

Mary Anne Raywid

Alternative Schools as a Model for Public Education

Alternative education differs considerably from most other reform proposals, including open education and progressive education. While the latter seem to have originated from theories, or on drawing boards, alternative education originated and is evolving largely in practice. This considerable difference gives rise in turn to a number of others, and it generates both advantages and disadvantages for alternative schools.

Educational scholars often share a particular conception of how educational orientations originate. It is a linear view not unlike the research-dissemination-implementation sequence long presumed to describe the process whereby new knowledge becomes operational in classrooms. General or pervasive ideas are assumed to be accepted first—i.e., philosophies or ideologies—and educational practice to be derived from these ideas. This sequence is an erroneous description, both of how ideas relate to practice and of the knowledge utilization process. The linear image suggests a far more acceptable *logical* analysis than a descriptive account of what actually happens.

Broad ideologies or orientations do play a part in what goes on in classrooms. One's world view undoubtedly affects one's choices and decisions. It surely figures in what we are immediately drawn to or repelled by. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that teachers' choices do not come from consultation of their world views (or of anyone else's). One hears about an activity or a procedure

Mary Anne Raywid is professor of education at Hofstra University.

and decides to try it. If one just happens to be drawn to enough procedures or activities that others have labeled *open education*, then one comes to be identified as an open educator. Try though we may in philosophy of education to urge the primacy of ideas, and the pitfalls of ad hoc-ism, trial-and-errorism, and eclecticism, I strongly suspect this is how most educational practices get adopted.¹ When educators come to be identified as progressives or as open educators, this is generally the history. They don't enlist in or subscribe to a whole school of thought or a movement—or to a full-blown classroom design or model. Teacher educators may be drawn to educational ideologies or movements. Teachers are more often drawn to particular practices, which may eventually accumulate into patterns identifiable with more comprehensive and systematic positions.

Alternative schools have probably exhibited an anti-systems tendency to an even greater extent than others. The counterculture out of which many of the first of them came had distinct anti-authority and anti-theory biases which would dispose them to reject established ideas. Free schools, which were among the first contemporary alternatives, were openly ahistorical. (Lawrence Cremin, 1974, is one of the people who have called attention to this, criticizing the attendant need to keep reinventing the pedagogical wheel.) The anti-scientism and anti-abstraction biases which began in the same period have also left their stamp on succeeding alternative schools (Cremin, 1974; Roszak, 1969). Thus, for a variety of reasons, alternatives do not

seem as obligated to a particular set of formative ideas as did progressive or open education.

Yet there seems considerable affinity between open education and alternative education. Many see alternatives as the high school version of open education. (Most, but not all of the nation's alternative schools are at the secondary level; most, but not all of the open schools are elementary.) Alternatives have also been identified as heirs of the progressive legacy. Whether any such kinships exist depends upon one's definition of alternative schools.

Formal and Substantive Definitions

There are two logically distinct conceptions of alternative education, a formal and a substantive one. For those subscribing to the *formal* definition, an alternative is any school (or administrative unit) within a system of differentiated schools or units that are available on a choice basis. To qualify as an alternative under this definition, a candidate must:

1. Be an administrative unit with its own personnel and program: a school or a school-within-a-school, but not just a course or a course sequence.
2. Be open to all within the district on an optional, not assignment, basis.
3. Be a unit deliberately differentiated from others in order to accommodate learner needs or interests, or parental preferences.

It is clear that under this formal definition, what is stressed is diversity and choice. Orientation is irrelevant; thus, free and fundamentalist schools are both alternatives.

The *substantive* definition, however, largely accepts but supplements the formal definition. It also makes alternative schools distinct and deliberately differentiated administrative units chosen by their students; but it adds a particular kind of educational orientation. Thus, distinct program similarities can be identified to link alternatives of this sort, and despite the variety in existing programs, accurate generalizations can be framed to include large percentages of them:

1. Alternative schools tend to emphasize the development of close interpersonal relationships within the school and to generate a strong sense of affiliation to the program and to the others within it.
2. They typically offer different content, differently packaged than neighboring conventional

schools. Courses may be designed not out of single disciplines but reflecting integrative themes that draw on several fields of study—e.g., a course on City Life and Survival, or Utopianism through Science Fiction.

