



Jon Wood

Synthesis of Research on Schools of Choice

Thousands of secondary-level alternative schools have been found to improve student attendance, attitude, and involvement. Their impact on achievement is less clear, but the available evidence is positive.

MARY ANNE RAYWID

Among the educational innovations introduced during the 1960s, alternatives—or schools of choice—have proved one of the most durable and are increasingly finding support from research. This support may be one reason why schools of choice continue to proliferate.

When looking at the research on schools of choice, it is necessary to understand that it is multifaceted. This is because schools of choice are multifaceted: they are not a curricular or an instructional or an organizational proposal, but all of these in combination. Since both interest and explanations of success have focused as often on the organizational features of alternative schools as on their programs, this review includes both.

A recent survey located 2,500 secondary-level alternative schools, but the estimated national total is several times this number (Raywid, 1982). The survey omitted elementary school alternatives and there is reason to believe that large numbers of magnet schools at all levels were also omitted. Simultaneously, however, another survey identified 1,019 magnet schools and programs in the nation¹ (Fleming and others, 1982). The magnet investigators concluded that one-third of our urban districts offer such programs and that they enroll up to 31 percent of each district's youngsters.

Perhaps a characterization of alternative schools is a good place to begin. We shall purposely sidestep a definition since definitional attempts have proved troublesome. What seems common to most is an emphasis on choice, on responsiveness, on broadly construed

educational aims, and on alternatives as grass roots or "home grown" programs (Deal, 1975; Smith and others, 1976; Parrett, 1981). It may be impossible to establish definitional accord, but it is possible to identify a series of characteristics common to most alternatives, albeit not all:

1. The alternative constitutes a distinct and identifiable administrative unit, with its own personnel and program. Moreover, substantial effort is likely to be addressed to creating a strong sense of affiliation with the unit.

2. Structures and processes generative of school climate are held important and receive considerable attention within the unit.

3. Students as well as staff enter the alternative as a matter of choice rather than assignment.

4. The alternative is designed to respond to particular needs, desires, or interests not otherwise met in local schools, resulting in a program that is distinctly different from that of other schools in the area.

5. The impetus to launching the alternative, as well as its design, comes from one or more of the groups to be most immediately affected by the program: teachers, students, and parents.

6. Alternative schools generally address a broader range of student development than just the cognitive or academic. Typically, the sort of person the learner is becoming is a matter of first concern.

Many view magnet schools simply as alternatives developed to the purpose of desegregation. So viewed, it seems clear that they are currently the largest subtype of schools of choice. And they also seem to differ from the parent group in some important ways. The 1982 magnet school survey (Fleming and others) found that these programs are designed

to "promote desegregation; develop an image of a 'high quality' public education; provide unique (or alternative) curricula or educational structures; retain public school students and draw non-public school students." The survey also found that, unlike other types of alternatives, magnets are located almost exclusively in large school districts or urban centers. Like other alternatives, they may consist of separate schools or schools-within-schools.

Organizational Forms and Structures

Schools of choice differ as to organizational type, although most are small in relation to conventional schools. Over half have fewer than 100 students, and 69 percent enroll fewer than 200 (Raywid, 1982). Some alternatives occupy the entire school building in which they are housed, while other smaller programs enjoy a comparable separateness by being placed in store-

"Schools of choice differ as to organizational type, although most are small in relation to conventional schools."

Mary Anne Raywid is Project Director, Center for the Study of Educational Alternatives, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York.

fronts or other small quarters. Some are schools-within-schools, usually assigned a limited contiguous set of rooms within the comprehensive high school. During the early 70s, a number of comprehensive high schools were transformed into sets of mini-schools, with Quincy High School in Illinois and Haaren High in New York being two of the better known. Individual schools-within-schools and mini-schools have both been successful, but their main challenge seems to lie in meeting two particular conditions of success: (1) enough separateness to sustain a distinct climate and ethos, and (2) enough autonomy so that staff can develop and implement their own vision of schooling (Raywid, 1982; Wehlage and others, 1982).

