

## WOULD CHOICE BE GOOD FOR U.S. PUBLIC SCHOOLS?<sup>1</sup>

Mary Anne Raywid

How one comes to choice, and what one seeks from it, figure prominently in whether or not it is a good idea. Choice proposals are not all of a piece and certainly not all of them would be desirable. My own view of choice has nothing to do with competition or driving bad schools and teachers out of business, or privatization or vouchers. I think economic arguments are often misplaced, and perhaps mischievous, in educational discussions; so the kind of choice I think would help has little to do with marketplaces and consumers. But I believe that another version of choice can benefit public schools very greatly. It can help in two much needed ways: choice is the most powerful change catalyst we've got for improving schools -- by transforming the way teachers and students experience school and thus the intensity and effectiveness of their efforts; and second, choice could bring changes desirable in school governance.

Why is school improvement so necessary, and why is choice the best strategy for pursuing it? One doesn't have to be a testing fan to conclude that kids aren't learning enough. And one doesn't have to be a teacher-basher to say so. As Al Shanker bluntly told a recent AFT convention, "95% of the kids who go to college in the United States would not be admitted to college anywhere else in the world." (Innerst, 1990) We've all heard enough about the horrors of urban education to know that major overhauling is needed there. What we don't realize is that a lot of those horrors have already spread to the suburbs.

For instance, in a suburban district close to my home, a district with a

substantial minority population, it was recently discovered that 29% of the Black boys in the district are being programmed into special education. (Schemo, 1992) It also appears that a suspiciously large percentage of the other youngsters who are being classified are children who speak English only as a second language. The following practices are occurring in another suburban district, one near my office: kids have been programmed by their counselors into classes they've already taken and passed -- thus leaving them ineligible for graduation. Some students are deliberately programmed into classes they will fail, to get them out of school and into a GED program. Others are programmed into remedial classes that pace workbook assignments so as to assure that these students will remain permanently in remedial classes -- and thus justify the job of a remedial reading teacher. Don't wonder whether these stories are just rumor. I got them from two highly credible sources, a central administrator and a board member in the district.

But the problem isn't limited to what can be told as dramatic horror stories. One of the major contributions of the largescale studies of Ted Sizer (1984) and John Goodlad (1984) was to force us to look at some of the shortcomings of our *good* schools -- indeed, of the way that most of us have been 'doing' school. Many, many classrooms, they both concluded, are non-appealing, non-challenging, affectively flat, intellectually dull places. In Goodlad's words, "Boredom is a disease of epidemic proportions." (1984: 242)

A significant part of the problem, said Goodlad, is we've assumed that schools were places where, once we got things right, all we had to do was maintain them that way. Such an assumption, he warned, is a part of the problem. Unless schools figure out how to make themselves into self-renewing systems, the good will not only prove the enemy of the *best*,

but even of the *adequate*. The costs of complacency -- of the "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" mentality -- are just as Susan Rosenholtz (1989) cast them in her study: There are essentially two types of schools -- either they are "moving" or they are "stuck." And if they are stuck, they are obviously in trouble. Improvement or stagnation are the only alternatives. Thus, we need schools that are flexible and receptive to change -- qualities it is hard to find in bureaucratic systems which are designed, of course, precisely to maintain stability.

Consequently, we keep undergoing these reform periods when the cumulative damage of stability produces loud demands for change. We have sought repeatedly to improve schools -- so often that we've made "change" an industry unto itself in education. Yet the results continue to be disappointing. I wrote several years ago about the path we have trod in the change efforts just of the last decade, starting with pseudo-reform (where the change is more rhetoric than reality, and the change target is public opinion rather than school practice). From there we moved to incremental reform, and finally to restructuring. (Raywid, 1990) What has nudged us onward from one level of aspiration to the next has largely been the pressure of the public's disappointment with results. I think that may now have generated a fourth type of change effort which, if named for the spirit propelling it, might be dubbed the "come hell or high water" phase of reform. The name seems apt both by virtue of the determination expressed by would-be reformers, and by virtue of the nature of their proposals. Some of them are ready to toss out public education altogether -- or to so completely re-shape it that it would be unrecognizable. Some (although not all) of these "come hell or high water" proposals are choice plans. They are voucher proposals or recommendations for so completely re-defining public education that it no longer looks like a public project. I

hope it does not come to what they are recommending: it is not only the bathwater that would go down the drain.

