

9-1-1999

Responses

Bruce S. Cooper

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ce>

Recommended Citation

Cooper, B. S. (1999). Responses. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 3 (1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.15365/joce.0301052013>

This Article is brought to you for free with open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for publication in *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* by the journal's editorial board and has been published on the web by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information about Digital Commons, please contact digitalcommons@lmu.edu. To contact the editorial board of *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, please email CatholicEdJournal@lmu.edu.

POLICY RESEARCH AND PRIVATE EDUCATION: A RESPONSE TO BRUNO V. MANNO

BRUCE S. COOPER

Fordham University

Private schools and the political and policy environments in which they live provide critical and stimulating opportunities for research. As Bruno V. Manno's (1997) essay illustrates, nonpublic schools often stand in fascinating contrast to the predominant model of publicly owned, publicly financed, and publicly regulated education in the United States. As living examples of schools based on (a) parental needs and choice; (b) religious commitment and energy; (c) values and ethical standards; (d) autonomous, market-driven communal efforts; and (e) a long history of being under scrutiny (and even attack) by the established political and educational order, nonpublic education and the policies affecting it deserve careful analysis.

Research since the groundbreaking *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* (1925)—establishing the legal rights of private schools to educate compulsory school-age children—shows that nonpublic education is constantly affecting and affected by the politics and policies at all levels of government: the U.S. Congress, the President, the U.S. Supreme Court, and a host of state agencies and bodies, not to mention local public school boards, superintendents, teachers' unions, and the media (Cooper, 1988, 1989, 1996; Cooper & Guare, 1997). Recall, for example, how Monsignor Frederick C. Hochwalt of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the major lobbying group for the Catholic bishops, held hostage history's largest federal aid policy to public schools, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, until President Lyndon B. Johnson extended Chapter 1 (also called Title I) services to needy children in parochial schools.

Remember, too, the abortive attempts of President Ronald Reagan to craft a Chapter 1 "voucher" for low-income, private school students, when

the Supreme Court outlawed public school teachers' entering parochial schools to offer Title I remedial services—offsite alternatives were used but proved expensive and less effective (Cooper, 1988; Vitullo-Martin & Cooper, 1988). And who could forget the “voucher fever” that hit Milwaukee when the state offered 2,000 public school children a chit to attend a private school, as long as religion was not on the curriculum. Reminds us of the joke about the public high school principal, who, patrolling the corridors of her school, encounters a group of students facing a wall. The principal pushes anxiously into the gathering, takes a look, and with some relief exclaims: “Oh, it’s okay, you’re only shooting dice. I thought you might be praying!”

Even local politics can become involved with private school issues, as this New York City case illustrates. The nation’s largest public school system, the NYC Public Schools, was incredibly overcrowded in 1997, with 91,000 more students than spaces. In a spontaneous act of Christian charity, the spiritual leader of the New York Archdiocese, John Cardinal O’Connor, offered to admit 1,300 students into the less crowded archdiocesan schools at a third the cost of public education. The Cardinal agreed to accept the “worst” or weakest students at that. The mayor, Rudolph Giuliani, concurred and actually offered to pay for these pupils out of public money—although he was immediately hooted down by the civil libertarians who were concerned about the legal doctrine of “the separation of church and state.”

So, instead, the enterprise was financed by private philanthropy which the mayor helped to solicit. And these students were removed from cramped quarters (e.g., converted bathrooms, closets, and hallways) of public schools and given free places, on a scholarship worth \$2,500 per year, at a Catholic school. (Rightfully, a few Catholic school families were heard to say, however: “Why have we been paying the full freight for our kids for years, and these non-Catholic, often black, students get a free place for 12 years? Why not everyone?”)

This recent case shows just how “political” (nay, radical) even the mildest gesture can become. First, note that Mayor Giuliani, a former federal prosecutor, and Cardinal O’Connor were on the same side: ergo, blurring the lines of separation between the church and state, the religious and the profane. Second, the sources and uses of money, both public and private, were real issues—a long-time trend in the so-called “parochi-aid” conflict. Third, the Cardinal made a special effort to anticipate the usual criticisms from detractors who say: Of course, private schools “do better” educationally, since they can freely recruit, select, admit, and dismiss students who fail to meet these schools’ goals and standards. Anticipating these accusations, the Catholic schools purposely took “the worst” kids to avoid public derision. (The New York City schools’ chancellor, Dr. Rudolph F. Crew, responded by refusing to help in locating and recruiting these students. So much for public-private school cooperation to assist students whom the public schools

could barely accommodate.)