There are numerous types of alternatives in addition to magnets—learning centers, continuation schools, schools without walls, street academics—each identifiable in terms of a particular student target group or a particular type of program. Not since the mid-70s have alternatives been associated with any specific ideological tendencies. Many of the early public schools of choice tended toward the informality and unstructured quality of free or open schools; but as early as 1973, some California parents began to assert that schools of choice ought to include some that are more conservative than the usual, as well as those which are less so. Thus, alternatives came to run the ideological gamut in education, ranging from relatively free schools to fundamentalist types, with even a military academy or two.

Alternatives are found at all school levels, K-12, although there are probably more at the secondary than at the elementary level. The situation appears to be reversed with magnet schools, with 59 percent at the elementary level (Fleming and others, 1982). Elementary school alternatives, including magnets, are most likely to define themselves in terms of a particular pedagogical style, such as open, basics, or Montessori. High school magnets tend to define themselves according to curricular specialities, while most other high school level alternatives seem to focus more on climate-related features than on curriculum. For instance, in the recent alternatives survey, 63 percent of respondents indicated that their

foremost point of departure from other schools lay in interpersonal relationships within the school, rather than in curricular distinctiveness (Raywid, 1982).

Internally, the more conservative alternatives have tended to depart very little in structural terms from conventional schools (Zusman and Guthrie, n.d.) And magnet schools have sometimes focused on modifying little but their curricular orientation (Fleming and others, 1982). Other alternatives, however, have pioneered some novel

organizational forms and have attracted considerable research attention by virtue of that. Perhaps one of their greatest, though less commonly recognized, contributions was to institutionalize a means for introducing variety into school systems. In the language of David Tyack (1974), alternatives represent a clear departure from the "one best system" approach that undergirded public schooling throughout the century. They presuppose, that is, that there is no one best way of educating all youngsters; instead, different learner needs and

Magnet Schools Offer Diversity and Quality

Rolf K. Blank

Magnet schools can improve the quality of public education while offering a choice to students and parents. This is one finding of a *Survey of Magnet Schools*, a two-year national study funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Although magnet schools are an established method of voluntary desegregation in urban districts, their educational role was less well-known prior to this study.

Among the 45 magnet schools intensively studied in 15 urban districts:

- Thirty-one emphasized academics as their central theme (science, social studies, college preparation, and so on).
- Nine had an arts theme complemented by a strong academic core.
- Three were for students with special needs.
- Two had career/vocational themes.

This theme analysis shows that most magnet schools stress academic studies while at the same time offering students the op-

tion of choosing a school based on their interests and goals.

A large majority of magnets rate very well on commonly used standards for school effectiveness. On a composite measure of instruction, curriculum, student-teacher interaction, and educational climate, a third of the magnet schools received "high" ratings and over half received "good" ratings.

In terms of student outcomes, 45 percent of magnet schools and programs had test scores in mathematics and reading significantly above their district average. While all magnet schools benefited from voluntary self-selection of students, only the top 15 percent had selective admission criteria.

Although magnets typically serve only a minority of the student population, districts with successful magnet programs have found increased public support and confidence to be a by-product of the plan.

For further information on the magnet schools study, or to obtain a "Guide to Magnet School Development," which is based on the findings, contact: Rolf K. Blank, Magnet Schools Study Director, 4610-A S. 28th Rd., Arlington, VA 22206.

Rolf K. Blank is Senior Project Director, Cosmos Corporation, Washington, D.C.

parent preferences call for a variety of educations. Alternative schools came to represent the mechanism for introducing departures—the means of institutionalizing diversity within a system highly resistant to novelty and change (Metz, 1981; Warren, 1978). They were also recognized by some as a means whereby school systems could inform, as well as reform, themselves: the demand for a new alternative would serve as an important indicator of community needs and interests, as would under-enrollment in an existing option.

At least some alternatives modeled arrangements that have been elaborated as school-based or site-based management and budgeting plans. Schools of choice provided early opportunities to see what happens when typical central district control patterns are relaxed and greater control reverts to the individual school level (Duke, 1976; Nirenberg, 1977; Rand, 1981). They have also facilitated study of novel social control arrangements (Metz, 1978; Swidler, 1979); of human interaction patterns in nonbureaucratic institutions (Argyris, 1974; Wilson, 1976); and of the impacts of school structure on both program (Gracey, 1972), and behavior (Gitlin, 1981).

