

1999

Free Market Policies and Public Education: At What (Opportunity) Cost?

Kim K. Metcalf
Indiana University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/mwer>

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Metcalf, Kim K. (1999) "Free Market Policies and Public Education: At What (Opportunity) Cost?," *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*. Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/mwer/vol12/iss1/6>

This Featured Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mid-Western Educational Researcher by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

Free Market Policies and Public Education: At What (Opportunity) Cost?

Kim K. Metcalf
Indiana University

School choice has been called the “most prevalent reform idea of the 1990s” (Witte, 1992, p. 206). Even Boyer (1992), a critic of school choice states, “Choice has, without question, emerged as the single most rousing idea in the current school reform effort” (p. 20). The notion of allowing parents and families the right to choose the school their children will attend is popular among both politicians and the public (VanDunk, 1998) and momentum to develop choice programs continues to grow (Fuller, 1996). The number of charter schools, magnet schools, and alternative schools is increasing at an unprecedented rate, each offering parents additional educational choices (Tucker and Lauber, 1995). School choice programs can take many forms, each of which raises issues regarding the role and scope of public education. Voucher programs, proposals to provide families with public funds to be used at the public or private school of their choice, are undoubtedly the most emotionally debated alternative.

The following sections of this paper discuss questions raised by the voucher issue. Among these are questions related to the impetus for the current choice movement, the nature or structure of existing school voucher programs, and the findings of research on the effects of the voucher programs. It must be acknowledged at the outset that definitive answers about the fundamental goodness of publicly-funded voucher programs are not available and they may never be. The present purpose is merely to promote a better understanding of the issue.

What are “voucher” programs?

The school choice movement, the notion of providing children and families with options for the school and educational program in which they participate without regard for the neighborhood in which they live, includes a broad range of approaches (Glenn, 1998). Vouchers represent only one of many forms of choice that may be made available to parents regarding the education their children will experience. Greater choice is made possible by providing families with money (in the form of a voucher) that can be used for tuition in any participating school, usually including both public and private schools. As a result, voucher programs differ from most other choice programs in at least three important ways. First, and usually most contentiously, the programs allow parents to use the voucher to select from among both public and private schools. Second, all currently operating voucher programs include schools with religious affiliations. The state-funded

voucher program in Milwaukee was the single exception until recent court rulings allowed the program to expand to include both secular and religious private schools. Third, unlike other choice approaches, 14 of the existing 16 voucher programs in the U.S. operate on private rather than public funding (Beales, 1994). It may be in this regard that they present their greatest threat to public education.

What are arguments for voucher programs?

The case for greater parental choice and voice in their children’s education is made by those of all political stripes and persuasions, from far-right to far-left, liberal and conservative, ethnic minority and ethnic majority, from the wealthy and from the poor, from the religious and secular. Not surprisingly in light of this diversity, the underlying rationale for the importance of choice and the likely benefits such programs will affect cross a broad range of perspectives. Thus, it is difficult to state precisely a single case that represents the position of choice advocates, particularly advocates of vouchers. For some, the importance of vouchers lies in providing poor families, particularly those living in the inner cities the opportunity for educational choice that more affluent families have always possessed (e.g., McGroarty, 1994; Ravitch and Viteritti, 1996). By this argument, families with even moderate income routinely choose their children’s school by the school district or neighborhood in which they live. For families with somewhat greater income, additional choices are available through personally funded private school enrollment. Poor families have little or no choice in where they reside, often being forced to live in neighborhoods near the most dangerous and least effective schools. Voucher programs would diminish the inequality of available choices by providing more options for poor families.

Other advocates believe that allowing parents choices in the schools their children attend would promote greater competition among schools and, thus, would improve the quality of schools and encourage innovative approaches to education (Chubb and Moe, 1990; Friedman, 1962). The current public monopoly on education reduces or eliminates incentives for school improvement or experimentation because there is no “market share” to be gained or lost. Ineffective schools, no matter how effectiveness may be defined, suffer no ill consequences and highly effective schools receive no tangible benefits. Such a system not only fails to support success but, combined with highly regulatory bu-

reaucracies, promotes maintenance of the status quo. Change and innovation are implicitly discouraged through unnecessary “red tape” and the difficulties associated with obtaining official sanction or approval.

