1-1-1971

Some of our children may live: a study of students in alternative and innovative schools.

Leonard J. Solo

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2630

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
An Abstract of a Dissertation

SOME OF OUR CHILDREN MAY LIVE:

A

Study of Students

in

Alternative and Innovative Schools

Leonard J. Solo, Sr.

Directed by: Dr. Glenn Hawkes

Submitted to the School of Education
University of Massachusetts
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

1971
ABSTRACT

A basic assumption and starting point for this study is the belief that there is a "crisis in the classroom," that "our children are dying" in most schools. The purpose of this study is not to again prove this point, but to examine schools where, reportedly, there is no crisis, where children learn joyfully in a humane environment.

The study was done with a ten-point questionnaire that was sent to 500 private and 150 public schools. One hundred and twenty-five private and 37 public schools responded to the questionnaire.

A category system was imposed on each question when patterns were discovered in the responses and information from each question was placed in the established categories for each school.

Then a frequency count was made in each category and cross-correlations were done. Finally, from analyzing and interpreting the responses and the categorized and correlated data, general types of alternative and innovative schools were defined.

On the basis of these analysis and interpretations, the following types of schools were established:

1) Alternative Public School
2) Modular-Flexible School
3) Integrated Day School
4) Montessori School
5) Free School
6) School for "Disturbed" Children
7) School for a Minority Group.

A profile of each of the above types of schools was made from the nature of their responses to each question:

(1)
The Alternative Public Schools

(a) have small enrollments  
(b) do not have students involved in formulating the schools' basic philosophy  
(c) have been in existence only 2 or 3 years  
(d) have heterogeneous populations  
(e) have compulsory classes  
(f) have a fairly wide choice of courses or subjects for students to choose from  
(g) have students rather significantly involved in the decision-making processes  
(h) evaluate students individually, in terms of the student's own growth  
(i) realize the need for community and have moved somewhat in that direction by stressing sharing, cooperation, responsibility and trust.

The Modular-Flexible Schools

(a) have large enrollments  
(b) have been in existence about 5 or 6 years  
(c) do not have students involved in determining the schools' philosophy  
(d) serve mostly middle class students  
(e) have compulsory classes  
(f) have moved only somewhat away from traditional course offerings  
(g) do not have students significantly involved in planning and regulating the schools' activities  
(h) evaluate students in groups with tests and grades  
(i) have not involved themselves in striving for community.

The Integrated Day Schools

(a) have small numbers of students  
(b) have been in existence only 2 or 3 years  
(c) do not have students substantially involved in determining the schools' philosophy  
(d) involve middle class students (because of their tuitions)  
(e) do not have "classes"  
(f) are set up with interest areas wherein the student can pursue his own interests at his own pace  
(g) have students somewhat involved in the decision-making processes, especially the curricular ones  
(h) evaluate students individually  
(i) are striving for cooperation, sharing and a sense of belonging together.

The Montessori Schools are similar to the Integrated Day
schools except that they tend to be more manipulative and more discipline oriented. They also stress cognitive learning to a greater degree.

The Free Schools in this study were found to be the most innovative and most radical: They

(a) have very small numbers of students
(b) have heterogeneous student bodies, in spite of having tuitions
(c) have been in existence only 1 or 2 years
(d) have their students somewhat involved in determining the schools' philosophy
(e) do not have classes
(f) emphasize the needs of individual students and thus have a variety of ways for students to learn--interest areas, tutorials, contracts, small and large groups, individuals doing/learning what they want, etc.
(g) allow the student to pursue his own needs/wants at his own rate
(h) have students rather significantly (some totally) involved in the decision-making processes
(i) evaluate students individually or do not evaluate them at all
(j) have achieved a sense of belonging, togetherness, sharing, trust--community.

The Schools for "Disturbed" Children

(a) have small enrollments
(b) have high tuitions
(c) have students only minimally involved in formulating the schools' philosophy
(d) have students who are "disturbed" and drop-out, alienated youths
(e) do not have classes but deal individually with children
(f) have a wide variety of learning situations available for students to choose from
(g) have students substantially involved in the decision-making processes
(h) evaluate students individually
(i) have achieved a sense of togetherness and belonging

The Schools for Minority Groups

(a) have small enrollments
(b) low tuitions
(c) do not have students involved in formulating the school's philosophy
(d) have students from various minority groups--Black, Mexican-American, American Indians, etc.--who are poor and also school drop-outs
(e) have compulsory classes
(f) do not have a variety of course offerings
(g) do not have students involved a great deal in the decision-making processes
(h) evaluate students individually
(i) realize the need for community, but have only achieved it in a limited way.

The study tended to show that these schools espouse the needs and rights of the individual and that many of the schools are, or are becoming, student-centered. The modular-flexible schools started this trend, but they have moved the least in this direction. Alternative Public Schools have become more student-centered, but far less than the private Montessori and Integrated Day schools. The Free Schools have moved the most in this direction. The main focus in many free schools is not just on learning subjects but on people learning and growing, alone and together, on personal relationships, on trust and honesty and dignity and sharing. Some of these free schools are evolving into non-schools or communes.

The whole trend examined in this paper indicates a movement toward "deschooling"--of having learning naturally and constantly occurring in the entire community with people of all ages involved with the on-going processes of living in that community. This movement has not yet profoundly affected the lives of most children, but it is a just-beginning trend that is already providing several thousand students with a variety of alternative ways to grow up. The movement seems to be toward having a great variety of alternative starting and on-going places for learning (not just "school"), a world (or parts of it) in which children could naturally learn as they grew in it.
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"Do you like school, Tom?", asked Tom's father.
"It's just one of those things you have to take. I don't think anyone likes school, do they, that has ever done anything else?"
"I don't know. I hated it.".
"Didn't you like art school either?"
"No. I liked to learn to draw but I didn't like the school part."

--Ernest Hemingway, Islands in the Stream

One had to cram all this stuff into one's head, whether one liked it or not. This coercion had such a deterring effect that, after I had passed the final examination, I found the consideration of any scientific problem distasteful to me for an entire year....It is, in fact, nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry: for this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom: without this it goes to wrack and ruin without fail. It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and searching can be promoted by means of coercion and a sense of duty. To the contrary, I believe that it would be possible to rob even a healthy beast of prey of its voraciousness, if it were possible, with the aid of a whip, to force the beast to devour continuously, even when not hungry--especially if the food, handed out under such coercion, were to be selected accordingly.

--Albert Einstein

It seems to me the most important thing that we can do, the most vital contribution to what we may call the "revolution," or maybe even better, this Renaissance, is to try in any and all ways we know to bring people together, become part of them, and help them see that to be what you are is to be everything.

--Steve Weitzman

Education is evocation. One person cannot add anything to another. Teaching, therefore, is not education. It is imposition. If one were to identify one condition that must prevail in order that education take place it would be the relationship between children and adults who can love.

--Les Abbenhouse
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INTRODUCTION:

ETHER OR JOY?

Our Children Are Dying, Compulsory Mis-Education,
Growing Up Absurd, How Children Fail, The Underachieving
School, and Death at an Early Age are no longer metaphors
for what happens to humans in schools. For this writer
they are facts--painful facts compiled over-and-over again
in the current avalanche of books and articles on the crisis
in American public education.¹ These show how most public
schools manipulate and mutilate students and teachers: how
they destroy joy in learning, spontaneity, pleasure in
creating, a true sense of the self that says, "I am capable
and loveable." These show how schools are, in Lillian
Smith's phrase, "killers of the dream."

Most public schools are now radical institutions. They
are "oppressive" and "joyless" says Charles E. Silberman in

¹See the Bibliography for a partial list of these books
and articles. A more complete list is "A Bibliography for
the Free School Movement," The Summerhill Society Bulletin,
October 1969. Another, shorter, list, is in Issue No. 55 of
The New Schools Exchange Newsletter. Because the facts have
been detailed in so many places, there is no need to go over
the same ground: a brief summary of the basic criticism is
given here.
his recent *Crisis in the Classroom*, a 3 1/2-year study commissioned by the Carnegie Corporation. Mr. Silberman, in this detailed and documented study—critically, yet conservatively so—discovered that the severest critics were underestimating their case against schools. He discovered that most schools are concerned primarily with discipline, order and control; that they are caught up in petty routine for the sake of routine; that they systematically subjugate, repress and etherize students; and that they promote passivity, alienation, docility and conformity in students. For twelve years blood flows out in gradual pulsations.

Most schools throughout the country are surprisingly similar, a monolithic structure where students are taught in a uniform manner: anonymous schools of 1,500 students, 20-30 (or more) students in homogeneous classrooms for 42 minutes, 8 periods a day, 5 days a week, all seated quietly in neat rows, all doing the same assignment, all being taught the same pre-planned lesson, all getting a "well-rounded education." What really happens is that their edges get rounded off, humans get homogenized. No wonder students are bored,
alienated, dulled in their conformity, cynical, turned-on to drugs, dropping out, have lost touch with their own impulse life and their own emotions, have a sense of impotence, or are in a rage to tear down the schools' walls.

Teachers usually do not consider if each student is interested in the subject they are teaching or if each person is truly an individual who is at a different and unique point intellectually, emotionally, socially, etc., than any other individual member of the class.  

And, as a crowning terror, Silberman notes that the curricula in these classes are often characterized by "banality" and "triviality."

The above criticism was neatly presented a long time ago in a metaphoric incident involving Ralph Waldo Emerson. Emerson visited an elementary school where a teacher was giving lessons to her class. After the class, the teacher asked Emerson what he thought of it and he replied: "Madam, I perceive that you are trying to make all of these children just like you. One of you is sufficient."

---

3 If teachers do consider students this way, many do not know how to translate their concerns into actual classroom practices.
The only beam of joy in this oppressive darkness seems to be the scattered reforms being attempted in a few public and (to a much larger extent) in private schools in this country.

There has been a tremendous growth of innovative, "free," community and alternative schools in the last four years. This writer, from being involved in this movement as co-director of The Teacher Drop-Out Center, has compiled a list of such public and private schools. Others have compiled similar lists: New Schools Exchange, John Holt, Les Hart, Education Switchboard in San Francisco, Vocations for Social Change, The Summerhill Society, etc.

Some educators believe that these alternative and innovative learning places provide "models" of what education can be and at the moment offer the main hope for improvement in education. Others say that these learning places are the only hope for education in this country.

---

4 The Teacher Drop-Out Center is a nationwide clearinghouse of information on and a specialized placement service for innovative and alternative schools. It publishes a monthly newsletter and helps people to establish new schools. See "The Teacher Drop-Out Center and a Missed Revolution," *Outside the Net*, Winter, 1970, p. 27, for a detailed account of the philosophy and practices of the Center.
It has been this writer's experience from contact with various groups of people that there is a great ignorance of innovative and alternative educational experiments, a dissatisfaction and deep frustration with what is happening now in education, and a desire on the part of some to find better, new and more joyful ways of learning and being. There is a need for information about these schools: about location, size, kinds of students there, philosophy, day-to-day methods of functioning, kinds of teachers there, etc. Teachers, school officials, parents, students, foundations, etc., want this information. They want this information so they can visit the schools and see what is happening, send their children there, start similar schools, teach there, etc.

Some people are looking for other kinds of information: Are these alternatives "successful?" Are they finding alternatives to boredom and alienation? Are they achieving community? Can they serve as models to help reform public education? How? Etc.

Thus, there is a great deal of interest in alternative and innovative schools. Yet, there is no real central

---

5For example, The Teacher Drop-Out Center alone receives about 50 inquiries each day about these kinds of schools; the same is true for the New Schools Exchange, a similar organization in California.
source of documented information about these schools.

This is the problem that this paper, in part, addresses: a compilation of information on one aspect of these innovative and alternative learning places and an analysis of this data. It will help fill the need for information about these schools and it is part of the long, just-beginning process of gathering data and trying to answer the many questions being raised about these new schools.

In *The Aims of Education*, Whitehead describes three stages of learning that are repeated in "minor eddies" whenever a new problem is approached. First is the stage of Romance when a person perceives unexplored connections in a new field. It is a time of color and encounter in a new challenge. The second stage is Precision, when a person masters the tools of inquiry of a discipline. The third stage is Generalization, when a person stands up from his desk and adventures into the world with the power of bodies of organized insight.

Whitehead's metaphors are valuable for understanding the new schools movement. Most of these schools have been in existence for only two or three years and most are still in the Romance Stage, perceiving the child as the center of
education and doing battle with the evil giant of public education. It has been a time of rapid growth and exhilaration in breaking free of some past bonds and voyaging into new lands.

This paper is written essentially out of a Romantic Stage perspective. A basic, "romantic" belief of many of these alternative and innovative schools--one shared by this writer--is that humans are naturally curious and, if given support and love in a rich environment, they will continuously learn and grow.

This belief leads to other educational beliefs and practices--also shared by this writer: Schools must be small so people can have close, face-to-face contact because schools are, first and foremost, places for personal relationships; schools should be democracies--places where the participants are directly and equally involved in the decision-making processes that effect their lives, places that provide for many alternatives, ones that involve real choices that are meaningful to students; schools should have heterogeneous populations because heterogeneity provides a basis for growth while homogeneity often produces elitism and incestuous in-breeding; schools should not be compulsory, for a student
must be free to choose and grow in his own directions if he is to be an independent, integrated being; schools should provide a wide variety of learning situations, hopefully meeting the needs of each student; schools should be places where there are adults who deeply care for children--adults who can share their knowledge and skills, help students reflect on their learning, help students find starting places for learning, let students alone when necessary, be friends with students, etc.; schools should be communities, places where there is a true sense of belonging, togetherness, caring and sharing.

Schooling--and most schools are alike--has come to be the only legitimate path for students to take into the adult world. One of the main purposes of the new schools movement is making alternative learning environments available to students. This practice is based on the belief that each person is unique, that each individual learns and grows in his own unique ways.

Some people in this movement are concerned with "deschooling society," with providing many legitimate ways--in and out (especially out) of schools--for children to grow into the adult world. They view a learning environment as a base.
a place that is supportive and warm, a place in which students can learn, a place that is used as a springboard for getting students involved in the on-going processes of the world, a place to which students can return to reflect on their experiences and to be with friends.

This paper is an attempt to understand some aspects and ramifications of the new schools movement. As already noted, these schools and this movement are young and it is still too early to definitely provide answers to the many questions being raised about them. But this study is part of a good and necessary beginning, a study that provides some tentative, positive, germinal answers to questions and problems about innovative schools in a nation that is at a crisis point in education.
CHAPTER I:
METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

During the past few years, this writer has talked with many people about alternative and innovative schools--students, drop-outs, parents, teachers, future teachers, public and private school officials, guidance-placement personnel, funding agencies, employers, etc. He has visited many schools, talked with others who have visited schools, and has read catalogues from and materials on hundreds of innovative and alternative schools. From all of this, a series of questions and areas of interest have been formed about these schools.

But it was quickly discovered that it was sheer foolishness to try to find the information and answers to the hundreds of questions that have evolved concerning these schools: about students, teachers, administrators, day-to-day functioning of the school, philosophy, learning materials and methods used, environment, community, parental involvement, finances, etc.

This discovery was made when this writer developed a questionnaire that covered many of these areas and it was piloted with over 60 schools. Nearly all of them refused to
do such a lengthy, all-encompassing questionnaire.

The questionnaire could have been broken into four or five parts and each part sent to a selected group of schools. But this idea was rejected because it would not provide enough of a profile of individual, specific schools. Two other ways of doing this study were considered and rejected: one was to travel around and visit many schools and gather the data first-hand. But this would have involved a great deal of money and time. This is undoubtedly one of the best ways of gathering the needed information and will be one of the ways that will be utilized by researchers in the future. The second alternative was to visit one school for a considerable length of time, observe it carefully, and write about the school, using it as a metaphor for all alternative schools. This was rejected because there really is no one type of alternative school, as this study will show.

So, this study was narrowed to one aspect of innovative and alternative schools, the one element that they are (or, in this writer's opinion, should be) most concerned with—the student. The study is concerned with the role of students in alternative schools: how do they learn? what do they learn? do they have classes? how are they involved in
planning and regulating the school's activities? how do they
directly and consciously strive for community? etc.

The method of this study--the gathering of information
in order to provide some germinal answers to questions like
the above--was done with a questionnaire. In developing
the questionnaire, two major possibilities were considered:
Is it better to have a check-list (or circle the appropriate
choice) type of questions or is it better to have a short
series of more open-ended, general questions? The second
alternative was chosen because it was felt to be more in
keeping with the tone of alternative schools that usually
resent the first type of questionnaire because of its imper-
sonalization and because the open-ended, general questions
would not restrict the schools' responses or overly influence
the answers as much as a check-list type of questionnaire.

The questionnaire was mailed to about 500 private
schools and 150 public schools all over the country. These
were randomly chosen from a list of approximately 1500 private
and 200 public schools. Only a few nursery schools and

---

1See Appendix II and Appendix III for copies of this
instrument along with typical responses from a private and
from a public school.
colleges were sent the questionnaire. Most of the schools are located on the East and West coasts, few in the South, more in inner city areas than in suburbs, many in Northern and Western rural areas, some in Canada.

One hundred and twenty-five private and 37 public schools (about 25% of each) responded to the questionnaire. Although this number is somewhat small, the data received is sufficient for the purposes of this study.

Many schools either did not respond to Question VIII or did not respond in much detail, so the question has been discarded. But most of the other responses were more than adequate for the purposes of this study and more than anticipated—from the length, care, and type of responses, it is evident that most of the schools took a great deal of time and thought in filling out the questionnaire.

The private schools tended to answer the questions more completely. Some public schools returned the questionnaire

---

2"Describe any evidence you have which demonstrates that students learn more, learn 'better' and/or learn more joyfully in your school than in more traditional schools."

3They tended to fill out the questionnaire more completely in spite of the fact, as several private schools noted, that many alternative schools received 5 other questionnaires the same month. None of these other studies has been published yet, but the process of gathering information noted earlier has obviously started.
partially filled out with notes referring to stacks of thick, slick collections of prepared materials. One conclusion (among several possible) drawn from this is that the private schools seem more informal, are more personal and tend to explain themselves in individual, tentative, exploratory ways—often noting that the school and the children are always changing and growing—rather than in the committee-prepared, definite, defined, more fixed and impersonal ways of some of the larger public schools. This concept is expanded and explained in more detail in succeeding chapters when individual questions are analyzed and responses quoted.

Initially, each returned questionnaire was read through in order for this writer to get a sense of the data—what was said and how it was said.

Then, the responses to each question were read separately and notes were taken. This produced a great deal of raw data that had to be organized. Each question was again considered separately and a category system was imposed on each question when patterns were discovered in the responses. The information from each question was placed in the established categories for each school. Each question—how the category was established, how the responses were placed in the categories
and an analysis of these responses—is discussed in separate chapters.

This paper is concerned with three major areas: a frequency count has been made in each category and has been put on a table in Appendix V. The resulting data have been described and interpreted in separate chapters for each question. Because the materials have been so categorized, cross-tabulations of the data were made possible and have been done. Thus, relationships between questions have been established, new questions asked and further insights gained. Thirdly, from analyzing the responses to each question, an attempt has been made to define general types of innovative and alternative schools, both public and private.

Educational theory and practice is essentially autobiography and it should be understood that these three major areas of concern are framed and informed by this writer's experiences and philosophy (some expressed earlier, others noted later, both explicitly and implicitly).

The third concern noted above is the immediate business of the next chapter. But these general types of schools will not be completely explained in Chapter II—some statements will be made about the schools; additional data and
clarifications are added in each succeeding chapter. So, the process of this paper is one of accretion: there is a steady build-up of information about the general types of schools and then a summary of these data is made at the end of the paper.
This chapter is concerned with the replies to Question II-A, "What are your school's philosophical premises, biases and/or values?"1

The question was asked of a great variety of schools: schools where students could choose to attend lectures, group discussions, sensitivity sessions, seminars, movies, programmed instruction texts, computer assisted situations, apprenticeships, etc.; "free" schools; learning-packaged schools; mini-schools; technical centers; apprenticeships; modularly scheduled schools, some with differentiated staffing; Summerhill-type schools; Montessori schools; storefront learning centers; street academies; schools-without-walls that use the resources of the community or the city; Skinnerian, behavioristically oriented schools; commune schools; integrated day schools; therapeutic communities; community-controlled schools; "free enterprise" schools;

1Because Question I of the questionnaire is concerned primarily with factual data, it is not discussed in the body of this paper. Instead, it is discussed in Appendix IV.
folk schools; schools that are coordinating agencies which function as bases that help channel the students into a variety of learning situations provided by the existing political, economic, social and religious institutions; schools that are supplementary agencies, like libraries, growing out of the needs of the community; etc.

