schools of preference. And, second, the interests of the community are advanced because racial and socioeconomic diversity is guaranteed, since all groups have genuine proportional access to all schools within a zone.

Moreover, in a controlled choice plan, the school system is obliged to make all of the relatively large zones that embrace multiple schools equivalent in range and quality of services offered so that no one is harmed by reason of residence. And so that the total system is continuously upgraded, such a plan requires a district to use community resources disproportionately in those schools that are least chosen.

Further, controlled choice does not cater to any racial population or social class but, rather, treats all fairly. However, spaces in schools are reserved for bilingual and special education students first so that they as well as others may choose good schools and be mainstreamed in the same school when remedial programs are completed. Magnet schools are accepted as schools with special offerings that should be available to all interested students, regardless of aptitude. But the ultimate goal of controlled choice is to magnetize all schools.

Because it accomplishes all of these things and achieves them simultaneously, controlled choice truly promotes excellence without compromising equity.
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### Not a Case for Market Control

**Response to John Chubb and Terry Moe**

The evidence does not support the conclusion that current methods of school governance are responsible for poor student achievement.

Seven years into the education reform movement, John Chubb and Terry Moe's argument that our public schools are overly bureaucratic and overly regulated is hardly earth-shattering. What is jolting and worth thinking about is their contention that these features are an inevitable consequence of democratic control of schools. But what is astonishing is their claim to have *proved* empirically that democratic control of schools is primarily responsible for poor student achievement and, therefore, that market control is the answer to our education problems. Have they proved this?

Not by a long shot. Chubb and Moe's empirical case for market control is based on their attempt to explain what accounts for the difference in the number of correct answers to 116 questions used in the High School and Beyond survey, which tested the verbal and quantitative skills of a large sample of high school students in both their sophomore and senior years. Sophomores averaged 62 correct answers to the 116 questions on the 63-minute test. By their senior year, these students answered, on average, 6.6 more questions correctly—a very small gain. But the lowest quartile of students answered, on average, 6.6 more questions correctly, while the top quartile answered 18.13 more questions cor-
On closer inspection, it turns out that the "strong" influence of school organization is very weak indeed.

Rather than proving the merits of school choice—and some plans have considerable merit—this book warns us that transforming our public education system into a shopping mall is a dangerous idea.