Fourth, and perhaps most important, Catholic schools were assuming a commonweal function, relieving pressure on the public sector: one "sector" helping another. Critically, in research on private education, sectoral concerns are paramount and cut at least three ways: between (a) public and private school affiliations, (b) religious and nonreligious education; and (c) various wings and ideologies within sectors, as among ultra-Orthodox, modern Orthodox, and more liberal Jews, and between more liberal and more traditional Protestant sects and their schools. In the case of the "Cardinal O'Connor voucher" for crowded public schools, New York City has witnessed a Roman Catholic prelate, supported by a moderate Republican mayor, offering Protestant African-American children cost-free places in parochial schools, ultimately paid for by "private" donors, many of whom were Jewish. Only in America!

What a rich landscape for research on politics and nonpublic education, richer indeed than restricting studies to the more monochromatic public system alone. This article, written in response to the Manno paper, outlines and suggests a wealth of policy research based on extant, but rather fragmentary studies in this field. This response begins with a few words about the politics of doing nonpublic school research, then the politics of values, of intersectoral relations, of the role of community in education, of the long legal tradition in private education policy, and of public funding and control. The methods used in such research (everything from micro-analysis, biography, history, surveys, program analysis, and philosophical/ethical studies to political economic views of the role of private schools in the education marketplace) are briefly explored.

SIX CONCERNS

THE POLITICS OF PRIVATE SCHOOL POLICY RESEARCH

The politics of private education begin in the academy. The very choice of a thesis topic, a dissertation study, a field of research, is itself political. We remember with horror the response of the academic community to the late, great James S. Coleman's (1926-1995) investigation of the academic attainment differences between students in public and parochial schools, using the *High School & Beyond* data (Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Coleman, Kilgore, & Hoffer, 1982). When he and his colleagues found that Catholic schools really helped the poor to achieve at a higher rate than comparable kids in the public system, rather than celebrating and opening the doors of these schools to the nation's most disadvantaged the public school community and its scholarly supporters held emergency meetings of the American Education Research Association (AERA), caucuses at the American Sociological

Association (ASA) where expulsion of Coleman was seriously discussed, and “damage control” exercises at the public education associations in Washington, DC, to discredit Coleman’s findings and put a better spin on their meaning.

Perhaps one of the goals of our writings and meetings should be to encourage and reassure new entrants into our field—the brightest and best doctoral students and new faculty—that it is both exciting and useful (and even sometimes occupationally safe) to do research on private education. Current researchers may learn lessons from the past experiences of scholars such as Donald A. Erickson, a founder of our field, who recalled sadly a time when his department chair and later dean at the august University of Chicago Graduate Department of Education repeatedly warned him that if Erickson wanted a contract renewal and tenure he should seriously consider ditching research on nonpublic schools and concentrating instead on the study of mainstream education. So much for academic freedom for the untenured.

Luckily for all of us, Professor Erickson ignored this advice and did research on both private and public schools. (He was subsequently granted promotion and tenure, and was elected in 1979 to the highest office in his field, Vice President of Division A—Administration, of the American Education Research Association. Incidentally, James Coleman was later elected to the presidency of the American Sociological Association, some redemption for a great sociologist who did unpopular research and reached controversial conclusions.)

Little did Erickson’s mainline colleagues know of his lifelong commitment to the study and assistance of private schools. Fellow academics seemed oblivious to Erickson’s leadership, as demonstrated, for example, in his pivotal court testimony on behalf of the Old Order Amish in the groundbreaking U.S. Supreme Court case, *Wisconsin v. Yoder* (1972). Erickson chronicled the heart-rending legal saga in which local and state authorities chased down and arrested Amish parents for violating the state’s compulsory education laws because they staunchly opposed continuing secondary schooling for their children beyond the eighth grade and preferred home education on the farm instead. Mr. Chief Justice Burger delivered the opinion for the High Court in the *Yoder* case, stating:

