

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 289

EA 011 205

AUTHOR Erickson, Donald A.
TITLE Research Opportunities in Private Schools.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on Private Educational Research (Washington, D.C., December 1-2, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Data Bases; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Research; Education Vouchers; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Minority Groups; Nonpublic School Aid; *Private Schools; Public Schools; *Research Opportunities; *Research Problems; School Law; School Organization; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT Private education as an area of study offers many opportunities to educational researchers. Four types of research that would include private education are discussed and examples of research possibilities under each type are offered. The first type involves fundamental educational processes. Suggested are studies of the effects of various levels of funding in schools and comparing school systems maintaining complex administrative bureaucracies with those that do not. Opportunities exist in Western Canada for comparing publicly supported Catholic schools with privately supported Catholic schools. The second type of research is that aimed at understanding private schools. Studies could concentrate on the social networks developed at private schools and their long-term functions. Another topic would be a comprehensive analysis of the legal problems of private schools, with emphasis on the special legal principles that apply to them. The third type of research would encourage more scholars to do research on private education. A carefully done analysis of major differences between public and private schools would be a starting point for many studies. The fourth type involves analyzing broad social issues. An examination of the roots of legal compulsion in education is suggested.
(Author/MLF)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED165289

RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS*

Donald A. Erickson
Center for Research on Private Education
University of San Francisco

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPR
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FRC
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGI
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIO
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPR
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Scanning the bulk of educational research, the proverbial visitor from a distant planet could easily conclude that all U.S. elementary and secondary schools were public schools. There are exceptions, of course. Greeley and Rossi's landmark study of Catholic schools was published more than a decade ago. Kraushaar's remarkable book, providing the first comprehensive national analysis of private schools as a whole, is five years old. But as far as I can see, the vast majority of researchers and practitioners in education still make an automatic association between "education" and "public." They know private schools exist, but see no need to understand or investigate them, as if these schools were an anomaly, a set of exceptions that don't matter much.

There are probably several reasons for this neglect. One may be the morass of misinformation that still lets many people regard private schools as catering, by and large, to a wealthy, snobbish elite; this misapprehension is the more serious when compounded by our society's current obsession with equality. Another reason for the neglect of research on private education may be the often-lamented preoccupation of educational researchers with means, medians and other central tendencies, as if not much could be learned from exceptions. Few scholars seem to recognize that comparisons and

*Prepared for National Conference on Private Educational Research, sponsored by the Council for American Private Education and the National Institute of Education in Washington, D.C., December 1 and 2, 1977. I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Barry Anderson, Patrick Duffy, Ralph Lane, and Richard Nault.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Erickson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EA 011 205

contrasts provide a particularly fruitful avenue for advancing knowledge.¹ Another factor behind the neglect, I think, is a strong strain of anti-Catholicism in our culture which, given the numerical strength of the Catholic segment of private education, produces discomfort among many people concerning the very existence of private schools. I am not the only scholar, I am sure, to be told that his research on private schools raises embarrassing questions about his university's commitment to public education (also to fraternity, the Boy Scouts, mother, and God, no doubt).²

Widespread neglect of private education as an area of study seems the more surprising and unfortunate when one recognizes a major, recurring dilemma in educational research--public schools are so remarkably uniform in policy, organization, and methodology that it is impossible, in studies focusing on these schools exclusively, to obtain empirical evidence concerning variables which some scholars estimate, a priori, as pervasively influential.³ Take a couple of straightforward examples:

There is an extensive literature on the effects of various levels of funding on schools. At one point, Paul Mort and his colleagues at Teachers College thought they had demonstrated that schools with higher levels of funding were more adaptive and flexible (and thus, better) than were schools with lower levels of funding. Later, it became clear even to research neophytes that Mort had largely overlooked a fundamental problem--how do you differentiate the effects of funding from the effects of different types of homes when it is obvious that most lavishly funded schools are patronized by wealthy families, while most penuriously funded schools are

patronized by poor families? Once the problem was identified, virtually all the concerned researchers proceeded to manipulate their data in ever more elaborate fashion, rather than looking for a better data source.