Organizational Processes

Schools of choice are noticeably different from conventional schools with respect to their feel and flavor. They elicit quite different responses and behavior from the human beings within them—and a considerable amount of organizational research has sought to explain that and identify its elements. A number of aspects of the way alternatives are put together and operate daily have been singled out as major contributors to their unique climates.

Many analysts have pointed to the importance of choice in this regard (deCharms, 1977; Fantini, 1973; Grant, 1981). It not only provides an initial advantage to the chooser, but it serves to heighten one's investment in what has been chosen (Erickson, 1982; Nault, 1975-76). The choice arrangement also has the advantage of yielding a group of human beings who are similar or united in some educationally significant way. They are agreed upon a particular type of educational mission or environment. Thus, collectively the choosers consti-



tute a more coherent group than do the students, staff, and parents of a comprehensive high school deliberately planned to bring all preferences and persuasions under a common roof. The importance of this likemindedness and cohesion have been underscored recently in both the private school literature (Erickson, 1982; Grant, 1981) and in the effective schools research (Rutter, 1979; Schneider, 1982-83).

Analysts have often named smallness as a key ingredient of the type of environment alternatives provide. Where numbers are limited, it is possible to run schools in such ways that the presence of thousands simply renders out of the question. One of the consequences of smallness is, of course, that everyone knows everyone else—an important ingredient of the personalization discussed below. Another consequence is that the limited number of staff make bureaucratic controls, with their tiers of formal authority, unnecessary. Limited numbers also make bureaucracy's elaborate divisions of labor impossible, and as a

“Schools of choice are noticeably different from conventional schools with respect to their feel and flavor.”

result, the responsibilities and prerogatives of everyone within an alternative school are likely to be much broader than in a conventional school. This means that the roles of both staff and students differ notably in schools of choice, and tend to be more expanded and diffuse—for instance, with teachers sharing administrative and counseling functions, and students and administrators sharing in more typical teaching roles.

As this suggests, the social order of schools of choice differs considerably from that in other schools, and is typically maintained in quite different ways (Metz, 1978; Swidler, 1979). Staff as well as students share a sense of substantial autonomy. Teachers feel they exert considerable control over their own programs, and students feel much less like pawns than in other schools (deCharms, 1977; Gladstone and Levin, 1982). The experience of autonomy is important since feelings of control over one's own fate are associated with a sense of ownership and affiliation; with teacher satisfaction (Wehlage, 1982); and, in the case of students, with educational achievement (Coleman, 1966). But the reason for the autonomy feelings is not always apparent, since alternatives students sometimes report such feelings even though their teachers describe the program as highly structured!

A number of early alternative schools sought to function as participatory democracies, with students and staff reaching decisions together in town meetings (Miller, n.d.). There are probably fewer alternatives making just that sort of attempt today (Raywid, 1982), yet students in schools of choice nevertheless often reflect a strong sense of power. This may stem from several causes. First, alternatives, as smaller organizations have less need for restricting students and hence have fewer rules and regulations (Duke and Perry, 1978). And many tend to permit a considerable amount of freedom with respect to clothes, language, and personal style. Second, students do retain the considerable final power to opt out if they are sufficiently dissatisfied. This right alone tends to make for a community of civility and respectful interaction. Third, as is commonly reported by youngsters who have rejected conventional schools, alternatives differ most by vir-

“Student attitudes toward school are widely reported to change for the better in alternative schools.”

due of their “caring” teachers. Where teachers are so perceived, and relationships are marked by trust, formal enfranchisement may appear less vital to having one's concerns taken into consideration.

As the above suggests, the climate and the culture or ethos of schools of choice differ considerably from that of other schools. As Erickson (1982) noted, it is the difference between *Gesellschaft* and *Gemeinschaft*—between a formally constituted group held together by regulations, and a genuine community bound by common, mutual sentiments and understandings.

