools use dual control cars for road instruction.[21]

In order to set up a good driver education program the following recommendations were made by Mr. Christman:

1. Have a trained teacher. This sounds trite, but because the automobile is so commonly accepted today it is often assumed anyone can teach another person how to drive.

2. Try to provide or have built by the school some driver testing equipment for checking the physical and emotional characteristics of students.

3. Provide a dual control car. To operate a high school driver training course without a dual control car is like operating high speed power machinery in the school shop without having safety guards on it.

4. Be sure to carry insurance.

5. At least fifty per cent of the time given to road training in the car should be devoted to experiences on city streets.

6. Let the classroom instructor be full time on an academic basis.

7. It is recommended that, whenever possible, one-fourth to one-half of Carnegie unit of credit be granted in "driver education" on a clock-hour basis similar to that assigned to academic subjects. (Being able to pass a driving test in states where it is required, is the reward for the time spent in "driver training").

8. When there is any question of driver education and training being accepted for credit toward high school graduation, the driver education and training can be considered jointly as an

---

[21] Ibid., pp. 92-95.

industrial arts course of one unit or as part of an industrial arts course.[22]

A study of driver education in the high schools of Texas was made during the year 1945 by Mr. Stephan Brougher,[23] while he was attending the University of Texas.

Mr. Brougher found that only about twenty per cent of all the high schools in Texas offered driver education and approximately eleven per cent offered driver training. Some schools offered these courses as separate courses and others were integrated with other courses. A large percentage of the schools placed enough value on their programs to give credit toward graduation.

Mr. Brougher felt that more schools should offer driver education and training, and as many students as possible should take the course. Teachers of these courses should strive to improve themselves by in-service training and workshops. The student should receive credit toward graduation for this work that should begin just as the student approaches the minimum legal driving age, and he should not have to pay a fee for this course.[24]

Need for the Study

Driver education is a rather new area in our Texas School System, and very little has been done in an attempt to survey what progress has

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

[23] Stephen Brougher, "A Survey of Driver Education and Training in the School of Texas" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Texas, Austin: 1951), pp. 45-50.

[24] Ibid.

been made since the initial driver education program. The writer feels that information revealed by this study will furnish the reader with a broader concept of what has been done, and what is being done to improve and expand this new area of education. It is the desire of the writer that the findings of this study will encourage administrators, teachers, and community laymen to consider and acknowledge the social, economical, and physical effects that driver education has on our modern society.

There is a definite need for better drivers today, and many of our drivers are of school age. So it seems logical to seek means of improving them, by starting with them while they are in high school.

CHAPTER II

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DRIVER EDUCATION AS A PHASE OF GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF TEXAS

The Origin of Safety Education

Safety Education progressed through many stages of development before driver education, the newly developed area of safety education, appeared. Our changing society has caused the form of safety education to be reconstructed many times with the addition of new areas as they became important.

Safety Education had its initial beginning with the primitive man. He sought shelter in caves and developed crude weapons to protect himself from the danger that was common at that time. Survival was a matter of anticipating dangers, and meeting them skillfully.

Through each stage of man's development, education for safe living was considered very important. However, early progress in safeguarding human life was hindered by selfishness and by the general conviction that accidents were predestined.[1]

Safety Education in Industry

The revolution in mining and manufacturing caused a great increase in the employment of European industries. Often the accident hazards

---

[1] Herbert James Stack, Education for Safe Living, (New York: Prentice-Hall Publishing Company, 1949), p. 1.

were overlooked due to the fact that there was a great supply of labor. Many women and children were employed. They suffered greatly due to their negligence and accident hazards. For the first time, the public became concerned about this terrible situation and action was taken to improve working conditions.

The first organized form of safety education was established at this time. Laws were enacted which shortened work hours, required factory inspection, required the placement of guards on moving machinery, and placed the responsibility of maintaining safe working conditions upon the employers.[2]

As strange as it may sound, organized programs of safety education in America did not begin with traffic safety. They had their origin in industry. The main objective of these programs was to increase production. Accidents in industry were looked upon as being wasteful. To retrain or replace an unjured worker, or to pay an injured worker compensation, placed an extra financial burden on employers.[3]

In order to curtail this industrial problem, a safety committee of the Association of Iron and Steel Engineers arranged the first cooperative safety congress in Milwaukee in 1912. Action taken at this meeting led to the organization of The National Safety Council in 1913, which spearheaded the safety movement in America. This was the first organization in this country that was devoted entirely to accident prevention. This organization was composed of industrial corporations,

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 2-3.

[3] American Automobile Association, Driver and Traffic Education (Washington, D.C.: American Automobile Association Company, 1958), p. 22.

government departments, insurance companies and other interests. This organization first was known as the "National Council for Industrial Safety". However, when it became necessary to widen the scope of its activities to include the field of public safety, it was given its present name.[4]

There were four stages of development in the Industrial Safety Movement:

1. The "bird-cage" stage - Safeguards (cages) were installed over dangerous moving parts of machine-gears, belt pulleys, etc.
2. The "horror" stage - Posters and photographs were displayed showing horrible mutilations due to accidents.
3. The Safety Talk Stage - Sometimes referred to as the "ballyhoo" or preaching method.
4. The Education Program Stage.[5]

The bird-cage stage of industrial safety reduced accidents by about 10%, thus indicating that accidents were preventable. The second stage proved to be less effective. Man tended to dismiss horror from his mind. He also tended to apply such accident possibilities to others, not himself. The safety talk stage was the forerunner of an education program for safety, which is an important phase of industry today.

> Safety education is now an accepted part of good industrial relation programs in all large industries. The worker is recognized as the chief factor in accidents. The procedures involve implanting worker information about hazards and safe practices in connection with the job, and the cultivation of good worker's attitudes encouraging safety.[6]

---

[4]Stack, Op. Cit., p. 4.

[5]American Automobile Association, Op. Cit., pp. 22-23.

[6]Ibid.

Safety Education in School

Before the child safety movement began, more children died from accidents than is the case today in spite of the increased child population. Educators observed that industry's major success in accident prevention came only after employees were taught safe work habits and the importance of developing the correct attitude concerning industry and its many hazards. Thus, this policy was carried over to the school.

There were nine million automobiles in the United States during the year 1920.[7] These automobiles had caused a revolutionary change in transportation. With this increase in the number of automobiles, came an increase in the number of deaths caused by automotive accidents. Many children were victims and the schools could no longer ignore this critical situation.

The first problem to be solved was that of preparing teachers for this phase of safety education. Mr. Albert W. Whitney and Mr. E. George Payne were the two men, who were largely responsible for inspiring and guiding the earliest effort to plan workable programs of instruction.[8]

> Safety education was first introduced in the primary grades. Students were taught to obey traffic signals, to follow the directions of school patron members, to play only in safe areas and to develop proper bicycling habits.[9]

---

[7]American Automobile Association, Sportman Like Driving (Washington, D. C.: American Automobile Association, 1955), p. 6.

[8]American Automobile Association, Op. Cit., pp. 6-7.

[9]A. E. Florio, Safety Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 149.

Driver Education Movement in the United States of America

A very comprehensive program of safety education was initiated in Detroit in 1919. A fourfold program was launched stressing the following aspects:

1. A study of traffic accidents among children of school age.
2. Construction of a course of study for the elementary schools.
3. Instruction of classes at Detroit State Teachers College.
4. Cooperation with all civic agencies concerned with public safety.[10]

During this time, national organizations were being formed that aided the safety education movement by; establishing the Uniform Vehicle Code, offering courses in traffic engineering and uniform road marking and signs, establishing school patrol, and distributing grade school teaching material.[11]

In general, safety education progressed slowly in the high schools until there arose a demand for automobile driver education and training. Experiemental work had indicated that the high school student's interest in accident prevention was to a great extent the same as the interest of an adult, and the subject matter could best be taught by integrating it with such subjects as civics, sociology, chemistry, home economics and physical education.

During the years from 1930 to 1935, national organizations and some colleges were attempting to get driver education courses for

---

[10] Stack, Op. Cit., p. 7.

[11] American Automobile Association, Op. Cit., p. 23.

teacher preparation in this field. A few schools on the secondary level were beginning to accept this new area of education.

At this time it was possible for educators to get a manual that attempted to outline methods of organizing programs of driver instructions. This manual, entitled "Good Driving", was developed by the Education Division of the National Safety Council. A few years later, a more comprehensive treatment of the subject matter was published. This book was entitled Man and the Motor Car, and was developed by members of the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety.[12]

There is no common agreement as to where driver education first began in America. Oklahoma is credited by some as originating the first program of driver education during World War I to prepare ambulance drivers. Others credit Pennsylvania with having first offered driver education and still others say that Delaware was first.[13]

Most writers give Dr. Amos E. Neyhart credit for organizing the first driver education courses in both high school and college. Both courses were taught at the Pennsylvania State University. The course on the secondary level was started in 1933. Both classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction were given. The college course, which was a teacher training course, carried three (3) hours credit toward

---

[12] Stack, Op. Cit., pp. 8-10.

[13] "A Report to the National Education Association by the National Conference on Teacher Education, Certification, and Program Standards for Driver Education," Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Washington (June 23-4, 1956), p. 9.

graduation and was taught during the summer of 1936. This course was six weeks in duration.[14]

During the years from 1930 to 1940, the interest in driver education on the secondary level increased rapidly. Some of the contributions that were made in order to accelerate this interest in driver education are listed below:

1. 1934 - Beginning of American Automobile Association's systematic program to promote driver and traffic education in high schools.

2. 1936 - First car loan for high school driver education by Pontiac Division through the American Automobile Association.

3. 1939 - "Standard Highway Safety Program for the States," a seven point program published by the Automotive Safety Foundation.

4. 1939 - American Automobile Association Pedestrian Safety Contests started in cities and states".[15]

A further contribution was made when in 1938, the Center for Safety Education was established at New York University. Its activities covered the whole field of safety education, but it concentrated on the preparation of teachers and supervisors.[16]

Driver Education Movement in Texas

The first driver education course taught in Texas was conducted at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station,

---

[14]Letter from Joseph Intorre, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania (August 19, 1958).