According to advocates, voucher programs would allow, even force, all schools to be as effective as private schools have been (Gintis, 1995; Glazer, 1993). Private school students routinely achieve at higher levels than public school students, students behave more appropriately in private schools, and parents are more satisfied with the quality of their children’s education in private schools (e.g., Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore, 1981; Martinez, Godwin, Kemerer and Perna, 1995). These valuable outcomes of private schooling result, at least in part, from the competitive market-driven context within which private schools must survive. Unlike public schools, private schools must meet the needs of a sufficient number of students and families to remain financially viable. As a result, private schools focus more on students’ needs, on the interests and input of parents, and on ensuring that clearly defined goals for student learning and behavior are reached. Voucher programs would force every school, whether public or private, to become more accountable in order to remain viable. Parents would choose to send their children to schools which best met their needs, and less desirable schools would be forced to change or close (McGroarty, 1994).

How strong is the voucher movement and what is its impetus?

While many of these arguments seem extreme and perhaps a bit naïve, they reflect the perceptions of a huge proportion of parents in the U.S. (Carlos, 1993). Over 95% of adults in the U.S. believe that parents should be allowed greater choice regarding their children’s education. When asked whether they would support the redirection of some current education funding to provide vouchers with which parents could enroll their children in the public or private school of their choice, 50% of *public school* parents said yes (Matthews and Hansen, 1995). Further, approximately half of current public school parents would send their children to a private school if they were awarded a publicly-funded voucher (Lowell and Gallup, 1998). Among minority families and those living in the inner city, over 80% of parents believe that state-funded vouchers are a desirable and important approach to improving education. It is clear that school choice in its many forms, and particularly voucher programs supporting enrollment in both public and private schools, is likely to continue grow (Jones and Ambrosie, 1995).

Underlying this movement are at least three factors that reflect the unique contemporary context of education in the United States. The most obvious of these is widespread and continuing concern over the quality of public schools. Clearly, and in spite of a small number of researchers who present evidence to the contrary (e.g., Berliner and Biddle, 1995; Bracey, 1995), many Americans are convinced that

the public schools are not effective, that they must be changed, and that radical measures are probably justified (Lowell and Gallup, 1998). A second factor that seems to undergird pressure for greater educational choice is a general societal movement toward egalitarianism and decentralization (see Morgan, 1997). Public respect for authority, belief in government, attitudes about the value of regulation, and acceptance of a uniquely “American” culture have eroded, probably not without cause. Within the realm of education, this trend can be seen in decentralization of school governance, site-based management, school and teacher autonomy, school improvement committees, and increased parental input in the functioning of their local schools. A third and probably related factor that seems to support the movement toward school choice is growing disagreement over the goals of mandatory public education. Public education in the U.S. was developed largely to enculturate the citizenry, particularly newly arrived immigrants, and to promote a common core of values, attitudes, and knowledge. Over time and as the sheer amount of information available has grown and ideas about culture and society have changed, there is increasing divergence on what should be the primary purpose of our schools.

What is the current extent of voucher programs in the U.S.?

To date, only two publicly-funded voucher programs are operational: in Cleveland, Ohio and in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. However, privately-funded voucher programs currently operate in 14 cities across the country, and new programs, both publicly and privately-funded are in varying stages of development in at least 33 other cities. None of these programs serves more than a small percentage of eligible students within their region, and most have been operating for only a few years. In spite of this, the nature of these programs and the threat they pose to the longstanding nature and status of public education have raised the visibility of the issue and intensified the already emotional debate over not just the future of voucher programs, but of public education in this country (Tucker and Lauber, 1995).

What do we know about voucher programs?

There are few definitive answers about the effects of voucher programs as too little evidence is available. Each of the currently available studies of publicly-funded voucher programs is reviewed below. The goal of this endeavor is not to critique the research, but rather to make the reader aware of what has been done and what remains to be done as the voucher debate continues.

Research on Publicly-Funded Voucher Programs

Privately-funded voucher programs outnumber publicly-funded programs and are much more limited in size and scope. In addition, very little research is available on these

programs and all of it has been conducted by sponsors of the programs. For these reasons, the current review is limited to studies of the two publicly-funded voucher programs: The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program and the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program.