3. They tend to stress learning by participation or observation, in preference to analysis and study. There is a lot of action and experiential learning, as well as service learning.

4. They are likely to have evaluation systems and formats which differ from those of other local schools. Students are often asked to participate in self-evaluation. Descriptions may replace grades, and portfolios, transcripts.

5. Fewer rules and less regulation of conduct are common, with students exerting more individual and collective decision making than in other schools.

The above generalizations seem true enough of most alternative schools. Recent evidence in the form of a national survey substantiates them.² But obviously, one can exclude identifiable subsets of alternative schools from almost all of them. For instance, few of the above claims would apply to back-to-basics schools, and there are a number of magnet schools to which they do not apply either. Back-to-basics schools generally, as well as a number of magnet schools, are alternatives only under the formal definition above. And there are programs called alternatives in some locales that meet neither of the above definitions: the in-school suspension and other punitive programs that have developed very extensively in the South. (Similar programs exist in other parts of the country, but there they are not called alternatives.) In view of all this confusion, I shall try to separate assertions about alternatives in the formal sense from assertions about alternatives in the substantive sense. But I shall simply exclude the punitive programs as a misnomer, since they fail to meet either definition.³

Alternative Schools as Models

The definitions facilitate asking more meaningfully about the usefulness and value of alternative schools as a model or design for education. Alternatives in both senses of the term have much to offer, although alternatives in the substantive sense have attracted the greater attention in public school circles. Some of the early ones were hailed as models of reform—as ways to restore the allegedly cold and indifferent bureaucracies which schools had become, to the humane, caring environments necessary for helping the young to learn. Those

dubbed the "compassionate critics" or the humanists were likely to see the alternative schools of the late '60s and early '70s as the model that *all* schools should be fashioned after.

The nation's interest in educational reform per se abated in the '70s (partly in response to the disappointments of many of the early reform efforts, which included a large array of innovations, of which alternatives were only one). However, a steady interest in alternative schools has been maintained by one group after another with *social* reform intent. News from some of the early alternatives had been extremely positive, with impressive success, often with youngsters who had previously detested school. Thus, through the '70s and into the '80s, alternative schools have been adopted as the prospective solution to a variety of the nation's ills. One can identify quite an array of separate purposes to which they have been recommended over the past decade. Both federal and state, as well as private initiatives, have sought to solve the following social problems through alternative schools: juvenile crime and delinquency; school violence and vandalism; the demands of inner-city minorities; anti-institutionalism; resentments against public bureaucracies; racial segregation; youth unemployment; declining school enrollments; and demographic changes in school populations.

Thus, alternative schools have in fact already been extensively used as a model for realizing diverse aims. Alternatives have attracted youngsters of assorted types and ability and achievement levels. But one thing these young people are likely to have in common is some degree of disappointment with or antipathy toward conventional schools. This means that alternative schools have enrolled far more than a normal share of the youngsters who were previously turned off, non-cooperative, truant, or otherwise problematic. The changes are often dramatic. Investigators report no violence in alternative schools and few behavioral difficulties of other sorts (see Berger, 1974; Duke & Perry, 1978; Mann, 1980). Parents tell about their youngsters who have hated school, yet began attending the alternative with enthusiasm and even pride. Indeed, the extraordinary loyalty and sense of affiliation which many alternatives engender have prompted some to call them "membership" schools. Youngsters it would be difficult to call students at all suddenly begin to show interest, effort, and accomplishment. Extensive improvement sometimes occurs, particularly among students who have previously been underachievers; and among these and

other students, attitudes toward school are sufficiently changed that many alternatives even send far higher numbers on to college than do other schools in the same district.⁴

The picture is not always so rosy, of course—not for every student and not for every alternative school. But there have been enough successes and dramatic turnarounds to attract considerable attention, with the result that all of the national committees and commissions that scrutinized education in the early '70s ended up recommending the spread of alternative schools.⁵

Subsequently, alternative education became rather a growth industry. Some of the programs were launched with insufficient planning, teachers who weren't happy to be in them, and other serious organizational flaws. Sometimes educational considerations were forced to take a back seat when the major reason for an initiative was desegregation or crime prevention. In such instances, success or failure was ascertained on the basis of outcomes not specifically tied to educational accomplishment. Unfortunately, it sometimes turned out that with the switch in focus from education to something else, a number of the advantages of alternative education were lost, including the very factors making them attractive to such diverse sponsorship in the first place.