There are systems in North America that sometimes fund schools lavishly and sometimes penuriously, but without following the above-described pattern. There also are schools that tackle difficult pedagogical tasks with a half, third, or quarter of the usual funds. However, one does not find these schools while assuming that all education is public.

There is also a related problem, though not pertinent to the precise issues Mort was investigating: How do you determine the consequences of public funding versus private funding (most economists think they are considerable) if you insist on drawing evidence only from publicly supported schools?

Another example focuses on the sprawling central bureaucracies that the textbooks on educational administration depict as essential to high quality in education. Here again, public school systems in the U.S. and Canada provide meager opportunities for analysis, for the professional educators who run them virtually always seem to develop complex administrative hierarchies at the earliest possible opportunity. There are some variations from system to system, and these have been studied, albeit inconclusively.⁴ International comparisons are illuminating in this regard, though frightfully expensive.⁵ Evidence on this question would be telling if it compared, within our own society, school systems maintaining complex downtown bureaucracies with school systems that do nothing of this kind at all. Examining the bulk of the relevant literature, one would never guess

that the latter systems exist in every state, but they do.

The preoccupation of educational researchers with public school settings may be one factor which explains the fragmentary, unproductive theories that clutter our textbooks, especially on topics regarding the organization and administration of schools. Small wonder! When we study situations so uniform that the variables under scrutiny do not vary, or vary only to a minuscule extent, we have no basis for generating grounded theory.

But to get to the heart of this paper:

I intend to mention four types of research on private education:

The first, Type A, concerns the argument I have just put forward, that studies involving private schools are more likely than studies limited to public schools to advance our knowledge of several fundamental educational processes. The second, Type B, involves the assumption that private schools, enrolling such a considerable proportion of the nation's future leaders, warrant extensive investigation in their own right. Type B research may be viewed as serving primarily to promote the well-being of this segment of our society's educational enterprise and to clarify our understanding of its functions. The third type of research, Type C, has, as one of its major objectives, the promotion of wider involvement of scholars in research on private education. Type D research concerns the broader social issues that revolve around private education, such as the issue of who should control the upbringing of the young, or the issue of whether all schools, public and private, would be improved in some sense if they were subjected to the competitive influences of the market. You will notice, I am sure,



that I place studies within the four categories rather arbitrarily. Also, I may end up discussing some categories less than others, but with no intention of implying that the ones discussed more have greater significance than the ones discussed less.

TYPE A STUDIES: ADVANCING OUR KNOWLEDGE OF FUNDAMENTAL
EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

As an instance of a Type A study, let me mention the comparative investigation whose exploratory, hypothesis-generating phase Nault and I are now drawing to conclusion.⁶ Basically we are comparing, in Western Canada, publicly supported Catholic schools with privately supported Catholic schools. We are making good use of the fact that, within the five most westerly Canadian provinces, three provide public and Catholic elementary schools with virtually the same tax support, whereas the other two provide tax support to public schools only. As one would expect, the publicly supported Catholic schools in the former three provinces, in comparison with the privately supported Catholic schools in the latter two provinces, are much more liberally funded, pay their teachers much higher salaries, and have more elaborate materials and facilities as a rule. There is no tendency, however, for the schools with more liberal support to be patronized by wealthier parents; the trend is in the opposite direction. We are able, consequently, to gather evidence on the effects of liberal funding, and of the regulatory processes that accompany public support, in a manner that is not possible within the usual public school confines of educational research. I am astonished that this remarkable laboratory has been available for years in Canada, yet never used, so far as we can