These distinctive elements in the climate of schools of choice seem closely tied to the remarkable levels of satisfaction of both students and their parents. Student attitudes toward school are widely reported to change for the better in alternative schools (Barr and others, 1977; Doob, 1977; Duke and Muzio, 1978), and the attitudes of parents toward these schools is consistently reported as unusually positive (Fleming and others, 1982; Metz, 1981). What is more, post-graduation surveys of former students of the alternative school suggest that they continue to regard it very positively, as a place where they received help that has proved relevant and adequate to their post-high school pursuits (Nathan, 1981; Phillips, 1977).

Goals

Most schools of choice demonstrate concern with multiple sorts of develop-

ment in their students, not solely with cognitive growth or intellectual achievement. Although conventional practice in public education narrows the school's focus quite sharply from 1st to 12th grade—with the elementary school's interest in “the whole child” giving way to the high school's concern primarily with the academic—alternative schools continue to acknowledge and actively foster various kinds of student growth over this entire period. Even in back-to-basics, or fundamentalist alternatives initiated for more intense concentration on the academic, there is much explicit concern with molding character; that is, with shaping values, pervasive dispositions, and other personal characteristics (Zusman and Guthrie, n.d.).

The broad concern with the sort of person each youngster is becoming yields several tendencies common to many schools of choice. One is a program consciously designed to abet social growth and such personal development as decision-making ability, moral maturity, and self-knowledge. The pursuit of such goals may be integrated with more traditional learning or stand as separate activities. Either way, such development tends to be viewed as an integral part of the school's mission.

A second consequence of the alternative school's developmental orientation is often a stronger preoccupation with realizing individual potential than with achievement in relation to group norms. This does not mean an indifference to standards; many alternative school students report working far harder in the alternative than ever before. It does mean, however, that these standards are not likely to be imposed or regulated by standardized tests.

A third tremendously important consequence of the developmental orientation of many schools of choice is the personalization it yields. Quite simply, systematic efforts to help someone grow require extensive knowledge of that individual. This requisite alone calls for a personalized education in the sense that students must become known as individual human beings to school staff. They cannot remain uni-dimensional consumers of instruction. Furthermore, activities then built on this knowledge yield the responsiveness to individuals that developmental purposes require. Thus it is no accident that teachers and

students both find alternative schools uniquely successful at meeting student needs (Gregory and Smith, 1983). This personalization feature seems strongly associated with the appeal of schools of choice to students, and to parents and teachers as well. It may also be an important factor in the other forms of success achieved by these schools.

Instructional Methods

Alternative school staff report instructional methods to be one of their main points of departure from conventional school practice (Raywid, 1982) and several studies have established differences in this regard (Baker, 1976; Zahorik, 1980). There is also evidence, however, that instructional practices in alternative schools do not differ very extensively from the methods of other schools. Yet, interestingly, both teachers and students in alternatives *think* that they do (Parrett, 1981). What accounts for this discrepancy? One reason may be that despite the group instruction often found in schools of choice, they manage considerable flexibility and have devised ways to respond to student needs and interests that are unshared. Perhaps the most typical mechanism is independent study.

There is wide variety in the form of such study, and it is a major means of providing the adaptiveness to individuals that participants again and again attribute to alternative schools. Independent study arrangements enable individual students to pursue topics or projects in which only they may be interested, such as participating in an archeological dig, designing a computer program, or investigating the case for Atlantis.

Independent study arrangements also permit the pursuit of traditional content at levels more advanced than those at which others are working, and hence where numbers do not warrant offering a course. At the same time, independent study may be enabling other youngsters to pursue remedial work, often in the form of contracts specifying assignments that differ from student to student. Collectively, these diverse arrangements may constitute the major device for "individualizing" instruction in schools of choice (Raywid, 1982).

One of the most prominent forms of independent study in both magnet and

"Since staff within alternative schools have considerable control of content, they often develop their own curricula."

other schools of choice is experiential learning (Fleming and others, 1982; Smith and others, 1976). Some involve students primarily in learning through direct observation; for instance, in learning about the judicial system's operation through sustained courtroom visits. Probably more have stressed participation, and assign youngsters to internships and other arrangements for learning about such things as municipal processes, or industries and careers, by actually participating in them. Still other alternatives feature service learning, enabling students to learn from the experience of providing a needed service to other human beings. Helping in hospitals and nursing homes, aiding peers and younger children in classrooms, lobbying, doing research for a lawmaker, or staffing crisis centers are frequent forms of experiential learning.