Not all of these "kinds" of schools responded to the questionnaire. Following are several pages of replies from schools that did reply to the question:

I. Trusting and respect for the child are fundamental conditions. Children, by nature, want to learn about their environment, and will learn in their own way and at their own pace that which is meaningful to them.

The environment is the curriculum.

Children learn through active involvement.

Self-direction, responsibility, and respect for self and others are major goals.

--Riverdale School

II. (1) Students should be able to control their education.

(2) There are better ways of vocational and academic education.

(3) Students should make their own intelligent decisions about their schooling and then be held responsible for them.

--Montpelier Educational Facility
III. Our goals: ...to foster self-control among the students rather than imposing control; to encourage the constructive use of freedom by providing a wide number of options, students' planning of programs and curriculum, and exposure to the wider community through use of the resources of the city; to provide a highly-motivating learning environment for the acquisition of basic skills and understanding.

--The Clinton Program

IV. Semi-structured--children are free to do things of interest to them. Adults are there to assist them.

--East Hill School

V. At various times, we have experimented with student involvement in decision-making in various areas (discipline, curriculum, staff hiring, etc.), with various student/teacher cooperative curriculum efforts, with teacher-originated elective courses, with physical changes in the building, with various sorts of faculty advising/counseling arrangements, with parents' roles in the school expanded, etc. All without many explicit theories or premises other than a general desire on the part of the staff to do interesting things with /our school/. All the usual jazz about not harassing kids, having more open classes, studying more relevant stuff, etc., would be subscribed to by most teachers....

--Cambridge Pilot School

VI. Our first consideration is that students feel good about coming to school. We have tried to establish a student-centered school, and students receive top priority. The instruction has been individualized and customized as much as possible. We believe in a great deal of student involvement, responsibility, and decision-making.

--Concord High School
VII. We value the individual and individual development, but also the teaching of basic skills. We try to balance freedom and discipline by having times for each. Students are encouraged to develop individual interests and are given time for them.

--Canyon School

VIII. Provide more individual instruction through small groups, independent study, and the opportunity for more teacher-pupil contact on a 1-1 basis; provide an atmosphere which will encourage student responsibility for learning; give students an opportunity to budget a large percentage of time; emphasize the direct relationship between increased freedom and increased responsibility.

--William Mitchell High School

The following is a rather long quotation from the Murray Road School, but one that is central to the ideas discussed later in this chapter and in other chapters:

IX. 1. A high degree of student freedom. When he has no classes scheduled, a student may use any part of the building which is not in use, without faculty supervision. With parental consent, a student may arrange to spend parts of his school time entirely away from the school....

2. Student involvement in school decision-making and school operation/including helping to choose the director and the faculty/. A weekly general meeting is held to discuss issues facing the whole school, and students are encouraged to take a great deal of initiative in trying to solve problems facing the school...Responsibilities students did take included (1) proposing and organizing new courses, (2) devising a means of fulfilling the state physical education requirement (the school lacks a gymnasium, so this was a
real problem), (3) deciding that there was a need to sound out colleges on their receptivity to students from a program such as ours, and organizing a committee to study the problem of course offerings and scheduling with a view toward revising the academic program of the school for the second year, (4) organizing a week in the spring during which all regular classes were suspended in order to allow everyone to participate in an in-depth exploration of a subject area of his choice, (5) proposing and organizing a committee to build and maintain good relationships with the residents of the neighborhood surrounding the school, (6) proposing and developing an afternoon activity program for children in the neighborhood who had been creating problems for the school by running through the building, damaging property, etc., and (7) participating (with faculty) in presentations of the program:

3. Student-involvement in classroom decision-making and evaluation. In many classes, students were involved in the planning of the content and organization of the course. Topics for study were chosen, goals were set, and a means of proceeding was hammered out. An important part of the evaluation procedure in each course was the student's written self-evaluation of his work in the course, which together with the teacher's written evaluation of the student's work became part of the student's record.

4. De-emphasis of ability grouping and curriculum designations....

5. Active participation in the research aspect of the program by both faculty and students. The group is periodically polled for written reactions to the program, and three randomly selected groups of six to eight students meet weekly to discuss their experiences in the program. These meetings are taped and analyzed by outside evaluators.
6. Student involvement in the community outside the school. The chief example of this was the tutoring program, in which about 75 of the 107 students were engaged for several hours per week, tutoring children in various/local/elementary schools.

7. Parent involvement in the school. Meetings held at six to eight week intervals brought parents, teachers and students in groups of various sizes to discuss the program, purposes, and progress of the school. Parental interest was extraordinarily high: parental attendance at such meetings ranged as high as 80%. As a consequence, the school enjoyed a high degree of informed parental support.

8. No designated principal. The faculty attempted to function as a committee to make administrative decisions for the school....

9. No guidance counselors assigned to the school. Each student was assigned to one of the five teachers, who served as his advisor....

X. We believe learning is a natural human process not requiring external motivations such as grades and hall passes. We believe everyone who is part of the school should take part in the direction and governance. We want to make our type of school available to everyone, regardless of economic means. We hope to promote the growth of whole human beings.

--Providence Free School

XI. Based on ideas of Neill, Paulo Freire, John Holt, Dennison, etc.; we try to be as much as possible a "non-school". Children are offered many possibilities but no compulsion to attend classes. Most activities are crafts and artistic plus a great deal of play.

--Tarango Growth Center
XII. At best education is not preparation for life, but life itself. Work and play are as important as class work. Student should participate in the daily work of the place and in building it. Some structure is essential to real freedom and optimum personal growth.
   --Arthur Morgan School

XIII. Each child is unique; learning is the marriage of natural tendencies and the environment; teacher's role is to help make marriage happen by being responsive to these individual tendencies for growth as they are observed in process.
   --Whitby School

XIV. That learning cannot take place in a coercive atmosphere, that ideally it is a process of self-motivation, of discovery of individual interests within a community. That rules can only be made by those who have to live under them. That all decisions must be made by the entire community (those interested in participating), that students hire teachers and together they establish the curriculum. Etc., etc.
   --Satya Community School

XV. We believe that students learn more and are happier when they are free to pursue interests and subjects they have chosen themselves, and have decided for themselves what is worth knowing. We do not believe in any external compulsion--grades, punishments, or compulsory courses. We stress preparing students to decide on their own values and alternative vocations and life-styles rather than preparing for material-valued vocations and roles.
   --Us.

Most of these statements emphasize individuality, freedom, choice and responsibility. Yet, the amazing thing about them is that the first nine statements are from public schools!
It must be noted, though, that several of these public schools are experimental, designed specifically to find alternatives to the current monolithic structure of education. Yet, it is still amazing that these public schools (witness the lengthy Murray Road School statement) say they are going in directions and are doing things that the most radical of critics have proposed. These directions include (among others) more freedom and responsibility for students, more concern for affective areas of life and an overwhelming emphasis upon the uniqueness of each individual human.

In spite of these likenesses, the responses to Question II-A were varied and personal and it was somewhat difficult to establish categories for the question. Also, some schools said that they do not follow one philosophy but eclectically incorporate the best of two or more, such as the Pinehenge School which is a combination of the integrated day and Summerhill approaches.

But the following seven categories were established after careful consideration of the responses:

1. Alternative Public School Program
2. Modularly Scheduled, Flexible Schools
3. Integrated Day Approach
4. Montessori Approach
5. Free Schools
6. Schools for "Disturbed" Children
7. Schools Run for/by Specific Minority Groups
These categories are large generalizations and so it is necessary to flesh out what these generalizations mean. As noted in the previous chapter, this will not be done entirely in Chapter II--some statements will be made here about these types of schools. It is the main concern in each succeeding chapter to add clarifications and data about each.

There are eleven Alternative Public School Programs included in this study.² There is a variety of schools in this category, but the one element which is basic to each is that they have been developed by their systems to find "new," "better," "different" or alternative ways of helping children learn--within the public school system. This last is an important item because these schools are in the system and--though they often do have a great deal of freedom and autonomy--they are still ultimately subject to local school board rules, regulations and pressures, and they are, therefore, limited in what they can attempt to do.

This category includes programs like the Parkway Project in Philadelphia and the 3 I's Program in New Rochelle High

²According to information compiled by The Teacher Drop-Out Center, there are from 40 to 50 public school districts that have set up alternatives within themselves.
School (a modified Parkway-type program). The basic philosophy of these two schools is explained in the following quotation from the New Rochelle School:

The central assumptions behind one of these alternatives, the 3 I's Program, are that (1) school is not a place, but an activity; (2) that activity should focus on learning and on learning how to learn rather than on teaching; (3) learning is much more likely to take place if the learners are actively involved in making choices about where, when, why, how, what and from whom they are to learn than if they are regarded as passive receptacles for somebody else's ideas about learning; (4) students need to participate, directly and authentically, in the life of their community, New Rochelle; and (5) New Rochelle needs their participation.

The school day of the 3 I's program is organized into four two-hour time blocks. Some offerings, however, are available to students only during the evenings or on Saturday. Students, teachers, and community participants conduct their activities and classes wherever they seem most appropriate (e.g., a bank, a church, a local college, a room in a high school portable) and move from place to place, using the city as their school....

The 3 I's Program is currently organized into the following structural elements, all of which, however, are under constant evaluation and subject to change.

---

3Such quotations have a great deal of importance in this paper for they are used not only to make or prove a point, but are used to convey important ideas. They are central to this paper.
(1) Tutorial groups. One teacher, one student teacher, and approximately 16 students are assigned to a tutorial group, which is the only mandatory component of the program. Tutorial groups meet two to three times each week for a two-hour period. Their functions are to offer guidance, instruction in skills, and individual and small-group help.

(2) Teacher-offered courses. Teachers offer courses in the major academic areas and across the usual subject lines. The courses are those which the teachers want to offer and in which they, too, are eager to learn.

(3) Community-offered courses and programs. These include offerings which involve city institutions (e.g., agencies of city government, New Rochelle Hospital), business (e.g., department stores, the local radio station and newspaper), and individuals with special skills and abilities (e.g., musicians, architects, engineers, artists).

(4) Service opportunities. Students are encouraged to participate in a range of service activities, which include work with younger children, programs for the elderly, and assistance to the blind.

(5) Independent and small-group projects. These projects usually develop out of the teacher and community-offered courses. Assistance to students is available through the tutorial groups.

(6) Management groups. Students participate with the faculty in a number of activities which involve the operation of the 3 I's Program. They include self-government and weekly student-faculty meetings, public relations, fund raising, the publication of a newspaper, and evaluation of the entire program.

The 3 I's Program is quoted at length here because it has the main elements of most of the other schools in this
category (and some of the elements of schools in other categories): the five basic assumptions, real choices involving many alternatives, emphasis on individual or small group projects, use of community resources, involvement in the real, on-going processes of one's community, learning while doing, participation of students in the decision-making process and close faculty-student relationships.

The Parkway Project is the model for the above program and it operates on a much larger scale: it now has three groups of students and it uses much of the city of Philadelphia for its campus. An interesting aspect of both of these programs is the concern with helping the student discover "where he's at" (through the tutorial groups, emphasis on individual choice, close student-staff relationships) as a human being and, simultaneously, establishing a great variety of alternative starting points for learning. John Bremer, founder of Parkway, says that in this way a student, given enough time and personal space, can come to find out what it is like "to live in that place, to be a real part of it, and for it to be a real part of him." Bremer is philosophically in the long line that stretches from Socrates ("For our conversation
is not about something casual, but about the proper way to live") to Whitehead ("There is only one subject-matter for education, and that is Life in all its manifestations"). Bremer argues that everything that is done in education must be judged in the light of this search for "the proper way to live"; everything that is done must itself be an appropriate way to live.4

Other schools in this category include a public "free" school; a Welfare Department-funded day care storefront that is community-controlled and that draws on diverse models: The English Infant School, which encourages independent, informal learning; Montessori, as it provides toys in which learning is embedded; and the principle, best stated by John Holt, that without a clear picture of what the child values and respects, his teachers are unable to help him. Our staff meets daily to review our learning about the children, to share our best thinking, and to plan experiences which, for those children who choose them, will help clarify their perceptions of the schoolroom, the community and the world...;

a "model schools" program that uses the "open classroom" concept and is an attempt to solve serious racial turmoil in its area and involves much cross-districting bussing; "schools-within-schools"; and a non-profit, private corporation,

4 Silberman, pp. 352-353.
the Pennsylvania Advancement School, that works primarily with "disadvantaged" youth and tries to "advance" them in basic skill areas, while "providing adults and children the opportunity to develop personal relationships, based on mutual trust and communication, that nourish their growth."

When were these alternative public schools established? Do they involve large or small numbers of students? To answer these questions, cross-tabulations of schools in this category were made with responses to Questions I-D and I-E.  

All of the alternative public schools are relatively new--all of them have been in existence since 1967, half of these are less than two years old. All of them have relatively small numbers of students--none with more than 200 students, half with less than 100 students. These two facts are important, as will be seen in later discussions.

This, then, is the beginning outline of Alternative Public Schools. Even more than the outline is here: there are some hints and expectations of how these schools responded

5Again, all cross-tabulations in this and succeeding chapters are in either Appendix V or Appendix VI. Included here in the body of the paper are generalizations and conclusions drawn from these tabulations.
to the rest of the questionnaire. In succeeding chapters, these expectations will be compared with their actual responses.

The second category for this question is concerned with schools that are modularly scheduled—schools that seem to be humane, concerned with the individual growth of their students. These include both public and private schools, though this type of structural innovation seems to be more prevalent in public junior and senior high schools. According to Dwight Allen, Dean of the University of Massachusetts' School of Education, there are now over 500 schools using a variety of modular approaches. Of the schools in this study, this type is probably the most known, for it has been written about, discussed and implemented more than any other type of innovative school in the United States.

One of the self-proclaimed pioneers of this approach is John Marshall High School and it describes its program thus:

Objectives: The development of each student to the optimum in relation to his capabilities within the parameters of available personnel, facilities, and materials resources, and especially developing:
   1. student responsibility for his own learning
   2. curiosity and love of learning
3. habits of intellectual inquiry
4. creativity and imagination
5. critical and analytical thinking
6. communication skills, oral and written
7. tolerance and respect for others and for opinions of others
8. increased awareness of alternatives
9. problem solving ability
10. initiative
11. self-discipline
12. social and personal adjustment
13. as well as attaining other fundamental, valid, and education goals.

To attain these objectives we have changed our former traditional educational program to a modular flexible design to stress individual teaching and learning through:

1. structuring of courses in length of time and numbers of class meetings by the nature of the subject and the characteristics of the students.

2. structuring courses by the use of four effective teaching-learning modes: large-group instruction, laboratory learning, small-group learning, and independent study.

3. improved staff utilization
4. improving staff competencies
5. use of para-professionals
6. use of a variety of instructional technology
7. providing more resources for student use
8. rearranging physical facilities for more effective student use

Perhaps the most important mode of learning for most students is independent study. During this time students may: (1) accomplish basic homework assignments in the resource centers, library, laboratories, and other appropriate learning centers; (2) plan, develop, and report on independent study projects which reflect in-depth student work in
areas of particular interest; (3) attend prerogative or mini courses (short-term courses offered by faculty or others in areas not covered by the formal curriculum); (4) visit classes other than those scheduled; (5) audit on a regular basis classes not taken for credit; (6) work as aides to teachers, office personnel, and other adults in the building; (7) work as tutors to other high school students needing special attention and to the several elementary schools in the area; (8) conference individually with teachers for whatever purpose deemed important to the student; (9) work for enrichment or extra credit in open laboratories; (10) browse or read in Club 45 (a special reading room), the resource centers, or the library...; (11) take a break in the student union, where snack bar facilities and vending machines are available.

One of the primary goals at Marshall is for students to develop responsibility for their own learning under guidance of the instructional staff. With this purpose in mind and with all the resources, materials, and personnel available to students, the staff strongly feels that the student's independent time should be profitably used on campus.

In order to meet the individual needs of our students, the Marshall staff and the school district have cooperated to develop courses not generally included in the curriculum of most schools. In addition to our regular courses, these include: auto mechanics, vocational work experience (on-the-job training), building construction, institutional foods, cosmetology, office occupations, and horticulture.

It would be very easy to pick apart this statement to show the contradictions in it—the illusory freedom of independent study, the discrepancy between the individualistic philosophy and the group practices, etc.—but these contradictions are more glaringly seen in later chapters
when specific practices are discussed in relation to this philosophy of individualism, freedom and responsibility.

There are schools included in this category that are not modularly scheduled. They are more conventional in structure (grades, classes, regular schedules, etc.) but are flexible, varied, low-pressured, concerned with the individual student and his needs. The statements quoted earlier in this chapter from Concord High School and William Mitchell High School are examples of this kind of school.

Modular schools are, in many ways, different from the alternative public schools. They both express primary concern for the individual and his needs, but they differ in the way they go about fulfilling these needs or providing for these individuals. Basically, alternative public school students have more influence in what goes on in their schools (hiring of staff, development of courses, administrative procedures, independence, autonomy, power, etc.) than do students in modular schools. This is evident from comparing the William Mitchell High School statement and the Murray Road School statement. Also, modular-flexible scheduling is mostly a structural, mechanical device that is concerned primarily with the manipulation of time. And, as Allan
Glatthorn has remarked, "time is the least important concern in schools." For him, the important concerns are people discovering what they truly want to know and to do, small groups of people working closely together, sharing and helping each other in a supportive atmosphere.

In most of these schools, the students do have a variety of courses to take in a variety of ways—yet the students must meet certain academic requirements set by the school; they must have "classes" even if students are released from the class to pursue its content in independent study; all studies are under the guidance and supervision of the staff; the students have to accumulate a certain amount of credits to graduate. A student does not do or study what he wants/needs to learn, though he has some power (usually advisory) in the content of his courses. These schools basically function as centers, places that try to replicate the world in miniature instead of functioning as

---

6 Mr. Glatthorn is principal of Abington High School, a well-known modularly scheduled school. The remark was made in a speech at the University of Massachusetts' School of Education and subsequently repeated in several conversations with this writer. Mr. Glatthorn is helping to plan three alternative public high schools, each of which will be small and autonomous and able to develop its own directions out of the strengths and weaknesses of the people involved.
bases for going out into the world. These schools are limited by "reasonable prudence" in the extent to which they can change and the speed with which they can transform themselves--this will become more evident from discussion in future chapters about compulsory classes, grading, community, student influence, etc.

There are 37 modular-flexible schools in this study--20 public schools and 17 private ones. A great majority of them are for students of junior and senior high school age and most of them have rather large enrollments: a majority with over 500 students, many with over 1000 students. It seems almost impossible to achieve and somewhat ridiculous to claim that a school is truly devoted to individualized instruction and have such large enrollments. Again, Mr. Glatthorn noted that the original drive, enthusiasm and gains toward freedom and individuality in his school have been virtually wiped out, primarily because of the large number of people jammed into one place which necessitates dealing with people in groups.

There is now an outcry for smaller schools. Many people think this is essential if children are to learn to know themselves and to feel part of their community. However
important this is, mere size is not enough; it is a beginning, a starting point. The quality of experiences children have and the grownups with whom they work and share make the important differences between success and failure, between alive and dead human beings.

Most of the private modular-flexible schools are college-prep ones and most have rather high tuitions—many over $500 a year, 10 with over $1,000 a year. Obviously, these private schools are rather selective and exclusive, catering to the upper middle class child.

The third category for Question II-A is what is variously called the "free day" school, the British Primary or Infant School Model, the non-graded school or the integrated day school. The last term is used here because of the metaphor involved—there are no separate, rigid time blocks for each subject, "subjects" are almost always interdisciplinary, the emphasis is both on cognitive and affective learning, learning and playing are synonymous, learning and "doing" are synonymous, learning is not confined to the classroom, etc. Learning is viewed as a continuum, as a whole, and all aspects of the school day (and, hopefully, of the child's life) are integrated into a oneness. The
concern is with the growth of the whole integrated child. Integrated day schools are usually for students between the ages of 3 and 13, though there is no reason that the philosophy and practice cannot be extended to include older children.