The testimony of Dr. Donald A. Erickson, an expert witness on education, also showed that the Amish succeed in preparing their high-school-age children to be productive members of the Amish community. He described their system of learning through doing the skills directly relevant to their adult roles in the Amish community as “ideal” and perhaps superior to ordinary high school education. The evidence also showed that the Amish have an excellent record as law-abiding and generally self-sufficient members of society. (Furst & Russo, 1993, p. 89)

Erickson orchestrated the court testimony such that not a single local official (neither police chief, head of welfare, nor mayor) could recall a situation where Amish people were publicly drunk, destructive, on the dole, or otherwise misbehaving, despite “dropping out of [public] school” at age 14. In fact, Erickson brilliantly helped to make the opposite case: that many adolescents learn their worst personal habits (e.g., drinking, taking drugs, cursing, sloth, sexual promiscuity, and having “an attitude”) in high school, years when Amish young people are working safely and productively at their parents’ side on the family farm. Despite the lack of professional glory for those doing research on private schools and their policies, we can outline a number of productive avenues of study, many of which have their pioneers and all of which need greater scholarly attention.

THE POLITICS OF VALUES

All education is value-laden, whether those values be religious or secular. Scratch the surface of virtually any issue in educational politics—and policy results—and one finds deep, profound value differences. In fact, one could realistically argue that until we understand the values of the policies under consideration, we cannot readily grasp the process of passing nonpublic school laws, setting policies, and implementing this legislation, as well as evaluating the results.

Take a range of policies—such as those concerning compulsory education, state regulations, standards and testing, teacher training and certification, curriculum and teaching, and public funding—and the values and beliefs are critical. Consider even more radical policies, such as the privatization of funding through vouchers, and the fundamental value differences are so enormous and the politics so divisive that opponents fight themselves to a standstill. Vouchers, long identified with the free market crowd (Milton Friedman, August von Hyack, Chester E. Finn, Jr., Myron Lieberman, Denis P. Doyle) have even had appeal in the 1960s among the liberal lefties like Christopher Jencks (1970). He saw vouchers as the best way to “free the children” of the burdens of life in “oppressive education bureaucracies” (p. 45).

Now, interestingly, the poor families of color most strongly favor vouchers: African Americans fed up with the failure of urban public schooling. As Nord explains in *Religion and American Education* (1995, p. 353),

For the past several years, Gallup Polls have shown the public to favor a voucher system that includes religious schools by a two-to-one margin. Indeed, in 1992, 70 percent of all adults and 78 percent of parents with school-age children supported vouchers. In one poll, 88 percent of the black respondents who were familiar with vouchers favored them. (See also, Lawton, 1992; National Catholic Educational Association, 1992).

Research

What are the values held by political actors that oppose or support programs to help nonpublic schools? How might the many scattered voucher experiments (e.g., Milwaukee, Indianapolis, New York City) coalesce into a significant voucher movement? And what political environments—national, state, or local—might spawn a variety of types of vouchers? Critically, what might be the impact of semirestrictive public aid on different types of nonpublic schools (see Erickson's research on the British Columbia aid scheme in the 1970s)?

THE POLITICS OF INTERSECTORAL RELATIONS

As Manno points out, public and private education are inextricably linked to one another, as competitors, as participants in various policies and plans, and as common educators of the nation's children. Yet, research on the relations among the public schools, government, churches and synagogues, private schools, and their parents, is still in its infancy. Manno talks about the changing "policy architecture" (1997, p. 1), i.e., the gradual privatization of public education: outsourcing, charter schools, deregulation, and school-site management. But he fails to make the point strongly enough: that "privatization" of public schooling may mean the "destructivization" of private schooling. In using the best qualities of private schools in the public sector, we run the risk of attracting families from the tuition-bound private sector into the "free" public system, particularly as the public schools become market-sensitive, competitive, and entrepreneurial (Chubb & Moe, 1990).

Research

We need to focus on regional markets to learn just how much the competition is destructive of private education. For example, what percentage of students applying to the newly opened, tuition-free charter schools, or public magnet or theme schools, are coming from nonpublic schools? Under what circumstances might private schools be given an even chance to compete, since "schools of choice" when restricted to the public sector are capitalizing on their private-like qualities (responsiveness, a clear mission) without having the burden of charging fees and tuition? What evidence do we have from other countries such as Holland and England on the effects of a truly mixed private-public school sector on family choice, student preferences, quality of programs, and level of results?