determine, for the perfectly obvious comparisons we are making. Our data tentatively suggest many effects of liberal funding and public regulation that I cannot discuss here. I can communicate the general flavor of the study, however, by observing very cautiously that, according to our limited evidence, the public support may have altered dramatically the commitments of teachers and parents. When we interview teachers who have moved from publicly supported to privately supported Catholic schools, or vice versa, almost without exception they tell us that teachers and parents are more strongly committed to their schools in the provinces where public support is withheld than in the provinces where it is provided. One phenomenon suggested again and again is akin to Barker and Gump's "undermanning." When funds are scarce, the institution's future is threatened, and the school is understaffed, everyone feels needed, appreciated, and virtually indispensable. When money is ample, the school is secure, staffing is adequate, and new people obviously can be purchased to replace anyone, an individual's sense of being needed, appreciated, and almost irreplaceable seems typically attenuated. Thus, ironically, in an era when teachers organizations insist that the way to improve schools is to increase teacher salaries, we have teachers telling us that they felt better about themselves and their work when their salaries were smaller. We think we are stumbling upon important insights! We intend to pursue these comparisons further.

2. Example 2 of a Type A study concerns a single Canadian province, British Columbia (B.C.), where the legislature has been acting as if it wanted to advance the cause of educational research, though I am sure it

had quite different objectives in mind. Just a few weeks ago, B.C.'s government passed enabling legislation as the first step toward extending major tax support to private (B.C. calls them "independent") schools. Private schools in B.C. are now signing up under the two categories in which the assistance will be made available (essentially, schools willing to give up more autonomy will get more money). The first money presumably will come after the end of the current school year. In the light of my sketchy knowledge of B.C. politics, after three recent years in that province, I think tax support of private schools, once given, will probably escalate year by year until it accounts for the major part of the school budgets. Here is an exceptionally rare research opportunity (should I characterize it as once-in-a-lifetime, once-in-a-century, or once-in-a-millennium?), a chance to replace interminable debate about the effects of tax support in schools with longitudinal data gathered during the actual phase-in of such support! We are currently seeking funds (and need them very quickly!) to finance the acquisition of base-line data from B.C. (and at least one other area for control purposes) before the situation is forever altered and the opportunity lost. Informants in that province tell us that people are already altering their behavior, in anticipation of the tax support.

3. Example 3 in the Type A category involves another area in Canada where one could almost believe that school officials were framing policy to facilitate research. Generally, in the above-mentioned provinces providing tax support, there is pressure on Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic elementary schools, though the pressure varies from

province to province. It seems weakest in Ontario, strongest in Alberta, and at an intermediate level in Saskatchewan. In two Saskatchewan cities, public and Catholic school boards have decided to nullify the legal aspect of the compulsion. They have made gentlemen's agreements (fairly typical under Canadian law, where citizens have difficulty challenging in courts the "interpretations" that officials often place upon the statutes), permitting all parents in the city to choose freely among all tax-supported schools, public and Catholic, without even signing a transfer application. At the end of each academic year, enrollments are tallied and funds adjusted accordingly, on a per-pupil basis. In many respects, these cities have established voucher experiments, made possible by Canada's unique constitutional and political realities! There is obviously no need to remind this audience of the long list of tantalizing questions which many proponents and opponents of educational vouchers have wanted to subject to empirical scrutiny. Here is a chance to do so, but here, again, we must move fast, for policies in these cities could change at any time, based entirely, as they are, upon the preferences of current school board members.

As Richard Nault can attest, there are other contexts, too, in which the important work of examining the choice behaviors of parents and older students can go forward, though in the U.S. these choices are constrained by a double-taxation policy. The parent who chooses a private educational option must pay twice for his child's schooling, once through taxation and once from disposable private income.