Integrated day schools philosophically subscribe to the writings of John Holt, John Dewey, Herb Kohl and other similar writers. They especially subscribe to the writings of Jean Piaget but they are not rigid in this subscription and do not make it into a prescription, as do some Montessori schools. They do not structure their environments so that certain skills are necessarily learned before other skills: for example, a child does not have to master motor skills before he is allowed to manipulate mathematics materials. In the early 1900's, Caroline Pratt, who founded the City and Country School and who wrote I Learn From Children, tested the assumption that one operation is fundamentally easier than another in doing some task and discovered that the system of graded exercises was basically unsound. The operations were different from each other, some more difficult for one child while another child found the same operations quite easy.
Usually the rooms in an integrated day school are set up with a variety of learning areas--math area, reading area, science area, animals area, dress-up corner, etc.--and the students (usually mixed in age range) are free to choose what they want to do from a wide variety of rich learning materials. These centers and materials grow out of the students in the room and are quite often made by the students and teachers, often from junk. Much of the materials are not pre-planned and the schools are usually different from each other because the students in each are different. Teachers are facilitators and the emphasis is on process rather than product, on learning how to learn rather than on the what of the process (though both co-exist in the process). There are times of group activities, small groups and larger groups, sometimes spontaneous and sometimes teacher-planned. But the child usually learns what he needs/wants to learn at his own pace in a supportive atmosphere.

The integrated day approach is widely used in England--one third of the primary schools there are fully operating under this approach and another third are moving in this direction. The integrated day approach--which is more than a method for it involves a philosophy about people and how
they learn—is just beginning to take root in America, much more rapidly in the private schools but also in some public ones, most notably in North Dakota where it is expected that most schools will have such classrooms by 1976.

The Longview School says the following about its philosophy:

(This depends on what day and who you ask, but--) basically we agree that the individual is valuable for himself, that there should be an individual pace and style of learning, kids should be helped to develop basic skills, competition is pointless and destructive; we are ungraded; developing self-motivation in kids.... Materials and human resources are available to kids; teachers and kids work out what they do, depending on kids' interests.

The principal of the Thornton Avenue School says the following about his public elementary school:

Four years ago when I became supreme ruler of this fantastic school we initiated a non-graded program that is now starting to pay dividends (sounds capitalistic). There has been a tremendous increase in the reading ability of students, but most of all kids are really starting to think positively about themselves. You know, self-concept and all that stuff. We threw out the traditional report card (a few people were upset), substituted it with parent-teacher conferences (in the parent's home so teachers will have a better idea as to what makes junior tick and also lets parents know we give a damn). Parent involvement is a big thing with us. We have initiated coffee hours where parents come in to rap and drink coffee with us in the A.M.... We have a volunteer program that brings in kids
from the colleges in the area, high school kids and some parents. These volunteers work with kids on an individual basis, small groups or if they have expertise in a particular area, large groups. Recently a girl from Wells College taught a group of students contemporary dance.

The above two quotations tell some more about this type of school: there is a great deal of emphasis on developing basic skills (reading, math, etc.), though this is most often done on an informal, personal basis and sometimes these skills are incidentally learned as by-products of other experiences (building a tepee, etc.); students are not compared and graded and in competition with each other--thus eliminating one of the basic fundaments of public education: namely, that there has to be winners and losers; and the relationships between adults and children seem personal and informal.

There are three public and 21 private integrated day schools in this study and all but one has been in existence for less than 6 years. Most of the schools have rather small enrollments (under 75 students, though only one of the public schools is small). Three of the schools do have rather large enrollments (235, 500 and 640 students), but it is not unusual for integrated day schools to have large classes or groups. In England, many of the classes have
from 30-40 students, although most of the schools are much smaller in total enrollment than most American schools.

The tuition in private integrated day schools ranges from $0 to $2,200, with the average being about $900 a year per student. Obviously, since this tuition is rather high, most of these private schools are not for children of low-income or even for many middle-income families. This, as was noted in the discussion of Question I, is one of the discouraging things about many of the new private schools that have been attacked by their critics: most of them must charge tuitions which are fairly high and thus they tend to be undemocratic and exclude certain groups of people--mainly the poor, uneducated and minority groups--and to attract certain other groups--mainly middle and upper middle economic groups, who are mostly white and who, because of their home and community environments, tend to "succeed" anyway in most schools. Thus, some critics say, they are not only undemocratic but they are hothouse environments for the inbreeding of already "successful" groups that guarantee themselves further success. This is an obvious over-simplification and at least two arguments can be raised against it: there are several very successful private integrated day schools that
enroll mostly poor students; if each student is unique, then a school naturally has a mixture of individuals, not a superficial homogeneity based on group classifications like middle class. Yet this judgment is a fairly true one for the private schools in this study.

The fourth category for Question II-A is the Montessori approach to teaching elementary children, developed by Maria Montessori in Italy for children who were "disadvantaged."

Of the six schools--all private ones--that are in this category, the Whitby School best explains this approach:

The structure of Montessori education involves the use of many learning materials which enable the child to work by himself or in a small group.

Children at Whitby are free to move about the classroom, to talk to other children, to work with any equipment whose purposes they understand, or to ask the teacher to introduce new materials to them. They are not free to disturb other children at work.

Freedom, not license is stressed in order to assist each student's potential for intellectual, physical and emotional growth. The teacher works with individuals or small groups, giving guidance where needed. He must observe each child carefully, to prepare the environment, direct activity, function as authority and offer stimulation. But the child is motivated through the work itself, and not through the teacher.
Emphasis is placed on self-discipline and hard work for the sake of fulfilling individual potential. The child is encouraged to work along lines of his interests while the teachers direct and channel his talents toward meeting modern academic requirements.

School has existed historically to teach children to think, to judge. Whitby, using Montessori, also introduces the child to the joy of learning at an early age, providing a framework in which intellectual and social discipline can develop naturally in the child as he matures.

The integrated day approach and the Montessori method are similar in many ways—emphasis on how to learn, on the individual, on the use of a rich variety of learning materials, on non-gradedness and multi-age grouping, etc. But there are some significant differences, as is evident from the Whitby School quotation: Montessori tends to be more cognitive and skill oriented and it tends to be more manipulative and directive, placing more emphasis on discipline:

"The teacher must observe each child carefully, prepare the environment, direct activity, function as authority and offer stimulation....The child is encouraged to work along lines of his interests while the teachers direct and channel his talents toward meeting modern academic requirements."

Maria Montessori once said that children who were "discipline problems" were "abherent," with the connotation that they
were psychologically ill: hence, one of the reasons for the emphasis on discipline.\(^7\)

There are other features that differentiate Montessori and integrated day schools: Montessori, for example, usually insists upon a predetermined sequence of motor activities leading to such intellectual attainments as reading. This insistence is often physically evident in the classroom: some Montessori schools do not have all their materials out for the children to freely use, but put the materials out in a planned sequence. The materials are often designed to accomplish specific goals and are intended to lead the child toward some previously defined attainment. Integrated day schools usually put out all their materials (while constantly developing new ones) and let the children use them and fit them to their own patterns of learning rather than fitting the children to the materials.\(^8\)

This is not to say that the integrated day schools do not have structure—they do—but the structure is individual and internal and the teachers usually put much less pressure on students to learn and less emphasis on discipline and

\(^7\)Maria Montessori and A. S. Neill in conversation.

function more as facilitators than manipulators of environments (material and human). They have not revived what some considered to be the monster of progressive education--the child bossing or completely over-ruling the teachers. Instead, children are seen as being naturally curious and given freedom and a rich and warm atmosphere with adults who have "natural authority" (George Dennison's phrase) these children will learn in their own ways in their own time.

There are six Montessori schools included in this study--all are private, day, elementary schools. None is more than seven years old; none has a really large number of students (the highest is 260, half have enrollments under 150); most have fairly high tuitions (a yearly average of about $800 per student) that make them, like most of the other private schools, selective and/or restrictive in the kinds of students they admit.

The fifth category for Question II-A is the "free" school, a recent phenomenon on the American educational scene. The following are main features of many of these schools that have been abstracted from the seventy-four schools that are in this category: learning through self-motivation and self-regulation; equal status to all pursuits;
evaluation through self-criticism; "teaching" based on interest; spontaneous formation of learning groups, centered on common interests; all can learn and all can teach; parents are directly involved in the education of their children; all members of the school community participate in regulating the school's activities; and the school is an integral part of the community. There are other features, too: extremely strong emphasis on freedom and individuality and, paradoxically, on community; a wide-range of people (3 to 65, sometimes) learning and often living together. These schools subscribe basically to the philosophy of A. S. Neill (except that many do not have scheduled classes as Neill's school does), John Holt, George Dennison, Robert Greenway, etc. Several of these schools are moving in the direction of communes, families (or unrelated people) living-learning-sharing together in a non-hierarchical manner.

Most of the free schools are new, most established since 1967. They are, therefore, still searching and growing and it is somewhat difficult to make judgments about them or put labels on them.

Most of these schools are small (92% have less than 100 students) and, interestingly, a fourth of them are boarding
schools. Also, a fourth of them have a mixed age-range of students, 3 to 19 and older. The tuition ranges from $0 (11 such schools) to a high of $2,700, with the average about $550.

Following are some responses from places that are free schools. These quotations help to better clarify what is meant by this type of school:

Mountain Grove, a place of 19 people, ages 4-63, is "an intentional community-school; life is our curriculum and our teacher....Krishnamurti's teachings were the original impetus."

Nethers Community School said:

No one here is exclusively a teacher. Hopefully every adult will play some educative role.

Some of us spend a major portion of our time with the students. Our role is not primarily teaching, but rather to be there, open to the needs of the students. We count on betheres to set a relaxed, accepting, and loving environment. A bethere may teach, conduct a seminar, work or play with the students.

Our aim is to create an educational environment which stimulates and suggests; which in its being-there conveys our resolution to live in harmony with each other and our environment.

We have a music room, an art room, and a quiet room. Soon we'll have a dance-theatre
studio, and a repair shop. Students have the free use of these rooms as long as they do not disturb others....

The boundaries between living and learning are tending to disappear. "School" is becoming the entire life of the community. Perhaps, one day, we will end the nominal start and finish of a "school day." This would not mean the end of scheduled classes.

Attendance at community happenings, including classes, is optional. Our present 8 don't want to miss anything!

Live Oak High School said its philosophy is:

"To each his own; it's all unknown" - Dylan. We attempt to make an educational experience for each student, based upon where he really is, what he really wants to do. It may mean lots of academic dialogue for one student, lots of survival trips and ecology classes for another, mechanical work experience, for another.

And, finally, Us (quoted earlier) said the following about its school:

We believe that students learn more and are happier when they are free to pursue interests and subjects they have chosen themselves, and have decided for themselves what is worth knowing. We do not believe in any external compulsion--grades, punishments, or compulsory classes.

We stress preparing students to decide on their own values and alternative vocations and life-styles rather than preparing material-valued vocations and roles.
Obviously, the above indicate that the free schools are a whole new approach to learning. When schools say (and practice this saying) that the function of teachers is "to be there, open to the needs of the student," that they have a "loving environment," that they "attempt to make an educational experience for each student, based upon where he really is, what he really wants to do"--then these are schools that most people have not heard of or attended.

The metaphor involved in the word free here is interesting: these schools say they are trying to free themselves from many nets: the dominant culture and its "material-valued vocations and roles"; the idea that someone else should decide what, how, when, where, why another person should learn or live; that one subject is more important or necessary than another; that students cannot be an integral part of all decision-making processes; that school and learning are distinct from living; etc. This list is practically endless because the free schools are, first and foremost, a reaction against all of what they see as harmful in public education. And they mostly see public education as being totally harmful and destructive to humans: ".../W/e think public education is fucked, that you really can't shine
shit...," is what a representative of Pacific High School wrote to The Teacher Drop-Out Center. It was echoed in similar words by several free schools in this study.

Children are often seen in one of two ways: either as vessels to be filled or as lamps to be lighted. Traditionally, school people have viewed children as vessels that need filled. They operate under a medical model of education: the children are diagnosed as ill because they lack knowledge, so they are confined to schools for twelve years of treatments, given large doses of information as cures. The empty vessels are poured full.

Many of the free schools have swung to the opposite pole of being exclusively concerned with lighting the fires of inspiration, emotion, intuition and the unconscious while being blatantly anti-intellectual. It's as if the vessels are filled with water and only need the mystical touch that will turn it to wine for the celebration already in progress.

But some of the free schools are now evolving into more than just a reaction to public schools: they are becoming a positive force, trying to balance the above dichotomy. One reason is the sheer number of them and their increasingly rapid growth. Mike Rossman, writing in the New Schools
Exchange Newsletter, says that there are about 1,600 new alternative schools (about 500 of them really free schools) and predicts that by 1973 there will be 7,000 such schools and by 1975 there will be an astounding 25-30,000 new schools.\(^7\)

Another reason is that some of these schools have been in existence for 4 or 5 years and are no longer experiments but functioning, viable alternatives. Schools like Harlem Prep, the Parkway Program, LEAP, CAM Academy, Lewis-Wadham, Children's Community Workshop School, Stamford Early Learning Center, and Pacific High School are just a few examples of learning environments that are nationally recognized as viable alternatives. Most of these places recognize the rhythmic alternation and simultaneous need of information and inspiration and they are trying to fuse these into one process rather than accentuating the dichotomy. What these schools are and what they do are radical departures from what most people know about schools and this will become more evident as each question is considered in succeeding chapters.

The sixth category for Question II-A are schools

\(^7\)Issue Number 52, January 1971.
that are for "disturbed" or handicapped children and/or diagnostic treatment centers for students "disturbed" in a variety of ways.

The Green Valley School says that it is for "children in trouble with the law, doing poorly in school, unhappy at home. Children who need a new and helpful environment to become psychologically sound." It is basically a Summerhillian place and says that it believes in "freedom, love and fellowship. A belief in sharing the quest for knowledge, direction, and insight. Respect for the autonomy and integrity of the individual." Its satellite school, Buck Brook Farm, says that it seeks to exclude only those children whose serious disorders are objectively based on organic pathology. We are not a custodial center. However, we have enjoyed substantial success with children otherwise diagnosed as incurable. Minimally brain damaged, mild cerebral palsied, speech disordered, autistic, conflicted, withdrawn, psychotic and other descriptions apply to the children who have successfully been educated here.

/ The school/ accepts unwed mothers, criminal children, autistic children, children with drug histories, children in active, but manageable, psychotic states....

There are four schools (three private and one public) that fall into this category. Interestingly, all of them
are striving to work with "disturbed" children in more open, free and honest ways ("in freedom, love and fellowship")--a radical departure from most other institutions that work with these kinds of children.

Only one of these places has a rather small number of students (Highland Community School with 21 students) while the other three have enrollments of between 70 and 110 students. It seems to this writer that even though these populations are small in comparison to most schools, they are still rather high for the necessary special and individual diagnosis, treatment and teaching/learning that they say they do (unless they have unusually large staffs). Disappointingly, all three of the private schools have high tuitions--between $6,200 and $12,000 a year--and are necessarily restricted to children whose families are fairly wealthy.

The seventh and final category for Question II-A are community-controlled schools or programs run for/by specific minority groups. An example is the Rough Rock Demonstration School; its philosophy is the following:

That Navajo people should have the right to run their own school and decide what is the best kind of education for Navajo children.
We are an alternative to the BIA or mission school. Our children are taught to be proud of and proficient in their Navajo Language and Culture (school is bilingual); community members, although uneducated, have complete control of the school and feel that the children cannot function in any culture unless at home with their own.

Another school in this category is the Dos Mundos Schools that have as their primary objective:

To help the 3 1/2 through 6 year old child learn his first language better, while simultaneously obtaining a coordinate control of a second language--English/Spanish or Spanish/English. We attempt to prepare each child to enter into the public school program at age six by means of a thorough preparatory, basic education program.

In addition, we strive to introduce the children to experiences outside their home environments. A regular program of field trips and special visitors are scheduled.

We also attempt to give the children an expanded knowledge of their own and the other cultures of the area.

Lastly, an extensive educational program is presented for the youth and older members of the community, as well as meeting and recreational facilities for neighborhood groups.

There are five schools in this category, two public and three private. All of them are fairly new--none more than six years old--and are for a variety of age groups. The enrollments in these schools vary widely, from 32 to 372 students. Interestingly, all three of the private schools
have low tuitions—$5, $50 and $108—and are obviously making it possible for many of these poor minority groups to attend their schools.

These schools involve students primarily from racial minorities—Mexican Americans, American Indians, Blacks, etc.—who have been "put down" by the dominant white culture and who are trying to retain or rediscover their identity through their own culture and to keep that culture alive with pride and dignity. And this is how they are similar to almost every school in this study: they all say they are concerned first of all with the pride, dignity and respect of the individual child.
CHAPTER III:
LIP-SERVICE?

Question II-B—"Who determined these premises, biases and/or values?"—was designed for several purposes: as a check on the previous question, as a check on some succeeding questions and to gather information that is valuable in itself.

After carefully reading the responses, the following categories were established for this question:

1. Administration
2. Administration and Staff
3. Administration, Staff and Students
4. Administration, Staff, Students and Parents
5. Administration, Staff and Parents

One of the basic concepts that the schools in this study profess (and one that is supposedly basic to American public education) is that each student is an individual, differing from every other individual, and should be free to develop in his own patterns, to realize his abilities to the fullest. Related to this basic concept is another stated by almost every public school in this study and expressed in the following by Interlake High School:

We believe that a democracy, where due process of law prevails among people and a social organization permits each person to
achieve dignity and worth, continues to evolve as the best form in the organization of human society.

Every public school that responded to the questionnaire, explicitly or implicitly, said that the above two concepts are part of their basic philosophy, yet many seem to be giving lip-service to these concepts. The majority (57%) of the public schools' philosophies were determined by the administration and/or administration and staff. There seems to be a head-on collision here between a philosophy that says children are not alike and a structure and practice created to treat them as if they were.

One encouraging result for this writer is that sixteen of these public schools are classified in categories 3, 4 and 5, categories that include student and/or student and parent involvement with the administration and staff in formulating basic policy. These schools seem to be practicing what they preach in their philosophical statements about concern for the individual, concern for democratic processes, and concern for student involvement in most aspects of the life of the school. This was simply stated by the Canyon school: "All of us together by trial and error /have formed the school's philosophy/."
The private schools, especially the free ones, seem to be a little more consistent when they say they are deeply interested in the individual, freedom, and responsibility and allow the students a great deal of participation in the life of the school. Seventy-five (62%) of them are in categories 3, 4 and 5.

Yet, forty-six private schools are in categories 1 and 2, schools that do not have students directly involved in formulating basic principles of the school. They seem to be shouting: DON'T DO AS I DO: DO AS I SAY!

It is more significant and meaningful, though to cross-correlate the seven types of schools established in the previous chapter with the categories in this chapter. Two types of schools are especially inconsistent here: only half of the modular-flexible schools and half of the free schools have students directly involved in meaningful ways in formulating basic philosophies. From what was said in the previous chapter, it would be expected that the percentage would be much higher, especially for the free schools that seem to be so loud in proclaiming student involvement. Just as inconsistent is the fact that only three of the alternative public schools have students involved in this basic decision.
None of the schools explained why they did or did not have students involved in formulating the school's philosophy. Several possible explanations of why they do not can be advanced: some schools noted that it is difficult to expect children who are very young, ages 4-10, to participate in such a process. Their thinking, abstracting and verbalizing powers are not usually sufficient to this task. It is not impossible, though, for there are several schools in this study--Worcester New School, Pinchenge School, for example--that have involved children of very young ages in helping to find the directions the school should travel. More often than not, schools are conceived and established by adults. Students are rarely asked if they want a school nor are they usually asked to be a part of the process of establishing the school. Some free schools do have students totally and equally involved with adults in the founding of the school and there are even free schools founded and run entirely by students.¹ But it has been this writer's experience that

¹The Skunk Hollow School is an example of such a school included in this study. A more famous example is the Milwaukee Independent School, founded entirely by students who were discontented with their public school experiences. The students govern themselves, raise funds, hire teachers, rent their own building, etc.
this is a rare phenomenon because it takes rare adults to be open and responsive to young people, to trust and risk themselves and the students. It takes a great deal of time and energy and hassling to come to a consensus about how a school should function. More time and energy is needed when more people, especially if they vary in age, are involved because each person usually has his own individual ideas about this very difficult subject. For, after all, educational philosophy is really autobiography. It is much easier for a few people to get together and decide on a philosophy, establish a school and then fit the students to the school or find students willing to accept the philosophy.