The considerable interest in alternative schools from outside education has been both boon and bane. It is a first principle of politics that the larger the number of groups and interests finding an idea a solution to their particular problems, the stronger that idea's chances. Thus, the confidence engendered by Birch Bayh's Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency that alternative schools were good solutions to youth crime undoubtedly proved a real stimulus to the alternatives movement. On the other hand, however, this sort of impetus has sometimes shifted resources and attention away from educational considerations, as noted above. For instance, school attendance and offender recidivism rates have been among the evaluation criteria used by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in assessing the alternative programs they have funded. Academic achievement has not been of equal import. The bias of the criteria surely had to affect the priorities of OJJDP-funded alternatives.

Canada's alternative schools and educators suggest interesting contrasts in this regard. In Canada, education seems to be viewed as more important in its own right and less frequently as the

means to resolving acute social ills. The contrast gives rise to some important considerations about the articulation of school and society. Most U.S. educators probably continue to act on John Dewey's argument that schooling should be closely geared to a society, changing as the society changes. Can it be that we have tried to make alternative schools too immediately responsive to social problems, using education in ways it cannot serve? (Another Deweyan message could have warned us against such attempts, but did not prevail: his insistence that the aims of education must not be made subordinate to other considerations.)

Rethinking the Term *Model*

Thus far, we have largely been concerned with the substantive conception of alternative education—and with problems arising in selected attempts to adapt alternative schools to a variety of purposes. Before turning to an examination of the attributes of alternatives in the other, or formal, sense—i.e., differentiated, optional programs of whatever type—we need to consider the term *model*. We are examining the desirability of alternatives as a model for reform. Until fairly recently, that meant an "ideal," and model schools were model in something of the sense that a Platonic form represents a prototype or perfect example for emulation. This idea of a model, and how it might serve us, left it to the emulators to work out how, and to what extent, they might seek to approximate the ideal. But our conception has shifted over recent decades, so that now an educational model is typically construed not as an approximation but as a program or procedure that can be lifted out of its context and set down virtually intact anywhere else one wants to put it! Thus, a model for dealing with alienated students or underachievers might be a total program—a whole alternative school, lock, stock, and barrel—that can be observed in Wisconsin and adopted largely *in toto* for transporting to a school district in Maryland or New Mexico.

The newer understanding of a model seems one of the by-products of federal assistance to education. One observer has suggested that related changes first began to overtake our talk of educational *programs* in the '50s and '60s, as notions of repeatability and reproducibility crept in (Baker, 1981). Later, as government investment in education grew, and the desire developed to extend the benefits beyond initial recipients, the National Diffusion Network was established. This is an agency

that verifies the success of a government-supported program and afterward makes it possible for people from other districts to observe it, learn it, and take it home as a transplant. A notion of interchangeable parts seems embedded, and it has even come to flavor our conception of educational success: programs not replicable elsewhere can no longer be judged successful in the eyes of many, irrespective of their effectiveness in the original setting.

One's conception of an educational model—Platonic vs. modern version—is important as we consider whether and how alternative schools are a desirable model for educational change. Stimulated by the National Diffusion Network, a number of alternatives have been born by this cloning-like process. It would be interesting to study their success as compared to that of other alternatives because, as we shall see, their origins tend to eliminate or minimize what change experts have seen as major requisites for successful innovation: the extensive adaptation of any innovation and the sense of psychological ownership which the adapting process generates (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975). In fact, it is unclear whether the major benefit of the adaptation is the better accommodation to local circumstances which emerges, or whether the gain is more a matter of the effects of the process itself on the innovators. Either way, some amount or degree of re-invention of the pedagogical wheel seems to have been found essential to successful educational innovation.