4. Example 4 of Type A research reflects the need, becoming more obvious day by day, to do a systematic, close-up analysis of the remarkable

reputed success of inner-city private schools in different areas of the country. After reading Madaus and Linnan, anyone should be aware of the problems in comparing the effectiveness of public and private schools since their clients are selected in different ways.⁷ It appears, however, that the inner-city private schools are not "creaming off" the best students as they have widely been accused of doing, and certainly do not expel their problem students in the manner often imagined. Our Canadian interviews suggest that the private school's selective mechanism may have more to do with acquiring like-minded parents than with creaming off students, and there are ways in which some of this tendency could be introduced into public education. Careful attention must be given to the possibility that the higher level of parental commitment apparently characterizing many private schools may be generated by the schools, rather than merely insured by selection. We need to discover why these schools are able to do so much with budgets incomparably lower than public school budgets in the same areas. Powerful dynamics must be at work here; we must find out what they are. I think the above-mentioned exploratory investigation in Canada provides many insights along this line--many postulates to be reasoned out and many hypotheses to be tested. I would like, in this connection, to identify a pool of private schools in inner cities that reportedly have experienced unusual success in dealing with difficult student populations. From this pool, I would like to select a sample of perhaps thirty schools, well dispersed geographically, for intensive study. They must have something in common that most public schools in the same neighborhoods do not have.

With information from a study of this type, we could probably help

preserve some outstanding private schools that are now in the process of dying, and perhaps provide models and guidelines for people who wish to start new ones. Many of the ideas might be adaptable, as well, to public schools in the same areas.

5. Example 5 is the work Barry Anderson is doing at Washington University, comparing public and private schools along several dimensions. His research, if I perceive it accurately, is related to such questions as the following: If huge central office staffs are essential to pedagogical effectiveness, how come the Catholic, Lutheran, Seventh Day Adventist, and other private schools do so well without them? If huge per-pupil expenditures are the key to better education, how come so many meagerly funded private schools do so well? If centralized control over teachers is so necessary, why do most famous independent schools let teachers enjoy so much autonomy? As Anderson observes, there are many provocative public-private comparisons begging to be done.

6. Example 6 of Type A research is a study, suggested by Richard Nault, of a sample of schools avowedly maintained to reflect distinctly different philosophies. The purpose of the study would be to determine how schools undergirded by contrasting philosophies differ with respect to organization, curriculum, peer relationships, activity structures, and other particulars. Perhaps the sample should also include a few schools whose philosophical underpinnings are ambiguous and even self-contradictory by virtue of the marked heterogeneity of their clientele. I think an investigation of this type would clarify the sources of many endemic difficulties in public education, to say nothing of other important outcomes.

Here once again, prompt action is necessary. Several private school types seem in the process of disappearing. Once they have gone, the most critical evidence may be lost forever.

7. Example 7 of Type A research has been suggested by Ralph Lane. It envisions private schools as settings in which the needs of urban minorities could well be clarified. As Lane observes, James Sanders' remarkable history of Catholic schools in Chicago suggests a particular striking pattern of ethnic development, and identifies the general factors that appear to explain that development. However, Sanders does not identify any dynamics as specific to the Midwest. Sanders has reported to Lane that current inquiries appear to identify a different pattern of ethnic-group development in Boston. Lane believes he discerns still a third pattern in San Francisco. "This suggests," Lane writes, "that the needs of urban minorities vary in terms of some specific regional items of social structure which have not been looked at, to my knowledge, in any systematic fashion. A combination of careful historical scholarship and some good sociological models might cast some light on the reasons for the variation. In sum, it suggests that public or private school systems do not serve some simple set of needs." Given the widely acknowledged lack of a firm knowledge base concerning urban minorities, the significance of the work Lane has suggested should be obvious. It is almost equally obvious, I think, that the suggested analyses of regionally differing minority-group needs would be extremely hard to conduct in public schools.

TYPE B STUDIES: IMPROVING THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND
ENLARGING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THEM

As for Type B studies, which I view as functioning largely to enhance the well-being of the private schools or to improve our understanding of them:

Example 1 illustrates not only Category B, but also the fact that not all needed studies are empirical in the usual sense of that term. Fr. Patrick Duffy is interested in developing what has been critically needed for many years--a comprehensive analysis of the legal problems of private schools, with emphasis upon the special legal principles that apply to them. Fr. Duffy's inquiries have convinced him that private school administrators are widely "observing laws which do not apply to them and are unaware of laws which embrace them." He sees much potential for trouble in the dearth of clear guidelines for private educators in the legal arena.