Yet there are school choice arrangements which in my judgment might be the best thing we could do for public education in this country. And I know they work because I have seen them in action. I can show you schools that kids love -- where they are lively and happy and fully immersed in what they are doing -- schools to which they bring their psyches, not just their physical presence. I can show you schools in which students far exceed predictable levels of accomplishment -- not just the prize winners but large percentages of those enrolled. And I can show you schools where some of these accomplishments are reached by youngsters who had earlier been sure bets for dropping out, the resolutely education-resistant.

The Urban Academy in New York that I've been studying for two years now is one such story. Virtually all of the Academy's students would be deemed 'at risk,' for one reason or another. Most are minority youngsters, a large majority from working class or underclass homes, many from dysfunctional and some from non-existent families, and all have encountered previous school difficulty -- usually in dealing with authority. Yet in the middle of a city with massive dropout rates and all sorts of school violence and disruption, Urban Academy has virtually *no* discipline problem, *no* dropouts, none who fail to graduate. What is more, almost all go on to college. (Raywid, 1994)

A good choice system has schools that are patient enough to succeed with such youngsters. It also has schools designed to respond to more motivated students -- and to kids with entirely different sorts of interests and inclinations and talents, and to families with different visions of education. Diversity is the hallmark of such a system, and it is organized

to encourage the sort of school differentiation that acknowledges the differences among human beings and what they need and what they care about. Teachers are invited to design new options in collaboration with colleagues, and teachers as well as families select the program in closest accord with their own perspective or interests. If this sounds idyllic, it not only *can* work, it has. This is the procedure that developed and is still operating in New York's District 4. The plan is as simple as I've described it, but as it unfolds it calls for a lot more.

For instance, if there is to be real choice, then there must be an array of options to select among. This in turn means that if there is to be genuine diversity -- that is, if real options are to exist -- then regulations and procedures and accountability requirements must be broad enough, or applied reasonably enough, to permit departures. If teachers are to design and sustain these programs, then they must be able to schedule time together so as to do so. All of this means that teachers will be cast in new roles -- teachers as well as students and parents. Teachers describe their work in such schools as more demanding, more interesting and challenging, more efficacious and professional, and a lot more fun.

So this kind of choice arrangement is good for teachers. It is also good for students. I've done several summaries of choice findings now (1984; 1985; 1989; 1993), and the literature recommends a number of generalizations about impacts. Students in schools of choice usually prove more interested in what they are doing, more willing to work at it, and hence they are more successful. It doesn't always work for everybody, of course; but when it doesn't, the assumption is that although this match between student and program is ill-fitting, another might work better. Thus other opportunities, and chances for fresh starts, are available in a choice system -- an advantage which zoned assignments lack.

Apart from its advantages for teachers and students, this sort of choice system is also good for schools -- far moreso in my judgment than school-based management. The reason is that it *invites* participation rather than mandating it. And it assembles groups who look at education in the same way, instead of trying to force compromise among what may be diametrically opposed positions. Good schools of choice invite teachers to focus on what *they* care about doing -- namely, designing classrooms and instruction and curriculum -- rather than requiring them to dissipate their efforts with added functions they may find extraneous. A move away from centralized control is implicit in the choice arrangement because a lot of matters must be decided within and by diversified schools rather than for them. And a move away from top-down control, and toward the professionalization of teachers, is implicit because teachers become the designers of the educational program. The result is that schools of choice generate both the creativity and the commitment of teachers -- by combining the *opportunity* to innovate with the *responsibility* to do so. (Metz, 1988) The combination adds up to the continuing self-renewal that Goodlad finds so crucial to sustaining good schools. The operation of a school of choice demands continuing dialog and collaboration -- unlike conventional schools which call upon teachers to work independently.