Alternatives of both the substantive and the formal type can be used as models in the contemporary sense as just described. However, this may be a mistake, substantially diminishing the success-potential of the new alternatives. Certainly, people planning to start alternative schools can gain a great deal from examining others and borrowing from them. But as many have noted, alternative schools need to be home grown—suggesting they cannot really be modeled after others in the contemporary sense of *models*. Alternative schools, then, should serve as models for new programs only in the sense of a general idea to be approximated and adapted, not a program to be replicated.

Alternatives as Schools of Choice

Alternatives in the schools of choice sense—the programmatically neutral, formal sense—also have substantial advantages to recommend them as sources of improvement in education. Perhaps their greatest asset is the mechanism or reform

medium they represent. One of the clearest lessons of the reform efforts of the '60s and '70s was that the capacity of school systems to respond to needed changes must be carefully cultivated. Large-scale, stable institutions often inhibit flexibility and the capacity for renewal. Thus, there is no guarantee that schools will respond to parent desires, student needs, shifting circumstances, or urgent reform demands. In fact, there is substantial reason to believe that they will not—short of a specific mechanism or instrumentality itself built into the system to institutionalize renewal. Optional schools serve as just such a device. As unmet needs or interests arise, new programs can be launched; and as such schools become insufficiently responsive to changing student needs or parent preferences, they simply fail to enroll sufficient numbers to sustain them. Then new programs are generated to respond to new circumstances. The new programs can and often do come from both inside and outside the school system: sometimes it is teachers who propose a new program, sometimes students, and sometimes parents. (The Board of Education in Toronto is encouraging the development of alternatives through community initiative and regularly aids proposers to establish new educational options which become part of the public system.)

Systematizing the establishment of new alternatives has a number of advantages. They maintain responsiveness within the system, and they also contribute to its rejuvenation. This is a vital function under contemporary circumstances, especially with an aging and increasingly dispirited teacher population. Investigators report that teacher alienation begins to set in after one to five years.⁶ The opportunity of moving into and establishing a new program is a powerful chance for change and novelty. The very existence of such an opportunity stands as a significant weapon against burnout and a stimulus to regeneration. And we have learned enough to know that the self-renewing teachers are only found in self-renewing schools, since such a regeneration requires too much support to permit individuals to accomplish it solo.

One of the ironies of the recent past is that the same period that has taught us about school failures has also taught us the difficulties of significantly altering the situation. We are considerably less optimistic about the possibilities of substantial turnarounds than we were 20 years ago. We perceive the challenges as greater, the obstacles as higher, and the chances for success as lower than the would-be reformers of the '60s viewed them.

One important reason for the difference in outlook is that we have learned that effective change for the better requires a fairly substantial set of nurturant conditions.

Those conditions include a number of process considerations pertaining to planning and implementation (e.g., it cannot be a top-down imposition effort; it must be designed or extensively adapted by those who are to use it.)⁷ There are also some base-line propositions such as: It is easier to create a new school than to change an old one (Sarason, 1976); and (counter to what one might expect) success potential is greater for efforts that involve several, or even multiple changes, than for those undertaking just one.⁸ The chances of a change effort are also increased by building in mutual support machinery extending beyond the change period, and by providing environmental features consonant with program features.

The purpose of this litany is not to provide a full checkoff list but to suggest the number and variety of requisites important to high success-potential for any improvement effort. Not all planners of alternative schools have met the requisites of successful change. However, most alternatives have been grass-roots efforts, and the very process of creating an alternative school is likely to involve people in meeting a substantial portion of the initial requirements for successful change. Thus, alternative school planners with little acquaintance with the change literature have managed to follow its advice fairly extensively. This would seem to be a considerable advantage for alternative schools as a reform medium or model.