Example 2 of Type B, suggested by Ralph Lane, is an inquiry that should be launched into the social networks developed at private schools, and the long-term functions of those networks. In terms of Merton's distinction Lane suggests, for example, that some private schools form lifetime linkages among people who will be local influentials, while other private schools develop networks among budding cosmopolitan influentials. He thinks private school networks may be active at various social strata, not merely the upper ones. It would be fascinating, I think, to have information of this type for both public and nonpublic schools. Otherwise, we may be missing some of the most pervasive, enduring effects of schooling, as researchers seem wont to do.⁸ Building upon this idea, it is easy to

envison (examples 3...n) many productive comparisons between public and private schools. In some areas, it may be fruitful to regard public and private schools as complementary, each doing on occasion what the other is ill-equipped to do. Thus, for instance, Nault and Anderson suggest that private schools may perform the function of preserving innovations that public schools too readily and uniformly drop. Take the "progressive era," which seems to live on in some private schools long after its last traces disappeared in public schools. Anderson and Nault also call for trustworthy data to compare with popular beliefs concerning the "divisive" qualities of private schools, the extent to which private schools are havens for racists, and the effects of private schools upon neighborhood stability. To what extent, these researchers ask, do enrollments in private schools represent barometers of discontent with public schools? In what respects are private school responses to enrollment shifts radically different from public school responses? Are the two educational sectors characterized by different career patterns among teachers and administrators, and if so, how do the consequences differ? The opportunities for research in this area have scarcely been touched. I think, for example, of Melany E. Baehr's National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship (Chicago: Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago, 1975), a remarkable, seminal study. I persuaded Baehr and her colleagues to include Catholic schools in their data-gathering effort (I would like to have had all major private school groups included), but the public and Catholic data have not been broken down to provide what I believe would be a striking set of comparisons. I understand that Columbus Salley, now at the Industrial

Relations Center is interested in moving that study into its next phase. Some of us should work with him, getting data from a wide range of private schools incorporated into that phase. Simultaneously, someone should capitalize on the Catholic school data that are lying unused but ready for immediate analysis on computer tapes.

TYPE C STUDIES: ENCOURAGING MORE SCHOLARS TO DO RESEARCH
ON PRIVATE EDUCATION

I would guess that if one asked twenty randomly selected scholars, at the next meeting of the American Educational Research Association, "Why don't you involve private schools in your studies?" the predominant response would be, "Well, I wouldn't know who to ask about getting access, and furthermore, I don't see any particular advantage in doing studies in private schools when I can do them in public schools. Findings derived from private schools might have no application to public schools, which the vast majority of students attend." I think, in other words, that one major reason for neglect of private educational research is ignorance. Most scholars don't know enough about private schools to be aware of the advantages they might gain in various studies by including these schools in their investigations.

From this standpoint, I think a massive step forward was taken when Kraushaar's book was published in 1972. Here finally is a source, descriptive of private schools as a whole, to which people can turn for the most basic information. After five years, unfortunately, the book is becoming a little outdated. As I mentioned in my initial review of the book, it is far too important a contribution to be regarded as a one-shot

venture. It should be seen as the first volume in a series whose units are issued every five years or so. I visited Otto Kraushaar in Baltimore a few weeks ago to talk about a follow-up to his excellent work. Kraushaar indicated that he did not wish to undertake a revision or sequel himself but would be willing to participate, and encouraged me to take the initiative. I have done some thinking, have begun to contact scholars, and have started the process of dickering with publishers and seeking money. It seems to me that the next volume of this work would be done best by a group of carefully selected scholars, governed by a conceptualization of the whole book. There could be a series of chapters on the various sectors of the private school movement, with a chapter (or sometimes two) on each segment, including Catholic Schools, Lutheran schools, Seventh Day Adventist Schools, etc. Another series of chapters could cross-cut the above-mentioned segments, dealing with such domains as (a) the history of private education in the U.S., with emphasis on what has happened since Kraushaar's volume, (b) the major research on private education, (c) the relevant legal frameworks and litigation, (d) major social issues, (e) pertinent public opinion data, and (f) an analysis of major points of comparison and contrast between public and private schools. The last of these was aptly suggested by Anderson and Nault. A carefully done analysis of major differences between public and private schools would be an enormously provocative starting point for research. I think it would be reasonable to expect scholars to contribute chapters to the planned volume without expecting a fee, but they should have an allowance for necessary costs, and more liberal funds would be needed for chapters featuring considerable new data or the development of new territories.