Although District 4's success can't be guaranteed for all choice systems, the idea has now been around long enough and there has been enough experience to discern what kinds of arrangements and practices are likely to succeed. Research has gradually confirmed what works -- what kinds of policies and practices and conditions are necessary to an effective, equitable choice system. For example, we have learned that schools of choice need support as well as autonomy in order to thrive. We have also

learned that for a choice system to be equitable, you've got to provide seats commensurate with area enrollments. For example, New York City boasts that its students can choose among 400 programs situated in 100 of its high schools. ("ETS and New York City...", 1992) What is not announced is that almost 40% of the high school population cannot be accommodated and must attend schools few would choose. (Crain, Heebner & Si, 1992) We've also learned that open enrollment isn't the panacea some fans had hoped, and that it doesn't prove nearly as attractive as other forms of choice. It doesn't change enough by way of student experience or of school improvement either. (In most open enrollment arrangements, students continue to attend schools with others who are there by virtue of assignment not interest; and open enrollment alone may generate little impetus for change -- either in adequate schools or in poor ones.) We've learned, too, that whether choice will desegregate a system depends a lot on the kinds of themes selected for its schools, as well as on admissions requirements, locations, and a number of other factors.

Now several sorts of evidence are important to assessing whether choice can and really does do what I've suggested it does: function as the most powerful lever for change that we've got. One kind of evidence comes from surveys and records in schools and districts where they've got choice. We have plenty of this sort of evidence, ranging from internal evaluations to extensive studies, and of everything from single schools to sets of school districts. This evidence, focused on impacts on those associated with schools of choice, is almost uniformly positive. Kids learn more, they remain in school longer, and they -- and their parents -- are considerably more pleased with schools they have chosen.

To my knowledge, there is very little negative evidence about the benefits of choice for those involved. Teachers, students, and parents

directly associated with schools of choice are typically highly positive about them, and the evidence regarding achievement is also positive. The negatives expressed by critics are almost always addressed to prospective effects on those who are not part of the choice programs -- on the non-choosers and others who end up in the non-choice schools.

Even when such concerns are clearly justified, and those outside the choice schools are not getting as effective an education as those inside them, the question we need to ask, it seems to me, is "What does that situation recommend that we do?" The answer many seem immediately to move to is "Remove any advantages that are not open to all." But *must* we level down, as this implies? It's not an automatic move. The situation needn't imply "Nobody can have the benefits if everybody can't." Why not "If this is an unusually effective way to improve schools, then let's help them *all* become schools of choice?" If school improvement is urgent, and if choice is an effective lever for accomplishing that -- with alternative strategies less successful -- why not learn to use choice to the advantage of all, rather than deciding that *nobody* is going to enjoy its benefits?

(Nobody in public schools, that is.)

But if there are few challenges about the benefits of schools of choice for those involved, there *are* challenges as to whether choice is really the causative agent of these results, or whether they're really due to something else. We're beginning to see the sorts of studies necessary to ascertaining this. To cite two types, there have now been studies of kids of similar achievement levels at the point some enter a school of choice and others continue in an assigned program, and comparing their achievement a year or more later. (Crain, Heebner & Si, 1992; Larson & Allen, 1988) Not only do the kids in the choice program achieve more -- but the longer the student has been in the school of choice, the greater the difference.

(Larson & Allen, 1988; Musumeci & Szczyrkowski, 1991)

A second example is even more telling. Researchers worry about selection bias and have raised the question of whether the very act of choosing introduces -- or is reflective of -- differences that make research comparisons invalid and the choice issue thus in principle impossible to resolve by investigation. Several recent studies have been designed to respond to this concern. One did so by comparing two groups of choosers -- one group that had been in schools of choice for seven or more years, the other who were relative newcomers averaging only a year's experience. Quoting from the study: (Musumeci & Szczyrkowski, 1991: 75)

Magnet school students outperformed their non-magnet counterparts in ... standardized test results, GPA, number of math and science courses taken, grade retention (non-promotion), attendance, extra-curricular activities, and school awards... These compelling findings cannot be attributed to initial achievement differences between students, student background factors, and selection bias, since the samples were equivalent on these factors.

Yet another attempt to avoid selection bias in examining the impact of choice was attempted in a study of New York City's career academies. Using an experimental design, investigators compared the effects of the schools of choice on students who were admitted, with the progress of applicants who were not admitted and who remained in a school of assignment. (Crain, Heebner & Si, 1992) The results testify to the positive impacts of choice.