This sort of learning is widely recognized to possess very distinct advantages. James Coleman (1972) declared it is what youngsters need most, growing up in an "information-rich, action-poor" society. There is substantial evidence that experiential learning stimulates moral development, enhances self-esteem, expands the interest of adolescents in social problems and their inclinations toward community involvement, and increases a sense of social and personal responsibility (Conrad and Hedin, 1982; Hedin, 1983).

Recent studies are also providing increasingly conclusive demonstration of the efficacy of experiential learning in

relation to traditional academic content. For example, a study comparing the gains of experiential and classroom learners in a high school biology course found the action learners scoring significantly higher (Agnew, 1982). Peer tutoring investigations yield the most extensive evidence in this regard, consistently finding that the experience of tutoring yields significant academic gains for the tutor. Moreover, consistent with the idea of experiential learning, the tutored—who, of course, are not involved in action learning or exploring new roles, but just in being taught by a different teacher—show more modest academic gains than do the tutors (Hedin, 1983). There is also evidence that experiential learning contributes to higher-level mental processes, including problem-solving ability and complexity of thought, as well as to the gain of specific content.

Curriculum

In magnet or specialty high schools, curricular distinctiveness is the school's most distinguishing feature. According to Fleming and others (1982), the arts are the most prevalent concentration, with humanities or social sciences coming second, and vocational or career orientations tying with intensified academic focus for third. At the elementary level, basic skills magnets predominate, with Montessori or individualized learning programs coming second, and arts third.

As noted earlier, schools identifying themselves as "alternatives" are less likely to be marked by a particular curricular focus than by other things—a pedagogical style or a particular school climate. Nevertheless, some curricular tendencies are identifiable. Since staff within alternative schools have considerable control of content (Raywid, 1982), they often develop their own curricula. There is also evidence that teachers in alternatives frequently prefer to organize content according to themes rather than to leave it separated by disciplines. Thus themes such as "Our Town," "The Good Life," or "Power" may serve as integrating concepts or articulating ideas drawing on content from a number of different disciplines. At the elementary level, for instance, one well-known alternative named The Zoo School uses animal and environ-

mental themes in the presentation and pursuit of a full range of learnings.

Although the choosing or devising of curriculum is a wide-spread practice in alternative schools, there are several curricular programs or approaches that have been adopted and adapted by a number of alternatives. One is the Foxfire approach to teaching English and history (and sometimes other subjects) by combining experiential and classroom learning, and simultaneously building a bridge between school and community. Using cultural journalism techniques, students learn history, or lore and legends, or skills, from community residents, and compile these in journals or magazines (Sitton, 1980). Another widely used curricular approach has been the Walkabout idea, sometimes known as Challenge Education, which organizes the curriculum around a specified set of challenges, the full meeting of which demonstrates one's readiness to graduate. This is a program aimed at providing a better transition from the dependency of adolescence to the independence and self-responsibility of adulthood. Still another curricular emphasis has been that of the "Just Community" schools inspired by the moral development theory of Lawrence Kohlberg. Just Community alternatives emphasize reasoning related to moral situations, as well as student participation in decision making (Kuhmerker, 1981). As popular as these particular examples have been, however, and as often used for inspiration and a source of ideas, it appears that most schools of choice develop their own curricula.

The People in Alternatives and How They Are Affected

Although 73 percent of 1982 survey respondents indicated that their districts associate alternatives with all kinds of students (Raywid), a large number of schools of choice have been established to deal with groups posing special problems. The early success of a number of alternatives probably made it inevitable that they would be embraced as solutions for the most educationally challenging groups (the turned-off, disruptive, underachieving, dropout-prone), as well as the means for resolving wider social problems (segregation, crime, youth, unemployment). Thus, today

Highlights from Research on Schools of Choice

- For all types of students, from the neediest to the most outstanding, alternatives seem to produce significant growth and achievement: cognitive, social, and affective.
- Both attendance and student behavior improve in schools of choice.
- Alternative schools prove highly attractive to those who are associated with them—staff, students, and parents. In various ways, all three groups show unusual satisfaction and approval rates.
- The success of alternative schools is variously attributed to the benefits of smallness, choice, climate, and degree of staff autonomy.
- Alternatives manage to "personalize" the school environment and to make it a genuine community of individuals.
- The two instructional modes most distinctive of alternative schools are independent study and experiential learning.
- Alternatives have institutionalized diversity. They exist in varying types and appear to be a well-established component of school districts across the country.