Most of the integrated day and Montessori schools' philosophies are determined by parents, teachers and administrators. This is not unexpected since their students are all of elementary age. All but one of the schools for "disturbed" children are run by the staff and administration and the same holds true for the schools for minority groups. This last item is not unexpected but somewhat paradoxical, as Paul Goodman has pointed out: These minority groups have been denied freedom and participation in the dominant culture and in their attempts to gain freedom it would be
expected that they would insist on freedom for the children in their own schools. Such is not the case, though.

Of the private boarding schools, a majority do not have their students involved in making basic school policies. Again, this is surprising because schools that board students should have a better opportunity for student involvement in basic decisions since students and faculty are with each other more. The lives of the students are almost totally encompassed by the school and interaction on deeper, personal levels among all is more possible than in most day schools.

Question II-B obviously did act as a check on Question II-A and takes much of the light away from the glowing ideals that most schools used to characterize themselves. But, the inconsistencies and disappointments of this data are somewhat assuaged by the discussions in succeeding chapters, especially in the consideration of Question VI.

Perhaps, some of the statistics in this chapter can be flipped over and they then appear in a different light and are more encouraging: half of the modular and half of the free schools do have students involved in formulating basic

philosophies. This is a rather substantial number of schools and an indication that students can be successfully involved in even the basic decision-making processes of the school.
CHAPTER IV:
HETEROGENITY AND DIVERSITY BEGET GROWTH

Many writers have pointed out that we have become a ghettoized society, that people tend very strongly to live among those who are similar to themselves—ethnically, economically, socially, etc. Schools tend to further accentuate this by dividing students into homogeneous groups.

These practices are destructive to individual growth and to society as the following article shows¹:

We, as in most American schools, preach the idea of meeting individual needs, yet—ah, brave new world that is so able to take the exact measure of a man—we put students into Advanced Placement, Honors, Regents, Non-Regents, and Basic classes.

Yet the fact is that none of the considerable research into the efficacy of present grouping patterns has shown any justification whatever. In other words, there seems to be no improvement in learning as a result of such grouping no matter which grouping pattern is considered. In the absence of any substantial evidence indicating improvement in achievement, it seems clear that grouping practices are continued simply because teachers, counselors and administrators find it convenient.

¹The article (quoted in part, only) was written by Stan Barondes for the first edition of a teacher’s magazine at Suffern High School, Suffern, N. Y.
There is a harsh human price paid for this "convenience." For the bottom groups, the situation is exasperating and almost embarrassing. The curriculum is watered down to such an extent that both teacher and students know that attendance and attention are difficult to justify. Commitment and curiosity are often lost. These conditions lead to the open secret that many of the students in the bottom groups consider themselves as inferior humans. The Honors classes fare a bit better (for aren't these the most worthy?), but they often have been together so long that they have become cynical in their expectations and superior in their attitudes. Both groups, highest and lowest, expect so little from each other which is new that often they transfer the entire burden of performance onto the teacher.

But more important than these arguments is the relevancy of the present grouping system to democratic living, human growth and the philosophy of pluralism. Has it not yet become clear that unless we share more of each other's hopes and fears and joys and pains we will be witness to even more isolation, manipulation, clubbing and murder than we do now?

Instead of offering facile justifications for separating students almost permanently and labeling them as inferior or superior, do we not have to make commitments to ideas and needs that transcend such justifications? Can't we come up with any other methods of meeting the students' individual needs without the divisiveness of present grouping patterns? In this re-evaluation, we need to not forget the power of the self-fulfilling prophecy. All of us establish an identity at least in part from the cues we get from the people around us. The question is, then: How much of the poor performance of "poor" students is due to capacity and how much is due to their fulfilling the prophecies made about them year after year as they are labelled and grouped?
By being able to associate with a wider variety of people—intellectually, emotionally, morally, ethically, economically, racially, etc.—will not students and teachers have a greater opportunity for human contact, understanding, learning, and growth? Isn't this what learning and living are all about?  

The schools in this study tend to reflect the divisiveness and ghettoization of the society. They were asked:  

"What kinds of students do you have in your school? (Are there any psychological, ethnic, cognitive, religious, social, etc., backgrounds that typify students in your school?)" The responses indicated that there are kinds of students in the schools and that these tended to fall into the following categories:  

1. Heterogeneous  
2. Middle Class  
3. Specific Ethnic or Religious Background  
4. "Disturbed" and Drop-Out  
5. High Intelligence, College-Prep  
6. Low Economic  

These categories are phrases and labels that the schools themselves used to characterize their students. Schools do not exclusively fit into one of these categories for they

2 Research supporting this article can be found in the National Education Association's Research Bulletin, Vol. 46, No. 3.
often have students with a variety of backgrounds: for example, Green Chimneys School said it has students "of average to above intellect; youngsters from the most affluent to the most deprived; many with learning and/or related emotional problems." Schools are placed in a specific category here because a majority of their students have specific backgrounds.

The first category includes schools that said they have students with a mixture of all the elements noted in the question. Some typical responses from schools in this category are the following:

All kinds. We feel we have all kinds of families involved in the school, rich, middle class, black, white, poor, struggling--all for their own reasons have decided on this kind of a place for their children.
--The Children's School

/We have/ a heterogeneous group reflecting other schools in the community. No particular ethnic, cognitive or social backgrounds.
--Alternative Junior High School

We operate on another assumption, to wit: that heterogeneity and diversity beget growth. Thus we try to achieve a balanced diversity within the school--in terms of sex, socioeconomic class, ethnic background, the physically handicapped and normal or unhandicapped children and so on. We make no preferential decisions on the basis of religion or politics, though the institution was founded by Quakers.
--Pacific Oaks Children's School
The second category is for schools that have students who are primarily from middle class backgrounds, primarily white and economically comfortable; these schools usually have a small percentage of various minority populations. This is a rather broad category, yet it is one that was so stated by the schools and one that is generally understood by most people. For example, the following are schools that were placed in this category because of the nature of their responses:

The typical student tends to be middle class, fairly bright and articulate. The great majority are white and it is a fairly typical suburban atmosphere.
   --Concord High School

The bulk of our students are from families of comfortable economic means, high education level, and include a mixture of religious affiliations--Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, ?. Very little ethnic mixture--a few (6-8) blacks, 4 oriental, and approximately 1020 Caucasian.
   --Interlake High School

The third category for this question includes schools that have a large percentage of a specific ethnic minority or religious group. Some were intentionally established for/by a racial or religious group and some of the schools serve a predominantly minority group because of the area in which the school is located. State and federal laws prohibit
racial discrimination but this does not mean that schools do not in fact practice discrimination—they cannot avoid it if the only students in their district are mostly all black, all white, all fairly rich, all poor, etc. This is the main reason why many of the schools in this study do not have heterogeneous student bodies: the schools are a reflection of their society. The grouping practices noted earlier are a reflection, amplification and reinforcement of that society.

Examples of schools in this category are the already mentioned Rough Rock Demonstration School which is for Navajo Indian children and Garfield High School that noted its students are "98% Black, medium to low economic level." Also included in this category are three private Catholic schools.

The fourth category is for schools that have a majority of students who are "disturbed," public school drop-outs (or potential drop-outs), alienated and/or "hippy-type" youths. Again these are all terms and labels the schools themselves used to describe their students. Some schools included in this category are the Green Valley School and Buck Brook Farm that were quoted earlier. Canyon School
said that its students "come from a predominantly 'hippy' (for lack of a better word) community. Most parents are college educated people who have moved to this rural community to gain more freedom." The Skunk Hollow High School said, "We are primarily white middle class adolescent hippy-type atheists." Finally, the Claremont New School said the following about its students:

Nope, except they are locals, anybody whose parents can muster up the bread (or part of it) or help out.

They do have one thing in common (at least from the beginning): somewhere in them they are tired of being fucked over in public schools, they and their parents knew that something was wrong.

Many other free schools made comments similar to this one from the Claremont School. The terms "drop-out," "alienated" and "hippy" are sometimes used inter-changeably by these schools and do not always seem to have pejorative connotations. The students have dropped out of sitting passively and listening to talking teachers; they have cut themselves off from the larger society and its values and are often judged as misfits by that society. The contrast with this category and number six is that most of the students here seem not to identify themselves as failures.
The fifth category is for schools that are primarily for high intelligence students or are a college-prep type of school. These schools usually have specific entrance and continuance requirements--for example, an I.Q. over 130, a "special gift," etc., and a certain grade average to continue--and are academically oriented, purposely and almost exclusively preparing their students for college. For example, the Palfrey Street School said they have students "who want to learn; students who are able to do 'college work' at some later date; students who are willing to participate in the school program." J.F.K. Prep School said its students "are screened for their leadership qualities."

The sixth, and last, category for Question III includes schools that serve predominately low-income students who are mostly potential or actual drop-out types of students (from a variety of ethnic and cognitive backgrounds). This category is best explained by the following statement from the City Hill School:

Typically, C. H. students come from low-economic families, have a school history of failure and negative responses and have already been adjudicated by the legal system. Furthermore, they identify themselves as the failures, "the Lake Street Bums," the outcasts, suffering
from a negative self-esteem and a lack of personal goals.

Forty-six percent of the public schools in this study said they have heterogeneous student populations. This is somewhat unexpected for this writer because many of these schools are in suburbs and most of the "innovative" and "progressive" schools in these suburbs usually have students who are mostly white and from middle class homes. But the eighteen heterogeneous schools here seem to disprove this and indicate that these schools practice their open enrollment policies.

Ten public schools in this study—like Concord High School and Interlake High School quoted earlier—are typical suburban schools where many of the parents are economically comfortable, white, college educated, "liberal," and insistent about their children getting "the most modern education" to prepare them for college.

When the public schools in these categories were cross-correlated with the seven types of schools, the following data were obtained: a large majority (about 75%) of the alternative public schools have students with heterogeneous backgrounds. This is evidence that they are trying to live up to the philosophies they expound in trying to find
alternatives within their school systems, for many of these are in districts where the total population is more homogeneous. One alternative that they are working on is that schools and classes do not have to be homogeneous for the best learning to occur; they, too, believe that "heterogeneity begets growth."

The other interesting factor gained from the above cross-correlation is that about half of the modular-flexible public schools have primarily white middle class students. A large majority of these schools are the "typical suburban schools" noted above. They are also similar to most of the modular schools around the country that are primarily located in economically comfortable suburban areas where the parents are white, many college educated and "liberal." There are probably many reasons for this—available money, educational backgrounds of the parents, parent expectations and pressures that their children get the "best of modern education" so they can go on to "good" colleges, kinds of administrators and teachers hired, etc.

Only 37% of the private schools in this study have heterogeneous student populations.

This is understandable because, as has been seen earlier,
most have rather high tuitions and are necessarily restrictive and selective. The disappointing aspect here for this writer is that many of the schools are forced into being elitist: they have not found enough ways around the money problem and are not open to all. Many provide scholarships, but it is still obvious that these are token gestures and not solutions to a very large problem. There are about 20,000 students in the 1,600 new, alternative private schools, less students than in several square blocks of New York City. The wildest predictions are that in five years, if these alternatives keep growing, there will be 1 1/2 million students involved. That is still infinitesimal in comparison to the large numbers of students who are not in innovative or alternative schools, public or private, who are victims of the "crisis in the classroom." These schools may truly be places where good learning is occurring, they may serve as models for reform, but schools that charge tuitions are not a permanent part of the solutions to the problem.

There are 25 private schools for "disturbed" and drop-out students. Only five have students who are "disturbed"; the other twenty have primarily white middle class students who are drop-outs from the public schools, turned off and
alienated by "the system." There are also eleven private schools that have students with primarily low-economic backgrounds, but they are poor and are, like the students in category 4, alienated from/by "the system" and are public school drop-outs.

The interesting thing here is that there are schools for these two groups that are the prime victims of the public schools: the "hippy-type" student--often bright, creative, from middle or upper-middle class families--and the "disadvantaged" student--poor, often bright and creative, too--who have been in various ways oppressed by the public schools, have had a poor education, education that is not relevant to their lives, who have had their selves mutilated.  

Does each of the six types of private schools enroll a specific type of child? To answer this question, a cross-tabulation of Question III and Question II-A was made and the results are somewhat confusing though some patterns do appear, but not definite and clear-cut ones. Four of the six Montessori schools have students with middle class backgrounds and the other two have students with heterogeneous

---

3 These are mild paraphrases of the many such comments made by the private schools in their responses.
backgrounds. This is somewhat at odds with Maria Montessori's original impetus in developing her methods for the poor children in some of Italy's slums. In the process of transplanting or adapting the method, a new creature has been formed.

About half of the integrated day schools have students who have heterogeneous backgrounds and the other half have students from middle class homes. These results are not unexpected. In England, the integrated day schools can be found in every type of neighborhood: London slums, wealthy suburbs, in farming areas, in coal mining towns, etc. This is also true of integrated day schools in this country, but the schools in this study are not in areas that have a great diversity of population. Half claim they have heterogeneous enrollments but most of these also have fairly high tuitions and a limited amount of scholarships. These schools may be heterogeneous, but the poor are only a very small part of this heterogeneity.

There are students from all but the "disturbed," dropout category in the private modular-flexible schools. This is somewhat of a contrast with their public school counterparts that have students from middle class backgrounds. These
private schools have taken this structural technique and made it more flexible by applying it to students from many backgrounds, rather than just having "safe" students. In other words, they have made some freedom, choice, and responsibility available to more kinds of students, available as a means to learning rather than as a result or reward, available to students who usually are not given this freedom in most public schools.

Free schools seem to be the most flexible and most democratic type of school in this study. A large majority have either heterogeneous populations or drop-out, alienated types of students. Only 17 of these schools have students from middle class homes. Though most of the free schools have tuitions (some rather high), some have been able to free themselves from the paralyzing and deadening practice of having only one type of student. They have opted for heterogeneity and diversity and thus they have opted for democratic living, pluralism, human growth and life.

By having a wide variety of people in the schools, students and teachers have a greater opportunity for human contact, understanding, learning and growth. And this is what living is all about.
In recent years, the big debate about structured and unstructured schools has risen like the Phoenix out of the ashes of the progressive school movement. One side accuses the other (usually the public schools) of being rigid and repressive and the other retorts that the alternative schools are too permissive.

James Herndon, in his *How to Survive in Your Native Land*, addresses himself to this issue when he narrates how he and several other teachers did away with two basic fundamentals of a junior high school classroom: (1) the kids could leave the room whenever they wanted and (2) a student did not have to do anything. In place of the usual classroom routines, the teachers planned a whole series of what they thought were really exciting learning situations. But--because the kids took them at their word and did not do these activities, left the room and did "nothing"--Herndon was forced into a fantastic revelation:

We were in a new world. Nothing can be worse than that. We had to face the fact that all the stuff we thought the kids were dying to do (if they only had time away from the stupifying lessons of other teachers) was in fact stuff
that we wanted them to do, that we invented, that interested us—not only that but it interested us mainly as things to be doing during periods of time when something had to be going on, when no one was supposed to be just sitting around doing nothing. And not only things to be doing—it was things for them, the kids to be doing. Things we wanted to see them do, the results we wanted to see.

When Herndon informed the students that he was going to give them assignments since they were not doing anything,

Indignation, disappointment and sneers greeted my own pronouncement. I was told in plain words that I was being chickenshit. I was reminded of my brave words when I talked them into taking this lousy course last year (I'd thought no one was listening) and quite clearly informed that it was the same old thing—teachers promising "class participation in decision making" and then if it didn't work out just like the teacher wanted, the teacher then unilaterally changed his fucking mind. (I reminded myself how things change when you give up your authority, officially, even if you really want to keep it, privately. The kids begin to talk to you just as if you are a real person, and often say just what they mean.) I was informed that the only virtue of the class was its freedom to do (to come and go) and not do; take away that and they all planned to see their counselors and ask for transfers.

Herndon and the other teachers took another look at the students and discovered that, true, they were not doing what the teachers wanted them to do—but "they were doing stuff all the time."
Herndon takes the issue a step further than is usually done in the debate about structure, freedom, license and control. The debate is usually in terms of the institution: a comparison of structured and unstructured schools or classrooms. Few talk about structured or unstructured people. Most of the schools in this study believe in some kind of structure, and some question those arbitrary, group-imposed, administration and faculty directed, self-justifying structures and rules upon which schools come to depend. But few (and most of these are the free schools) talk about an internal, individual and dynamic structure: the emotional and intellectual structure of a healthy, happy person. Holt says that learning, growing and knowing are the structuring a person does as he builds an internal model of reality which helps him cope with the world, with himself and with others.

The free schools can be faulted, too. It has been this writer's experience that when some of these schools talk of freedom for children they really practice something akin to neglect: "You're free to do whatever you want to do. We're not going to inhibit you; we're not going to put our thing on you. If you want our help, we'll be around." Often this really means, "I don't give a damn what you do."
There is a fine, personal line between rigidity and neglect. Schools that are serious about their intention to help children grow and develop their own potential are letting kids down if they do not expect of the students what they are capable of. That is, in Plato's phrase, midwifing what is there, leading forth that which is within, not shoving things down a student's throat. The important thing is that each child is different, has different needs, different wants and different potential.\(^1\) Group processing—whether the authoritarian rigidity of many public schools or the obsessive, self-conscious libertarianism of some of the free schools—diminishes the importance of the individual child and that is bad for him. Kozol, Dennison and others have shown that children need adults, adults who can have intense, genuine involvement with a youngster, with a recognition and acceptance of his individuality, his capability and his needs. These adults start with "where a child's at" but they do not leave him there.

This involves love, involves the whole range of emotions.

\(^1\)Obviously, humans have many similarities—we all need clean air, food, love, etc. The issue raised here and throughout this paper is the importance of recognizing individual differences—something preached for many years but rarely practiced in schools.
Most public schools fail miserably in the development of positive feelings. The innovative and alternative schools in the study seem concerned with the development of feelings such as love, yet they also encourage hatred: of parents, straight schools, the straight society, the Establishment, the System. It is tough to learn to love in a world busy hating.

Besides, such values as love, dignity, mutual respect, honor, courage, will and a humane ethic cannot emerge from the child in a moral vacuum or in a world of empty slogan-eering.

The above paragraphs are something of a preface to the succeeding chapters of this study, a frame in which to picture the responses of the schools. It is extremely difficult to discover from a questionnaire whether a school is a moral vacuum, preaches empty slogans, neglects kids, does or does not have a loving atmosphere. Yet, there are hints or contradictions in the responses. Though the concern here is with school structures, the discussions will also try to follow out the hints that go beyond structure to the humans involved in the schools.

In his book, Herndon goes on to say another thing of
significance:

The fundamental act of the American public school is to deal with children in groups. Once it has a group of children of any age, it decides what those children will be expected to do, and then the teacher, as representative of the school, tells the children all at once. The children hear it, and when they hear it they know whether they can do it or not. Some of the children will already know how to do it. They will win. The teacher comes into the teacher's room the first day and says I already know who the good students are. I can predict the grades of almost every kid. Sure enough, the prediction works with minimum variation.

Well, Question IV of the questionnaire is concerned with how schools deal with children. It is a three-part question and each will be considered separately in this and the following two short chapters.

Question IV-A simply asks, "Do you have classes?" and the schools were asked to circle either (1) yes or (2) no. But, because the responses showed that all schools do not fit either category, a third one--yes and no, classes for some, classes sometimes--had to be established.

Amazingly, 92% of the innovative public schools in this study have classes for their students, one of the primary aspects of schooling that is under attack by many critics as opposed to the philosophy that each student is an individual
who learns at his own pace in his own time—a philosophy, as has been seen, these schools espouse.

One reason for this is the size of the schools. Most of them have enrollments of over 200 students. The three public schools that do not have classes all have less than 50 students. There is a positive correlation here between size and methods of learning: public schools with large enrollments deal with children in groups and have classes; schools with small enrollments do not have classes and deal with children individually.