A third kind of evidence for assessing whether choice really is our most powerful lever for school improvement comes from the records of rival policy options. What other strong change catalysts have we got? We have decades and decades worth of evidence on the difficulty of modifying an

instructional program. We're now amassing evidence that even determined efforts to *restructure* schools are similarly difficult. A recently completed study of a \$40 million restructuring effort in four cities has concluded that despite it all, the interventions produced only "superficial change" at best, and "little has changed in the day-to-day life and outcomes of students." (Wehlage, Smith & Lipman, 1991: 51, 5)

And what is our main strategy today for restructuring schools -- the *alternative*, that is, to choice? School-based management (SBM). This is a strategy that has been widely enough adopted to warrant comparing its change and improvement potential for schools with that of choice. There's a fair amount of evidence, since SBM is a change strategy that's been adopted in a number of districts across the land. Yet the evidence is largely negative: School-based management doesn't yield greater student achievement, because it rarely seems to affect instruction -- or decision and influence patterns either, for that matter. (Levine & Eubanks, 1991; Malen, 1992; Malen & Ogawa, 1988; Malen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1990) In fact, so disenchanted were two researchers as to comment that school based management appears more "a political response to conflict and a strategy to stabilize school systems" than a means to actually improve education. (Ogawa & Malen, 1989)

I think there are two other important reasons why choice is a superior change strategy to SBM. The first is that it makes more sense to me in principle or in theory than does SBM. I have serious concern about turning over instructional policy decisions to parents and other community members. While I believe parents are well entitled to more voice than they ordinarily now have in the education of their children, I don't think we're likely to get the best schools by turning them over to non-educators to plan and run. The appropriate role for more involved parents is going to be a real question in

the future. To me, that role should not include very much participation in the design of classrooms. Offering professionally-designed programs for parent selection seems a much better way to involve and empower parents -- preserving educational interests while honoring parent rights.

My other major concern about SBM is the results we've heard about teacher response to it. The long-awaited evaluation of the Dade County program showed that it had not done very much for teacher morale. (Collins & Hanson, 1991) And an extensive, 1991 survey of Chicago teachers revealed that about half thought SBM there had improved things, and half were less satisfied. (Consortium on Chicago School Research, 1991) A smaller sampling this year suggests teacher views may now be somewhat more positive, but the number still falls short of a strong majority. (Forte, 1993) These results contrast sharply with the almost universal enthusiasm of teachers in schools of choice. And it's important, of course, not only because it's nice to have happy teachers -- but because it is now so clear that unless teachers have 'bought into' what they are doing, it's not going to be done very successfully.

So the negative evidence about SBM -- as well as the difficulties that are now clear in conventional school arrangements -- strengthen the case for choice as we seek the most powerful strategy we can find for improving schools. As a restructuring strategy, SBM has proved too susceptible to becoming projects-for-some instead of transformations-for-all. The result is an epidemic of what some researchers have called "projectitis" in lieu of pervasive change. (Hill & Bonan, 1991)

Contrast this with the evidence already cited here regarding choice. It comes from studies where schools and systems of choice have been the object of investigation. But equally telling are findings and conclusions from investigators exploring other questions, in an effort to solve present

problems, particularly problems of school organization. At least two major investigations of secondary education have now concluded that schools of focus, with their distinctive purposes and common expectations, are preferable to the comprehensive high school. (Hill, Foster & Gendler, 1990; Powell, Farrar & Cohen, 1985) And for both, choice is the way in which students and teachers should become affiliated with their schools. Adds another investigator of high school structure, the problems of elitism now so prominent in the comprehensive high school could be resolved through distinctive schools chosen by their affiliates. (Clark, 1989) At the system level, a team exploring how to realize both decentralization and accountability concluded that choice may be "the most accurate and efficient downward accountability mechanism for schools." (Hill & Bonan, 1991: 53) Finally, analysts examining district desegregation studies concluded that choice plans ultimately yield more interracial exposure than mandatory ones. (Russell & Clarke, 1987)

Focusing on more immediately student-related contexts and concerns, one group found choice pivotally important to generating "a personalized environment and ... the community that supports it" (McLaughlin, Talbert et al, 1990: 232-233), while others have found choice especially important for youngsters who might otherwise get lost in the comprehensive high school. And a sociologist exploring the requisites of schools that mold character found choice a needed advantage. (Grant, 1985) Thus, it is not only in choice studies, but in others, that the choice idea is garnering support.