The enduring interest in school choice is also an advantage. The idea of optional schools began in the '60s with the voucher proposal. Although vouchers seemed, as one of their advocates later suggested, a proposal without a constituency (Doyle, 1977), the basic idea of choice appears one that will not go away. When bested, it keeps resurfacing in new forms. We have seen it since the original voucher plan in a variety of other voucher and tuition tax credit proposals, in the growth of magnet and alternative school programs, and in the decisions of those who have withdrawn their children from the public schools altogether. The opportunity to choose the education of one's child within the public school has been argued as the way to: render a bureaucracy responsive to its clients; restore democracy to a public institution; respond to the needs and special concerns of various minority groups; increase educational effectiveness by responding

differentially to diverse student needs; enhance students' interest in education and commitment to their schools; restore public confidence in the schools; restore education's commitment to fulfilling "private and disaggregated values" as well as public aggregate interests;⁹ retain the support of the middle class and prevent public schools from becoming pauper schools; save public schools from a downward spiral of diminishing student quality, educational effectiveness, and financial support.

The durability of the interest in choice, the variety of values and concerns to which it is perceived responsive, and the likely continuation of the conditions which lend it impetus—all suggest that the idea of optional schools is also likely to prove durable.

Finally, optional schools appear a good model for educational reform and continuing renewal because they offer direct benefits, experienced as benefits, for all of the participants involved with the school. This is a considerable advantage when one considers other major reform proposals. Many—e.g., curricular reforms—impose changes which only promise intangible gains. They make new demands on participant groups (i.e., teachers, students, administrators) but they often offer no real experience or sense of benefit. This is not the case with alternative schools, however. The benefits extended to teachers are considerable, as a recent study of teacher alienation would suggest. It found schools to offer insufficient opportunities "to experience such need satisfaction factors as autonomy, creativity, and recognition for achievement.... Dissatisfaction prevails," it was concluded, "because teachers are denied participation in a large number of school decisions affecting their work" (Vavrus, 1979). They are often excluded even from the planning of the curricula they will be expected to teach. And parents sometimes add to the devaluing of teaching by viewing teachers as babysitters with three-month vacations.

Contrast with Traditional Schools

The picture in the alternative school is sharply different: Figures from the national survey earlier cited suggest that in contrast to other public schools, 85 percent of the teachers in alternative schools have chosen to be there. Moreover, alternative schools tend to have far more control over the full gamut of educational questions and conditions (course content, learning activities, program planning, staff and student selection, evaluation) than

is common in public education; and *within* the school, teachers are prominent in the making of such decisions. Alternative school teachers have a significant role in decisions regarding school goals, curriculum, staff hiring and evaluation, and budget allocation in more than 90 percent of the nation's alternative schools (Raywid, 1982). Not surprisingly, then, even teachers forced by a series of district emergencies to accept assignment to an alternative school chose after a year to remain there. Only 7 percent of the teachers thus assigned to Philadelphia's Parkway School for 1978-79 preferred to leave when at the end of the year they were offered re-assignment choices (Lytle, 1980).

Students experience changes, too, in an alternative school, and most studies have found significant increases in daily attendance rates. It is common to hear alternative school students and their parents report that youngsters genuinely like to come to school. It is an experience most first-time observers cannot believe, to hear—in this day and age—youngsters trying to testify and bear witness for a school! It leaves little doubt that the benefits which *they* perceive accrue to alternative school students. And these are evident not only in their reports but in enhanced academic accomplishment. For some, this is close to the first experience of academic success.

Parent benefits are also obvious and directly experienced. Much of the literature has called attention to the empowerment that accompanies choice. For some disadvantaged groups this empowerment is viewed a considerable gain in itself. But whether or not it is so experienced from the start, the benefits of choice typically emerge quickly. A number of alternative school evaluations have sought systematic parent response on how their youngsters seem at home. Such changes as more cooperative behavior, enhanced self-esteem, and the appearance of a generally happier person are common reports.

Administrators also report advantages since many of their more disagreeable tasks are greatly diminished in alternative schools. As earlier noted, discipline problems are rare. Teacher commitment, dedication, and involvement are likely to be unusually high, eliminating the all too familiar problems associated with trying to obtain the cooperative participation of lukewarm staff. Dealings with parents who are well disposed toward the school and its teachers are of quite a different order than in schools where this is not the case.