[15]American Automobile Association, Op. Cit., p. 24.

[16]Stack, Op. Cit., p. 13.

Texas, during the summer of 1937. This course, titled "Traffic Safety and Auto-Operation," was offered for six weeks. Classroom instruction was taught by Mr. W. H. Kenne, who was principal of Ball High School at that time. The practice phase of this course was conducted by Mr. George Schauer. Mr. Edd Williams of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas was given credit for organizing and managing this course.[17]

This course was composed of twenty-eight students who were being prepared to teach driver education on the secondary level.[18] In order to complete this course, each student had to teach one fourteen year old boy to drive. Boys who had no experience in driving were used as students.

The second course in driver education to be offered on the college level was a teacher preparatory course conducted at the University of Texas in 1940. This course was promoted by Dr. D. K. Brace, who was chairman of the Department of Health and Phsycial Education, and Dr. C. J. Alderson, an instructor in the same department at the University of Texas. Dr. F. R. Noffsinger and Dr. Amos E. Neyhart were the instructors. Dr. Noffsinger was associated with the American Automobile Association and Professor Neyhart was a member of the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. There were fourteen students

---

[17] Letter from George Schauer, Industrial Safety Engineer, Corpus Christi, Texas,(July 11, 1959).

[18] Letter from Leslie V. Hawkins, Associate Professor of Driver Education, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Texas, (July 13, 1959).

enrolled in this course. Class was conducted in the form of a seminar and lasted about six hours per day for a period of ten days. This course included behind-the-wheel driving but this was not emphasized.

It was believed that two hours credit was given toward graduation in this course. However, a number of officers and supervisors took the course for no credit.[19]

The North Texas State Teachers College conducted a teacher preparatory course in 1941.[20] The writer does noe have information concerning the operation and development of this course.

Driver education got off to a slow start on the secondary level. Some educators were very critical of the idea of putting driver education in the secondary school curriculum. Some thought it was plain silly to talk about giving credit to a student for learning how to drive.[21]

It is not known what high school in Texas was first to offer driver education. However, data received from returned questionnaires revealed that Mr. Dennis E. Cowan taught a course in driver education at Baker High School of Austin, Texas in 1939. This school, and other initial driver education programs of Texas, will be discussed in the next chapter.

---

[19] Letter from C. J. Alderson, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas (July 13, 1959).

[20] Letter from Lewis Spears, Consultant in Health, Safety and Physical Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas (July, 1958).

[21] Letter from George Schauer, Safety Engineer, Corpus Christi, Texas (July 11, 1959).

The driver education movement in Texas began as early as 1935. The major cause for this movement was the upward trend in automobile accidents. During the period from 1935 to 1942, motor vehicle traffic deaths were very high. More than 1,500 persons were killed each year. Texas traffic fatalities reached their peak in 1937 when 2,043 persons died. The situation improved slightly for about three years. In 1941, 1,979 Texans died on streets and roadways. The economic loss was great. For these two years alone the average loss was approximately 62 million dollars.[22]

These problems aroused the interest of some educators to the extent that two state organizations were organized to assist the Texas Education Agency in taking action to make Texas a safer place in which to live.

The Texas Department of Public Safety was organized in Travis County in 1935. The establishment of this organization grew out of a felt need that a coordinated state level enforcing effort was necessary to cope with the situation of crime and traffic problems.[23]

The operation and services of this organization were very broad. It covered 18 different areas. All of these dealt with the promotion of safe practices in Texas. The primary purpose of this organization is stated as follows:

---

[22] Texas Department of Public Safety, Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents (Austin, Texas, 1958), p. 2.

[23] Letter from J. B. Carlisle, Texas Department of Public Safety, (Austin, Texas, June 28, 1959).

> The basic mission of the Texas Department of Public Safety is to develop and carry out in cooperation with other governmental agencies, positive programs of police and regulatory services, within existing regulations, that will maintain order in our society, so that the people within the state may be secure in person and property and many enjoy the rights and privileges naturally theirs or insured to them by constitution or statute.[24]

This organization aided in the development of the first course of driver education at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and the University of Texas. It worked cooperatively with the Texas Safety Association in getting authority and facilities to establish a consultant in Safety Education in the Texas Education Agency and in getting the legislature to enact the law permitting students under 16 years of age to be licensed, provided they successfully passed a course in Driver Education approved by the Texas Education Agency and the Department of Public Safety. This law was passed in 1945.[25] Some of the activities[26] of this organization for the year of 1942 are listed below:

	ACTIVITIES	NUMBERS
"1.	Safety talks made by highway patrolmen.	678
2.	Total attendance at safety talks.	86,706
3.	Radio safety talks and programs.	13
4.	Radio stations carrying broadcasts.	17

---

[24]Texas Department of Public Safety (Mission of Texas Department of Public Safety (Austin, Texas, 1959), p. 3.

[25]Letter from J. B. Carlisle, Texas Department of Public Safety, Austin, Texas (June 28, 1959).

[26]Accident Records Section, Drivers License Division, "Texas Traffic Accidents 1942" (Austin, Texas: Department of Public Safety, 1942), p. 40.

	ACTIVITIES	NUMBERS
5.	Safety films used.	28
6.	Safety film showings.	239
7.	Total attendance viewing safety films.	49,308
8.	School safety patrols organized by highway patrol.	23
9.	State-wide safety releases to newspapers.	160
10.	Safety bulletins and pamphlets distributed.	25,934
11.	Copies of state motor and vehicle laws distributed.	1,154
12.	Safety posters distributed.	1,571"

The Texas Safety Association was incorporated in 1938 at the request of Governor James V. Allred. The primary objective of this organization was to promote the conservation of human life in Texas through the prevention of accidents.

This organization made a great contribution to the Texas driver education movement through such activities as:

1. Collecting, compiling and dissemenating pertinent information relating to accidents and their prevention.

2. Assisting local groups in organizing their own safety councils and offering material and technical assistance in their individual problems.

3. Organizing safety conferences, contests and other stimulating projects that would kindle interest for more and greater safety.

4. Developing cooperation among professional, public, governmental and industrial safety men and groups.

5. Following any legal and moral path which may have been necessary or desirable for the futherance of the association and it's program.[27]

The Texas Safety Association spent half of its time working toward reducing death and destruction along Texas Highways. Yet other areas were not neglected. Much time was expended in developing strong accident prevention programs in industry, homes, schools, and farm-ranch safety.[28]

By 1940, members of the Texas Education Agency and members of the two newly organized state bodies as well as some school administrators agreed that driver education rightfully belonged in the secondary school curriculum. On this assumption, the Texas Committee on Classification and Accreditation approved the establishment of a course of study in traffic safety and driver's education as acceptable for one-half unit of credit as a part of the sixteen academic units required for high school graduation. It was possible for parents and other personnel who desired to train students to enlist for training by the state.[29]

Mr. George Schauer, one of the instructors of the first course of driver education at the Agricultural and Mechanical College, and Mr.

---

[27] Texas Safety Association, A Story of the Past, Present, Future (Austin, Texas), p. 3.

[28] Ibid., p. 3.

[29] State Department of Education, Training Youthful Drivers, (Austin, Texas: Texas Department of Public Safety), pp. 1-2.

J. R. Eddy went before the Board of Classification and Accreditation in an attempt to get credit ($\frac{1}{2}$ unit) toward graduation for high school students. There was much opposition to this idea, but these two educators finally won out.[30]

The course standards that were used for classroom instruction are listed below:

1. A minimum of 90 regular periods of classroom instruction, including laboratory training with five periods per week for a semester.

2. The course shall be given in that semester in which most students are arriving at the legal driving age.

3. Each class shall be small enough and yet provide economy in instruction cost.

4. The student must pass an examination more rigid than required by any state for securing a driver's license.[31]

In this course of study the standards for teacher qualification and teacher responsibilities were set forth.

First the teacher had to meet the same educational requirements as those of any other teacher. He had to have an interest in safety education, and possess above average driving skill. He was required to have completed special teacher training courses in safety education or, preferably, to have completed a major or minor in safety education.

The teacher was required to make his driving schedule, secure driving areas, check the vehicle for safe operation, keep a record of

---

[30]Letter from George Schauer, Safety Engineer, Corpus Christi, Texas (July 11, 1959)

[31]State Department of Education, Op. Cit., p. 2.

each student driver, supervise home project units and do other necessary things that contributed to good teaching.[32]

Students were required to complete at least four clock hours behind-the-wheel and twelve hours as an observer. It was desired that students be grouped in fours for practice driving; one driving while three observed.[33]

Formulation of National Driver Education Policies

The formulation of our national policies to improve traffic conditions begain in 1946. Before this time, states and cities had attacked their own traffic problems with various types of programs to relieve traffic congestion and to prevent traffic accidents.

> Some of the states and cities had developed different phases of traffic controls sufficiently to indicate that a pooling of the proved know-how gained through trial and error by these states and cities would form a national blueprint to guide all states and cities in developing sound traffic control programs.[34]

In May, 1946, President Truman called the initial Highway Safety Conference in Washington, D. C. The Committees appointed worked in the following subject areas.[35]

Law and Ordinances
Accident Records
Education
Engineering
Enforcement
Motor Vehicle Administration
Public Information and Support

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 4-6.

[33] Ibid., p. 2.

[34] "The President's Highway Safety Action Program," (Washington, D. C.: National Safety Council), p. 1.

[35] Ibid.,

This organization met year after year working toward improving our traffic conditions.

Before this time, no national effort had been made in attempt to really place driver education in general education. Other states had taken steps as Texas did to work driver education into the area of general education, but no definite place for this area had been set. No common objective had been formulated. The scope of driver education had not been clearly set. Educators all over this country had not begun to think seriously about finding a place in general education for this new area of safety education. The need for a common agreement concerning its place in general education was quite clear. Thus the conference that was needed to accomplish this task was planned. This need was put forth by Brody and Stack as follows:

> Because of its obvious values, the growth of driver education has been rather dramatic. Research could not keep up with the movement during the thirties and forties. As a result, personal opinion and experiences often took the place of scientific methods in identifying and working out solutions to the many problems encountered. The potential dangers of this situation were recognized by the National Commission on Safety Education of the National Education Association and in cooperation with other national groups the commission called a national conference on High School Driver Education at Jackson's Mill, West Virginia, in October, 1949. Educators from all states were invited to participate as voting delegators. Other safety authorities were asked to serve as consultants. The conclusions of this conference which represents a milestone in the history of the field, were published under the title "High School Driver Education: Policies and Recommendations.[36]

---

[36] Leon Brody and Herbert J. Stack, Highway Safety and Driver Education (New York: Prentice Hall Inc., 1954), pp. 65-66.