**LEGAL TRADITIONS IN PRIVATE SCHOOL
POLICY MAKING**

Private education has been in and out of court for decades over political issues such as its very existence, its funding and regulation, and to what

degree it must conform to the more general laws and regulations for public schools. As Furst and Russo explain in their book, *The Legal Aspects of Nonpublic Education: A Casebook* (1993, p. 9):

In summary, while the provisions of the United States Constitution, in general, do not directly apply to the nonpublic schools, there are statutory laws at both the state and federal levels, as well as contracts and tort law, which specifically apply to nonpublic schools. Even more pervasive is the agency law formulated by departments of state governments, and in local levels of government, which directly affect the operation of nonpublic schools. As such, the operation of the private schools is both supported and limited by a wide variety of legal structures [and strictures, one presumes].

In fact, the study of policies and their effects on nonpublic education cannot be attempted without some knowledge of the laws, court cases, and rulings. Recently, the case law has become more interesting and complex. In upstate New York, an ultra-Orthodox Jewish community established Kiryas Joel, a theocratic community with its own “public” school district devoted only to Jewish special needs, challenged children. Yes, theocratic since the head of the Satmar Chasidic sect, the Rebbe, made all decisions for the “district,” including personally appointing all the board members. When another Jew from the community tried to “get elected,” he was dismissed by the omnipotent Rebbe, and he took the district to court— where it has been ever since, one level reversing the other. What could make for a more interesting study of politics, policy, private schools, religion, and the law?

Research

Four strands of research are woven around issues of courts and nonpublic school policies: First, what are the current legal definitions of what is a private and what is a public school? Second, which laws and policies promulgated in the public sector must be followed by families and schools in the private sector? What if a state mandates testing? Do the private school kids have to take it too? And what about teachers? If the rights of public school teachers to seek collective bargaining for pay and benefits are protected by law, do these same laws apply to their colleagues in the private sector? It appears not.

In 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Catholic school teachers were protected neither by the private sector unionization law, the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), nor the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) which handles appeals. Similarly, since Catholic schools are privately owned and operated, they do not readily fall under the purview of the state Public Employment Relations Law or Act (PERL or PERA) with its Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) or Commission (PERC), leaving private school employees somewhere in no-person’s land. As teachers in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia have recently been on strike for these rights,

research is essential on private school law, interpretation, and use of the legal system.

Third, a body of case law treats the legality of giving public financial support to private and religious schools. Central here is *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971), with its three-pronged test of the constitutionality of funding: “(1) the statute must have a *secular* legislative purpose; (2) its principal effect must be one that *neither advances nor inhibits religion*; and (3) the statute must not foster ‘an excessive government *entanglement* with religion’” (1971, p. 612).

Fourth, private and religious schools and their supporting groups have become more aggressive themselves about using the courts to protect their rights. For example, an active private schools group, backed by the New York City Public Schools, engineered the reversal of *Aguilar v. Felton*, the 1985 Supreme Court ruling that it was “excessive government entanglement with religion” to have public school teachers deliver Chapter 1 services to parochial school students on the premises. The legal problem rested with the public school supervisors who were required to oversee, manage, and evaluate these public school teachers in parochial schools. In 1997, *Agostini v. Felton* (1997) was initiated jointly by the private and public schools since the expenses of delivery of Chapter 1 remediation “off the school grounds were \$100 million, thus reducing remaining resources for the public school portion of Chapter 1.” *Agostini* was argued on the grounds that private school students were being treated inequitably under mandated Title I services since they had to meet in cramped off-campus mobile vans or travel to “neutral sites.”

Research questions in the legal areas of private school policy making abound. What are the latest trends in the courts and private education? Will cases like *Mueller v. Allen* (1983) that legalized Minnesota’s tax deduction for costs incurred from educating school-age students in both public and private schools be the basis of declaring constitutional other funding schemes for private and religious schools, such as the various voucher initiatives? If vouchers or other forms of subsidy are enacted, what legal limits on state/local regulation and control will inevitably follow?