The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program

The Milwaukee Parental School Choice Program, was created in 1989 and initiated in 1991, provided up to \$2,500 in private school tuition for children in families whose income did not exceed 1.75 times the national poverty level, with funds used to provide vouchers deducted from state general equalization aid to Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). Originally, qualifying schools were to be non-secular but in August, 1998 the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that the program can be structured to include religiously affiliated schools without violating the state's constitution.

To date, three studies have been conducted of the Milwaukee voucher program. The original and most extensive was that of Witte, Thorn, Pritchard and Claibourn (1994) who were selected by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction to conduct a multi-year evaluation of all aspects of the program. Shortly after release of Witte's fourth-year report, Greene, Peterson, and Du (1996) and Rouse (1997) released studies of the program in which the original data were reanalyzed.

Witte, Thorn, Pritchard and Claibourn (1994). The most comprehensive evaluation of the Milwaukee voucher program was conducted over a multi-year period by John Witte of the University of Wisconsin. Beginning in 1991, Witte and his associates collected data on the students, schools, and families who participated in the choice program. The fundamental effectiveness of the program was judged by comparing data from participating students and families with those from non-participating Milwaukee Public School (MPS) students and families.¹ The primary data sources were student school records (including achievement test scores, eligibility for free or reduced price lunch, etc.), records maintained by the voucher program office (e.g., student attrition, etc.), and surveys of parents and students conducted by the research team

The voucher program in Milwaukee successfully met its goal of providing private school educational opportunities for the children of economically disadvantaged, inner-city families. Further, students attracted to the program were not, as many had feared, among the higher achieving public school students, but were instead among the lowest achieving. However, and interestingly, the families of the voucher children were better educated and more interested in their child's education, both before and after entering the program, than families of Milwaukee Public School students, though their involvement with the school was lower before entering the program. Perhaps most notably, the voucher program did not affect any consistent change in students' academic achievement. Voucher students' adjusted reading

achievement was greater than that of MPS students in year one, lower in year two, and roughly the same in years three and four; adjusted mathematics achievement was roughly the same during years one and two, significantly higher in year three, and significantly lower in year four.

The Witte evaluation remains the most thorough study of the Milwaukee voucher program to date and, as the first study of a publicly-funded voucher program, was greeted with substantial attention. Voucher opponents hold up the study as evidence that such programs do not result in the desirable outcomes that advocates had suggested, particularly improved student learning. Supporters of vouchers note that the program effectively serves poor families, does not draw high achieving students from public schools, and improves parent involvement and satisfaction, even if it does not clearly increase student learning.

Greene, Peterson and Du (1996). Shortly after the original data were released, researchers at Harvard and Princeton independently reanalyzed the Milwaukee data using the "natural experiment" afforded by the voucher applicants who were not selected in the random voucher assignment process. Greene, Peterson, and Du (1996) argued that not only did Witte et al. (1994) fail to analyze the data available for randomly assigned students, but that they also failed to apply necessary blocking and hierarchical techniques. Thus, in a series of analyses, Greene et al. compare ITBS scores of voucher students with their randomly assigned public school peers over each of the first four years of the program. Each hierarchical analysis is blocked on three variables: ethnicity, year of entry (into the voucher program), and grade level. The results of the subsequent analyses indicated that when achievement scores are adjusted for gender, voucher students outperform their public school peers in mathematics during year four (estimated standardized effect of 11.59 using 2-tailed tests of significance) or years three and four (estimated standardized effect of 4.98 using 1-tailed tests of significance);² however, no significant differences were found in mathematics for years one or two, or in reading for any year. When achievement scores are adjusted for gender, family income, and mother's education, there are no significant differences in mathematics or reading for any year. However, when achievement scores are adjusted for gender and prior test scores, voucher students significantly outperform their public school peers in both reading and mathematics during year three, but not in years one, two, or four. Thus, Greene, Peterson, and Du were led to conclude that, "Students who remain in the choice experiment for three to four years learn more than those not selected" (pp. 5-6).