Private educational research would also be stimulated by the publication of good studies, many of which are still in fugitive form. I began several years ago to collect chapters for a book of readings on private educational research, each chapter providing a report, sometimes a boildown, of a major work. This effort needs to be completed. We should also institute somewhere a monograph series, devoted to the reporting of major research on private education.

Two other devices that may encourage more relevant scholarly work are (a) a directory of scholars and (b) an abstracting service, both under development by the American Educational Research Association's new Special Interest Group, Associates for Private Educational Research, formed in April, 1977. The ARPE Directory will identify scholars conducting various types of relevant inquiry, providing information on their interests and activities, and the ARPE Abstracts will draw attention to scholarly work gleaned from a long list of journals and other sources in various disciplines.⁹

We need to get reviews of research on private education developed and published in the major journals. The recent bibliography published by the Council for American Private Education is an important resource.¹⁰ We must secure better treatment of our area of research by the ERIC system, whose descriptors thus far do not, in my opinion, permit efficient retrieval of the information for our purposes.

Finally on Type C work, there is a massive unexplored potential in carefully designed data banks, complementary to the work of the excellent data bank operated by the National Catholic Education Association. Both Project TALENT and Coleman's 1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity study have demonstrated that, when significant bodies of data are made available,

scholars line up to analyze and reanalyze them almost endlessly. Talking recently with some Catholic dioceses about their data-processing problems, I discovered that they need help, and I suspect most other private school groups do as well. In the case of these dioceses, school principals are being asked to aggregate, school by school, data obtained from teachers and other sources. When these data are later processed by hand at the diocesan level, it becomes obvious that an enormous amount of error is introduced by the principals' aggregations. The diocesan data processing, in turn, is onerous, time-consuming, and subject to all the inflexibilities of slow methods. I think a system should be developed that would gather all original data, from teachers and others, on mark-sense forms and use computer-room equipment from that point. However, I cannot become unduly excited about system that simply eliminates the error and pain from conventional procedures. I would be excited about using the new methods to provide rich data never before made available on a systematic, ongoing basis, data that would link students to teachers, curriculums, etc., and make possible longitudinal productivity studies of unprecedented scope and power. I have been encouraged by the interest of diocesan officials, and I hope progress will be made along this line. By providing a data bank of the type I am suggesting, private schools could find themselves, virtually overnight, the major setting for some of the most important educational research being conducted anywhere.

If I may insert a parenthetical note, we must not overlook the doctoral student, who conducts a large proportion of educational research. I once received a grant of \$5,000, a meager sum as research monies go, with the stipulation that I use it to enable doctoral students to extend their

studies in ways that their finances would not otherwise permit. The money was used to provide travel funds, etc., for students who were conducting well designed studies. In a number of cases, the funds permitted students to utilize more adequate samples, or to supplement their original designs with important additional data. I was struck at the time with how far the money went, since we were paying only marginal costs. I continue to feel that there should be a fund somewhere from which we could allocate monies to graduate students in the manner I have indicated. I know of no other expenditure of research funds that is more productive dollar for dollar.

TYPE D STUDIES: ANALYZING THE BROADER SOCIAL ISSUES

A plethora of fundamental issues involving private education call for investigation. I think, in this context, of the work of John Coons, Stephen Sugarman, and their colleagues at the Berkeley Childhood and Government Project; I understand that the major report of their work will be published in book form early in 1978. Some of their ideas have been disseminated in a chapter entitled "A Case for Choice," and Sugarman has offered additional provocative ideas in an article on "Education Reform at the Margin."¹¹ I expect we will hear a great deal more from them in the future.