About half of the public schools added notes similar to the following when they responded to the question:

Students may choose from a variety of elective courses during their 3-year tenure in school.
--Interlake High School

Some independent study courses taught by staff and students.
--Abington High School

Area studies. Projects. We try to use our small student-to-staff ratio effectively. We feel that proper guidance along with an interesting program can draw students to our program.
--Alternative Junior High School

James Herndon had some interesting things to say, quoted earlier in the chapter, about a similar belief.
We have developed a "school-within-a-school" design to enable students to pursue a particular interest that might have greater depth. This also enables them to spend less time through contracting or periodic classroom meetings to meet the basic requirements of other subjects.

--Ernest Righetti High School

Meadowbrook Junior High School also noted that it has developed the school-within-a-school concept and has broken itself into four different units.

These notes are of interest for they show that the schools are trying other ways of organizing the school and the classroom. But they can also be seen as evasions, evasions of confronting the fact that their school structures are in conflict with their stated individualized philosophies. They are still basically dealing with children in groups. The biggest discrepancy--because of the antithesis between philosophy and practice--lies with the alternative public schools. In spite of having small enrollments, in spite of being specifically founded to discover alternatives to present educational practices, in spite of having some tutorials and using community resources, in spite of having electives, projects and independent study, they still rely on the standard class as the basic means of learning.

The two public school programs without classes are:
The Learning Lab at Cross Keys Junior High School that is an individualized program conducted in a large, open, well-equipped resource center where each student chooses what he wants to learn and works at his own pace, with the teachers functioning as facilitators; and Kent State's Akron Neighborhood Faculty Program that involves students in over 450 experiences in the Akron Black community. The Discovery Room for Children, the lone school in category 3, says its children learn: "Independently, /classes/ by child request, and in small groups by teacher invitation."

As a contrast to the above public schools, there are 81 private schools that do not have classes or have classes sometimes. It is a rather significant difference and one of the ways that makes these private schools so different from the public schools in this study.

The three types of schools that more than the others do not have classes are the integrated day schools (78%), Montessori schools (83%) and the free schools (68%). These represent a rather substantial number of schools. Following are two responses from schools that do not have classes:

The only learning that is real can happen only when the motivation for that learning comes from within the child. Learning happens when a
child decides he wants to learn. He may want to make a tipi. The mathematical and other skills necessary to accomplish this will be acquired by the child in order to build the tipi—and he'll enjoy learning these skills! Other learning or subject matter presented happens when a teacher has a project or something he wants to get into. The kids see him at his work and some of them may want to get into it.

--The Lorrillard School

Interests are pursued by the students as and when they will. Teachers insure safety of students, administrate the building and other problems, and remain as fully available as possible. We bring students everything that we can think of which might be interesting or otherwise worthwhile.

We have tried almost everything I know of by way of normal or traditional teaching methods—all limited by our ban on coercion. Our conclusion is that, without threat, all teaching methods are shit.

And yet, our kids learn like crazy.
--Free Schools, Inc.

Of the forty-nine schools that said they have classes sometimes, the following from the Community School is a representative response:

Class equals people coming together with resource person to learn a specific area, skill, etc. Length varies.

Learning is organic (at least sometimes). The idea: do things as they become important—get a job, do volunteer work, study astrology, make the revolution, learn about nutrition, start a bakery, make love, learn Spanish, travel to Mexico.
The above quotations were chosen because they are rather typical responses and because they show that there are schools that do not have classes and do have learning happening—learning that is involved in doing and in living, learning that seems natural, zestful and joyful.

They indicate that there is a tremendous amount of trust in individuals and an equal amount of intense care and attention given by the adults to the students. Further, they indicate that adults are people here who have their own adult lives to lead, who do what they are doing for their own reasons and not necessarily to teach or to amuse the children. A school is not for kids only, some of these schools seem to be saying. They are also saying that a good way for kids to learn and to grow up is by getting involved in the on-going processes of the adult world, something Paul Goodman has been advocating for years. This idea—a world in which children could naturally learn as they grew into it—is discussed in more detail near the end of this paper.

Most of the schools that do not have classes have small enrollments: 87% have under 100 students, 71% of which have under 50 students. This is again a sharp contrast with the public schools and it seems one of the primary
reasons why the private schools have been able to move beyond classes as the primary way for students to learn.

Of the forty-four private schools that do have classes, about half are modular-flexible schools that are primarily academically oriented. Surprisingly, there are twenty-four free schools that have classes. Most of these are also small schools. It would seem—because of their stated objectives and their small size—that these schools should have found other ways than dealing with children in groups as the primary means of learning.

The private boarding schools were categorized separately and about half of these have classes. Some of these boarding schools are free or integrated day schools: from their stated objectives of individualism, disdain for conventional methods and concern for sharing and growing, it would seem as if people who live so much of their lives together would have a much easier opportunity than most other schools in finding a variety of alternatives to the traditional classroom situations.
CHAPTER VI:
TO ROB EVEN A HEALTHY BEAST OF PREY

The second part of Question IV is concerned with those schools that have classes and whether these classes are compulsory. The categories originally established for this question were (1) yes and (2) no, but, as in IV-A, a third category had to be established because some schools have classes compulsory for some students or compulsory classes sometimes.

Volumes, like Paul Goodman's *Compulsory Mis-Education*, have been written about how destructive is the compulsory nature of education and about how freedom is necessary to the flowering of joyful learning: students learn best what they themselves discover they need and want to learn. The quotation from Einstein at the beginning of this paper is a powerful, personal testament of this viewpoint, one subscribed to by this writer.

Sixty percent of the public schools in this study have compulsory classes.

Some of these schools again found it necessary to add notes like the following:
All structured parts of a pupil's program are compulsory; however, each student has 20-25% of his schedule unstructured. Each student can make decisions as to how best he or she can use this "responsibility time." Less than .5 of 1 percent misuse or cannot handle this time.

--Bingham Junior High School

One wonders what happens to the student who wants to use his "responsibility time" to sit under a tree and dream? This unstructured time seems a long way from freedom, one of the missed revolutions of history.

The Clinton Program said the following about its classes:

Students are expected to have complete programs and to attend the courses which they have chosen to take. Programs are extremely flexible and are chosen from an exceptionally wide range of interest areas.

Again, it is encouraging that schools are making choices available to students, but far from encouraging that the students are compelled to take classes. It is like saying to a child who is in dire need of meat: "O.K., here's some corn, carrots, potatoes and salad. Take your pick."

There are fourteen public schools that do not have compulsory classes. These are mostly alternative schools (half of them) and some few modular-flexible ones. Obviously, if they do not have compulsory classes, they must provide
alternative ways of learning and these schools have found some: elective (small and large) classes, tutorials, learning packages, independent study, independent projects, participation in community activities, etc. These will be elaborated upon in more detail in the next chapter.

All of the public integrated day schools said their classes are compulsory. This is entirely contrary to the basic philosophy of the approach and is also a marked contrast to the private integrated day schools.

One of the reasons that so many of these public schools have compulsory classes is the number of students in the schools. The schools with high enrollments tend to have compulsory classes. How else can schools with large enrollments have their students learn? None of the schools in this study really have an answer to this question and there are only a few schools in the country attempting to answer it: by developing learning packages, by having schools-within-schools, etc.

One answer is that there is no answer: schools have to be small not to have classes or not to have compulsory classes. Most of the schools in this study that have found alternatives to classes and compulsory classes are small--
with less than 150 students.

Eighty-eight percent of the private schools that have classes either do not have compulsory classes or have compulsory classes sometimes. This is a stark contrast to the public schools.

There are twelve private schools that do have compulsory classes and the following is a response from one of them:

Yes--we have an obligation to our kids to help them--not to do them the dis-service that the well-intentioned but entirely misguided free school people are inconceivably going to do (not that their schools will last that long).

--The Chinquapin School

Obviously, it is not the intention here to say that all schools which have compulsory classes do not have high-quality academic learning. Obviously, this is possible and has been documented by various writers. The main point is the discrepancy between the word and the deed: a school cannot in one breath say that each child is unique and in the next say that they only work with children in required groups. Nor is it necessarily the intention here to say that all schools which do not have classes or do not have compulsory classes are more humane or have more learning or more joyful learning occurring. The first condition does not necessarily lead to the second situation--though there
are schools which argue this point and say that freedom is a necessary basis for true learning. There are indications in this study that the first condition, along with other factors, leads to more humane and joyful learning situations. As Albert Einstein said: "...for this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom: without this it goes to wrack and ruin without fail. It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and searching can be promoted by means of coercion and a sense of duty."

A large majority of the schools that do not have compulsory classes (or compulsory sometimes) are the free schools (73%), the integrated day schools (all), Montessori schools (all), and schools for "disturbed" children (all). Some typical statements from schools in these two categories are the following:

It's more likely that we have more of what Goodman called "incidental education."
--Shaker Mountain School

I don't know what you mean by classes. Our program varies from teacher to teacher (11 of them), and many structure these activities that require structure, e.g., music, and often require of the children that they come together for the action. If such efforts don't fit, they don't last. That is, if the kids don't dig the action that effort is stopped.
--Pacific Oaks Children's School
We have some subjects set up as classes, especially those with teachers who can only be with us at certain times during the week. Students can choose certain areas to study individually at their own speed (math, typing, Spanish, etc.), get together for group projects, and participate in various field trips, usually whenever the opportunities come up.

--Us.

The instruction is individual and personal. We have group meetings in the primary class which everyone must attend because I believe some sense of "groupness" is important. Mostly, students select their own involvements, which would not necessarily be classified as "academic"....

--Hudson Montessori School

These last three quotations point out clearly an important fact: some schools do not have classes or do not have compulsory classes, but this does not mean that they do not have group activities. As will be seen when Question X is considered, many of these schools combine a seeming contradiction: they emphasize individuality and they emphasize "groupness," "social skills," togetherness, sharing and community.
CHAPTER VII:
INDEPENDENTLY, INCIDENTALLY, ACCIDENTALLY, NATURALLY

Question IV-C asks: if your school does not have classes, "explain how subject matter, content areas and/or interests are pursued by the students."

The following five categories were established from the schools' responses:

1. Interest Areas. This category is best explained by the following quotation from The Children's School:

   The school is set up in areas--math, reading (books, tape recorders, records, printing press), woodworking, science (organic gardening, microscopes, bird watching, lots of animals), art, water areas, etc. The children and adults are free to move around and use any or all of the areas or none of them to accomplish what they want to do.

   Most of the schools in this category are for children of elementary or junior high school age, though this approach has worked successfully with older students.

2. Tutorials - Contracts - Small Groups - Learning Packages. This category is explained by The Claremont New School:

   Just about all the traditional course stuff (from titles anyway)--but done a la CNS, mostly on tutorial basis, small groups, etc., community people in and out, heavy on drama (just did a
fine and funny production of Midsummer's Night Dream, next Camino Real, improvised theatre, lots of field trips, moving about in vans, German, French, Spanish for those who want, folk guitar, pots, welding, organic garden beginning to move, hiking, fun PE, anthro, dance, cooking good eats, political realities and so on and so on.

3. Individual Choice/Needs of Each Student. This category is self-explanatory and the following are some responses from schools in the category:

    Academic needs are set up according to the individual's needs.
    --Highland Community School

    Independently, incidentally, accidentally, naturally.
    --Saturna Island Free School

    If more than one person is interested in the same area, they form a class. If only one person is interested in some area--he does it on an individual basis.
    --Second Foundation School

4. Interests of the Group. Only one school, Super School, is in this category and it said the following about how learning is pursued in its school:

    School-wide projects, pursued continuously during consecutive school days. The difference being, instead of one hour of mathematics, we might work all day on that area, etc.

5. Combination. This category includes all of the above ways: projects, resource areas, individual or group
activities, contracts, independent study, use of the community, etc. Two typical responses from schools in this category are the following:

Class meetings are held each day where the children are presented ideas or think of things themselves. Sometimes a group will work on an activity together, other times a one-one relationship with a teacher and student will facilitate learning.

--Pepper Canyon School

Study and interest groups meet by the students' demand in addition to regular classes. Art and music continue throughout the day and beyond schedules as do encounter groups, sensitivity sessions, etc.

--The New School

Of the three public schools that do not have classes, The Discovery Room for Children and the Akron Neighborhood Faculty Program are in category 5; the Learning Lab is in category 3. All have been noted earlier.

A large majority of the private schools that do not have classes are either in category 5 or in category 1. Both of these are categories of schools that are experimenting with the widest variety of ways of learning--schools that believe individuals learn in unique ways and that each subject may be unique. They, therefore, do not have a "Way" for all of their students to learn.
A cross-correlation was done with the schools in these categories and the seven types of schools and this produced the following data: All four of the modular schools have a combination of ways in which their students learn. This is somewhat unexpected for up to this point there was no indication that this type of school could be so flexible. It certainly is a contrast with most other modular schools that usually have only 20-25% of the time unstructured for students and the rest of the time is rather rigidly scheduled in compulsory classes as has been noted.

All of the integrated day and Montessori schools are set up with areas of learning. This is what they profess to do, this is the way these methods were conceived to operate, and it is in fact the way these schools do function.

The free schools again are the most interesting because they are in every category, though a large majority are in categories 3 and 5. It is the one type of school that seems the least like a type because of its adaptability and flexibility—in ways in which students learn, enrollment, student backgrounds, non-compulsory classes, etc. It is the one type that has done the most to truly enable each person involved in the school grow in his own individual way.
Following is a quotation from the New Community School that exemplifies and amplifies the above comments:

/We learn/ primarily in real-life situations such as running a farm, building buildings, learning how to live together and in society, gaining skills to direct and pursue our own learning interests.

Secondarily, deliberate interaction with people having specific skills in various areas, and with other human and educational resources as represented specifically by the Pennsylvania State University.

The responsibility for learning is shared equally among all of us.

The private schools which have just been examined—the free, modular, integrated day and Montessori schools that do not have classes and that have a wide variety of ways in which students can learn—seem to be the most exciting and innovative and offer promise that they are places for healthy, happy humans.

They are concerned with the individual and his growth and they offer the individual freedom, choice, responsibility and a wide variety of ways to pursue learning with a group of fellow learners in a concerned and caring environment. Individual freedom is one of the missed revolutions that these schools seem to be trying to rescue from history.
CHAPTER VIII:
YOU NAME IT, WE PROBABLY HAVE IT OR
PUT THAT IN YOUR PIPE AND ENJOY IT

Following are some school responses to Question V--
"What subjects or areas of learning do you offer?": New
Rochelle High School's 3 I's Program listed the following
courses under Social Studies:

Repression, Rebellion, Rebirth; Contemporary
and Historical Character Studies in American
Life; "Black Ghetto"; Government, City
Structure and Politics; Challenge of the City;
"The Religious Man"; "Consumer"; Insurance and
Real Estate; Up the High School and Down the
Elementary School; Encounter; Scapegoat: Study
of the Nature of Prejudice; Child and Adolescent
Psychology; Psychology; Ecology and Conservation.

Some of these courses are held in small seminars, some
are done on an independent study basis and some are offered
in/by business firms in the New Rochelle Community. They
were developed by teachers, students, administrators and
community people, and the student has a choice of which
course(s) to take to fulfill his Social Studies requirements.
Similar, interesting and innovative courses are offered in
every other major curriculum area.

The Parkway Program gave the following reply to the
question:
You name it, we probably have it—some 300 courses available. /Studies/ are classified according to subject areas in which students must meet requirements for graduation, however, a wide choice of alternatives is offered in each area, and each student may choose his own way of approaching the subject.

Other replies include the following:

We offer most of the traditional secondary comprehensive school subjects from the basic areas of English, social studies, foreign languages, fine and practical arts, health and physical education, science, math, business courses, etc. We have made every attempt to make these subjects relevant. For example, we now teach a course in Urban Problems in lieu of the traditional World History.

--Concord High School

Within the Pilot School students take English (eight to twelve different elective versions), most math (Geometry and Algebra), some Science (three versions), some Social Studies (five or six electives), various art and media electives, plus most French and Latin. All students have a required class called Home Group, which does all sorts of non-school things outside the building, and is an attempt to integrate the school's social classes. There are lots of other random electives in music, art, drama, photo stuff, law, anthropology, etc., etc. All other subjects which students want are taken at the regular high school (health, gym, etc.).

--Cambridge Pilot School

We try to offer whatever subjects the students ask for and to find teachers if we do not have them. Right now, we have classes or individual work in math, creative writing, nutrition, biology, psychology, art, pottery, textiles, cooking, drama, jewelry making,
photography, leatherwork, Spanish, typing. We are also planning a month-long camping trip to Mexico in March.

--Us

We work with people in the community in that they teach classes here. We have 200 resource people willing to teach everything from auditing to embalming to silversmithing to Radical American Consciousness. (Put that in your pipe and enjoy it!)

--The Montpelier Educational Facility

...we offer literally every conceivable subject, from carpentry to theoretical physics, from organic gardening to computer programming. We are on a major university campus, but on a farm area on the periphery, so have incredible, seemingly limitless resources.

--The Farm School

We try to offer whatever the students want to learn.

--Riverwood School

Out of responses like the above grew the following categories for this question:

1. Areas of Interest. This category is best explained by the quotation from the Children's School in the previous chapter.

2. Standard, Traditional Course of Study. The Concord High School quoted above is a typical example of a school in this category.

3. Standard, Traditional Courses, Plus. Usually, students in these schools have a limited choice of courses in general areas; sometimes courses are not a semester in length and are scheduled on a modular basis.
4. Standard, Traditional Course Listings, Plus, Plus. Studies are classified according to the traditional subject areas (for convenience and to meet state or local school district requirements), but a student has a very wide choice of electives within the broad areas. The Parkway Program is an example of a school in this category.

5. Whatever the Student Wants to Learn. This is self-explanatory. Examples of schools in this category are Us, The Montpelier Educational Facility, the Riverwood School and the Farm School, all quoted above.

The whole issue involved in the question here is how do the schools help make learning relevant for the student. Should a school decide what the society thinks is necessary and offer these as courses, usually a limited number, that all of their students must take? Should a school do the above—try to find that which is common and necessary to all—but also provide for individual differences? Or should a school provide only for each individual's needs? These questions have led schools to organize themselves in variations of the above five basic ways to help children learn. In general, the above three questions (changed into statements) are each valid and pedagogically-sound philosophical premises. But, in the context of this study which is based on the schools' philosophical statements, category
5 and, less so, categories 1 and 4 are preferred because they offer individual choices and freedom to students.

Up to this point, the public schools have not appeared to be too innovative. But, almost half of the public schools have moved away from the traditional course offerings and present their students with a fairly wide choice in what they learn and how they go about that learning. The other half have moved somewhat away from traditional courses and seem to be trying to individualize their programs, though they have succeeded only in limited ways. There are three public schools that say they offer whatever the individual students want to learn. If they do not have the faculty or resources to satisfy the individual student's needs, they (or the student) usually go out into the community to find the necessary human or material resources.

The alternative public schools have moved most away from traditional courses: ten of the eleven schools are in categories 1, 4 and 5, schools that offer the student a wide variety of what to learn and how to learn.

Most of the modular-flexible public schools offer traditional subjects. One of the primary intents of modular scheduling is to individualize programs but this intent has
not materialized in most of these public schools.

The other three types of public schools—integrated day, schools for "disturbed" children and schools for minority groups—have all moved away from the traditional course offerings, the integrated day schools more than the rest. These three types of schools have not appeared to be innovative, unique or different from most other schools up to this point, but now they appear in somewhat of a more favorable light.

Most of the public schools that are still fairly traditional in their course offerings have large enrollments, most of them with over 200 students, many with over 500 students. A large percentage of the schools in other categories—places that provide more choices for students—have smaller enrollments, usually under 200 students. So, there seems to be a positive correlation between the enrollment a public school has and whether or not it offers only the traditional courses. This is a further reinforcement of what had been discovered earlier in this paper and a primary reason why some public schools are dividing themselves up into sub-schools, schools-within-schools or establishing alternative schools.

In the 1950's Conant and others argued that larger,
consolidated schools would have more and more varied human and material resources and would thus be able to offer greater opportunities for learning. Many schools in this country have consolidated (often at a state's insistence), but not many have become varied, flexible, or student-centered.