Rouse (1997). Independent of Greene et al. (1997), Rouse (1997) reanalyzed the Milwaukee data comparing voucher students with randomly non-selected public school students and a separate random sample of Milwaukee public school students. Rouse estimates the effects of program participation controlling for individual fixed-effects and reports that participation in the voucher program increased mathematics scores by 1.5 - 2.3 percentile points per year, a

statistically significant and positive program effect. However, she finds no significant program effect on students' reading scores. Rouse notes several caveats to her analyses and cautions that "these are average effects that do not necessarily mean all of the choice schools are 'better' than the Milwaukee public schools" (p. 33).

Across the three studies, it seems clear that the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program is effective in enhancing choice for low-income, predominately African American and Hispanic families. Children of families who pursue the vouchers may be somewhat more "at-risk" than the typical MPS student in that they are: more likely to live in a single parent home, poorer, are achieving at lower levels, and have parents who are less involved in their education. Conversely, these children are somewhat less "at-risk" in that: their mothers are slightly better educated and they have fewer siblings. What is much less clear is whether participation in the voucher program leads to greater student achievement.

The Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program

The most recent publicly-funded voucher program was implemented in Cleveland, Ohio in 1996 and provides private school tuition scholarships (i.e., vouchers) to poor families within the Cleveland public school district. Vouchers are awarded to families primarily on the basis of income, but with an attempt to ensure that the relative ethnic enrollments of Cleveland public schools are maintained within the program. First consideration is given to families whose income is at or below the federal poverty level, then to families with income of between 100% and 200% of the federal poverty index, and then, if any scholarships or tutoring grants remain, families with greater income are eligible. Within each income range, scholarships are awarded through a random lottery process, structured to ensure that 75% of the scholarship recipients are African American. In its first year (1996-97), the program enrolled 1,801 children in 41 private schools, three of which these schools were non-religious.

As in Milwaukee, the focus of the program was on providing educational choice and assistance to low-income, inner-city families, including the option of using state funds to pay for private education. However, the Cleveland program differed from the choice program in Milwaukee in three significant ways. First, the Cleveland program focused on children in grades kindergarten through three during the first year with a grade added each subsequent year through grade eight. Second, the Cleveland program provided state assistance to families who wished to continue to enroll their children in public school, but who wanted additional educational assistance from state-approved tutors. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the Cleveland program allowed parents to choose private schools with religious affiliations.

The legislation which established the scholarship and tutoring grant program required the Ohio Department of Education to conduct an independent evaluation of the pro-

gram during the first three years of its operation. Through a competitive bidding process, the Indiana Center for Evaluation at Indiana University was selected to complete this work. In addition to the state-sponsored evaluation, Greene et al. (1997) have completed studies of two non-religious schools (HOPE schools) which were established by an active supporter of vouchers and have conducted a reanalysis of the first-year results of Metcalf, Boone, Stage, Chilton, Muller, and Tait (1997). These reports provide the limited source of empirical information on the Cleveland voucher program.

Metcalf, Boone, Stage, Chilton, Muller, and Tait (1997). Beginning in April, 1997, the independent research team at Indiana University implemented the first of a multi-year examination of several elements of the Cleveland voucher program. During the first year, primary focus was given to evaluating the effects of the voucher program on students' academic achievement and to establishing a dataset and procedures that would allow longitudinal evaluation of the program's effects for at least three years. Because all students who had applied for a voucher had been offered one, the ideal comparison group (consisting of students whose families had applied for a voucher, but who had not been selected in the random lottery) was not available. As a result, it was critical that the impact of the program take into account other relevant variables which might impact students' academic performance. Previous literature had suggested that students who participated in choice programs were likely to be among the most successful public school students, the evaluation team felt it particularly important to obtain a measure of students' academic performance prior to entry into the voucher program.

In May, 1997, the Terra Nova Survey, Form 13 (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1996) was administered by independent proctors who had been trained and were supervised by the evaluation team. It should be noted that the two HOPE schools refused to allow their students to be tested, however they agreed to provide students' scores on a different achievement test administered as a part of the Greene et al. (1997) study.