These are some of the reasons I believe choice would benefit public education. But before concluding I want to deal with two questions that are often asked: First, do I believe choice is by itself enough to improve schools? Is it some golden wand that alone can transform them? Of course not. As I've tried to show, simply declaring open enrollment isn't likely to change

much. In fact, since it may serve largely to enable the most discontented to escape their present schools, that kind of move might even make improvement less likely. (Hirschman, 1970) Thus, a good choice plan requires some other provisions, including the diversity commitment and the affiliation of all within every program as a matter of choice. No, choice alone cannot guarantee school improvement. But I suspect it's the linchpin holding together the multiple essentials.

Another challenge often put to the choice idea is, What happens to the schools and the teachers everybody flees? I'm asked this question frequently and two answers always come to mind. The first is, "Would you really want to consign *any* kids for a period of years to a school so bad that *nobody* wanted to be there?" The second response is that we are obligated to do something drastic about schools that are that bad. In fact, isn't it the responsibility of the system to see that they get better long before they reach the point that everybody wants out? Here is one way to do so: It seems to me quite legitimate for the public to require schools to restructure themselves. But a wise public will leave the question of how to each individual school. To reorganize as a school of choice -- or perhaps even better, as a building with a number of mini- schools of choice -- ought to be one option. Or, given the current enthusiasm for it, schools should probably be permitted to go SBM instead, if that's what they prefer. And if neither of these alternatives is acceptable to a particular school, the third option should be to have the district devise and monitor an improvement plan for them.

As all of this suggests, a choice plan that will bring benefits to public education must be carefully crafted and multi- faceted -- not just simply an opening of the doors. The reasons I have stated explain why I favor such a choice policy: it's the most effective way we know for bringing about much needed change and improvement in schools. In the course of doing so, it will

also change school governance in desirable ways, shifting decisions from central offices to schools, and from administrators to teachers. It will also empower parents at the same time it empowers teachers -- and in ways that honor the expertise and prerogatives of both. I strongly believe the right kind of choice programs -- not the kind, sadly, that some are advocating -- are our best hope for improving schools.

And they are the best hope for all youngsters -- the average and the privileged as well as for those who most desperately need a decent school to open doors to life's opportunities. Speculated one Black journalist who visited District 4, if it can happen in East Harlem, maybe it can happen anywhere. The schools there, he said, have "romanced the children of Harlem into the pleasures of the life of the mind." (Maynard, 1987) What choice systems offer, concludes another observer very much concerned with urban minorities, is "the possibility of making universal public education ... a reality in cities. It certainly isn't now." (Lemann, 1987: 19)

#### Sources

Clark, B. R., "The 'Distinctive' High School, Structural Change, and the School Reform Movement," in *From the Campus: Perspectives on School Reform*, edited by S. Cohen and L. C. Solomon. New York: Praeger, 1989.

Collins, R. A. & Hanson, M. K., *Summative Evaluation Report: School-Based Management/ Shared Decision-Making Project 1987-88 Through 1989-90*. Miami: Dade County Public Schools, January, 1991.

Consortium on Chicago School Research, Charting Reform: The Teachers' Turn," *Catalyst*, III(2), October, 1991, pp. 1-15.

Crain, R.L., Heebner, A.L. & Si, Y-P, *The Effectiveness of New York City's Career Magnet Schools: An Evaluation of Ninth Grade Performance Using an Experimental Design*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992.

"ETS and New York City Create an Application System, to Support Almost

Unlimited Educational Choice in Public Schools," *Network News and Views* (Educational Excellence Network), XI(2), February, 1992, pp. 61-3.

Forte, L., "Bad Teachers Worry Teacher Leaders," *Catalyst*, IV(8), may, 1993, pp. 1-5.

Goodlad, J. I., *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1984.