The conference drew up a definition for driver education, and then formulated five general objectives. Driver education was defined as, "All those learnings and experiences provided by the school for the purpose of helping students to learn to use motor vehicles safely and efficiently".[37]

It is worthwhile to note the similarity between the objectives formulated by this conference and those of safety education and general education. The objectives of driver education formulated at this conference are:

1. To develop in young people a strong sense of personal and social responsiblity for the common welfare, particularly as it is affected by and involved in the operation of motor vehicles.

2. To develop pride in maintaining high standards of performance, particularly in the operation of motor vehicles.

3. To promote safe, efficient, and enjoyable use of equipment and environment, especially of motor vehicles and highways.

4. To promote effective habits of cooperation in meeting problems of the common welfare especially those concerned with the use of motor vehicles and highways.

5. To prepare young people for socially useful vocations suited to their individual ability, particularly those that involve the use of motor vehicles.[38]

---

[37] Ibid., p. 66.

[38] Ibid., pp. 66-69.

Objectives of safety education formulated by the Commission on Safety Education of the National Education Association are listed below:

1. To develop those understandings, attitudes, appreciations, habits, and skills which will make the child increasingly able to protect himself and others.

2. To develop self-direction and self-responsibility.

3. To develop initiative, foresight, and judgement.

4. To develop an understanding of, and a fundamental respect for, law and order.

5. To develop courtesy and consideration for the welfare of others.

6. To cultivate a social consciousness.

7. To teach a regard for the nation's resources.

8. To develop an understanding of the difference between bravery and bravado, between true adventure and recklessness.

9. To develop a keen responsibility for the fulfillment of one's civic duties.

10. To install ideals of cooperation and service to one's fellow men.

11. To develop an appreciation of the greatest principle of democracy-the supreme worth of the individual.[39]

The objectives stated above support directly the three general objectives set forth by Gordon O. Wilber. They are:

1. To transmit a way of life.

---

[39] Floria, Op. Cit., p. 41.

2. To improve and reconstruct that way of life.

3. To meet the needs of the individual.[40]

About four years after the first meeting of the Conference at Jackson's Mills, it was felt that a review of the recommendations that had been made and exploration of further needs of the field of driver education were necessary. Thus another conference was called. The meeting took place November, 1953, at Michigan State College. This conference was composed of the National Commission on Safety Education, The Nation Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Education Association. The participants met in workshop groups and discussed the following problems:

1. Driver education for adults and out-of-school youths.

2. General supervision, teacher certification, and program standards.

3. Driver education for college students.

4. Research in driver education.

5. Preparation of driver education teachers.

6. Driver education for secondary students.[41]

In general, the recommendations of the second conference reiterated, improved and magnified the policies that had been adopted earlier at Jackson's Mills. There was a common consent that driver education was a vital part of general education, and that all youths

---

[40]Gordon O. Wilber, Industrial Arts in General Education (Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1954), p. 3.

[41]Brody and Stack, Op. Cit., p. 77.

and adults should receive training in this course. It was recommended that driver education be placed at the grade level below, but nearest to, the legal driving age of a student. The recommendation also was made that it should be taught as a separate course on a full semester basis with the same status as other academic or vocational areas of the curriculum including credit acceptable as part of entrance requirements of instruction of higher learning. Driver education was also to be taught at the college level.[42]

Driver education, the new area of safety education, had rightfully won its place in general education. The participants of the two national conferences had stamped approval on the fact that driver education was, and should be recognized as, a phase of general education in Texas as well as all other states.

---

[42] Ibid., pp. 77-78.

CHAPTER III

EXPANSION OF DRIVER EDUCATION IN TEXAS HIGH SCHOOLS (1939-1959)

Initial Driver Education Programs, 1939-1945

Questionnaires received from different high schools in Texas revealed that driver education had its initial beginning in Texas on the secondary level as early as 1939. All indications led to the assumptions that the driver education program of the Baker Junior High School, Austin, Texas, is the oldest or one of the oldest driver education programs in operation on the secondary level in Texas today. This program and four other initial programs will be discussed in this section of this chapter.

From the thrity-six questionnaires returned, five reported programs that were in operation by 1945. This is a very small percentage of the total number of initial driver education programs that were in operation at that time. In the light of this fact the writer wishes to acknowledge that the information here reported may not be a reliable index as to what the typical early program in driver education was like.[1]

It was found that there was great similarity among the factors that influenced the establishment of these initial driver education programs. The increasing automotive accidental rate in Texas was

---

[1] See Appendix A for the names of the schools that had initial driver education programs.

the leading factor. It was felt that if students developed a basic knowledge of safety rules and regulations concerning driving and traffic safety, and developed skill in driving under good supervision, many lives would be saved in the future.

The second major influencing factor was that of the increased number of young drivers. It was noted that their records as drivers were bad and growing worse. Since the number of young drivers was on the increase, it was felt that there were specific needs that demanded careful considerations.

The third factor of major importance was a common feeling that the school was the most logical place to fulfill the needs of the young drivers. This would be the best place for them to develop the correct skills, habits, and attitudes, which contribute to citizenship development.

It appeared that training for young people was the major concern, since no response contained as an influencing factor, a desire for driver education programs for adults.

It was revealed that three of these programs grew out of the industrial arts department. These courses were started and taught by industrial arts teachers. Of these three, it was found that at least two of these programs grew out of the auto-mechanic shops. One course was taught by a health and physical education teachers, the other course was taught by a mathematics teacher.

It appears that the training industrial arts teachers received concerning accidents, their causes, and the prevention of them in shop

and industry, was reflected in their keen interest for the development of ways to prevent automotive accidents. From the basis of this assumption and facts revealed by returned questionnaires, it is further assumed that a large number of the initial driver education programs on the secondary level were started within the Industrial Arts Department, and taught by industrial arts teachers. The fact that most teachers of these initial courses were prepared for work other than driver education proves that a number of the initial programs were taught by teachers who had received little or no formal training in driver education. Evidence points to the fact that the beginning of many initial driver education programs grew out of the interest of classroom teachers.

Eighty per cent of these courses were offered as a separate course. One course was integrated with physical education. Classroom instruction and behind-the-wheel driving were offered in all schools except the two junior high schools. On the basis of the findings concerning the courses taught as separate courses it is assumed that a large number of the initial courses of driver education were not integrated with other subjects, but were taught from the beginning as separate courses. Evidence also points to the fact that few if any junior high schools offered practice driving. All automobiles used in these programs were secured by loan. This means that local automobile associations and dealers were quite interested and cooperative in the development of these and other initial driver education programs.

There was no common method used for the scheduling of these classes. They were scheduled: (a) during study hours (b) at student's off periods

(c) after school hours and (d) during regular class periods. Since driver education was a new addition to the school curriculum, it appears that little or no time had been allotted entirely for this course in many initial driver education programs.

Over half of those schools reported, offered this course as an elective. Two programs were offered as required courses. In the oldest program, driver education replaced auto-mechanics, and it became a requirement for all 8th grade boys. From these findings it is assumed that both methods, elective and requirement, were used quite frequently during the early development of driver education in Texas.

Accidents and Their Effect on Driver Education

The progress of driver education in Texas was retarded during World War II, but there has been a rapid expansion in driver education programs since 1945. More schools began to offer practice driving. College credit courses replaced one-week institutes. There was a noticeable increase in public support. By 1945, more than eighty organizations endorsed driver education. The growth, during the period from 1945 to 1950 in driver education programs was astonishing.[2]

Only a few schools on the secondary level offered driver education in Texas before 1940, but by 1958, 736 Texas High Schools offered driver education as approved courses. This represents more than fifty

---

[2] Leon Brody, Highway Safety and Driver Education, (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945), p. 67.

per cent of the total number of public high schools in Texas.[3] The increased use of the automobile and its effect on society has had its effect on this expansion. The automobile has raised the standard of living everywhere, but, along with the good things, it has also brought destruction and damage to many. In 1940, Texas had 1,763,255 vehicles registered for operation, but in 1958 there were 4,179,100 vehicles registered, which means that there are twice as many automobiles in operation today as there were just a few years ago.[4]

Along with this increased number of vehicles came increased speed and power. Roads proved to be inadequate as well as man's knowledge concerning the safe operation of these powerful machines. This led to one of the most talked about situations of modern times "traffic accidents". This situation has caused more concern and interest in the expansion of driver education in Texas than any other factor.

The automobile is the number one killer of today. More than 2,300 Texans die from traffic accidents annually. Table I on page 42 shows that the most critical stage of motor vehicle traffic deaths came in 1956. In that year 2,611 persons lost their lives. It also shows a slight improvement for the two following years. These accidents cost Texans over $300,000,000 annually. This table reveals that motor vehicle deaths and injuries rank well above every other single accidental cause of death. It has caused more than 40% of all

---

[3]A report of the "Eleventh Annual National High School Driver Education Award Program" (New York: Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 1958), p. 45.

[4]Texas Department of Public Safety, Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents (Austin, Texas, 1958), p. 4.

accidental deaths for each of the last three years, and on an average it has caused 17% of all accidental injuries during the same period of time.[5] On an average, a person was killed every 3 hours and 44 minutes; a persons was injured every 4 minutes; and an accident occured every 83 seconds on the streets and roadways during 1958 in Texas.[6]

Situations like this have prevailed for quite some time. In 1940, 1.757 persons died from Texas traffic accidents. Looking at

TABLE I

REPORT OF TEXAS ACCIDENTS (1956-1958)

Causes	Killed			Injured		
	1956*	1957**	1958***	1956	1957	1958
Motor Vehicle	2,611	2,539	2,343	111,501	122,195	111,842
Home	1,300	1,393	1,202	195,000	208,950	72,120#
Industry	650	763	678	235,288	229,900	207,882
Farm, Ranch, School and Miscellaneous	1,600	880	481	240,000	132,000	88,940
Public Non-Motor Vehicle	-----	-----	845	-------	-------	126,750#
Total	6,176	5,575	5,548	781,789	693,045	622,534 plus

*Texas Safety Association, Past Present Future, (Austin, Texas, 1956), p. 6.