The findings of Metcalf et al. (1997) seemed to support those of Witte (1994) in that the voucher program did not promote increased student achievement, at least in the first year. Achievement of participating students was not significantly different from that of non-participating public school students after other relevant variables were accounted for. Similarly, Cleveland voucher students were more likely to come from single parent households, usually headed by a mother. However, Metcalf and his colleagues report somewhat different results related to the characteristics of the participating students. Voucher students in Milwaukee were of lower income and somewhat more likely to be non-minority than their public school peers, but students in Cleveland were of very similar income and ethnicity to students in the public schools. Further, whereas voucher students in Milwaukee were among the lowest achieving students prior to their entry into the program, voucher students in Cleve-

land were achieving at slightly higher levels than their public school peers before they entered their voucher schools.

The first-year results from the Cleveland program were noted by Metcalf et al. (1997) as tentative, based only on the first of a multi-year evaluation and subject to the limitations of the evaluation. While the study addressed the concerns of Rouse and others related to control of the achievement testing process, it did not control for at least two important variables. First, no measure of parental education level was obtained, a factor related to students' academic achievement. Second, the study did not make use of a randomly assigned comparison group of students, thus leaving open the possibility that the voucher and non-voucher students were different in important ways. The release of the first-year report provoked a flurry of attention from both advocates and opponents of vouchers and, like the evaluation efforts in Milwaukee, prompted reanalysis by Greene (1997) and his colleagues.

Greene, Howell, and Peterson (1997) and Peterson, Greene, and Howell (1998). Greene, Howell, and Peterson (1997) provide two additional evaluations of the Cleveland voucher program during its first year. In their first study, Greene et al. (1997) collected data on the effects of participation in the voucher program on parents' satisfaction with their children's schools and the effects of the voucher program on students' academic achievement. This was done by conducting telephone surveys and by examining fall to spring changes in the academic achievement of 263 voucher students attending the two private HOPE schools.

Parental interviews were conducted during the summer of 1997 with response rates (number of parents agreeing to be interviewed) of 74.1% for recipients and 48.6% for non-recipients. Green et al. (1997) report that recipients indicated that the primary reason for their interest in the voucher program was improved academic quality (85%), followed by safety (79%), school location (not reported), and religion (37%), and that they were much more satisfied with virtually every aspect of their children's schools than were non-recipients. Minority recipients were slightly less satisfied with their private school than were non-minority recipients (3% difference indicated, but not reported), whereas there were no differences between minority and non-minority non-recipients.

In the second portion of their study, Greene et al. (1997) examine fall to spring changes in academic achievement test scores of children attending the two HOPE schools. These schools were newly established specifically to accommodate voucher children for whom sufficient space might not be available in other private schools and are of particular interest. These schools announced from the outset that they would accept all students who applied for admission including "many of the poorest and most educationally disadvantaged students" (p.10), a fact that is borne out by examination of second grade test scores. Further, the HOPE schools enroll nearly 15% of all voucher students.

From their inception, the HOPE schools integrated a program of self-evaluation which was to include administration of the California Achievement Test, Form E (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1985) in the fall and spring of each year. Classroom teachers proctored each administration of the Complete Battery over a week-long period. The investigators found that the students improved significantly from fall to spring testing in math and reading. Upon collection of fall, 1997 data, the investigators found the gains made by students during the previous year continued, though they diminished somewhat.

Greene et al. (1997) note that "definitive conclusions about the effects of the scholarship program on academic achievement depend upon the collection of additional data" (p.10). However, they suggest that the generally positive and statistically significant gains made by these students are particularly impressive when contrasted with "the 1 to 2 point decline that is typical of inner-city students" (p. 10). Across the parental attitude and student achievement data, the investigators find substantial evidence in favor of the voucher program and little evidence to support those who argue against it. They further conclude that the results indicate the need for choice programs to be structured to provide special funding arrangements when necessary and to ensure that students with special needs are not overlooked.