THE POLITICS OF FUNDING NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

We have a detailed, 35-year story of the relationship between private education and the federal government in enacting and implementing Title I (later Chapter I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, now the nation’s largest federal education aid program. Private and religious schools were “written into” the legislation crafted by the great compromiser, President Lyndon B. Johnson. In 1965 Johnson retained support of the (overwhelmingly Democratic) Catholic community by enabling poor, under-achieving children in parochial schools to be given remedial services by

teachers hired by the public school (Meranto, 1967; Thomas, 1975). This policy of using public school teachers, with no federal dollars reaching religious schools directly, avoided the accusation between 1965 and 1985 that federal aid to private religious schools violated the First Amendment.

This policy of allowing public school staff to visit parochial schools to offer “resource room” help lasted until 1985. *Aguilar v. Felton* determined that these visitors were violating the doctrine of “the separation of church and state” because these teachers were supervised by public officials in religious schools. In 1997, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed itself, ruling that teaching remedial reading to poor kids at private and religious schools hardly entangled the two sectors. In keeping up with these private school cases, what trends in public policy assist private education financially, and what laws and rulings apply? As the world’s only modern nation that denies public funds to private and religious schools, what are the new policies and practices that might span the “wall of separation” and allow public aid?

THE POLITICS OF COMMUNITY AND PRIVATE EDUCATION

Finally, the relationship between private education and the community is central for both parties. That is, schools (public and private) depend on political, financial, and emotional support from the immediate and parent community; conversely, we are now learning that schools are also important to the building and sustaining of local communities and have been studied with some interest. Perhaps the most robust research on community support is that of Coleman and colleagues who measured the effects of what they called “social capital,” the combined effects of people sharing ideas, supporting the mission of the school and its children, and working together, based on common communal values. The Catholic parish is Coleman’s prototype: a place where co-religionists band together to pray, interact with one another, and in turn support their house of worship and their parochial school.

Research

Which policies help to build social capital around each school and which detract or even destroy this mutual support? How do choice policies, such as open enrollment, magnet schools, charter schools, and community schools, include the family and parent community in the school and which policies and practices weaken this cohesion? A high school magnet may suffer from weak social capital (most high schools are weaker than elementary schools in this area) since children apply from all across the system, not just their own catchment or attendance zone. How do these schools overcome this lack of a geographically based community and create an artificial but workable bond based on attending the same school, not living necessarily in the same neighborhood?

METHODS OF STUDYING PRIVATE EDUCATION AND PUBLIC POLICY

Private education policy research lends itself nicely to a number of vital study questions, inquiry methods, and analytical approaches. At the micro-analytic level, for example, scholars such as Peshkin (1986) and Rose (1988) lived in private, fundamentalist Christian communities and composed highly detailed accounts of the world of the evangelical school. These skillful applications of micropolitics and microethnography to private education have proven successful at underscoring the role of external and internal politics and policies in shaping behavior and results.

Biographies, like McPhee's (1966) spellbinding account of the salvation of Deerfield Academy in Deerfield, MA, at the hand of Frank Boyden deserve replication, i.e., additional detailed studies of the great leaders of private and religious schools. What better way to understand the traits, policies, and accomplishments of those men and women who have shaped private and public education? History, too, is a valuable means to learn and preserve the narratives of private education and its politics and policies. Each sect and denomination will have its own story to tell: of their isolation and reaction to the public schools' indoctrination and their escape to schools of their own making. Of course, the Catholics have the longest, most elaborate story: how as newly arrived immigrants they were herded into Protestant public schools and forced to read the King James Bible, as the Protestant public establishment used common schools as devices for Protestantization and Americanization. In 1884, at the Council of Baltimore, the Catholic bishops decided that withdrawal from public education was the only answer and that all Catholic children should have a parochial school education as a crucial means of preserving their identities. Buetow (1970) explores the whole sweep of Catholic schooling in America and the policies and programs that supported this expansion.

By the 1980s, some Jewish leaders had reached much the same conclusion, but not because of anti-Semitism. Jews were widely accepted and had gained such rapid upward mobility through public education that assimilation was gobbling up the young people (55% of marriages were to non-Jews) at an alarming rate. Even the liberal Reform Jewish communal association, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, has passed a resolution supporting Jewish day schools, or Yeshivot, as the Orthodox schools are called, to teach the religion and to preserve Jewish continuity. The history of school politics and policies, from both a governmental and a private school perspective, is important and is often sorely lacking.