**Texas Safety Association, An Ounce of Prevention, (Austin, Texas 1957), p. 5.

***Texas Safety Association, The Challenge is Yours, (Austin, Texas 1958), p. 5.

#Estimated.

---

[5] Texas Safety Association, Past Present Future, (Austin, Texas, 1956), p. 5.

[6] Texas Department of Public Safety, loc. cit., p. 3.

Table II on page 44, it can be seen that the accident rate was quite serious during the Forties as well as the Fifties. The number of miles traveled by Texans increased, but the number of auto-accidents decreased. The 2,342 traffic deaths in 1958 was the lowest number for any year since 1949 when 1,957 were killed. While traffic deaths were being reduced by 197, accidents increased from 261,000 in 1957 to 304,000 in 1958. Injuries increased from 122,000 in 1957 to 127,000 in 1958.

On all rural roads there were reductions in deaths except on farm-to-market designated highways where deaths increased by 10%. Regularly patrolled rural state and United States highways showed a reduction in deaths of 15%.[7]

The figures shwon in Table II represent Texas' share of the approximately 35,000 or more persons killed each year in the United States.[8] Texans are involved in slightly less than 7% of all accidental deaths caused by automobiles in the United States.

Texas teenagers are permitted to drive at a rather early age. Under certain conditions one can get an operator's license at the age of fourteen. This adds to the problem caused by Texas teenage drivers. However only.1% of this age group operated vehicles in 1958. Table III on page 45 reveals that six male drivers of this age group were killed in Texas during 1958. In general, far more

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, High School Driver Education? (New York: 1956), p. 2.

TABLE II

CHANGES IN MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC DEATHS AND VEHICLE MILEAGE IN TEXAS (1940-1958)*

Years	Deaths	Increase or Decrease in Deaths	Deaths per 100,000,000 Miles Traveled
1940	1,757	+ 5.71%	10.9
1941	1,979	+ 11.01%	11.1
1942	1,316	- 9.86%	8.2
1943	1,179	- 21.06%	9.2
1944	1,373	+ 7.36%	9.8
1945	1,517	+ 14.32%	9.7
1946	1,959	+ 32.75%	9.5
1947	1,997	+ 10.50%	8.7
1948	2,059	+ 8.74%	8.3
1949	1,957	- 8.13%	7.3
1950	2,410	+ 13.08%	7.9
1951	2,546	+ 8.38%	7.8
1952	2,498	- 7.58%	7.0
1953	2,368	- 4.12%	6.4
1954	2,431	+ 0.25%	6.6
1955	2,547	+ 7.54%	6.4
1956	2,611	+ 1.22%	6.5
1957	2,539	- 5.72%	6.0
1958	2,342	- 3.43%	5.3

*Texas Department of Public Safety, Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents, (Austin, Texas, 1958), p.2.

+Increase in Deaths.

-Decrease in Deaths.

TABLE III

TEXAS MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTAL DEATHS-1958
STATE-WIDE URBAN AND RURAL*

Age	Drivers		Pedestrians	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
14	6	0	0	2
15	9	1	2	0
16	13	6	3	0
17	25	3	3	1
18	21	2	1	1
19	31	2	2	1
20	33	1	1	2
21	26	2	2	0
22	26	0	3	0
23	38	0	3	0
24	22	2	3	0
25	22	1	2	0
26	27	4	2	0
27	31	0	1	2
28	27	2	2	0

*Texas Department of Public Safety, Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents, (Austin, Texas, 1958), p. 34.

male drivers were killed than were female drivers at all age levels.[9] However, there are more male drivers than there are female drivers in Texas.

In Texas only 6.9% of all drivers fall in the age group of fourteen to nineteen years, yet this group has a considerable number of accidents. The most reckless group of drivers is not the teenager group. As shown by Table III, page 45, those persons ranging from twenty to twenty four years of age, 11.5% of all drivers, have more accidents than any other group. Accidents increased sharply with the sixteen year old group and continued an upward trend until around twenty-five. It levels off at this age and decreases at approximately thirty.[10]

Most female drivers' deaths occured at the age of 16. After this first year of driving there was a sharp decrease in deaths which remained rather low thereafter. Table III, page 45 shows that female drivers have safer driving records than the male drivers, and they also seem to have developed better pedestrian habits.[11]

Most Texans who died from the result of an automobile accident lost their lives on rural highways. In 1958, 1,294 accidents of this nature happened. This figure represents 55% of all accidents caused by automobiles in Texas in 1958.[12]

---

[9] Texas Department of Public Safety, loc. cit., p. 34.

[10] Ibid., p. 32.

[11] Ibid., p. 34.

[12] Ibid., pp. 2-9.

The major causes of rural accidents are listed in Table IV on page 47.

There is direct relation between these accidents just reported and untrained drivers. Untrained drivers cause problems that can most logically be solved by driver education. The contrast of the number of violations and accidents caused by trained and untrained drivers has had a great influence on the expansion of driver education in Texas.

TABLE IV

MAJOR CAUSATIVE FACTORS IN RURAL ACCIDENTS
(FATAL ACCIDENTS)

Causes of Accidents	1956	1957	1958
Too Fast for Conditions	58%	57%	52%
Driving while Drinking	39%	34%	42%
Disregard Warning or Stop Sign	8%	23%	20%
Wrong Side of Road	9%	16%	17%
Did not have Right-of-Way	3%	8%	7%
Improper passing	5%	8%	6%
Improper parking	3%	2%	1%
Following too closely	1%	1%	1%

*Texas Department of Public Safety, Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents, (Austin, Texas, 1958), p. 28.

In the few years that driver education has been offered as a formal subject in public schools, careful surveys show that drivers completing driver education courses in public schools can,

as a group, drive year after year with 50% fewer accidents than the untrained drivers.[13] One of the primary reasons for the bad record of the untrained drivers is that they have "picked up" habits from friends and relatives, who often teach but do not have sufficient knowledge about driver education to give this vital instruction.

A poll was once taken at a large city automobile show, which revealed that 90% of the nearly eight thousand drivers polled had learned to drive without a systematic driving course. Of this number 38% had taught themselves to drive.[14]

Those untrained drivers had missed the valuable instruction that was provided by the high schools. Courses in driver education would have taught them correct attitudes about driving on the streets and roadways, and provided for them knowledge that would have meant the difference between driving safely or recklessly.

A survey of 1,500 trained and 1,500 untrained drivers was conducted in the state of Pennsylvania. From comparison of these two groups, it was found that only fourty-one accidents were committed by the trained drivers and seventeen arrests were made. For the second group, the number was much higher. One hundred and one accidents were committed and eighty-six members of this group were arrested.[15]

---

[13] Texas Federation of Women's Clubs, How to Increase and to Improve Driver Education in Texas Public Schools, (Austin, Texas, 1956), p. 2.

[14] American Automobile Association, Sportmanlike Driving, (Washington, D. C., 1955), p. 16.

[15] Texas Education Agency, A Report of Driver Education in Our Schools, (Austin, Texas, 1956), p. 4.

A similar survey was conducted in Delaware. Eight hundred trained drivers and eight hundred untrained drivers were the subjects for this study. Only twenty-four accidents were committed by the trained drivers. The untrained drivers committed 112 accidents. Thirty-one trained drivers were arrested compared to 219 arrests for untrained drivers.[16]

Texas is no exception to this type of situation. A survey was conducted at the Crozier Technical High School of Dallas, Texas. This school has one of the oldest driver education programs in Texas.

Two hundred trained students and two hundred untrained students were surveyed. Only twenty-eight traffic tickets were issued to members of the trained group. The tickets issued to the untrained group of students amounted to 478.[17]

Situations like these just reported can be found in most of our major cities. These situations, especially when the young driver is involved, have a direct bearing on the rate of liability insurance rates.

More than ten years ago a study to determine the influence of age upon driving records was conducted in Connecticut by its Motor Vehicle Department. This study was based upon accident reports for the period 1932 to 1936. It indicated that licensed operators under 25 years of age were involved in far more than their share of fatal and non-fatal accidents. It was on the basis of this study that recognition of the extra hazard of the youthful driver was first

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Jim Tysor, Value of Driver Education, (Austin, Texas: Texas Department of Public Safety, 1957), p. 1.

introduced in determining rates for automobile liability insurance.[18]

The cost of insurance premiums is determined in part by the accident experiences of all the persons insured by the company. If there is an increase in the number of costly accidents, the company is out of an increased sum of money. To offset this increase, premium rates are increased. Because of the serious driving record of young people, many companies refuse to issue policies where the car will be driven by a person under 25 years of age unless a much higher premium is paid.[19]

Texans are paying for the lack of driver education in the form of increased insurance rates. A boy or girl can cause the insurance on the family car to increase over $150.00 in four years, providing they have not completed a state approved course in driver education.[20]

Students who have completed a driver education course of 30 hours classroom instruction and 6 hours behind-the-wheel practice driving in Texas can enjoy a 10% discount in automobile liability insurance rates.[21]

---

[18] William H. Brewster, Teen-Age Drivers and Their Influence on Automobile Liability Insurance Rates, (New York: National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters, 1956), p. 1.

[19] American Automobile Association, loc. cit. p. 381.

[20] Department of Public Safety, Driver Education in Our Schools. (Austin, Texas, 1956), p. 10

[21] Ibid.

Nature of the Present Programs

Data for this section of Chapter III were supplied by 31 questionnaires. These responses came from schools having programs that had their initial beginning after 1945. The two parts of this questionnaire supplied data concerning the early development and the present status of each program.