there are large numbers of alternatives targeted for dealing with particular groups and problems, as well as others reflecting a representative cross-section of local youngsters. Programs targeted for disruptive youngsters, underachievers, dropouts, and other varieties of "at risk" youngsters have provided instances of impressive success. They appear particularly effective at improving student attitudes toward school and learning (Foley and McConaughy, 1982; Mann and Gold, 1980), self-concept and self-esteem (Arnove and Strout, 1978), attendance (Foley and McConaughy, 1982; Wehlage, 1982), and behavior (Berger, 1974; Duke and Perry, 1978; Wehlage, 1982). They also lead to greater academic accomplishment on the part of those students variously known as "marginal," "resistant," and simply "at risk" (Arnove and Strout, 1978; Foley and McConaughy, 1982).

The evidence suggests that similar benefits accrue also to quite different kinds of students in alternatives not targeted for "special needs" groups. Average and above-average students also profit from schools of choice. However, fewer investigations and comparative studies have been undertaken in these kinds of schools of choice and indeed, almost all of the evidence regarding impacts comes from individual program evaluations. There have, however, been three careful analyses of multiple evalu-

"Programs targeted for 'at risk' youngsters improve attitudes, self-esteem, attendance, and behavior."



Anne B. Adamson

ations (Barr and others, 1977; Doob, 1977; Duke and Muzio, 1978), and based on these it seems clear that the attitudes of students toward themselves and toward school are markedly enhanced in the alternative setting. Attendance and school involvement increase, and dropout rates decline. Higher grade-point averages and test scores, and gains in math and reading levels are common, although academic impacts are less clear and consistent in these evaluations than are other sorts of outcomes. The academic evidence seems positive, even though it remains tentative and somewhat scant.

In contrast to aggregate studies of many schools—which average out and thus obscure dramatic accomplishment along with dismal failure—there is now at least one individual school study with a highly credible and extensive comparative base. It demonstrates remarkable academic success. It was done in Pennsylvania where a state-administered quality assessment program not only yields statewide percentile rankings, but also assesses achievement levels in relation to reasonable expectations for a particular school. In the spring of 1982, the Alternative Program in State College ranked at the 99th percentile for its students' performance in reading, writing, math, knowledge of law and government, and analytic thinking. The percentile fell to 90 on humanities and science, but returned to the 99 level with respect to student self-esteem, interest in school and learning, understanding of others, sense of societal responsibility, and appreciation of human accomplishment. In eight of these 11 measures of school quality, the Alternative Program scored above what the state deemed appropriate expectations.²

There is no way to know at this point how typical such success may someday be found to be. The evidence is already clear enough that not all alternative schools are successful—so schools of choice are not the elusive model guaranteeing success under any and all circumstances. But perhaps subsequent research will further clarify the requisites of success and identify the pitfalls to avoid.

Meanwhile, however, there is one more group that needs attention in our review of the effects of schools of choice: this is their teachers, for there is evi-



dence of considerable impact of alternatives on those who work within them. A number of the findings already mentioned would predict that such schools are pleasant places to be: the absence of discipline problems and the trust of students augur less adolescent-adult conflict as the tussle between student and staff subcultures evaporates. Furthermore, the amount of autonomy teachers enjoy and the unusual control over their own programs would suggest distinct professional rewards. Such predictions are borne out. Alternative school teachers report unusually high levels of satisfaction (Gladstone and Levin, 1982; Nirenberg, 1977), which they attribute to increased collegiality, and to greater professional autonomy and personal agency in their work. Although many report working harder in the alternative than in their previous school, morale is clearly enhanced.

The benefits to the school of such teacher satisfaction are reported by one researcher to fulfill the organizational idealist's dream, wherein staff become sufficiently identified with the school to find personal fulfillment, or self-actualization, in doing its work (Nirenberg, 1977).