Research

What are the similarities and differences among the histories of key policies passed by private school sponsors? What is the history of key public programs, laws, court cases, and other governance and decision-making activities? Investigation of private school politics also benefits from the use of survey methodologies. In fact, some of the largest longitudinal research investigations in U.S. history, such as *High School & Beyond* and the *National Educational Longitudinal Study* (NELS), after some prodding from private school scholars' groups, now include cohorts of private and parochial schools, staff, and students, permitting intersectoral comparisons. However, more attention should be paid to the role of politics, laws, and regulations in shaping the private school environment. By surveying private school parents, teachers, administrators, and students, we may gain clearer insight into the effects of policies on key groups. The early work of Krauschaar (1970) illustrates the power of fine-tuned surveys.

Case study research is yet another method of in-depth, detailed analysis of the impact of policies on schools, teachers, and students. Unlike histories that treat the full expanse of school development, case analysis focuses instead on the dynamics of implementing specific policies and programs. What, for example, was the effect of *Aguilar* on the delivery of remedial help to needy private schoolers? How did the voucher experiment in Cleveland work to increase poor families' access to quality private education (Greene, Howell, & Peterson, 1997)? These case analyses answer questions in detail about specific sites and policies.

The political economy of private school policy analysis is a promising new method for examining and evaluating the effects of these laws, regulations, and requirements on nonpublic schools and the communities they serve. Here, nonpublic education, an application of public choice theory, is treated as both a personal and collective good, embedded in local and regional markets that shape the behavior and quality of these schools. To what degree does the market work to provide choice and options, raise quality, and redistribute opportunity within both the private and public school markets?

Policies that fulfill the free market concepts of political economy or public choice theory would be deemed successful, while monopolistic, closed, and restrictive laws would not. Weeres and Cooper (1992) cite Hirschman's (1986) four key conditions for assessing the appropriateness of education markets:

- (1) there are differences in preferences that are widely recognized as equally legitimate;
- (2) citizens generally are knowledgeable about the quality of services and can evaluate and compare them;
- (3) purchasers can move freely from one supplier to the next and can learn from their experience; and
- (4) there are many competing providers. (p. 67)

This perspective raises several key questions for research on nonpublic school policy. First, to what extent can and will private and parochial school groups respond to increased consumer demand for education by expanding the existing schools and opening new ones? Some data from England and Wales indicate that the start-up costs are high for new schools; and that even with vouchers or other subsidies (for tuition but not capital resources), the market may not so easily respond without considerable public and private investment. (Note that the Edison Project in the U.S. abandoned plans to open 1,000 new for-profit private schools, given the enormous costs and risks in new school development.)

Second, how will the needs of poor, less able, and special needs children be addressed in the free market model? Will schools open to attract the students that more exclusive schools reject? And will government policies allow schools accepting vouchers to raise their tuition to dampen the effect of the subsidy for lower-income families? For as Weeres and Cooper (1992) discovered, “even modest market inefficiencies produce relatively severe untoward effects on school politics in middle and lower income communities, effects which perhaps institutionally reinforce the association between school district socioeconomic status and school achievement” (p. 67). Thus, the political economy viewpoint examines the balance between education as a private good versus a collective or common good, whereby everyone contributes (through taxes, for example) and everyone benefits from a value-oriented, well educated, high-quality school graduate who is prepared for productive work and civic responsibility.

DOING RESEARCH ON NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Whichever research methods are employed—whether microanalytic, biographical, historical, sociological, case study, or political economic—it should be obvious by now that much is yet to be learned about policy making and policy effects on nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. (And we’ve not even considered private and public, religious and secular higher education at all.) Whether one is exploring issues of the politics of values, relations between public and private schools or governments and schools, legal developments, funding issues, or the politics of community and social capital, the research is sure to be complex, critical, and consuming. Six suggested research questions emerge from this field:

1. How do changes in the wider “political architecture,” to use Manno’s term, affect private and parochial schools in the U.S., and by comparison in other countries?