Grant, G., "Schools That Make An Imprint: Creating A Strong Positive Ethos," in *Challenge to American Schools: The Case for Standards and Values*, edited by J. H. Bunzel. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Hill, P.T & Bonan, J., *Decentralization and Accountability in Public Education*. Santa Monica: Rand, 1991.

Hill, P. T., Foster, G. E. & Gendler, T., *High Schools with Character*. Santa Monica: Rand, 1990.

Hirschman, A. O., *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Innerst, C., "Schools 'Really Bad,' Says AFT Leader," *The Washington Times*, July 5, 1990.

Larson, J. & Allen, B. A., *A Microscope on Magnet Schools, 1983-1986, Vol. 2: Pupil and Parent Outcomes*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools, 1988.

Lemann, N., "Magnetic Attraction," *The New Republic*, April 13, 1987, pp. 16-19.

Levine, D. U. & Eubanks, E. E., "Site-Based Management: Engine for Reform or Pipedream? Problems, Prospects, Pitfalls, and Prerequisites for Success in Site-Based Management." Unpublished paper, May, 1991.

Malen, B., *'Finding Our Way Forward' -- Teachers Unions and Education Reform: The Bellevue Case*. Claremont, CA: Claremont Graduate School, 1992.

Malen, B. & Ogawa, R.T., "Professional-Patron Influence on Site-Based Governance Councils: A Confounding Case Study," *Evaluational Evaluation*

and *Policy Analysis*, 10(4), Winter, 1988, pp. 251-270.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T. & Kranz, J., "What Do We Know About School-Based Management? A Case Study of the Literature -- A Call for Research," in *Choice and Control in American Education. Vol. 2: The Practice of Choice, Decentralization and School Restructuring*, edited by W. H. Clune & J. F. Witte. London: Falmer, 1990, pp. 289- 342.

Maynard, R., "If A School Can Prosper in Harlem," *Oakland [California] Tribune*, April 2, 1987.

McLaughlin, M. W., Talbert, J., Kahne, J. & Powell, J., "Constructing A Personalized School Environment," *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1990, pp. 230-233.

Metz, M.H., "In Education, Magnets Attract Controversy," *NEA Today*, Special Issue, January, 1988, pp. 54-60.

Moore, D. R. & Davenport, S., *The New Improved Sorting Machine: Concerning School Choice*. Chicago: Designs for Change, 1989.

Musumeci, M. & Szczykowski, R., *New York State Magnet School Evaluation Study. Final Report*. Larchmont, NY: Magi Educational Services, 1991.

Ogawa, R. T. & Malen, B., "Site Based Governance Councils: Mechanism for Affirming Rather Than Altering Traditional Decision Making Relations in Schools." Paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco, April, 1989.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E. & Cohen, D. K., *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.

Raywid, M. A., "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-Reform, Incremental Reform, Restructuring," *Phi Delta Kappan*, October, 1990, pp. 139-143.

Raywid, M. A., "Synthesis of Research on Schools of Choice," *Educational Leadership*, April, 1984, pp. 70-78.

Raywid, M. A., "Family Choice Arrangements in Public Schools," *Review of Educational Research*, Winter, 1985, pp. 435-467.

Raywid, M. A., "The Mounting Case for Schools of Choice," in *Public Schools By Choice*, edited by J. Nathan. Minneapolis: Free Spirit Press, 1989, pp. 13-40.

Raywid, M. A., "Alternatives and Marginal Students." Unpublished manuscript, 1993.

Raywid, M. A., "A School That Really Works: Urban Academy," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter, 1994. Forthcoming.

Rosenholtz, S.J., *Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Longman, 1989.

Rossell, C. H. & Clarke, R. C., *The Carrot Or the Stick in School Desegregation?* Report to the National Institute of Education. Boston: Boston College, 1987.

Schemo, D. J., "Huntington Schools Accused of Bias in Special-Ed Programs," *New York Times*, May 7, 1992.

Sizer, T. R., *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

Wehlage, G., Smith, G. & Lipman, P., "Restructuring Urban Schools: The New Futures Experience." Unpublished manuscript, 1991.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was adapted from a statement prepared for a debate on choice at the April, 1992, conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in New Orleans.