Eighty-four private schools say that they offer whatever the student wants to learn. It is rather amazing that so many schools not only recognize that each human is unique and learns in unique ways, but they actually structure their schools so each person can pursue whatever he wants/needs to learn.¹ There are fourteen private schools in categories 1 and 4, schools that provide for a great deal of individualized learning. Together, 79% of the private schools have individualized their programs a great deal.

If the content and tone of the quotations at the beginning of this chapter (and in the rest of the paper) can be taken at anywhere near face value, then it seems as if these

¹This is an important point. The large consolidated schools often do have a fairly wide range of learning opportunities (actual or potential), but they are usually organized (with "teaching" systems, various compulsory activities, requirements, etc.) to prevent a student from experiencing this wide range of possibilities.
schools are not neglecting students but are truly concerned with each child's growth and the adults seem to be working closely with each child. Obviously, one of the reasons that this can happen is that these schools have relatively small numbers of students. In these small schools it should be easier for people to know and to help each other and it appears as if this is the case.

Most of the modular-flexible type of private schools are in category 3—an indication, again, that they are very similar to their public school counterparts and that they offer only a limited choice beyond the traditional curriculum. Most of the integrated day schools have individualized their programs. But the free schools have almost all completely individualized their course offerings. Sixty-one schools are listed in category 5. This is a substantial number and it seems as if most free schools do not practice the motto, "Do as I say, not as I do," the unwritten rule of most schools. Most of these two types of private schools are also the ones noted at the end of the last chapter, ones that do not have classes and that offer a great deal of freedom and responsibility to their students.

Three of the four schools for "disturbed" children have
moved away from the traditional course offerings. It is of note that children who are "disturbed" are given a great deal of freedom and responsibility and personal attention, the opposite of what usually happens to this kind of person in many other institutions.

But only one of the schools run for/by minority groups allows for much individual freedom and choice in curriculum matters and this is a contradiction, as was noted in an earlier chapter.

When the private boarding schools were examined separately, a possible contradiction appeared. A majority of them claim to have individualized their academic programs a great deal, 72% completely. But in previous chapters, these schools noted that they have classes and these classes are compulsory. It is extremely difficult from a questionnaire to judge whether this is a contradiction, for the schools may have compulsory classes and still have individualized programs. For example, such classes may be "open classrooms." Instead of listening to a teacher lecture to the entire class, a student follows a program geared to his special needs, interests and abilities. In an English class, for example, one student might be working on a composition,
another reading a book, another studying spelling. The teacher's job is to plan her time so that she can give each student individual help on his work and guidance in planning his own study program.²

Originally, this chapter was planned to end with a Whitman-like catalog of all the courses or areas of learning being pursued by students in the schools in this study. But, as the compilation began, it quickly became apparent that the list would be over ten pages in length. So, instead, this chapter will end with a limited catalog of some of the things that students are doing/learning in these schools:

art, music, dance, crafts, all regular academics, athletics, running around, boredom, the outside world, field trips, carpentry, theater, swimming, scientific investigations through active participation, languages, printing, organic gardening, bird watching, ceramics, creative writing, the daily newspaper, skydiving, snakes Muhamad Ali, encounter sessions, photography, religions, dreams, economic realities of everyday life, knitting, weaving, film, women and their bodies, yoga, oriental philosophy, mountain-climbing, radio broadcasting, media, interior decorating, Trachtenberg arithmetic, ice skating, folk guitar, welding, anthropology, poetry of Rock, ecology, social change, nutrition, psychology, leather work, batiking, tie-dying, candle-making, life, farming, reading and discussions groups, sculpture, computers, real estate,

²See Herbert Kohl's The Open Classroom.
animal care, simulation games, logic games, boat building, fairies-dragons-monsters, microbiology, astronomy presdidigation, silverculture, stained glass, etc.

For one who went to public schools in the 1940's and 1950's and who taught in public schools in the 1960's, as this writer did, this multiplicity and diversity seems incredible. One suspects that it is also a far cry from what most students are given a chance to learn in most schools in America.
CHAPTER IX:

POWER STRUCTURES--MEANINGFUL OR MEANINGLESS?

In some ways, the previous chapter dealt with some aspects of what is the primary concern of this chapter since many of the schools have elective courses which students choose from (and help create) and some schools have a completely individualized approach to learning. But there are other ways in which students are or are not involved in the operation of schools and these ways are what this chapter is concerned with: "In what ways are students involved in planning and regulating the school's activities (including classes and/or learning activities)?"

Responses from schools varied and following are some examples of these responses:

Unfortunately, very little.
--Righetti High School

As little as possible.
--The Southern School

Students are members of the Instructional Council which is the recognized body that makes recommendations on all instructional matters.
--Garfield High School

The students have an active part in planning what goes on. The power is given to the people.
--Montpelier Educational Facility.
Initially, all courses were planned by the faculty. As time went on, most courses were modified in accordance with the wishes of the students. With each new trimester, more courses are being introduced at the specific request of the students. Students are also helping to take part in planning several of the afternoon courses, meeting in advance with representatives of the institutions concerned....We have attempted this through the use of small tutorial groups and weekly Town Meetings; both of these devices have encountered severe difficulties and rarely function well, thus far. They are both about to be modified....

--The Clinton Program

There is a school general meeting at which internal school rules, policy and disputes are dealt with. Students also request activities and classes they want and materials they need. Administrative matters are mainly handled by parents in a business meeting held every three weeks. Of course, students are free to attend or not attend any class.

The students have not been too active in the governing of the school, so we just happen. This is one of our least successful areas. We don't know why, but we're working on it.

--Providence Free School

All plans and decisions are made by the group as a whole.

--Study-Travel-Community School

From responses like the above, the following four categories for Question VI were derived:

1. Advisory. Students have no real influence or involvement in decision-making. Usually the school has a student council
but it is mainly concerned with social activities, like planning dances, etc.

2. Advisory, Plus. Students have some real, but limited, influence: they sit on administrative and faculty committees and/or on curriculum committees in an advisory capacity only.

3. Advisory, Plus, Plus. Students have real influence in almost every area of a school's activities, yet the influence is ultimately advisory.

4. Equal Status. Students have equal power with the staff in determining all policies. Usually this is done in daily or weekly Summerhill-like community meetings.

Several points need to be made about the above categories. So far, there has been no distinction made for schools with only elementary age students.¹ There really was no need. But here the distinction has to be made because, as several schools noted, it is very difficult to expect very young students to be totally involved in the running of a school. There are some private schools in this study that do involve their young students in all decision-making processes: for example, the Pinehenge School which is a

¹This writer recognizes the discoveries of Piaget and others about the developmental stages of people’s lives. But, important as these discoveries may be, they are not significant in the context of this study.
combination of the integrated day and Summerhill approaches.

Many of these elementary schools are integrated day or Montessori places and they have been placed in the second category because the students do have a great deal of influence in learning activities, but they have little real influence in other aspects of the schools' operations.

There were several areas of school activities that were considered before the categories were established: how much influence do students have in curriculum matters? making internal school rules? in hiring and firing of staff? etc.

The concern of the question is: How much control does a student have of his own destiny? Some schools answered grandly, witness the following (previously quoted) from Interlake High School's "Statement of Philosophy":

We believe that a democracy, where due process of law prevails among people and a social organization permits each person to achieve dignity and worth, continues to evolve as the best form in the organization of human society.

But the following is the response the principal made to Question VI:

ASB Council, Student Appeals (judicial) Council, ad hoc committees of students, parents, faculty. Students may attend faculty meetings and
Student involvement in planning class activities for learning experiences is a matter between individual teacher and his students.

Obviously, Interlake High School is not a democracy in the way that Free Schools, Inc. is a democracy:

We have two daily meetings. All decisions relating to anything except safety or administration of the plant are made at those meetings.

Teachers are far from passive, however. We always let our biases be known.

When you get right down to it, power structures become pretty meaningless when you really practice freedom.

It is apparent from this quotation that it is hard work to involve everyone in the decision-making processes. Two meetings a day with people grappling with problems of the school and with inter-personal relationships are undoubtedly difficult—much more difficult than making democratic pronouncements and then acting autocratically. Perhaps this is why so many schools are not truly democracies and systematically deprive students of their constitutional rights—because it is difficult, is not "efficient," is time consuming and involves a great deal of personal risk.²

²See the quotations from Nat Hentoff at the end of this chapter.
Most of the public schools in this study do not practice much democracy\(^3\) or allow their students much freedom. Only one school--the Montpelier Educational Facility, a high school for twenty-seven students--has its students totally involved in all decision-making processes. Another twelve schools have students somewhat involved in many areas of activity: students sit on many committees-social activities, discipline, curriculum, etc.--but they can only offer advice and suggestions and ultimately have no real power, which is usually vested in the chief administrator. Most of these schools are the alternative public schools and three of them are modular-flexible schools. But the rest of the students in the other schools have quite limited influence over what goes on in their schools.

Interestingly, neither enrollment nor student backgrounds seem to be factors in determining whether public schools do or do not have students involved in decision-making. Most of the schools that have some active student participation have fairly large enrollments, over 150 students, 4 schools with over 500 students. A majority of the schools

\(^3\)Democracy expressed, for this writer, in A. S. Neill's practices at Summerhill.
that have student involvement in running the school have students with heterogeneous backgrounds.

The private schools are again in marked contrast with the public schools. Seventy-two of them are structured so that students have equal status with the adults in forming most policy. Usually, this is done in a daily or weekly community meeting where anyone can bring up an issue that he thinks is important and where all such issues are decided by mutual understanding, concensus, or majority vote. Each person--student and adult--has one vote. 

Quite a number of these private schools involve the youngest members of the community--kids who are 5, 6 or 7 years old--in the running of the school. The Pinehenge School noted earlier is a good example of this.

Another twenty-eight of the private schools have their students substantially involved in the decision-making processes. So, all together, about 80% of the private schools in this study directly and actively involved students in planning and regulating the school's activities.

Most of these schools are the free ones: fifty-seven

---

4For an inside view of the workings of such a meeting, see Herb Snitzer's Summerhill: A Loving World.
of them allow full student participation; another eleven are schools where students have a great deal of influence.

Even most of the modular-flexible private schools say they have their students substantially involved in many decision-making processes. This seems to be something of a contradiction to what was discovered in earlier chapters—many have compulsory classes, their philosophies were not determined by the students, etc. Evidently, students are involved in helping to form policy and make decisions, but there are some areas that they do not have influence over. Also, at least three schools noted that the students had decided to have compulsory classes and had made other strict regulations.

The two types of private schools that have the least student involvement are Montessori and integrated day. But this is not surprising since they have only very young students. Students in these schools, as noted previously, have a great deal to say in what and how they learn but their influence usually does not go beyond curricular areas.

Even the private schools for "disturbed" children and those run for/by a minority group have a great deal of student involvement in the government of the school. The
first was anticipated for, in earlier chapters, these schools have fairly consistently been seen as humane and student-centered. The second is somewhat of a surprise and opposite to what has been portrayed so far: these schools for minority groups appear to be rather authoritarian and rigid. Now, they say they involve their students in the running of the schools, though in limited ways. None of them are structured so students have an equal voice with the adults.

The private boarding schools also continue to be paradoxical because most of them say they run their schools by decisions made in community meetings. Previously, it was noted that most of these schools had compulsory classes, had no student involvement in formulating basic philosophy, etc. Again, the students seem to have influence in certain areas and are restricted in other areas; the schools say the students are substantially involved and have a rather strong voice when it comes to deciding on many of the school's activities. For example, the Stonewall Jackson Academy and the Windsor Mountain School both noted that they have community meetings where many school decisions are made. Students in both schools decided to have compulsory classes, very strict dormitory rules, etc.
Earlier, Free Schools, Inc. was quoted as saying: "When you get right down to it, power structure becomes pretty meaningless when you really practice freedom." This is a view echoed by many of the private schools in this study: from the content and tone of their replies, there seems to be freedom, responsibility, trust, respect, honesty, caring, sharing, etc., in many of these schools and so there doesn't appear to be any kind of power struggles in them. People decide things together. It is not easy, as was noted earlier, but people do decide together as equals. Certainly, the adults do not lose their natural authority but they also do not use institutional authority to make students do what the adults want them to do.

But in many American schools the issue of power is increasingly becoming important; usually it is a real struggle on the part of students to wrest some of the power (in search for dignity and humanity) from the vested interests of faculty and administration. The root of this struggle grows out of the fact that most schools really do not practice freedom and democracy. Students struggle for power because they have none.
Nat Hentoff, in a major article on this subject\(^5\), quotes Dr. Alan Westin, Director of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties:

The great majority of the students are angry, frustrated, increasingly alienated by school. They do not believe they receive individual justice or enjoy the rights of dissent or share in critical decision-making affecting their lives within the school. Our schools are now educating millions of students who are not forming an allegiance to the democratic political system, simply because they do not experience such a democratic system in their daily lives in school.

Hentoff and his staff traveled the country, visiting many schools, talking to parents, administrators, teachers and students. Hentoff says, "In secondary schools, many students told me, 'it was like a prison,'" and he goes on to talk about one specific student:

A young man at Rufus King High School in Milwaukee speaks for many students, in rural and urban schools, in suburbs and in ghettos: "They give us a whole lot of language about responsibility. They punish us for lateness and bad attendance and how we dress and what we say, and we don't have a damn thing to say about any of what they call our education. They claim they're trying to teach us responsibility. But what they're doing has nothing to do with responsibility. It's force. If they really cared about our being responsible, they'd treat

us like human beings. They'd listen to us once in a while. The kids here just aren't interested in school, because the whole system is so hypocritical and cynical. It's got to be, to treat us this way.

These schools and these students could learn a great deal from many of the private schools in this study.
CHAPTER X:
SHE KNOWS TOO MUCH TO ARGUE OR TO JUDGE OR
SOME IN THE FAST LANE, SOME JUST GETTING ON THE RAMP

Most schools, especially secondary schools, test and grade students. Not only are students given letter or number grades but they are also given a class rank based on these grades, a figure that is sent on to college admission offices and/or to employers. What happens in these practices is that nobody can gain except at everyone else's expense. A student is not usually evaluated so he can assess his progress toward the educational goals that he, in collaboration with his teachers and other interested parties, has set for himself. He is usually rated and set in competition with other students and what happens is that some are winners and some are losers, but few are sharers. Often, probably more often than most people realize or admit, students end up trying to get good grades instead of learning. Grades thus degrade.

John Hurst makes the following points about evaluation:

Most of the evaluation /public schools/ undertake is not designed to promote the education, welfare or self-determination of the student, but rather to help the educational institutions make decisions primarily for their own benefit.
Grades do not in any valuable way predict anything beyond a student's likelihood of getting similar grades in the future. This conclusion has been upheld by virtually every study investigating grades for the past forty years. That is, grades have no sizeable relationship to the goals of education as set forth by the schools. They do not predict job success, satisfaction in life, good citizenship or anything else in society.

Not only are they of no real value, they are also destructive. Many studies have shown that various student behaviors contribute as much to the grade a teacher assigns as does the student's actual mastery of the subject matter. Thus they are often an instrument of coercion and a source of tremendous fear and anxiety. Also, since it is grades, rather than knowledge, that teachers, parents and college entrance committees demand, a major portion of the drive that leads students to learn is based on fear of getting poor grades. This almost guarantees that they will never know the pleasure and satisfaction of learning for its own sake.

Hurst examines other traditional methods of evaluation: Standardized tests are comparative devices that "only tell us how many questions one student answers correctly relative to all other students, but nothing about an individual's growth relative to his own intellectual development or potential"; intelligence tests "are a kind of generalized achievement test which predicts how well a person will do in a white middle-class school, and that is all they have ever predicted well enough to be of any value for the individual.... They have no practical relationship to creativity in any
realm, to the ability to find fresh solutions to problems, to manual-conceptual skills, to leadership, or indeed to any of the requisites for leading a happy, successful and responsible life"; achievement tests are "rooted in the assumption that all students who take them have been exposed to the same content, at the same time, and in the same order, and to a lesser extent that they have the same cultural and environmental backgrounds....This means that if the tests are to be meaningful, all teachers must teach identical content at the same time and in the same order, without variation. They rob the teacher of the ability to be flexible, to meet the needs of students in a variety of ways, and are therefore antithetical to the concept of a pluralistic education in a pluralistic society."\(^1\)

Few teachers ever question the validity of giving tests and grades to their classes. In What Do I Do On Monday, John Holt remarks: "In a class where children are doing things, and not getting ready to do them in the distant future, what they do tells us what they have learned." He goes on to say:

\(^1\)^"To Humanize Education," published by the New Schools Network in Berkeley, California.
It is not grading alone that is stupid, but the whole idea of trying to have a class move along on a schedule, like a train. Children do not learn things at the same time, or equally easily and quickly. Nor is it any better or wiser to label some children "fast" and some "slow" and to put them in different groups, each with its own little "fast" or "slow" train schedule. We all know people who found some parts of math easy and others hard. Because one part is hard for A, or easy for B, does not mean that everything need be. A might find long division easier than B, but B—if we have not made him stupid by officially labeling him stupid—may later find fractions, or decimals, or algebra, or calculus, much easier than A. Even if we do insist on making up for children a list of things that they are (as James Herndon says) Spozed to learn in school, we should give them the freedom to learn those things in the order and way and rate that is most natural and easy for them....

In the article, "Why We Need a New Schooling," which I wrote for Look magazine (January 13, 1970), I said that any tests that were not a personal matter between the learner and someone helping him learn, but were given instead to grade and label students for someone else's purposes (employers, colleges, evaluators of schools, administrators, anxious parents, etc.) were illegitimate and harmful. I then said that students should organize to refuse to take such tests and that teachers should organize to refuse to give them....

Only when we stop being judges, graders, labelers, can we begin to be true teachers, educators, helpers of growth and learning.²
This chapter is concerned with teachers and schools and whether or not they are "judges, graders and labelers." The innovative and alternative schools in this study were asked, "How are students in your school evaluated?" The following six major categories evolved out of their responses:

1. Tests-Grades. Students are tested in various ways—group tests, standardized exams, classroom exams, etc.—and are given number or letter or, less so, pass-fail grades (the latest innovation) by the teachers. Schools and teachers usually claim that the grades students receive are based on "objective measurements" or "objective criteria" or (the newest of the new innovations) "behavioral objectives."

Some examples of schools in the category are the following:

Rather traditional, but increasing emphasis on its relationship to behavioral objectives.  
—Cloquet Senior High School

Conventional grading methods still used with pass-fail alternatives possibly within the next year.  
—William Mitchell High School

Tests. Old-fashion report card every six weeks.  
—Taylor Public Schools

Criteria established by individual teacher—student involvement as he sees appropriate. Grades A, B, C, D, F and I are issued quarterly.  
—Interlake High School
2. Individual Written Evaluations. A student is not compared or contrasted with other students, but evaluated individually by teachers on his strengths and weaknesses, on his growth and "work" accomplished. Often these evaluations are descriptive, anecdotal and subjective. They are also based on the student's own self-evaluation combined with the teacher's informal observations and discussions with the student. An example of a school in this category is the City Hill School:

Each student is evaluated individually in a written report, in terms of attendance, improvement, cooperation, production, and, significantly, in terms of their own self-evaluation.

3. Parent-Teacher Conference. Usually, the teacher and parents meet to verbally discuss the individual child, his strengths, weaknesses and growth, both at home and in school. Sometimes written evaluations are part of this discussion; sometimes a student's work or portfolio are given to the parents; sometimes the child is present at this conference. Two typical examples of schools in this category are the following:

    False goals such as report cards, grades, and high praise are removed and no longer provide a block to the more appropriate goals of: learning for learning's sake, learning "so I can do something I couldn't do before," and
learning because "I want to learn." Progress in learning or lack of it is reported to parents in personal conferences. The student is in control of the conference and, with the teacher's help, reports to the parent directly any and all progress achieved.

--The Learning Lab

Teachers meet with each child's parents at least once a year to tell them about their child's progress and activities at school--each teacher is responsible for keeping whatever records they feel necessary of a child's development.

--The San Francisco Montessori School

4. Student. The student evaluates himself in a number of possible ways: by writing an analysis of his academic and/or personal growth, by a similar but verbal analysis given to teachers, peers and/or parents, by not giving any report. Some typical schools in this category are the following:

Students evaluate themselves, with teachers and with fellow students--both by looking back at contracts they wrote for the school at the beginning of the year and just by discussing the program. No grades, no exams.