The second study conducted by Peterson, Greene, and Howell (1998) was a reanalysis of third-grade achievement data collected and then made public by Metcalf et al. (1997). Peterson et al. were critical of several aspects of the initial study, noting particularly the decision of the original researchers not to include in their analyses the unique test data for students in the two HOPE schools (see above) and suggesting that the second-grade test scores used as covariates in the original study were "dubious" (p. 2). Thus, Peterson and his colleagues transformed students' scores to a common metric (they use the term "percentile points" when referring to these scores, but they appear to be NCE scores), producing a larger sample, and then reanalyze the achievement data. They found that after covarying on gender, ethnicity, family income, and family structure, but without including the measure of prior achievement, voucher students' third-grade achievement is significantly higher than that of their public school peers in language and science ($p < .01$), but not significantly different in reading, mathematics, or science. The investigators note that the differences in reading and social studies, which favor voucher students, are significant when a one-tailed test with $p < .10$ is applied. When prior achievement is included in the covariates, the differences in language and science, both favoring voucher students, are significant at $p < .10$ in a one-tailed test.

Summarizing their report, Peterson et al. (1998) indicate differences in methodology between their study and Metcalf et al. (1997), but that "Both studies find positive choice school effects in some subject domains among third-grade students" (p. 5).

The results of evaluation of the Cleveland voucher program are tentative and early; much more time and data are needed before conclusions can be drawn with confidence. Perhaps because the program is so new and data drawn from it limited, the findings of three studies conducted to date appear to provide somewhat conflicting results. In general, parents whose children participate in the voucher program seem to be pleased with the opportunity they are provided and feel satisfied with the private schools their children attend. They based their decision to pursue a tuition voucher primarily on their interest in improving the quality of their children's education and concern over the safety of their children's public school. The effects of the voucher program on children's academic achievement are unclear. Students who participate in the program were achieving at higher levels than their public school classmates before entering the program. When these initial differences are taken into account, the voucher program appears to affect no significantly greater improvement in students' academic achievement than they would have experienced had they continued to attend public school after one year.

Summary

Surprisingly little research has been conducted on publicly-funded voucher programs. And, in many ways, the findings have been subjected to interpretations based as much on ideology as on scholarly detachment. Unfortunately, there remains considerable misunderstanding of the results of research on vouchers and confusion is exacerbated by highly public commentary from those on both sides of the issue. Nonetheless, examination of research related to school choice and particularly of publicly-funded vouchers reveals some consistent, though undoubtedly tentative patterns. A multitude of factors will impact the direction, extent, and nature of school choice in coming years. Still, some "predictions" are possible.

Families will continue to press for a wider variety of choices for their children's education and policy makers, both conservative and liberal, are likely to respond. Public schools have and must continue to develop programs to attract and retain families who now expect at least some range of choices. As forced busing for desegregation continues to decline while non-public alternatives become more prevalent, metropolitan school districts are presented with both a challenge and an opportunity. Students and funds which have previously been moved from these districts to suburban schools now provide an increased market for public school education. Further, whereas previous attempts at desegregation relied on imposed school assignment, most efforts (e.g., the federal Magnet Schools Assistance Program) now focus on developing programs which attempt to improve racial balance by attracting targeted minority or non-minority students. It seems, then, that at least one impact of the choice movement has been and will continue to be an

increase in the number and variety of options public schools will provide.

If a substantial number of families are provided with and take advantage of alternatives to public education, the effect on public schooling as it has been conducted will be negative as resources for public schools would diminish if funds are redirected. It could be argued that if public schools fail to provide a service that is desired by enough people (i.e., customers) to remain viable, they should be forced to redesign themselves or close. However, even though U.S. public schools must deal with greater competition than ever before, there is no evidence to suggest that non-public competition will ever be allowed to reach a point at which the public school system itself is endangered. Public education employs millions of people, many of whom belong to a well-organized professional union with substantial political clout, it generates substantial income for businesses that supply services and products to the schools, and it touches literally every citizen. To date, no choice programs, public or private, have the potential to destroy the well entrenched monolith that is public education in this country.

Fundamentally, greater family control over education, within obvious parameters, should be encouraged. Many in the education establishment would argue that the parameters within which choice should be allowed should be relatively restrictive to minimize differences in the outcomes and benefits students derive. However, I would argue that the widest possible range of choice should be made available and that, though it will not be popular, the educational market should be allowed to operate.

Educational choice will continue to be the most contentious issue in U.S. education for the foreseeable future. As educators, particularly university-based educators, we have a unique opportunity to use the educational choice movement to promote innovative, creative approaches to schools and teaching. In order to draw students and maintain enrollments, schools will be seeking assistance in developing and improving programs to make them more attractive to greater numbers of families. If we take advantage of this opportunity, we have to potential to make schools more inviting and supportive places for children.