Driver education began in several of the major cities of Texas before World War II.

Classroom instruction in driver education was taught in some of Houston's high schools before 1941. However, behind-the-wheel driving did not appear until 1946. At that time, this phase of driver education was added to two senior high schools in Houston. By the year of 1946 all junior high schools of this city offered classroom instruction in driver education, which amounted to 30 hours. That course satisfied the state requirement as prescribed by Texas law. At the present time, all but one senior high school in Houston offer practice driving and all junior high schools offer courses in driver education. However, behind-the-wheel driving is not offered by any of the junior high schools of Houston.[22]

As revealed by responses of returned questionnaires, school administrators led out in the development of the programs which were started after 1945. Table V, page 52, shows that 42% of the superintendents took a leading role in the establishment of these programs. Only

---

[22] Letter from Edwin D. Martin, Assistant Superintendent, Houston Independent School District, Houston, Texas, January 8, 1959.

6% of the schools reported teachers as having taken a leading role in the establishment of their courses. This shows a contrast between the establishment of these programs and those started before 1945. A majority of those programs were organized under the leadership of the classroom teacher.

TABLE V

PERSONS WHO WERE INSTRUMENTAL IN ORGANIZING DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS (1945-1959)

Position Held	Number of Programs Organized	Percentage of Total Schools
Superintendents	13	42%
Principals	11	35%
Curriculum Coordinators	7	23%
Parent Teacher Associations	5	16%
Physical Education Supervisors	4	13%
Teachers	2	6%
Others	10	32%

As revealed by Table V, page 52, a remarkable number of persons holding positions other than those within the public school systems were leaders in the development of many of these programs.

The establishment of these programs for the most part were influenced by realization that the students had needs which could be met by such programs. This was an influencing factor in almost half of the schools reported. The Texas accident situation as an influencing

factor shows a slight decline in priority after 1945. It was the number one influencing factor in the programs begun before 1945. (See Table VI below).

TABLE VI

MAJOR FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED THE DEVELOPMENT OF DRIVER EDUCATION (1945-1959)

Influencing Factors	Number of Times they Appeared	Percentage of Total Number of Programs
A necessity for a program to meet the needs of students and other young drivers	15	48%
Increased Accidents	12	39%
A need for trained drivers	6	19%
A desire of parents for students to learn to drive under proper instruction	5	16%
For insurance benefits	3	10%
Others	12	39%

There is a noticeable increase in the recognition that students today have specific needs which can and should be met by the schools through driver education programs.

For the most part, the teachers of the courses after 1945 were selected entirely on the basis of their qualification. More than 90% were selected by this method. One per cent of the teachers of these courses volunteered to teach a class in driver education. The other

few per cent were selected by other methods. This points up the fact that qualification is the basic method used in selecting driver education teachers today. This also points up the fact that most of the teachers of driver education today are qualified to teach the course.

Most teachers of the initial driver education courses after 1945 taught other subjects before qualifying for driver education. Only the driver education programs that have been established in the last few years received instructors who were trained especially to teach driver education. Table VII, page 55, reveals that a majority of the first teachers, of the early programs following the year 1945 had taught physical education. More than one-fourth of all teachers had worked in this area. Most of the other teachers had either taught industrial arts or a social studies course.

This shows a slight contrast between this group of early teachers with those of the initial driver education programs of 1939 to 1945. More teachers of those programs were instructors of industrial arts courses.

Table VIII, page 56 shows that 70% of these courses were first taught as separate courses. Only a few were integrated with other courses such as physical education, industrial arts, and home economics, and social studies. There is noticeable similarity in this group and the group of courses taught before 1945 in this respect.

Both classroom instruction and practice driving were given in 83% of the schools which responded. Three junior high schools and

two senior high schools offered only classroom instruction. Only one junior high school reported teaching practice driving. Evidence point to the fact that very few junior high schools offer behind-the-wheel training.

TABLE VII

POSITIONS HELD BY THE FIRST TEACHERS OF DRIVER EDUCATION IN TEXAS HIGH SCHOOLS (1945-1959)

Position Held Before Teaching Driver Education	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Total Teachers
Physical Education	8	25.8%
Industrial Education	5	16.1%
Social Studies	4	12.9%
Just out of College	3	9.7%
Unknown	6	19.4%
Others	5	16.1%
Total	31	100.0%

Ninety per cent of all schools that offered behind-the-wheel driving operated only one car. These cars were secured by loan in most cases. Only eleven per cent of the cars used were purchased by the local school board.

On an average, there were 15 students per class. However, most schools had more than one class in driver education.

There was a great variety of methods used for the scheduling of practice driving. Only 19% of those schools that offered behind-the-

wheel instruction had a designated period set for nothing but driving at that time. Most of these schools taught practice driving during study hours. One school reported having an over-crowded condition and a shortage of teachers, which resulted in students taking practice driving whenever they could find time and caught the teacher free. Another school reported having to offer practice driving one Saturdays to cope with the overcrowded condition of the driver education classes. (See Table IX, page 57).

TABLE VIII

METHODS USED TO TEACH INITIAL DRIVER EDUCATION COURSES AFTER 1945

Subjects Taught As/or as a Part of	Number of Programs	Percentage of Total Programs
Separate Course	22	71%
Physical Education	3	10%
Social Studies	3	10%
Industrial Arts and Home Economy	2	6%
Science	1	3%
Total	31	100%

Eighty-four per cent of the present courses in driver education were reported to have been offered on an elective basis. Only five schools required that driver education be taken.

Of this group, four were junior high schools and one was a senior high school. One junior high school required its 8th grade students to

take theory. No practice driving was offered at this school. The other three junior high schools required theory for their ninth grade students. Only one of these offered behind-the-wheel driving. It was offered to tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students. The senior high school required its students to take driver education theory at the ninth grade level. Practice driving was given the summer following the completion of classroom instruction.

TABLE IX

METHODS USED IN SCHEDULING BEHIND-THE-WHEEL DRIVING IN THE INITIAL PROGRAMS FOLLOWING THE YEAR OF 1945

Methods Used	Number of Programs Used in this Method	Percentage of Total Programs
During Study Hour	18	69%
Regular Class Period (55 minutes)	5	19%
At Off Period	2	8%
By Other Methods	1	4%
Total	26	100%

Most practice driving courses were offered on a tenth through twelfth grade basis. However, different methods were used. It was sometimes taught on a ninth through twelfth grade basis, in other cases it was taught only to ninth and tenth grade students, tenth and eleventh grade students, and one school offered it to seniors only.

One elective course was offered to students in the ninth grade and/or students who were fifteen years old. Another elective course was offered to students who were fifteen years and four months old.

Table X, below, shows that 50% of all cars used were secured by a loan. Forty-two per cent were secured by the local school board. This last figure shows an increase in interest on the part of the school boards, according to the number of cars that were purchased by the school boards for early programs.

TABLE X

PRESENT METHODS USED TO SECURE CARS FOR PRACTICE DRIVING

Methods Used	Number of Schools that Used This Method	Percentage of Total Practice Driving Programs
By loan	13	50%
By lease	1	4%
Purchased by School Board	11	42%
By other Methods	1	4%
Total	26	100%

Of the present programs, 88 per cent of the schools that offered behind-the-wheel training used a dual control driver education program. The others conducted other types of programs.

Only two schools reported having an auto-trainer. One of these schools was a junior high school that offered only classroom instruction. The other was a senior high school that offered both phases of driver education.

Seventy-eight per cent of the responses revealed that students had an excellent attitude toward their driver education program. The remaining 22% were rated as having a good attitude toward their programs.

In one of these cases class theory was conducted on alternate days. Behind-the-wheel driving had been discontinued due to the policy of the school board of charging a $25.00 tuition fee per student. The other course was an elective course offered only to tenth grade pupils.

Some schools reported that they received support from local community organizations, but forty-five per cent of these schools reported that no support came from the local community organizations. The local police led all other organizations in giving support to the driver education program. The parent teacher association followed the police department in lending support to driver education programs. (See Table XI, page 60).

Twenty-three per cent of all schools reported that driver education was offered to adults. Three schools conducted summer classes which were open to adults and students. Of these three, a tuition fee of $24.00 per student was charged in one case and a tuition fee of $25.00 per student was charged in another case. The third school did not report a fee for this course.

Four schools conducted after school/evening classes for adults. No charge of fee was reported.

Present Trends and Future Prospects for the Expansion of Driver Education in Texas

With the constant increase in power of modern automobiles, the advancement of adequate highways, and the number of drivers and vehicles increasing yearly by the millions, there is no turning back for driver education. It is here to stay.

More teachers are being prepared each year. More than 400 co courses in driver education are taught at 200 or more colleges which offer such courses throughout the United States.[23]

TABLE XI

ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPORTED THE PRESENT DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Name of Organization	Number of Schools aided	Percentage of total programs
Local Police Department	14	29%
Parent Teacher Association	5	16%
Local Insurance Companies	4	13%
Junior Chamber of Commerce	3	10%
Local Automobile Dealers	3	10%
Local Safety Councils	2	6%
Others	6	19%
No Support	14	45%

More schools in Texas are adding driver education to their curriculum each year. In ten years Texas progressed from 168 schools that offered driver education in 1947 to 736 schools that offered driver education in 1957. In 1946 approximately 40% of all public high schools in Texas offered driver education. Today over half of the public high schools in Texas offer driver education.[24] During the year of 1957,

---

[23]Leon Brody, Highway Safety and Driver Education. (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1954), pp. 432-433.

[24]Accident Prevention Department, "National High School Driver Education Award Program," (New York: Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 1957), pp. 34-44.

59.6% of the 736 public high schools in Texas that were offering driver education granted credit toward graduation for this course.[25]

Texas educators are constantly planning for the expansion and improvement of driver education. In January, 1958, the Texas State Board of Education authorized eleven curriculum commissions to study different phases of the secondary school curriculum and to make recommendations for the improvement of these areas.

The report of the commission on Safety and Driver Education shows evidence of a brighter future for the expansion of driver education in Texas.