--Satya Community School

In terms of their own judgments of accomplishments. We try to help them look critically at their own experiences.

--Margaret Silby Research-Development Center

5. Student-Teacher Conferences. This method of evaluation is done both formally and informally. A teacher and student meet to discuss the student's growth. Sometimes the
discussion is based on the student's portfolio or other evidence of "work accomplished." A written report, by one or both parties, is sometimes produced from this meeting. Sometimes an audio or audio-visual tape is made of the conference. More often, schools noted, these conferences are informal and occur naturally on a day-to-day basis because of the personal contact between the teacher and student.

Examples of schools in this category are the following:

The idea, with the older kids, has been that it should be student initiated, that the kids themselves know best what they have done, can or cannot do. They all decided that when students want an evaluation, they will go to a teacher and ask for it. So far, one appointment has been made. One student wanted it compulsory but it wasn't accepted. I feel that had it been accepted we would have had one and been happier with it.

--Montreal Free School

Informally and jointly by staff and students--no tests or grades--students choose a staff member to discuss their plans and progress with.

--Atkinson School

In weekly student-teacher conferences the work of that past week is evaluated and goals are set for the following week. Evaluation is in terms of goals set: "This is what you said you would do; this is what you did. Did you achieve your goals and if not what stood in your way?"

Sometimes this is done daily.

--A New School for Children

6. No Evaluation. Students are not evaluated on their lives in schools. This category is best explained by
the schools themselves:

moment to moment. Weekly staff meetings, daily staff meetings.
by how they feel.
how they walk, run, laugh, are in or out of contact with their deep creative juices.
ALL THESE WORDS ARE VERY INADEQUATE TO DESCRIBE THE SMELLS, AND TOUCHES AND LOOKS AND CRIES AND LAUGHTERS...HOW DO YOU EVALUATE LIFE? Do you have to? Too bad!
--You and Me, Inc.

There are no evaluations of students. People are just with themselves and each other.
--Study/Travel/Community School

all grades are A--that's so they can get into Harvard or U. Mass. if they choose--work done is work done, a learning is a learning, getting shit in order is appreciated, not evaluated, we have transcripts (gilt edge and seal entry)
we value very highly the use of the mind and the use of intellectual analysis but frown on head trips. fairly young people, young people, older types, all are complex creatures with lots of old bad shit and chestnuts
acceptance and understanding come first we all do better than before, no question about that some in the fast lane some just getting on the ramp

Only the first category involves grades and competition among students. Schools in remaining categories usually do not give grades, evaluate children individually and often do this evaluation subjectively and informally.

Over half of the public schools in this study evaluate
their students with group, class and standardized exams. Some few have moved to variations of a pass-fail evaluation but the fundamental fact here about these innovative public schools is that they still deal with children in groups and make comparisons of them using group norms. And, as noted earlier, this leads to competition and to schools having winners and losers instead of individual children and teachers helping each other to realize their outer limits.

All but two of these public schools are the modular-flexible ones; the other two are integrated day schools. This is most interesting because it means that all of the alternative public schools do not give grades and do evaluate children individually, using either written reports, parent-teacher conferences or student-teacher conferences. It seems as if these schools are finding alternatives to how most public schools evaluate students and are more interested in how people are valuable rather than how valuable people are.

Only two modular-flexible schools evaluate students individually. This is not unexpected from knowing their responses to previous questions, but it is discouraging that so many of these schools that are supposed to be so innovative
have continued a basic tradition of most schools in this society.

Two of the three integrated day schools evaluate children with tests and grades. This is in complete contradiction to the basic philosophy and usual practice of the integrated day approach.

None of the public schools allow the student to be his own evaluator and none has dared to go without evaluations at all. But, many of the private schools have moved in these directions.

Twenty-four private schools say their students evaluate themselves and another nineteen schools say they have no kind of evaluation. In comparison to most schools, this is rather amazing, yet it is understandable from these schools' point of view: people who live and work together in small groups "know" what each other can and cannot do so there is usually no need to judge anyone. They are what they know and do. Also, the schools say that evaluations are labels and labels often become self-fulfilling prophecies. They would prefer to relate with people who are constantly changing and growing rather than to labels. One school stated the point thus: "/We evaluate ourselves/ just as you evaluate your
acquaintances, friends, etc." If an evaluation has to be done, it is best done by the individual because only he can truly know what he has learned, these schools argue.

The private schools are rather evenly distributed among the six categories for this question, though only 10% of them give tests and grades as their method of evaluation. The largest category is the fifth one--students and teachers together, usually informally and as an on-going, day-by-day process, making evaluations.

Most of the private schools that give grades and tests are the modular-flexible schools: half of them do. The other schools that give grades and tests are: one integrated day, one free, two of the schools for "disturbed" children and one of the schools for a minority group. Most of the boarding schools evaluate students individually or not at all.

Obviously, an overwhelming percentage of private schools evaluate children individually, without grades or marks. The method (parent conference, student-teacher conference, verbal or written report) does not seem to be too important here: that children are informally evaluated in terms of the individual child's development is the important factor.
The private schools that have no evaluations or have students evaluate themselves are the most radical challenge to the traditional approach on this subject. They, like the in-love woman in Dylan's song, "Love Minus Zero/No Limit," are in essence saying, "She knows too much to argue or to judge." How, some schools ask, can the really important things that happen inside a person or between people be evaluated—the personal growth, the voyaging into new territory, the excitement of the discovery of self or another, etc.? Can even the things that don't count so much be really measured? Can anyone really know what another person has learned? Do all the outcomes of the tests and evaluations, the degrees and the credentials, really mean anything? What have all the tests and evaluations done to/for people? Have they made them expand to "no limit" or are they inherently limiting devices, with built-in, growth-destructive, self-fulfilling prophecies?

Certainly, most people agree that it is best to be interested in how people are valuable rather than how valuable people are. People in many of the free schools are concerned with personal growth and the development of free people living happily and lovingly together. So, people in
these schools probably know each others' strengths and weaknesses. They would not express it that way for people are who they are and that is good.

But how are other people—in the larger society, people who may not be able to extend their trust and acceptance to all people—to know these strengths and weaknesses? Not judge, but know? How are people to know if a person is a truly skilled bridge builder or surgeon? Because he says so? Certainly, "by their fruits ye shall know them." But this might involve a bridge buckled under the weight of twenty cars or a dead body on the operating table.

Some of these schools are aware of the above argument. They themselves say they are struggling to find ways to show that students in their schools have learned and have become proficient in certain areas. It is not easy, for they are moving into territory where no one has gone ahead to mark the trees—while still being in a society that demands "objective evidence," a society based on credentials and degrees. They know that most traditional ways of judging people really do not prove or insure a person's competencies, yet in some ways this proof or insurance is necessary if schools cherish the child's right to grow in the way suitable
to him, because reflection on the process of becoming is an integral part of the process of learning and growing.

Some people in the free school movement are stopping and are turning and looking inward, beginning to look at themselves, at what they have brought with them from the old territory, at what they have newly discovered, at what they have been doing. It is a promise that they may be beginning to evolve into Whitehead's Stage of Precision, and this evaluation may involve new ways of understanding a child's growth.

---

Evidence of this in-turning can be found in many places, in many schools and in some journals, most notably in recent issue of The New Schools Exchange Newsletter.
CHAPTER XI:

PRIDE OR PLEASURE OR SHAME

What effects does a school have on its students? As was seen in the last chapter, this is a vital concern for some schools and they have found various ways of trying to discover these effects while students are in attendance. Some schools go further in trying to answer this question by doing follow-up studies of their graduates. They want to know if their programs "worked," if they helped students "succeed": Is the school doing what it says or thinks it is doing? what it should be doing? what other schools are doing? What is it doing?

To go into the area of follow-up studies is to go again into the realm of evaluation because schools have to ask themselves: What are the critical aspects that should be examined in such a study? How is such a study to be done?

What they ask their graduates should logically depend upon the school's philosophy, purposes and practices, its view of human beings and their learning processes. Is further school achievement an important criteria? behavior? job placement? student's attitude toward self? student's attitude toward school? relationships with people? ability
to change and grow? etc.

Questions like the above have led some school people into more questions: Can any cause-effect relationship between a person's schooling and later life be established? Can the really important things that happen to people be evaluated by follow-up studies? Should schools do follow-up studies of students? Why?

One answer is yes. If a child spends several years in a school then he is bound to be influenced by that school's environment and it is necessary to know if he has been hurt or helped. Maybe many effects cannot be measured or discovered with such studies, but some can be found and these are better than not knowing anything. For example, the Pennsylvania Advancement School did a follow-up study of boys who went through its program and back into regular public schools. "The report deals with only three variables: grade-point average, advisor's 'behavior' rating, and advisor's 'work habits' rating." PAS knows that "these are only a few of a host of important considerations in determining 'what happens' to a boy when he leaves PAS." Yet, they have not found how to evaluate these other factors, though they are planning to employ a private research firm
to gather other quantitative data and to interview students and parents so they can find "helpful indications as to why the boys perform the way they do when they return /to regular school/ ."

Another answer to the above question is no. One of the responders to the questionnaire suggested that Herb Snitzer and Dick Bliss would have a few choice remarks to make about the idea of follow-up studies. Mr. Snitzer (Director of the Lewis-Wadhams School) and Mr. Bliss (Director of East Hills Farm School) did not respond to the questionnaire but they did respond to telephone calls. In essence, their comments about follow-up studies are the following, paraphrased ones:

Follow-up studies. Who has the time, energy and resources to do them? Who wants to do them anyway? We're not preparing people for life--we live here. Students here are responsible for themselves: they make all the important decisions about their own lives, who and what they are and want to be.

Teachers and schools always face the danger of trying to fulfill themselves in their students: when the student's success is theirs, then the teaching is a form of self-continuation, which is detrimental to self-knowledge and freedom. We don't want our students to be personifications of us.

Being in our schools effects people. But we don't pressure kids into doing what we want: we
let them grow in their own ways and we try to help when they want or ask us to. Being free has tremendous effects.

But when students leave here they live somewhere else, have new and different lives, and that's their business. We continue to live here and that's our business. We have no right to "follow" them: we're not their substitute parents or Big Brothers. We take no particular pride or pleasure or shame in what people do after they leave here.

People are free here and, hopefully wherever they go.

Yes or No answers are absolutes and absolutes often lead to tyrannies, especially in schools: in the case of evaluation, they lead to a tyranny of objectivity or a tyranny of sentiment and feelings.

The purpose of this chapter is to see if schools have done follow-up studies of their graduates and what kinds of studies they have done and their results.

There are not many schools in this study that have done follow-up studies. The primary reasons for this are not philosophical, but practical: many of the schools have not been in existence long enough to have had students go through their entire program. Also, many of the private schools and the alternative public schools are small and do not have the time, money or man-power to do such studies.
Another factor, expressed by a few schools and hinted at by others, is that they do not know how to find new ways of evaluating their new programs.

The forty-five schools that have done follow-up studies tend to have ones that are in no way extraordinary and tend to fall into the following three categories:

1. Traditional. This category includes studies that are primarily quantitative: statistical studies that tell how many students go on to post-graduate schooling, are employed, enter the armed forces, marry, etc.

2. Attitudinal. This category includes studies that try to determine students' attitudes and feelings about their school experiences and how the experiences helped or hurt them. None of these studies have been extensively or carefully done; most seem rather informal, reports of conversations with graduates; only few report any negative feedback.

3. Quantitative-Qualitative. This category includes studies that are a combination of categories 1 and 2.

Only one school in this study--CAM Academy, discussed below--has mounted anything near a full-scale study of graduates that delves into many areas: specific skills and bodies of knowledge learned, attitudes toward school experiences, other people's perceptions of the graduate, later school or job achievement and satisfaction, students' attitudes
toward self and others, self-actualization, etc. The proposed study by the Pennsylvania Advancement School (the only alternative public school that is in the process of doing such a study) appears to be fairly wide in scope but it falls far short of something like the "Eight-Year Study" done on thirty progressive schools in the late 1920's and early 1930's.\(^1\) Again, the primary reason for this is that many of the schools are very young and still in Whitehead's expansive Romantic Stage, in the freedom of his "rhythmic claims of freedom and discipline."

Only two public schools in this study have done any follow-ups that are more than (barely) quantitative and statistical. For example, Cloquet Senior High School said that the results of its studies show that its graduates have a "better adaptability to college and vocational schools; better attitude of grades toward their educational experiences." And the Canyon School said: "They have to go on to a very traditional restrictive high school. They do well

---

\(^1\) Commission on the Relation of School and College, *Adventure in American Education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942). James Hemmings' *Teach Them to Live* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957) is a fine summary of the original five volume study, which was commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation.
academically, for the most part, but have trouble conforming." These are not penetrating studies and tell very little about the schools and their students.

Most of the public schools that have done follow-up studies are the modular-flexible ones and they have usually done rather traditional studies. These studies show a very large emphasis on the percentage of students who go on to post-graduate schools and it seems to be a matter of great pride to have 70% or more of a graduating class go on to some further schooling.

All but three of these public schools are rather large—many have over 1,000 students. Such large numbers undoubtedly make in-depth follow-up studies difficult, but, on the other hand, none of the public schools with small enrollments have done a comprehensive study.

The responses from the private schools were similar to those of the public schools. Only four schools said they were opposed to the idea of follow-up studies (no public school expressed this sentiment), but none of these went on to expound or explain or defend their position. This is unusual given their attitudes toward evaluation (seen in the previous chapter); it is especially unusual for the free
schools. It would be expected that these schools would strongly echo Dick Bliss and Herb Snitzer's attitudes.

Most of the twenty-eight private schools (of every type) that reported doing follow-up studies have done very limited, usually informal, ones. Many are attitudinal studies, but these are mostly reports about how a student feels looking back at his time in the school. Few are documented studies:

The feedback from our findings indicate that our graduates are doing well in their present schools, even though many are in antithetical situations. Having developed some self-awareness, kids are less concerned as to how others see them—less anxious or needing of less approval for being oneself.

--The Sequoyah School

Every graduate has returned many times with reports of his or her activities in or out of college.

Those attending college report back their success, feeling of assuredness and advanced reading history.

We find our graduates successfully functioning, happy people with real goals and well-defined value systems.

--The Urban School of San Francisco

The majority of our students are able to adjust to society, often in spite of very serious problems. Most of the students turn out to be decent human beings. We feel that such would not have been the case if the students had been left in jails, institutions, and incompatible homes....
In the four years which ended June 30, 1968, we graduated 46 students, all but one of whom are now either successfully enrolled in college or productively employed at higher than average salaries. The school goes on to give a list of how the students were "diagnosed" when they entered the school and where they are now and what they are doing. --Green Valley School

The above three quotations indicate that these schools have done somewhat more extensive, careful studies that include more variables, but the only school in this study that has done a fairly extensive evaluation of its program is the CAM Academy. Following is a lengthy excerpt from its report:

The framework for guiding the study was, with some modification, the one proposed by Stufflebeam which designates four areas of evaluation: context, input, process, and product. Utilizing these four evaluation areas as a guideline for data collection, the following data sources were tapped:

1. Focused interviews were held with the administrators of the CAM Academy and the Christian Action Ministry.
2. Focused interviews were held with the four faculty members.
3. A ninety-five item questionnaire drawing heavily from the items in instruments used in Project Talent and the Coleman Report was constructed and administered to the student body.
4. Focused interviews conducted by black interviewers were held with a sample of thirty-two Academy students.
5. Standardized achievement tests administered on a pre and post-test basis were analyzed.
6. A questionnaire was constructed to survey students who had gone to college using many of the items from the Academy Student Questionnaire.

7. Telephone interviews were conducted with student personnel staff at thirteen colleges where CAM Academy students had been or were in attendance.

8. Contrasting achievement data from neighboring public high schools, especially where Academy students had been in attendance, were obtained.

9. Interviews were held with some of the former faculty members of CAM Academy.

10. Archival data on attendance, advisor worksheets, student work samples, Academy fiscal records, minutes of meetings and correspondence were consulted.

11. A national sample of alternative schools was studied for comparison of constructs in instructional and curriculum design.

**RESULTS**

The data were analyzed against data on public school curricula and students. Intragroups as well as intergroup comparisons were made.

Partial answers were formulated to each of the objectives of the evaluation, and mixed findings resulted. The overall conclusions were favorable to the Academy's efforts....

This last sentence is somewhat modest for the study shows that the school—with its freedom of choice for its "disadvantaged" students, its close, supportive faculty-student relationships, its voluntary attendance, its small size, etc.—is a successful place. It is the only school that did a follow-up study as part of an overall evaluation
of its program, so the follow-up was done in the context of the philosophy, purposes and practices of the school's program. It is an extensive study and one that could well serve as a model for many innovative and alternative schools.

But even this report falls far short of the "Eight-Year Study" noted earlier. This study is summarized rather well in the following paragraphs:

...The "Eight-Year Study" took in thirty schools, ranging from luxurious private schools to slum public schools. There was a special twenty-point outline for the kind of changes in curriculum and teaching methods that these schools agreed to make. Essentially the changes were in the direction of giving more authority and responsibility to the children and making curricula more flexible. In the most extreme school the teachers refused to teach altogether. They just stayed around as guardians and facilitators for the children, answering their questions, helping them to find books in the library, etc., but refused to tell what to study and would not give lectures. The fifteen hundred children in these thirty schools were tracked down through their four years of high school and through the subsequent four years of college—thus the name Eight-Year Study. Next, a survey was made of how they did when they got into the real grim world of dog eat dog, individualism and competition.

The final step was to compare these fifteen hundred children with fifteen hundred children from schools using conventional teaching methods. Each student was matched and paired for age, sex, social background, aptitude test scores, vocational and avocational interests, etc. The results were astounding: on every parameter, on every variable— their grades in high school and college, their academic
honors, their leadership capacity, their job attitude while they were in school, and their success in maintaining themselves after they were out of school-- the children from the experimental schools were superior to those in teacher-and-curriculum centered schools. The children in the most experimental of the schools, including the one mentioned where the teachers refused to teach, had the highest scores of all.

The Eight-Year Study is a powerful indictment of traditional, authoritarian methods of teaching children. But there are also many smaller experiments that can be repeated by anybody at a very small cost, which are equally persuasive. /Three such studies are then explained./

Obviously, there are ways to do studies that are more than merely statistical ones, studies that humanly focus on areas that the innovative and alternative schools say are important to them. So, it is somewhat surprising that only one of the schools in this study has made any really far-reaching, systematic attempt at seeing what happens to students in their innovative or alternative programs. The free schools are the most loud in proclaiming that they have freed themselves and have found new ways of helping children learn and grow in human(e) ways. Some of the claims are

---

probably true. For example, here is what the parents of a child in a free school say about their daughter's education:

The crises and anxieties we have felt as free school parents are overwhelmed by the joys we've all experienced in the last two years. There was an immediate sense of relief at being out of a very bad situation. Immediately Lori really wanted to go to school. Her creative impulses stopped regressing and grew and grew. Her wonderment at the freedom returned to her gradually and became belief that it would continue to be her right to control her own life. She began to recognize that she was a unique individual who people really liked and cared for. She respects people not because it's her obligation to, but because she can understand what marvelous beings we all are. We as parents have not only gotten to share in the marvelous joy of her growth--we've grown too, closer to her and each other. We feel totally right about free schools being better....

Statements like this (in some ways, almost religious statements of witness) can be found over and over again in the current, scant, but growing, literature on alternative schools. If these impressions are true on a wide scale, for many children in many of the innovative and alternative schools, if these schools are really different, if their graduates are truly different people, then it is all the more surprising that there has not been a plethora of really far-reaching, systematic attempts at understanding the how,

---

3Teacher Drop-Out Center Newsletter, June 1971.
what and why that happens to students in innovative and alternative schools—studies that are concerned with statistics and souls.
CHAPTER XII:
COMMUNITY AND EDUCATION - WE PATCH IT AS WE CAN

Hundreds of articles and books have been written about the loss or death of community in America: how the processes of competition, specialization, centralization, etc., have caused a breakdown of communion and communications among individuals and groups, the rise of transient rather than enduring relationships among a people who have become fragmented and ghettoized rather than integrated, the disintegration of common bonds and the reluctance to share collective responsibility.