Conclusion

It would appear, then, that schools of choice offer heightened satisfactions to the several groups most immediately associated with them: staff, students, and parents. They also claim other advantages with respect to climate and productivity. Although not all such schools succeed, the number of positive instances brings real promise to the diversification and choice arrangement reviewed here. Challenges and reservations that have been expressed have not been reviewed, since these have not

been subjected to systematic investigation and thus remain speculative. But commentators and observers have wondered whether the diversification would prove culturally divisive (Broudy, 1973), whether it would increase social class isolation (Amove and Strout, 1978), whether it would yield "skimming and dumping" (removal of the most desirable students from neighborhood schools, and concentration of the least desirable in separate programs), and whether it would in consequence diminish the quality of non-choice schools (Fleming and others, 1982). Investigation of these questions is certainly needed, along with much more extensive study of the correlates of success in schools of choice. We need much more of that kind of evidence, which will help practitioners to decide just which features are vital for such schools and which can and should be omitted. □

¹Definitions are cloudy, so that whether magnets are a first cousin to alternatives—or a variety of alternative, or vice versa—may depend on no more than who happens to be speaking. Here, we shall view magnets as one type of alternative and we shall use "alternatives" and "schools of choice" synonymously. This makes for fairly broad and inclusive usage, but it does exclude the punitive programs that in the South are called alternatives.

²Unpublished study. For further information, contact Rick Lear, Director, Alternative Program, 411 S. Fraser Street, State College, PA 16801.

References

- Agnew, J. C. "Better Education Through Application." *Synergist* (Winter 1982): 44-48.
- Argvris, Chris. "Alternative Schools: A Behavioral Analysis." *Teachers College Record* (May 1974): 429-452.

Arnove, Robert, and Strout, Toby. *Alternative Schools for Disruptive Youth*. Prepared for the National Institute of Education, Grants P-76-0217 and P-77-0254 (September 1976).

Baker, Thomas. "An Investigation of Teachers and Students Perceptions of Instructional Practices in Selected Conventional and Alternative Public Schools." Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, 1976.

Barr, Robert; Colston, Bruce; Parrett, William. "The Effectiveness of Alternative Public Schools: An Analysis of Six School Evaluations." *Viewpoint* (July 1977): 1-30.

Berger, Michael. *Violence in the Schools*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan, 1974.

Broudy, Harry. "Educational Alternatives—Why Not? Why Not?" *Phi Delta Kappan* (March 1973): 438-440.

Center for New Schools. "Some Conclusions and Questions About Decision-Making in Alternative Secondary Schools." In *Alternative Schools*. Edited by T. Deal and R. Nolan. (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978, pp. 301-306.

Coleman, James. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, James S. "The Children Have Outgrown the Schools." *Psychology Today* (February 1972): 72-75.

Conrad, Dave, and Hedin, Diane. "National Assessment of Experiential Education: Summary and Implications." *Journal of Experiential Education* 4 (1982): 6-20.

Deal, Terrence. "An Organizational Explanation of the Failure of Alternative Secondary Schools." *Educational Researcher* (April 1975): 10-16.

deCharms, Richard. "Pawn or Origin? Enhancing Motivation in Disaffected Youth." *Educational Leadership* (March 1977): 444-448.

Doob, Heather. *Evaluations of Alternative Schools*. Arlington, Va: Educational Research Service, 1977.

Duke, Daniel Linden. "Challenge to Bureaucracy: The Contemporary Alternative School." *Journal of Educational Thought* (May 1976): 34-48.

Duke, Daniel Linden, and Muzio, Irene. "How Effective Are Alternative Schools? A Review of Recent Evaluations and Reports." *Teachers College Record* (February 1978): 461-483.

Duke, Daniel Linden, and Perry, Cheryl. "Can Alternative Schools Succeed Where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B. F. Skinner Have Failed?" *Adolescence* (Fall, 1978): 375-395.

Erickson, Don. *The British Columbia Story: Antecedents and Consequences of Aid to Private Schools*. Los Angeles: Institute for the Study of Private Schools, 1982.

Fantini, Mario. *Public Schools of Choice*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.

Fleming, Patricia; Blank, Rolf; and others. *Survey of Magnet Schools: Interim Report*. Washington: James H. Lowry and Associates, September 1982.