2. What trends in federal, state, and local governments directly affect nonpublic schools, including the home schooling movement?
3. How do recent developments in case law (e.g., *Kiryas Joel*, *Agostini*, and other church-state decisions) affect public/private school relationships and the interactions between government and schools?
4. To what degree are recent political developments and school reforms bringing public and private schools closer together—such as charter schools, outsourcing (contracting out) services, and school choice schemes—and how has blurring the boundaries between public and private schools affected local education markets, costs, behaviors, and results?
5. How does the avid search in our society for faith, values, and morality alter policies affecting private and parochial schools?
6. Finally, how might the U.S. and the world's scholarly community focus their collective energy and skill on analyzing and improving private education policies and practices for all children?

REFERENCES

- Agostini v. Felton, 117 S. Ct. 1997 (1997).
- Aguiar v. Felton, 473 U.S. 401 (1985).
- Buetow, H. A. (1970). *Of singular benefit: The story of US Catholic education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T. (1987). *Public and private high schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Coleman, J. S., Kilgore, S., & Hoffer, T. (1982). *High school achievement*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cooper, B. S. (1988). The uncertain future of national education politics: Private schools and the federal role. In W. L. Boyd & C. T. Kerchner (Eds.), *The politics of excellence and choice in education* (pp. 165-182). London: Falmer Press.
- Cooper, B. S. (1989). The politics of privatization: Policy-making and private schools in the U.S. and Great Britain. In W. L. Boyd & J. G. Cibulka (Eds.), *Private schools and public policy: International perspectives*. (pp. 245-268). London: Falmer Press.
- Cooper, B. S. (1996). National crisis, Catholic schools, and the common good. In T. McLaughlin, J. O'Keefe, & B. O'Keefe (Eds.), *The contemporary Catholic school: Context, identity, and diversity*. (pp. 42-57). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Cooper, B. S., & Guare, R. (1997). Cross-national analysis of religious schools: Institutional adaptation from four perspectives. In T. Hunt & J. Carper (Eds.), *Religion and schooling in contemporary America: Confronting our cultural pluralism*. (pp. 107-138). New York: Garland Press.
- Furst, L. G., & Russo, C. J. (1993). *The legal aspects of nonpublic education: A casebook*. Barrien Springs, MI: Andrews University.
- Greene, J. P., Howell, W. G., & Peterson, P. E. (1997, September 18). Cleveland shatters myth about school choice. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A-14.
- Hirschman, A. (1986). *Rival views of market society*. New York: Viking Press.
- Jencks, C. (1970). Giving parents money for schooling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 52(1), 40-52.
- Krauschaar, O. F. (1970). *American nonpublic schools: Patterns in diversity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lawton, M. (1992, September 23). Gallup polls find wide support for tuition vouchers. *Education Week*, p. 18.
- Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602, 91 S. Ct. 2105, 29 L. Ed. 2d 74 (1971).

- Manno, B. V. (1997, November). *American education's changing policy context: What does it mean for private education?* Paper presented at the National Research Conference on Private Schools, Dayton, OH.
- McPhee, J. (1966). *The headmaster: Frank L. Boyden of Deerfield*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.
- Meranto, P. (1967). *The politics of federal aid to education in 1965: A study in political innovation*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Mueller v. Allen, 463 U.S. 388 (1983).
- National Catholic Educational Association. (1992). *The people's poll on schools and school choice: A new Gallup survey*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nord, W. A. (1995). *Religion and American education: Rethinking a national dilemma*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Peshkin, A. (1986). *God's choice. The total world of a fundamentalist school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925).
- Rose, S. D. (1988). *Keeping them out of the hands of Satan: Evangelical schooling in America*. New York: Routledge.
- Thomas, N. C. (1975). *Education in national politics*. New York: David McKay.
- Vitullo-Martin, T., & Cooper, B. S. (1988). *The separation of church and child: Federal aid to parochial schools after Felton*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Weeres, J. G., & Cooper, B. S. (1992). Public choice perspectives on urban schools. In J. G. Cibulka, R. J. Reed, & K. K. Wong (Eds.), *The politics of urban education in the United States* (pp. 57-86). New York: Falmer Press.
- Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972).

Bruce S. Cooper is professor at the School of Education, Fordham University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bruce S. Cooper, Fordham University, 26 E. 10th St., 9C, New York, NY 10003.

Copyright of *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice* is the property of Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.