A considerable advantage of deliberately differentiated schools of choice, then, is their delivery of immediately experienced gains for all involved. If we assume a need for educational reform and improvement, the ability to extend such a promise serves as a powerful incentive for undertaking the effort. Do alternative schools represent a desirable, as well as a practicable direction in which to move? The consequences we have identified are no small indices of merit. The world offers no guarantees, of course, and not all alternative schools succeed, nor do all students succeed even within the best ones. But the need for change in education is sufficient, and the past successes of alternative schools substantial enough, to lend encouragement to districts considering them.

In both the substantive and formal senses, then, we have tried to show that alternative schools seem a worthwhile model for educational improvement. But the model is positive and useful, however, as we have also tried to indicate, only for emulation and not replication. The reason is that its value resides not only in the particular attributes of alternative schools: they also offer a valuable model of the change process itself. Finally, they respond to a message that recurrently rouses the consciousness of educators and public alike: Americans will have educational choice. If the public sector does not provide it, they will seek it elsewhere.

Notes

1. A large number of practices, of course, have been adopted at least formally when an administrator makes the decision involved. But there is no evidence to suggest that administrators are any more drawn to schools of thought or to logically derived practice than are teachers.
2. Conducted by the Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y. 11550.
3. My purpose here is less to join an argument over a definition than to focus attention on programs that seem to offer particular and fairly frequent sets of advantages. The evidence is clear that punitive programs do not claim these advantages, whether they are called alternatives or not.
4. Little extensive outcomes research has yet been undertaken in connection with alternative schools, and the bulk of the existing evidence about outcomes is taken from evaluations. Most claims come from three evaluation analyses: Robert Barr, Bruce Colston, & William Parrett, The effectiveness of alternative public schools: An analysis of six school evaluations, *Viewpoints in teaching and learning*, July 1977, pp. 1-30; Heather Doob, *Evaluations of alternative schools*. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1977; and Daniel Duke & Irene Muzio, How effective are alternative schools? A review of recent evaluations and reports, *Teachers College Record*, February 1978, pp. 461-483.
5. The list of recommending bodies includes: the 1970 White House Conference on Children; the 1974 Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee; the Office of Education's Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education; the Phi Delta Kappa Task Force on Compulsory Education and Transition for Youth; the Council for Educational Development and Research; the Kettering Foundation's National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education; the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; and the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.
6. Five is Seymour Sarason's figure in *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976. Michael Vavrus suggests one, in *The relationship of teacher alienation to school workplace characteristics and career stages of teachers*. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, 1979.
7. These are among the major lessons of the now classic Rand study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975).
8. Underscored most recently by John Goodlad's Study of Schooling, as reported at the American Educational Research Association meeting, New York, March 22, 1982.
9. The phrase is Tom Green's in The private school threat to public schooling: Fact or fiction? American Educational Studies Association, Colorado Springs, November 8, 1980. Professor Green uses the term to contrast the individual's interest in and hopes from education with the public's interest and expectations of schools.

References

- Baker, E. *Toward local control and national accountability in federal program evaluation*. Paper presented at the Conference on Planning the Evaluation Process for the Follow Through Program, February 19-20, 1981, Austin, Tex.
- Berger, M. *Violence in the schools*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M.W. *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. IV: The findings in review*. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1975.
- Cremin, L. The free school movement—A perspective. *Today's Education*, September/October 1974.
- Doyle, D. The politics of choice: A view from the bridge. In *Parents, teachers, and children: Prospects for choice in American education*. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1977.
- Duke, D., & Perry, C. Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B.F. Skinner have failed? *Adolescence*, Fall 1978.
- Green, T. *The private school threat to public schooling: Fact or fiction?* Paper presented at the American Educational Studies Association, Colorado Springs, November 8, 1980.
- Lytie, J.H. An untimely (but significant) experiment in teacher motivation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1980, 700-702.
- Mann, D. *Disruptive students or provocative schools? School differences and student behavior*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Montreal, September 2, 1980.
- Raywid, M.A. *The current status of schools of choice in public secondary education*. Hempstead, N.Y.: Project on Alternatives in Education, Hofstra University, 1982.

Roszák, T. *The making of a counter culture*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969.

Sarason, S. *The culture of the school and the problem of change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Vavrus, M. *The relationship of teacher alienation to school workplace characteristics and career stages of teachers*. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, 1979.

tip