Foley, Eileen M., and McConaughy, Susan. *Towards School Improvement: Lessons from Alternative High Schools*. New York: Public Education Association, 1982.

Gitlin, Andrew. "School Structure Affects Teachers." *Educational Horizons* (Summer 1981): 173-178.

Gladstone, F., and Levin, Malcolm. *Public Alternative School Teacher Study*. Toronto: Ontario Institute of Educational Studies, Mimeo, 1982.

Gracey, Harry L. *Curriculum or Craftsmanship: Elementary School Teachers in a Bureaucratic System*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Grant, Gerald. "The Character of Education and the Education of Character." *Daedalus* (Summer 1981): 135, 149.

Gregory, Thomas, and Smith, Gerald. "Differences Between Alternative and Conventional Schools in Meeting Students' Needs." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 11, 1983. Mimeo, 16 pp.

Hedin, Diane. "The Impact of Experiential Learning on Academic Learning: A Summary of the Theoretical Foundations and Review of Recent Research." Mimeo, n.d. (1983).

Kuhmerker, Lisa, ed. *Moral Education Forum* (Winter 1981) (Issue devoted largely to Just Community Schools).

Mann, David W., and Gold, Martin. *Alternative Schools for Disruptive Secondary Students: Testing a Theory of School Processes, Students' Responses, and Outcome Behaviors*. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, December 1980.

Metz, Mary H. *Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Metz, Mary H. "Magnet Schools in Their Organizational and Political Context." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Toronto, August 23-28, 1981.

Miller, Lynne. "Patterns of Decision Making in Public Alternative Schools." National Alternative Schools Program, University of Massachusetts, n.d. (1974).

Nathan, Joe. *Attitudes Toward High School Education Held by Graduates of a Traditional and an Alternative Public School in St. Paul, Minnesota*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1981.

Nault, Richard. "School Affiliation and Student Commitments." *Administrator's Notebook*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1975-76.

Nault, Richard, and Uchitelle, Susan. "School Choice in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Parental Decision Making." Edited by Michael E. Manley-Casimir. In *Family*

Choice in Schooling. Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath, 1982, pp. 85-98.

Nirenberg, John. "A Comparison of the Management Systems of Traditional and Alternative Public High Schools." *Educational Administration Quarterly* (Winter 1977): 86-104.

Parrett, William. "Alternative Schools: What's Really Happening in the Classrooms." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April, 1981. Mimeo, 40 pp.

Phillips, Gary. *Descriptive Study of the Impact of a High School Alternative Learning Environment on Post High School Lives by a Group of Resistant Learners*. Unpublished dissertation, Ball State University, 1977.

Raywid, Mary Anne. *The Current Status of Schools of Choice in Public Secondary Education*. Hempstead, N.Y.: Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University, 1982.

Rutter, Michael, and others. *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Schneider, Joseph. "Stop the Bandwagon, We Want to Get Off." *R & D Report* (Winter 1982-83): 7-11.

Sitton, Thad. "Bridging the School-Community Gap: The Lessons of Foxfire." *Educational Leadership* (December 1980): 248-250.

Smith, Vernon; Barr, Robert; and Burke, Daniel. *Alternatives in Education*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.

A Study of Alternatives in American Education, Vol. VII: Conclusions and Policy Implications. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, August 1981.

Swidler, Ann. *Organization Without Authority: Dilemmas of Social Control in Free Schools*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Tyack, David B. *The One Best System*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Warren, Constanca. "The Magnet School Boom: Implications for Desegregation." *Equal Opportunity Review*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. Columbia: Teachers College, Spring 1978.

Wehlag, Gary, and others. *Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Center for Education Research, 1982.

Wilson, Stephen. "You Can Talk to Teachers: Student-Teacher Relations in an Alternative High School." *Teachers College Record* (September 1976): 77-100.

Zahorik, John. "Teaching Practices and Beliefs in Elementary Specialty Schools." *Elementary School Journal* (January 1980): 145-157.

Zusman, Ami, and Guthrie, James W. "Back to Basics: The 'New' Tradition in Public High Schools." Berkeley: University of California, Mimeo, n.d.

Copyright © 1984 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.