Reports of these committees are being submitted to school administrators, teachers and all citizens of Texas for study during the 1959-1960 school year. Following the suggestions for additions, deletions, and changes in the proposed standards, final recommendations will be submitted to the State Board of Education in mid-1960.[26]

These recommendations, if accepted, will improve upon our present standards in driver education.[27]

Some of the recommendations of the Commission on Safety and Driver Education[28] are listed below:

1. It is recommended that schools make it possible for all students to receive training in Driver and Traffic Safety Education

---

[25] Ibid., p. 44.

[26] Report to the Texas Education Agency of the Commission on Safety and Driver Education, Texas Education Agency July, 1959, p. i.

[27] See Appendix C for a copy of "Standards for an Approved Course in Driver Education for Texas Schools," 1957.

[28] Report to the Texas Education Agency by the Commission on Safety and Driver Education, Austin, Texas, July, 1959., pp. 6-13.

2. The course could be taught as an elective course if desired.

3. The course should be a part of the regular school curriculum.

4. The instructor of driver education should not be required to put in any more time than the teacher of any other subjects.

5. The school should receive a written permit from each parent, to enroll his child in practice driving before the student begins this phase of training.

6. Credit toward high school graduation should be based on the following factors:

   (a) One-half credit will be granted to students who satisfactory complete a Driver and Traffic Education course of a full semester of the classroom phase and minimum practice driving program. Such a program will consist of five periods per week for a semester for all students enrolled.

   (b) Not more than one-fourth credit will be granted to students who satisfactorily complete a Driver and Traffic Safety Education course consisting of 30 clock hours of classroom instruction, six hours of practice driving, and six hours in a training car to observe the driving of the other students.

7. An approved driver education course should include both classroom instruction and behind-the-wheel driving.

8. Classroom instruction should include the following subjects:

   (a) The Driver and Pedestrian
   (b) The Automobile and Preventive Maintenance
   (c) Highway Characteristics and Traffic Engineering Control
   (d) Highway Traffic Laws
   (e) Driving Procedures
   (f) Physical Laws
   (g) The President's Highway Safety Action Program
   (h) Evaluation

9. At least 27 hours of the 30 hours should be devoted to formal classroom instruction. The other 3 hours may be

used for activities such as outside speakers, psychophysical testing devices, and field trips.

10. If a regular course of one semester is offered, additional time should be devoted to traffic laws and driving procedure.

11. A student should not practice drive more than 60 minutes per day.

12. The student should not complete his minimum six hours of driving practice in fewer than 12 calendar days.

13. The instructor should devote at least four hours of the six hours, and any additional time note needed for elementary lessons and skill exercises, to urban and/or rural practice.

14. An automobile equipped with a dual brake control should be furnished.

15. The teacher should be required to:

    (a) Have a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution of higher learning and a valid teacher's certificate.

    (b) Be endorsed in the field of Driver and Traffic Safety Education. (A minor in Safety Education is desirable)

    (c) Have valid Texas Drivers' License.

    (d) A three-year driving record, State and local, free from repeated accident experiences and numerous traffic law violations.

    (e) Have good physical, mental, and emotional health.

Financial Aid and Supporting Organizations

There are more than a dozen states that provide financial assistance for their driver education programs. Texas has not worked up to this point yet. The local school boards are entirely responsible for supporting their own driver education program.

A number of national, state and local organizations that do not give financial support, do aid the teachers by supplying teaching material, consultative services, program suggestions, and other aid.[29]

---

[29] See Appendix B for a list of organizations that support Driver Education.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND PROBLEMS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study is primarily an investigation of the development of driver education in the high schools of Texas from 1937 to 1959. In addition, it is a study of the factors which led to the recognition and acceptance of driver education as a phase of general education, the major factors which cause automotive accidents in Texas, and the requirements for an approved driver education program.

In order to conduct this study, the investigation was centered around the following questions:

1. How does driver education support general education?
2. What was the nature of the initial high school driver education programs in Texas?
3. What is the status of the present driver education programs in the high schools of Texas?

Summary

Driver education had its initial beginning in America shortly after the turn of the Twentieth Century. It is difficult to say just where driver education first began in America. However, it is known that driver education programs were organized around 1930 within the states of Delaware, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. These courses, and other driver education courses that were established later, grew out of the situation caused by an increased use of the automobile,

an increase in automobile accidents, and other problems brought about by the automobile.

The development of driver education in America was rather slow during the early years of its progress, but as it gained public support it also gained in momentum.

Driver education was taught in its very early stage as a co-curricular activity. But following World War II, which had put driver education programs in a state of arrest, there was a rapid growth in the number of programs with an addition of the phase known as behind-the-wheel driving. From that time until the present, we have witnessed a steady increase in the development of driver education in America.

The expansion of driver education reached Texas in 1937. The first driver education course in this state was taught at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas during the summer of 1937. The purpose of that course was to prepare teachers for the future driver education programs that were expected to be organized on the secondary school level at a later date.

Within a period of four years, programs, such as the one that was conducted by the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, had been organized at The University of Texas, and North Texas State Teachers College.

It is not known just when and where driver education first found its way into the secondary level of the Texas school system, but it is known that it had made its arrival by 1939. A course in

driver education was taught at the Baker Junior High School, Austin, Texas in 1939.

Increasing automotive accident rates in Texas had more influence on the establishment of initial driver education programs in the public high schools of Texas than any other factor. The establishment of these programs was also influenced to a great extent by a common belief that young drivers had specific needs that could be met by high school driver education programs.

A majority of the initial driver education courses were offsprings of the industrial education departments, and were taught by industrial arts teachers. A few courses were taught by physical education and mathematics teachers. Eighty per cent of these initial driver education courses reported, were offered as separate courses.

The classroom teacher took a leading role in the establishment of over half of the initial driver education programs.

The junior high schools of the initial group did not offer behind-the-wheel driving. The other schools that conducted both phases of driver education secured their cars by way of loans.

There was no set pattern for the scheduling of practice driving. However, most schools scheduled this phase of driver education during study hour periods.

Over one-half of the schools that had initial driver education courses offered them as elective courses.

There was an increase in interest on the part of school administrators for driver education after 1945. Forty-two per cent of the initial driver education programs after 1945 were led in their

organization by superintendents. These programs were influenced, in most cases, by the belief that students had needs that should be fulfilled by a high school driver education program.

Teachers of these courses were selected, in most cases, on the basis of their qualifications.

Approximately 71% of the initial driver education programs after 1945 were offered as separate courses. Other courses were integrated with physical education, social studies, industrial arts, home economics classes, and science.

The practices used in scheduling behind-the-wheel driving in the current programs are the same as those of the initial programs. Most schools that offered this phase of driver education scheduled driving during the students' study hour. Almost three-fourths of all schools that offer driver education offer this phase . .

Eighty-four per cent of the current courses in driver education are offered as electives.

One-half of the cars used in the current programs are secured by loan. Forty-two per cent of the schools that now have driver education programs reported that their cars were secured by the local board of education. Eighty-eight per cent of all cars that were operated were dual control.

Many community organizations support high school driver education programs. However, forty-five per cent of all the schools that have driver education programs receive no support from community organizations. The local police force leads in the number of schools aided by any single community agency. Parent Teacher Associations

rank second in supporting driver education programs.

Over three-fourths of the students of the present classes have excellent attitudes toward their driver education program according to respondents to the questionnaire used in this study.

Most of the automotive accidents committed in Texas are caused by male drivers, however most drivers in Texas are male drivers. The male drivers between 19 and 25 years of age commit more accidents than any other age-group. Texas female drivers have far safer driving records than do the male drivers.

In Texas, students who have completed an approved course of driver education can enjoy a 10% deduction in liability insurance rates.

Some schools have to charge a tuition fee for behind-the-wheel driving in order to aid in financing the driver education program. It was suggested by some educators in the field of driver education that the state aid those programs that need financial assistance.

Only two schools reported having auto-trainers to supplement practice driving.

Even though course standards for driver education had been set by the Texas Education Agency by 1940, the progress in the development of driver education was slow until after World War II. Since that time, the growth in the number of approved driver education programs has been tremendous. Today more than half of the public high schools of Texas offer courses in driver education. More than half of the public high schools in Texas that offer driver education, grant

credit toward graduation for this course.

The present trend of driver education in Texas is toward further expansion and development. The present standards for an approved course of driver education for Texas schools are being revised in order to do a better job in meeting the needs of Texas youths and adults.

Conclusions

In so far as the data supplied by the different sources are accurate, the following conclusions may be drawn relative to the development of driver education in Texas.

The fact that at least three states had driver education programs in operation around 1930, that grew out of the situation caused by the increased use of the automobile and accidents caused by them, indicates that some educators became aware of the need for driver education.

Due to the fact that driver education progressed slowly in America during its early stage of development, it appears that driver education went through a stage of experiementation before gaining a noticeable amount of public support.

Since driver education in America was taught in its early stage as a co-curricular activity in many cases, it seems logical to conclude that classroom instruction in driver education was engaged in a more extensive basis in the early programs than was the practice driving phase.

The rapid expansion of driver education programs that contained behind-the-wheel driving in America following World War II can be attributed, to a great extent, to the economic prosperity which caused a rather rapid increase in automobile transportation, which in turn resulted in a higher rate of automobile accidents.

The classroom teacher took the leading role in the establishment of initial driver education programs in Texas before 1945. This fact suggests that school administrators were slow to accept and support the new idea of offering driver education on the secondary school level.

Since more than half of the initial driver education programs that were in operation before 1945 were outgrowths of industrial education departments, and since a noticeable percentage of these were connected with the auto-mechanic courses, it may be concluded that driver education courses were correlated with auto-mechanic courses more often than any other course within the industrial education field.

Both initial and present driver education programs used cars that were secured, in most cases, by loan. Apparently this method of securing cars is the most accepted, most economical, and most convenient.

Most practice driving in the initial and present driver education programs was scheduled during the students' study periods. In view of this fact, it is certain that in many cases no special time has been allotted entirely for practice driving in Texas high schools.

In the light of the fact that most schools which offer courses in driver education offer them on an elective basis, and that most students taking these courses have excellent attitudes toward driver education, it would appear that a majority of the students enrolled in driver education courses in Texas schools today have done so because of personal interest.