References

- Beales, J. (1994). *School Voucher Programs in the United States: Implications and Applications for California*. Santa Monica, CA: Reason Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 000).
- Berliner, D. and Biddle, B. (1995). *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America's Public Schools*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bracey, G. (1995). *The Myth of School Failure*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, San Francisco.
- Carlos, L. (1993). *The Privatization of Choice. Policy*

- Update Number 3*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 933).
- Chubb, J. and Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Coleman, J. and Hoffer, T. *Public and Private High Schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Coleman, J., Hoffer, T. and Kilgore, S. (1982). *High School Achievement*. New York: Basic Books.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuller, B. (1996). School choice: Who gains, who loses? *Issues in Science and Technology, Spring*, 61-67.
- Gintis, H. (1995). The political economy of school choice. *Teachers College Record*, 96, 492-511.
- Glazer, N. (1993). American public education: The relevance of choice. *Phi Delta Kappan*, April, 647-650.
- Glenn, C. (1998). Public school choice: Searching for direction. *Principal*, May, 10-12.
- Greene, J., Howell, W. and Peterson, P. (1997). *Lessons from the Cleveland Scholarship Program*. Cambridge, MA: Program on Education Policy and Governance.
- Greene, J., Peterson, P. and Du, J. (1996). *The Effectiveness of School Choice in Milwaukee: A Secondary Analysis of Data from the Program's Evaluation*. Paper presented before the Panel on the Political Analysis of Urban School Systems at the August-September meetings of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco.
- Jones, W. and Ambrosie, F. (1995) What are the challenges inherent in schools of choice? *NASSP Bulletin*, September, 21-32.
- Lowell, C. and Gallup, E. (1998). The 30th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80, 41-56.
- Martinez, V., Godwin, R., Kemerer, R. and Perna, L. (1995). The Consequences of School Choice: Who Leaves and Who Stays in the Inner City. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76, 485-501.
- Matthews, L. and Hansen, J. (1995). Choice Within Schools Can Help Students, Schools, and Society. *NASSP Bulletin*, September, 69-76.
- McGroarty, D. (1994). School Choice Slandered. *The Public Interest*, Fall, 94-111.
- Metcalf, K. (1998). Advocacy under the guise of science. *Education Week*, 18 (3), 34, 39.
- Metcalf, K., Boone, W., Stage, F., Chilton, T., Muller, P., and Tait, P. (1997). *An Evaluation of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Grant Program: First Year Report*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Center for Evaluation, Indiana University.
- Morgan, K. (1997). *Real Choice, Real Freedom in American Education*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Peterson, P., Greene, J. and Howell, W. (1998). *New Findings for the Cleveland Scholarship Program: A Reanalysis of Data from the Indiana University School of Education Evaluation*. Cambridge, MA: Program on Education Policy and Governance, Harvard University.
- Ravitch, D. and Viteritti, J. (1996). A new vision for city schools. *The Public Interest*, Winter, 3-16.
- Rouse, C. (1997). Private School Vouchers and Student Achievement: An Evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. Forthcoming in *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
- Tucker, A. and Lauber, W. (1995). *School Choice Programs: What's Happening in the States*. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.
- Witte, J. (1992). Public subsidies for private schools: What we know and how to proceed. *Educational Policy*, 6, 206-227.
- Witte, J., Thorn, C., Pritchard, K. and Claibourn, M. (1994). *Fourth-Year Report: Milwaukee Parental Choice Program*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Department of Political Science and The Robert LaFollette Institute of Public Affairs.

¹ Two related facts are noteworthy. First, the comparison sample of non-voucher public school students is open to question due to selection bias. Although Witte and his colleagues attempted to control for many relevant, non-program variables (e.g., prior achievement, gender, income, etc.), it must be assumed that participating students and families were substantially different from non-participating families at least in their motivation, interest, willingness, or ability to pursue the voucher. Second, because comparisons of students' academic achievement were based on the results of tests administered by the schools, no control of the conditions of testing were available to Witte et al.

² See Abelson (1996) for a humorous discussion of the "one and a half tailed test."