E.G. West continues his illuminating analyses of the roots of legal compulsion in education and of various ways of overcoming at least the fiscal aspects of that compulsion. Everyone contemplating research in this area, particularly with an economic slant, should be acquainted with

West's work, particularly his recent book on Nonpublic School Aid.¹²

Stephen Arons has come up with an exceptionally creative analysis of some constitutional components of the fiscal compulsion.¹³ I congratulate the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for providing funds to carry his work forward.

Much more can be done. There are plans under way to get a group of scholars together to begin analysis of the rationales underlying curriculum requirements. In a related vein, I have suggested to several graduate students recently that they uncover the thinking that went to the regulations for private schools that several states have developed. We need some thorough oral history projects to document the human anguish that has resulted from state prosecution and harrassment of parents who, following the dictates of conscience, have elected to educate their children in unconventional ways. My report on the "Showdown at an Amish Schoolhouse" in Iowa illustrates that type of work.¹⁴

At this juncture, I am more than a little worried about the many examples that I have not had space and time to mention. Numerous scholars whose work I have not mentioned are conducting important studies, and the scholars whose work I have mentioned may easily feel that I have ignored some of their best ongoing work. The opportunities for research on private education are so multifaceted, furthermore, that one ends up, in a paper like this, feeling that he has produced more of a grocery list than a conceptually integrated analysis. But for the purposes of our conference, perhaps these ideas will provide a few stimuli and starting points.

FOOTNOTES

1. In his excellent analysis of teachers, for example, Lortie resorted repeatedly to comparisons involving radically different settings, and he traces many of his best insights to these comparisons. See Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).
2. Obviously, I am not talking about my present university.
3. See, for example, Eric A. Hanushek and John F. Kain, "On the Value of Equality of Educational Opportunity as a Guide to Public Policy," in Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds., On Equality of Educational Opportunity (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 138-140.
4. E.Q., Charles E. Bidwell and John D. Kasarda, "School District Organization and Student Achievement," American Sociological Review 40 (1975): pp. 55-70.
5. A.H. Passow, H. J. Noah, and M. A. Eckstein, The National Case Study (New York: Wiley, 1976).
6. We are grateful to the Spencer Foundation for financing this work.
7. George F. Madaus and Roger Linnan, "The Outcome of Catholic Education," School Review 81 (Feb., 1973): pp. 207-232.
8. Cf. Kjell Harnqvist, "Enduring Effects of Schooling--A Neglected Area in Educational Researcher," Educational Researcher 6 (Nov., 1977): pp. 5-11.
9. For further information on ARPE, contact me at the Center for Research on Private Education, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94117.
10. Nancy I. Zeidner, "Private Elementary and Secondary Education: A Bibliography of Selected Publications (1950-1974)" (Washington, D.C.: Council for American Private Education, 1976), available from CAPE at 1625 Eye St., N. W., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20006.
11. John E. Coons and Stephen D. Sugarman, "A Case for Choice," in James S. Coleman et al., Parents, Teachers, and Children: Prospects for Choice in American Education (San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1977), pp. 129-148; Stephen D. Sugarman, "Education Reform at the Margin: Two Ideas," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (Nov., 1977): pp. 154-157.
12. E. G. West, Nonpublic School Aid (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976).
13. Stephen Arons, "The Separation of School and State: Pierce Reconsidered," Harvard Educational Review 46 (Feb., 1976): pp. 76-104;

also available as a reprint from the Center for Independent Education,
11419 Matinal Circle, San Diego, CA 92127.

14. Donald A. Erickson, "Showdown at an Amish Schoolhouse: A Description
and Analysis of the Iowa Controversy," in Erickson, ed., Public Controls
for Nonpublic Schools (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp.
15-59.