Since almost all teachers of the present driver education programs in Texas were selected on the basis of qualification, it is a logical assumption that most students of driver education in Texas high schools are taught by well trained instructors.

A majority of the automobile accidents in Texas are committed by male drivers. Those male drivers between the ages of 19 and 25 commit more accidents than any other age-group. In view of these facts it seems logical to conclude that the expansion of driver education in Texas has been influenced to a great extent by the driving records set by young male drivers.

Forty-five per cent of all present schools reported that their driver education programs received no support from community organizations. This fact leads to the conclusion that a number of communities have not been sold on the value of a high school driver education program.

The fact that only two schools reported operating auto-trainers indicates that the auto-trainer as a teaching aid is not used to a great extent in Texas.

The act of revising the present standards of driver education for Texas schools, reveals that state level educators are taking

steps to improve our driver education programs.

Recommendations

In view of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations seem apparent:

Since a large per cent of automotive accidents in Texas are committed by young male drivers, it is recommended that all male students be required to take driver education before they are graduated from high school.

It is further recommended that teachers of driver education classes give careful consideration to factors that might lead to the discovery of a need for different types of driver education programs for male and female drivers.

It is recommended that the common practice of scheduling behind-the-wheel driving during study periods, after school hours, on Saturdays etc. be replaced with designated class periods within the regular school day, provided entirely for this phase of driver education in all Texas schools that offer driver education.

Since courses in driver education meet a need that is common to all students, it is recommended that all high schools in Texas provide courses in driver education.

It is recommended that any person who is at fault in one or more major accidents, due to negligence on his part or due to his lack of adequate skills and/or knowledge of driving, be required to attend approved courses in driver education.

Due to the fact that many adults completed formal education before driver education entered the public school system, it is

recommended that more schools offer courses in driver education to adults.

It is recommended that community organizations such as the Parent Teacher Association, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Mother's Club, etc., support the school driver education programs by providing activities which will stimulate interest on the part of students and adults in driver education.

In order to maintain the excellent attitudes toward driver education that most of our students have, and to encourage more students to become interested in driver education, it is recommended that all schools that have driver education programs present some type of award and give special recognition to outstanding students of driver and safety education.

In behalf of the students' and teachers' safety, as well as the safety of others, it is recommended that school personnel do not attempt to conduct a course in behind-the-wheel driving without a dual-control car.

In order to provide some form of practice driving for students who recieve only classroom instruction, it is recommended that programs that consist of only this phase of driver education be furnished auto-trainers.

Problems for Further Study

The writer feels that the problems listed below offer some suggestions as to areas of driver education that need further

investigation. It is sugested that:

A study be conducted to determine how many schools in Texas need financial aid in order to conduct a first class driver education program.

A further study be conducted to determine to what extent Texas adults are being educated in driver education.

A study be conducted to determine the nature of the aid given to driver education programs in Texas by community organizations.

A study be conducted to determine whether the time that practice driving is scheduled, such as during study periods, at off periods, during summer, etc., has any effect on the outcome of the student as a driver.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Automobile Association. Sportmanlike Driving. Washington, D. C.: American Automobile Company, 1955.

_____. Driver and Traffic Education. Washington, D. C.: American Automobile Company, 1958.

Brody, Leon and Stack, Herbert J. Highway Safety and Driver Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945.

Florio, A.E. and Stafford G. T. Safety Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

National Conference on Driver Education. Policies and Practices for Driver Education. Michigan: National Commission on Safety Education, 1954.

Stack, Herbert James. Education for Safe Living. New York: Prentice-Hall Publishing Company, 1949.

Texas Department of Education. Training Youthful Drivers. Austin: Texas Department of Public Safety.

Texas Department of Public Safety. Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents. Austin: Texas Department of Public Safety, 1958.

Texas Safety Association. Texas and the Action Program for Traffic Control. Austin: Texas Safety Association, Inc., 1958.

White, Earnest B. The Road to Better Driving. New York: Cambridge Book Company, 1955.

Whitney, Albert W. Man and the Motor Car. New York: J. J. Little and Ives Company, 1936.

Wilber, Gordon O. Industrial Arts in General Education. Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1954.

Reports

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies. Tenth Annual National High School Award Program. New York: Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 1957.

_____. Eleventh Annual National High School Award Program. New York: Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 1958.

Pacific Lutheran College. Teacher Education Certification, and Program Standards for Driver Education. A report prepared by the National Conference on Teacher Education. Washington: Pacific Lutheran College, 1956.

Texas Education Agency. Safety and Driver Education. A report of the Commission on Safety and Driver Education, Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1959.

Pamphlets

Accident Prevention Department. High School Driver Education. New York: Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 1956.

Brewster, Williams H. Teen-age Drivers and Their Influence on Automobile Liability Insurance Rates. New York: National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters, 1956.

Department of Public Safety. Driver Education in Our Schools. Austin: Department of Public Safety, 1956.

National Safety Council. The President's Highway Safety Action Program. Washington, D. C. National Safety Council.

Texas Department of Public Safety. Mission of Texas Department of Public Safety. Austin: Texas Department of public safety, 1959.

Texas Federation of Women's Club. How to Increase and to Improve Driver Education in Texas. Austin: Texas Department of Public Safety.

Texas Safety Association. A Story of the Past, Present, Future. Austin: Texas Safety Association, 1956.

_____. Ounce of Prevention. Austin: Texas Safety Association, 1957.

_____. The Challenge is Yours. Austin: Texas Safety Association, 1958.

Tysor, Jim. Value of Driver Education. Austin: Texas Department of Public Safety, 1957.

Unpublished Materials

Brougher, Stephen. "A Survey of Driver Education and Training in the Schools of Texas". Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Texas, Austin, 1951.

Christman, Webster M. "A Study of Certain Administrative Features of Driver"Education" and "Training" Courses in the High Schools of the United States in 1940". Unpublished Master's thesis. The Graduate School Department of Industrial Education, Pennsylvania State College, Philadelphia, 1940.

Loft, Bernard I. "The Effects of Driver Education on Driver Knowledge and attitudes in selected Public Secondary Schools of Indianapolis and Marion Counties". Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1956.

Neyhart, Amos E. "The Relation of the Training and other Characteristics of Automobile Drivers to Their Proness to Accidents". Unpublished Master's thesis, The Pennsylvania State College, Philadelphia, 1934.

Yost, Charles Peter. "An Analysis of Graduate Theses in School Safety in the United States from 1925 to 1950". Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, 1956.

Letters

Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. Letter from Leslie V. Hawkins. July 13, 1959.

Corpus Christi Industrial Safety Engineering Company. Letter from George Schauer. July 11, 1959.

Houston Independent School District. Letter from Edwin D. Martin. January 8, 1959.

Pennsylvania State University, Letter from Joseph Intorre. August 19, 1958.

Texas Department of Public Safety. Letter from J. B. Carlisle. June 28, 1959.

Texas Education Agency. Letter from Lewis Spears, July 1958.

University of Texas. Letter from C. J. Alderson. July 13, 1959.

APPENDIX A.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL, QUESTIONNAIRE, AND SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY.

Appendix A

P. O. Box 201
Anahuac, Texas
May 12, 1959

Dear Sir:

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for a Masters Degree at Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, I am making astudy of Driver Education Programs in Texas High Schools; the title of my thesis is "The Development of Driver Education in the High Schools of Texas".

Enclosed in this letter is a questionnaire which will aid me in making this study. Any additional information or suggestions you can give will be appreciated.

Please respond at your earliest convenience. If your response is to be mailed later than May 27, 1959 please send it to the following address:

P. O. Box 2169
Prairie View A & M College
Prairie View, Texas

Very truly yours,

Herman E. Williams

HEW:bef

Enclosure: 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of school _____

2. Location of school: _____ (City), _____ (County)

3. Principal _____

4. Name of person who is responding to this questionnaire _____ position held _____

SECTION I

1. What year was driver education instruction first given at your school? _____

2. What persons were instrumental in organizing and developing this program?

   (a) _____

   (b) _____

   (c) _____

3. What were some of the basic factors that influenced the initial development of this program?

   (a) _____

   (b) _____

   (c) _____

4. What position did the first teacher of driver education hold prior to the appointment of the driver education position?

   _____

   _____

5. How was he selected? _____

   _____

6. Did the first teacher play a part in the organization of this program? _____

7. How was this course taught?

   (a) As a separate course_____

   (b) Integrated with another course_____
   Subject

8. How was initial instruction given?

   (a) As classroom instruction_____

   (b) As practice driving instruction_____

   (c) Or both_____

9. In your first class what was the approximate enrollment in practice driving,_____classroom instruction?_____

10. How many practice driving cars were employed?_____

11. How were these cars secured?

   (a) By lease_____

   (b) By loan_____

   (c) Purchased by the school board_____

   (d) By other methods_____

12. In the early driver education instruction how much time per class meeting was devoted to theory_____, practice driving _____

13. How was practice driving time, scheduled? Check one.

   (a) During study hour_____

   (b) Off period_____

   (c) After school hours_____

   (d) By other methods_____

SECTION II

1. Is driver education an elective or a required course in your school?_____

2. At what grade level does your school offer classroom instruction, _____practice driving?_____

3. How many teachers do you have employed in your driver education program?_____

4. Approximately how many students do you have enrolled in driver education?_____

5. How many vehicles are they operating?_____

6. What king of driver education program does your school conduct? Check one.

   (a) Dual control_____

   (b) Multiple car plan_____

   (c) Other arrangement_____

7. Do you have a class auto-trainer?_____

8. What local community organizations lend support to your driver education program?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

9. How are driver education vehicles secured for your present program? Check one.

   (a) By lease _____

   (b) By loan _____

   (c) Purchased by the school board _____

   (d) Or by other methods _____

10. Does your school sponsor evening classes in driver education for adults?_____

11. What is the general attitude of your students toward your driver education program: Check one.

(a) Excellent_____

(b) Good_____

(c) Fair_____

(d) Poor_____

Appendix A

TEXAS HIGH SCHOOLS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY

Year	County	School
1939*	Travis	Baker Junior High School
1940*	Dallas	N. R. Crozier Technical High
1942*	Travis	Allen Junior High School
1944*	Jefferson	South Park High School
1945*	Jefferson	Thomas Jefferson High School
1946	Dallas	Highland Park High School
..	McLennan	Waco Junior High School
1948	Harris	Jack Yates Senior High
..	El Paso	El Paso Technical High
..	Lubbock	Lubbock Public Schools
..	Tom Green	Lake View High School
..	Smith	John Tyler High School
1949	Bexar	Alamo Heights Senior High
..	Lubbock	Slaton High School
..	Tom Green	San Angelo Central High
1951	Harris	Stephen F. Austin High
1952	El Paso	Bowie High School
..	El Paso	Stephen F. Austin High
..	Wichita	Iowa Park High School
1952	El Paso	Jefferson High School

1953	Jefferson	Lincoln High School
..	Nueces	Flour Bluff High School
..	Lubbock	New Deal High School
1954	Lubbock	Roosevelt High School
1954	Lubbock	Carroll Thompson High
1955	Potter	Palo Duro High School
..	Travis	Lamar Junior High School
..	Smith	Roberts Junior High
1956	Travis	Wm. B. Travis High School
..	Brazos	E. A. Kemp High School
..	Nolan	Divide High School
..	Smith	Hogg Junior High School
..	Ector	Blackshear High School
1957	Nueces	Tulaso Midway High
..	Wichita	Burkburnett High School
Unknown	Potter	Fannin Junior High School

* Schools that had initial driver education programs.

APPENDIX B.

ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING SCHOOLS WITH INFORMATION FOR DRIVER EDUCATION

ORGANIZATIONS WHICH PROVIDE SCHOOLS WITH INFORMATION PERTINENT TO HIGH SCHOOL DRIVER EDUCATION

American Automobile Association, Washington, D. C.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, New York

Automobile Manufactures through local dealers

Center for Safety Education, New York

Insurance Companies

Inter-Industry Highway Safety Committee, Washington, D.C.

National Safety Council, Chicago, Illinois

State and Local Police Departments

State and Local Association of insurance agents

Texas Department of Public Safety, Austin, Texa

Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas

Texas Safety Association

Other Organizations Interested in Traffic Safety

American Association of Motor Vehicle Administration
Washington, D. C.

American Association of State Highway Officials
Washington, D. C.

American Bar Association Traffic Program, Chicago, Illinois

American National Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

American Trucking Association, Washington, D. C.

Automobile Protective and Information Bureau
Chicago, Illinois

Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois

Institute of Traffic Engineers, Washington, D. C.

National Association of Insurance Agents, New York

National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Chicago, Illinois

Presidents' Highway Safety Conference, Washington, D. C.

United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Oklahoma

APPENDIX C.

APPROVED STANDARDS FOR DRIVER EDUCATION IN TEXAS SCHOOLS

July 12, 1957

To School Administrators:

The following standards for Driver Education have been developed jointly by the Texas Department of Public Safety and the State Department of Education and are approved as the official basis for establishing and maintaining Driver Education programs in the public schools. They were developed under the authority of Section 4, Article 6687b, Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, as amended by Senate Bill 53 of the 55th Legislature, 1957. If you have any questions concerning these standards, please let us hear from you.

J. W. Edgar
Commissioner of Education

STANDARDS FOR AN APPROVED COURSE IN DRIVER EDUCATION FOR TEXAS SCHOOLS

LEGAL AUTHORITY

1. Section 4, Article 6687b, Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, as amended by S. B. 53, of the 55th Legislature, 1957, sets forth exceptions to the law which prohibits the Department of Public Safety from issuing an operator's license to a person under 16 years of age. One of the exceptions reads as follows: ". . . or (5) it appears that the applicant has completed and passed the State Department of Education approved standard driver training course, which course must also be approved by the Department of Public Safety; and the application for such license under clause (5) shall include a certificate by the superintendent of the school that said driver training course is part of the regular curriculum, and that the applicant has passed this course. . . . In no event shall an operator's license of any class be issued to any person less than 14 years of age. . . ."

2. Pursuant thereto the Commissioner of Education and the Director of the Department of Public Safety herein prescribe standards and regulations of an approved Driver Education program for Texas schools.

DRIVER EDUCATION COURSE STANDARDS

1. An approved course in Driver Education shall consist of two phases:

   a. The classroom phase of an approved Driver Education course shall consist of a minimum of 30 clock hours of instruction, including the following subjects:

      (1) The Driver and the Pedestrian
      (2) The Automobile and Preventive Maintenance
      (3) Highway Characteristics and Traffic Engineering Controls

(4) Highway Traffic Laws
(5) Driving Procedures
(6) Physical Laws
(7) The President's Highway Safety Action Program

When a student satisfactorily completes the classroom phase of an approved Driver Education course he will be entitled to a certificate which will authorize a Drivers License Examiner to give him an examination for the issuance of a Restricted Operator's License. This certificate must be signed by the certified Driver Education instructor who actually taught the student the classroom phase of Driver Education. A restricted operator's license permits a student to operate a motor vehicle only when a licensed operator is in the front seat with the student. The Department of Public Safety will remove the restriction on this license only after the student has completed the practice driving phase of an approved Driver Education course or has reached the age of 16 years.

b. The practice driving phase of an approved Driver Education course shall consist of:

(1) A minimum of 6 clock hours of actual behind-the-wheel driving by each student, and
(2) A minimum of 6 clock hours observation time by each student, each under the direct supervision and observation of a certified Driver Education instructor. Practice driving shall include lessons in skill exercises and in both city and rural traffic.

When a student satisfactorily completes 6 clock hours of behind-the-wheel practice plus 6 clock hours of observation in the practice driving phase of an approved Driver Education course, he will be entitled to a certificate which will authorize a Drivers License Examiner to complete the student's examination immediately for the issuance of an Unrestricted Operator's License.

2. The standards for developing and administering the course in Driver Education shall become a part of the Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools in Texas.

PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT CERTIFICATION

1. Two certificate forms shall be prepared by the Department of Public Safety, one for certifying classroom instruction and one for certifying completion of behind-the-wheel instruction. Each certificate shall be signed by the superintendent who certifies that the course is a part of the regular curriculum of the school and that the student has passed the course. Each certificate also shall be signed by a certified Driver Education instructor certifying that

he personally taught the student the phase of the course and the number of hours stated in the certificate.

2. When two certified teachers have taught the same student in the classroom and/or in the car and neither teacher has taught the student a minimum of 30 hours classroom and/or 6 hours behind-the-wheel, then both teachers shall sign and number the form(s) that apply.

3. When a student changes schools before completing the classroom phase of a Driver Education course, he shall receive credit for the classroom hours completed providing he enters immediately and completes a classroom course that is running parallel to the course he left. The teacher of the course he leaves shall execute the regular form certifying the number of hours completed (noting subject matter covered) and mail the form to the Driver Education teacher in the school to which the student is transferring. When the student completes the classroom phase of the course in the new school the teacher shall add to the application certificate form the hours he taught, his signature and certificate number and issue the certificate to the student. The same transfer procedure shall be followed by teachers who instruct a student in the car, whether or not the teachers are in the same schools or whether or not the behind-the-wheel instruction is given during the same semester.

Under no circumstances shall students be examined until they receive the minimum number of hours of instruction by a certified Driver Education teacher as described in this program. The students may receive credit for course hours completed prior to a certificate suspension date providing the suspension was not for an infraction that would make the course hours per se illegal.

CONTROL OF STANDARDS

1. The Texas Education Agency will suspend the certification of a Driver Education teacher who places or permits his or her name and certification number to be placed on an application for examination certificate presented to an Examiner by a student when the certified Driver Education teacher did not personally instruct the student the stated number of hours in the course described in the certificate. The period of suspension shall be not less than one full semester of a school year.

2. When the certification of a Driver Education teacher is suspended, the Texas Education Agency shall notify the Department of Public Safety in writing, giving the full name of the teacher, his certification number, and the date of expiration of the suspension. The Department of Public Safety shall transmit this information to all

Examiners, who shall not accept an application for examination certificate bearing the name and number, during the period of suspension.

3. If a teacher signs application certificates after the period of suspension for instruction given during the period of suspension, the Texas Education Agency shall immediately suspend the teacher's certification for an indefinite period of time.

4. When an officer of the Department of Public Safety obtains any evidence through questioning an applicant or otherwise that a standard of the Driver Education program has been violated, the officer shall make a report through proper channels to the Director of the Department of Public Safety, giving a description of the purported violation in writing. He shall include the names of sources of information and attach any document, or a copy thereof, that might aid the Texas Education Agency in enforcing the standards. The Director of the Department of Public Safety, upon receiving sufficient evidence that a standard has been violated, shall notify the Commissioner of Education.

5. The Texas Education Agency shall maintain annually for the Department of Public Safety a list of the names and addresses of the schools offering approved courses in Driver Education. The names and certification numbers of the teachers teaching the courses in these schools will be supplied to the Department of Public Safety by December 1, of each year.

RATIFICATION

Under the authority of Section 4, Article 6687b, Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, as amended by the 55th Legislature, 1957, the foregoing Standards for An Approved Course in Driver Education for Texas Schools have been developed by the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Department of Public Safety and are hereby approved by the Commissioner of Education and the Director of the Department of Public Safety.

The provisions of this program shall become effective September 1, 1957.

Subscribed this 8th day of July, 1957

Homer Garrison, Jr., Director
Texas Department of Public Safety

Subscribed this 5th day of July, 1957

J. W. Edgar
Commissioner of Education

VITA

Herman E. Williams

Born: August 22, 1930, Benchley, Texas

Education: Seals Elementary School, Benchley, Texas, 1936 to 1944
John M. Moore High School, Kurten, Texas, 1944 to 1948
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Texas, undergraduate work in industrial education, September, 1948, to January, 1951, September, 1954 to January, 1957; graduate work in industrial education, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, February, 1957, to September 1957; Summers of 1958 and 1959.

Experience: Industrial Arts Teacher; George Washington Carver High School, Anahuac, Texas, September 1957 to present.