A good summary of this view of the "missing community" in America is the following:

The first theme prominent in the missing community view is fragmentation of life. Modern society, it is argued, accelerates a process of specialization, division of labor, and personal isolation, making it difficult for the individual to relate to other human beings outside of a narrow social class or vocational group. The inability to associate or communicate beyond the limits of one's special "place" is destructive to a sense of identity within community, because community demands the ability to perceive (or at least unconsciously assume) relatedness among a variety of people, institutions, events, and stages of life.

Second, and related to fragmentation, is the theme of change. In a way, the essence of
American character is zeal for change; yet the exponential rate of social change in modern society tends to destroy the essential stability required to establish a sense of relatedness among people. Social change aggravates the difficulties of one generation's relating to the next; it thwarts the opportunity to observe continuity within the human career; and it places considerable strains on the human personality by valuing primarily adjustment and flexibility.

Third, critics decry our present state of ideological and aesthetic bankruptcy. It is argued that modern society, through a reverence for technology, cultivates excessive stress on the fulfillment of instrumental values, and pays scant attention to ends or ideals. Mass culture discourages utopian thought; it has slight regard for ideals of beauty and contemplation because it directs its major energy toward producing more products with less effort. This quantitative rather than qualitative emphasis is most evident in the cult of the consumer. Commitment to conspicuous consumption and means of social mobility seem to outweight commitment to what may be considered more vague or visionary ends such as social justice, personal salvation, or the attainment of inner virtue. Total emphasis on the instrumental and the material (it is argued) is harmful because commitment to more intangible ideals is a prime requisite for building a sense of individual worth.

Fourth, and centrally related to all of these theses, is the trend toward depersonalization of experience, typically noted in humanist attacks upon the influence of automation and cybernetics. Delegating to machines a vast number of activities formerly performed by humans may well erode our ability to discriminate the more subtle, less easily communicated difference among human beings—the differences that make each person unique. Not only automation, but a variety of conditions of
modern and suburban living (specialization, extreme mobility, geographic isolation of production and consumption) tend to inhibit the development of meaningful interpersonal experience. Outcries against depersonalization—the prospect of man being governed totally by computer-based, predictable decisions—reveal wide-spread concern over this problem.

Finally, the missing community is characterized by a feeling of powerlessness—the sense that no individual has significant control over his own destiny. Powerlessness becomes a central issue in American culture because of its contradiction to premises of liberal political thought; namely that the destiny of the community is determined by the wishes of individuals, by the consent of the governed, rather than by unresponsive elites, aloof bureaucracies, or impersonal forces. But in the face of such conditions as impersonal bureaucracies, the growing influence of corporate structures, and extreme social mobility and change, it is difficult for the individual to see how he affects the determination of social policy or the making of decisions that have profound effects on his life.¹

Community in education is an important issue for, as many critics have pointed out, schools are now the primary agents for perpetuating the status quo values of the society, are primary agents in bringing about the loss of human dignity and the loss of human community. Newman and Oliver mean the above points to apply very specifically to the

schooling process, to how the schools foster the five theses and how they themselves are anti-community.

Community is rather an amorphous term. Newman and Oliver give a "working definition" of the term, an explanation that serves as a basis for the discussion in this chapter. A community is a group

(1) in which membership is valued as an end in itself, not merely as a means to other ends;

(2) that concerns itself with many and significant aspects of the lives of its members;

(3) that allows competing factions;

(4) whose members share commitment to common purpose and to procedures for handling conflict within the group;

(5) whose members share responsibility for the actions of the group;

(6) whose members have enduring and extensive personal contact with each other.

Schools in this study were asked: "How do you directly and consciously strive for community--for belonging, togetherness and sharing?"

The responses from schools form a continuum from schools that are not striving for community to places that are communes where people live-work-share-play-plan everything together. For the purposes of this study, the continuum has
been divided into the following categories:

1. Not Striving for Community. This category includes schools in which the relationships among people are rather traditional, where roles are defined and where getting together is a rather formalized affair. Concord High School, Riverdale and Union High School quoted below are typical examples of schools in this category.

2. Halfway Houses. This category includes schools that realize the need for community and are striving for it. But, because of various limitations—9:00 to 3:00 schedules, environment, personal abilities to be open and honest, etc.—they are only half way toward community. These schools may involve participants in some of the decision-making process, have a great deal of freedom, have community meetings, have some close personal student and staff relationships, etc., but these schools still stress curriculum above all else, have not broken out of traditional roles, etc. So they are houses and, as the old joke goes, a house is not a home. The Cambridge Pilot Project, the Clinton Program, the Murray Road School, etc. (some of which are quoted below) are examples of schools in this category.

3. Community. Here, community and education are
synonymous. People live and learn together: they live-work-
learn-share-play-plan together. Their lives are fairly
integrated: the emphasis in these places is on informality,
intuition and naturalness—on people who share many levels
of their lives and are deeply involved with each other. The
involvement is in doing and being: being one's self and
doing a great variety of things together. These are not
necessarily all communes or boarding schools, but places
where people have moved into each other's lives very deeply.
For example, the Community School is a day school where
members have achieved a sense of community by:

Eating and cooking together.
Field trips (Mexico, the most extensive),
skiing, camping.
Celebrating: lots of parties, singing, etc.
Building and creating together: our own
school, the farm, etc.
It's a difficult process. Most people
learn soon how to confront their own boredom.

Few of the public schools are striving for community in
the way it is defined by Newman and Oliver. Some schools
do not even seem to comprehend the concept:

We have a very active PTA. Parents have
been involved on various committees. We have
a Lay Advisory Committee from the community-at-
large. We have activities such as a two-day drug
abuse workshop which involved students, teachers,
and parents with some sensitivity-type training.

--Concord High School
Many opportunities throughout the day to work and talk together—in pairs and small groups.
---Riverdale

Cooperation with civic organizations; parental conferences; student conferences.
---Union High School

Many phone calls, parent memos—our building is used by 33 groups weekly, from church groups to bridge clubs—a community school concept.
---Walnut Hills Community Elementary School

These things are very difficult to come by in a fairly large institution. The lines of communication and channels for dialogue are kept open and sharing of decision-making is encouraged by the administration. Teachers are responsible for the development of their own curriculum and selection of their curriculum materials. Students have a great deal of choice in selecting elective courses.
---Garfield High School

Twenty-three public schools gave similar responses—most of these are the modular-flexible ones. These responses are not unexpected given the structure of most public schools, the emphasis on curriculum and teachers teaching, grades and competition, the 9:00 to 3:00 schedules, the milieu in which most exist, the large numbers of students, the lack or absence of emphasis on the affective areas of human life, etc. Many of the public schools tend to separate people by assigning or assuming limiting roles: administrators, teachers, students and parents have specific territories in which to function
and these areas do not usually overlap. The schools operate as centers rather than bases and thus separate themselves from their communities. School environments then tend to mock reality: education becomes unworldly and the world becomes non-educational. Students go to school to do the teachers' work and not to do their own work or to enjoy themselves. These practices may lead to "maximum plant efficiency" but other effects of these practices are the separation of people from themselves and from each other.

Most (9 out of the 12) of the public alternative schools are aware of the need for belonging, togetherness and sharing and they are striving in various limited ways to achieve a sense of community. This is another factor that makes them so distinct from other public schools. The Pennsylvania Advancement School, the Murray Road School, the 3 I's Program and the Parkway Project are such schools as was indicated in previous quotations in earlier chapters. Following are two other alternative public schools that are striving for community:

We have attempted this through the use of small tutorial groups and weekly Town Meetings; both of these devices have encountered severe difficulties and rarely function well, thus far. They are about to be modified.
A Food Fiesta for parents, also attended by a number of students, was highly successful and provided the occasion for a friendly get-together.

Representatives of business and cultural organizations have been invited to attend our faculty meetings.

In a thoroughly unplanned way, many students have formed interest groups. Two of these have become more formally organized as the Film Club and the Astronomy Club.

The faculty members meet weekly for a two-to-three hour session with a community psychologist to work out emotional and other problems which may hamper or disturb our working together. Student teachers are invited to participate. These sessions and business meetings often continue to coffee, dinner, and/or drinks.

--The Clinton Program

Staff responses to this would vary enormously, depending on individuals' personal assessment of where we stand now. I tend to feel that such efforts as we have made (all sorts of rituals, summer programs, after-school and weekend activities, school government efforts, Home Groups, etc., etc., etc.) have all foundered on the rock of gross cultural differences which students in an urban polyglot group bring into the building with them. We just haven't been able to touch people very deeply--partly the result of many years of kid-assumptions that school can't touch him, shouldn't, etc. Partly the result of fantastic adult naivete about what kids want out of school (i.e., some don't want to share, communicate, etc.--they wanna job and get out). Building trust among fantastically hostile and uncommunicative sub-groups of students is a long, hard task, and our efforts have only scratched a surface. Retreats, meetings, calling off school to go into difficult matters, being with kids in natural hangouts,
visiting in homes a lot, having kids at staff homes, trips, etc., etc.--we could list a lot of things which have been "trying consciously and directly" to join kids to the school and to each other. But...it's bigger than us.

--Cambridge Pilot Project

These programs involve schools with fairly small enrollments and this seems to be an important factor because community is "very difficult to come by in a fairly large institution."

Most of the private schools are aware of the need for community and are striving in various ways to achieve it. The ways, the mechanical how, are not important for the schools listed hundreds of activities that involved sharing and cooperation--singing, dancing, community meals, living together, community meetings, going on trips together, etc. The ways are not important for they grow naturally out of people who are open and honest and loving, who know each other on many levels. Scores of schools could be cited here to "prove" this, but the following few should suffice:

romantic concepts in the philosophical tradition

the teacher dropouts along with one student live together in an old frame orchard house--we combine almost everything

this brings many economic blessings in varying degrees for all involved this is emotionally very tough, very
we all have scars and wounds that need patching, it is hard to do it sometimes trusting yourself, others and reality is a habit
we are working on the habit.
we patch it as we can
don't know if we can bring it full round "the imperfect is our paradise" - Wallace Stevens

--The Claremont New School

Families get together frequently. Parents work at school with kids and teachers. Parents work together on school. Festivals of sharing food, drink, and friendship among all--parents, kids, teachers. Teachers eat often at parents' homes. Kids stay all night--or for a couple of days--at other kids' homes. Parent meetings each Thursday evening involve problem sharing, role playing, business, pleasure; food. We are separate on so many things, together on so many, growing toward community. War, racism, money, relationships, change, are continuing problems for understanding and activity of parents, kids, teachers. We are all growing, learning, changing--toward community.

--Pepper Canyon School

We try to create an atmosphere where openness and honesty and warmth predominate. We try to keep the decision-making process collective. The staff and volunteers understand that learning is not a one-way street, that sharing is most important and that love is a meaningful word. The students respond in kind.

--People's School

By giving all we can as individuals to each other mostly: relying on individual feelings of personal responsibility. There is a natural community which forms around the goal of providing a good alternative to the established educational system, and perhaps this form provides more impetus
for a sense of belonging and sharing than any other single factor. Community, I believe, has more difficulty in arising if it is treated as a goal in itself than as the by-product of people working together on the accomplishment of some more concrete objective.

--Shasta School

Wow. Physically, mostly. But equally, through sensitivity to personal and cultural differences. Here we feel loving and free to express love by hugging, mauling, even, sometimes, biting and slugging. We have many, many council meetings. We are so supportive you wouldn't believe it. We hassle and shout and eat and eat and enjoy! We find kids need to find out that adults care, and care deeply, like no sleep, maybe, or get together outside of school--and that they need to find out that what they do effects the community, sometimes in crucial ways. Like we can be closed down if kids act bad with outsiders or break windows in the area, etc. We act as intermediaries with parents, supporting their supportiveness, but coming down hard on their violence. It ain't easy. I've come to think Neill's job is cushy in comparison. Mainly--everybody who is here is here because he wants to be! That's half the battle....

Freedom includes the freedom NOT TO ENGAGE! But mostly, we do. Our violence-prone kids keep involving us in dangerous activities which could bring us down, so we use this fact to reinforce community sensitivity. It takes time!

--The Free School

Over and over again, the responses from private schools are filled with similar ent usiasms and concerns of people being and doing: of being themselves in the sorrows and joys of living, and doing all sorts of activities as a
natural physical expression of that being.

These private schools are of a great variety—in size, in number of years in existence, of philosophical orientation, of students' backgrounds, of methods of operation, etc. But most of them are free schools. Many of the free schools are established specifically for the purpose of achieving shared understanding and so indicate by putting the word community in their names.

But the free schools do not have a monopoly on this. All but two of the private schools said they are striving for community; every type of school is aware of the "missing community" in the lives of most people. They may not have all achieved the same degree of community as some of the free schools, but most are aware that "we all have scars and wounds that need patching /and that/ it is hard to do it sometimes." But they are trying.

They realize that when people are aware of themselves, of others and of their society then walls seem to fall. Belonging, togetherness and sharing are possible--possible with much continuous effort because the scars and wounds do not heal quickly, the dead places in people can come back quickly.
But total community is not possible in any school--free or not--according to Jerry Friedberg in his "Beyond Free Schools: Community."² It is a long, delicate article and some of it will be quoted and summarized here for it is one of the best pieces written about schools and community:

The Lorillard Children's School was the most nourishing, wonder-ful, genuinely libertarian scene I had ever known, and yet I left it after just one year of being its non-Director. For all of us (and I think I can generalize safely here) it was the best educational enterprise we had ever experienced, both as an institution and in our own personal growing--and most of us who founded it and were its original staff have left.

We came to feel that ANY school AS SUCH--at any level and no matter how "free"--cannot be as natural, spontaneous, organic, and life-integrative as we want our lives to be. Several of us have gone on to join with still others in founding an intentional community, hopeful that it will prove a better alternative for us.

Our brief experience in our community since leaving Lorillard has reinforced the feelings we came to by the end of that first year there. And that others at experimental colleges and free schools are coming to similar conclusions. The transition--from schools to communities--is becoming increasingly common. What is this transition about?...

Friedberg goes on to discuss the Lorrilard School and how

the staff functioned:

We operated without any rules. There were no formal duties, penalties, hierarchies, or ways of enforcing anything even if somebody wanted to. Decision-making was communal, by consensus. We never once took a vote or felt moved in that direction. We operated, rather, on the basis of personal encounter, dealing with our feelings as they emerged, working through our differences, and confronting our angers, fears, frustrations, and joys. It helped that some of us had had experience with encounter groups, gestalt therapy, and related approaches. Once a week whoever wanted to, generally most everybody, went to a gestalt-encounter group led by a fine professional who helped us get at some of our deeper difficulties.

The style which developed permitted no easy refuge in theories, abstract commitments, or rules, but demanded personal and fairly constant contact. That the process had developed organically over a full year and had clearly worked reinforced the trust on which it was based. Sure, it was excruciatingly painful at times, and far less convenient and secure than having a rule-book or hierarchy or majority-rule to fall back upon—but with the difficulty and vulnerability came a sense of much growing and being more real....

I've talked a lot about the staff before talking about how we were with kids, because the latter derived directly from the former (it always does). We began with 33 children, 3-7 years old, committed to expanding the upper age limit by at least a year each year. We established an environment with lots of things for kids to play-destroy-learn-explore-build with. We had woodworking materials, blocks, water and sand, a rope swing, a homemaking and dress-ups corner, a huge climbing structure made of scavenged tree-trunks and boards, arts and crafts materials, books and a quiet reading corner, manipulative games-puzzles, etc., some
animals and science equipment, the Botanical Gardens and Fordham's pool, the neighborhood and its people and stores, and lots of New York City to explore.

The staff was there, generally, to support, provide materials, be interested, leave alone, bring in interests and skills, suggest, prod, confront, question, and play—but not to force or push. We only intervened forcibly, by and large, to prevent physical or psychological damage (though we had our differences in deciding when that point had been reached). We did our best not to lay on the kids ex cathedra judgments and should's. Instead, we attempted to be honest with them about our feelings and perceptions. With our upset and anger, for example, our goal was to express it immediately and fully, rather than turn it into held-in, festering resentment masked thinly by resort to rules, procedures, or moralisms. Similarly with love, boredom, excitement, etc. The children, at first suspicious and adult-cue centered, came to trust and relax with us. The adjective most commonly used by visitors who liked what they say at Lorillard was "relaxed," with "comfortable" and "full of life" runners-up.

But, in spite of this success, the staff came to see that there were aspects inherently wrong in the situation. Friedberg discusses four of these aspects, reasons why they left the school and set up an intentional community:

Unfortunately, the very fact that we were a school meant that enrollment did NOT come about through a similarly personal, gradual, organic process. People came largely because the public schools were felt to be terrible and this school was bound to be at least something of an alternative....
More than this, the parents came from very different backgrounds (that had, in fact, been one of our initial goals), and shared very little of their daily lives, perceptions, and orientations with one another or the staff....

Parents did not, could not, partake of an organic, self-selecting, daily sharing, working things through process such as the staff experienced. Here was no group of close friends shaping day-to-day a common experience as part of their over-all life-way, but, rather, BY VIRTUE OF BEING A SCHOOL IN THE CITY, a well-enough-intentioned group of heterogeneous people pulling and tugging at one another and the staff....

To be with children from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M. five days per week, and see them go off to radically separate and different situations for the remaining time, felt often hopeless and always amiss. We wanted, rather, to be with the children in ways that integrated with their home and total life contexts....

Being a school meant, too, an atmosphere of expectations about responsibility for teaching and learning. The staff felt pressured (and not all of it was external)--we had to come in, things had to happen, contact was scheduled, responsiveness to children became a duty, a labor of love that began to feel like a job....

What Friedberg and the other staff wanted was beyond the school:

...We felt increasingly that we didn't like removing children from our total lives and the lives of their parents and placing them in specialized environments for a good chunk of their lives--not as a matter of choice, but as a given. We didn't want to be adults running a special place for kids, a special world with lots of expectations about specialized functions. That felt artificial and phony compared to what
began to emerge as an alternative vision. We wanted a place for people, adults and children, where each had lots of freedom to be or not be with others; where children could relate to adult activities and vice versa, since it would be an adults' as well as children's world; and where contact and learning would be natural, sporadic, and not worried about much, since there would be lots of things happening all the time as adults and children went about their work and play.

We began to see that such a thing cannot happen as much as we would like in an enterprise run in good part for (and increasingly by) others with whom little daily life is shared, among whom there is little intimate knowledge and love, from whom mostly hassle comes, and who have their own separate and very different life-way. (I have difficulty writing this, remembering many with whom much knowledge, sharing, and caring developed. I hope they will not feel slighted.) It cannot happen in a school, with all the expectations and fragmentation a school must involve.

So, the staff went exploring an alternative beyond school: a small scale, self-selecting, organic community "in which children and adults live, work, play, experiment, hassle, learn, and grow together."
Jerry Friedberg's solution is one alternative to the separation of schooling and community. Other writers like Paul Goodman, Ivan Illich, Paolo Friere and many others have talked about "deschooling" society, of having learning naturally and constantly occurring in the community—the entire community, not just in one small closed group of people—with people of all ages involved with the on-going processes of living in the community. Then, there would be a great variety of alternative starting and on-going places for learning, a world in which children could naturally learn as they grew in it.

The schools in this study can be arranged in an order that shows this process beginning to happen. Modular-flexible schools began the attempt in the 1960's at making learning student-centered by freeing-up some time for the student, by giving him some variety of courses to choose from, by giving him some responsibility for his own life.

But, as was seen when each question was considered, these modular-flexible schools have not moved far in these directions. Most of them
1. have large enrollments
2. did not have students involved in determining the schools' philosophy
3. serve mostly middle class students
4. have compulsory classes
5. have moved only somewhat away from traditional course offerings
6. do not have students significantly involved in planning and regulating the schools' activities
7. evaluate students in groups with tests and grades
8. have not involved themselves in striving for community.

The alternative public schools, taking cues from the experimental schools in this country and in England, are attempting more. Most of them

1. have small enrollments
2. did not have students involved in formulating the schools' philosophy
3. have heterogeneous populations
4. have compulsory classes
5. have a fairly wide choice of courses or subjects for students to choose from
6. have students rather significantly involved in the decision-making processes
7. evaluate students individually, in terms of the student's own growth
8. realize the need for community and have moved somewhat in that direction by stressing sharing, cooperation, responsibility, and trust.

On the elementary level, the private integrated day and Montessori schools parallel and extend some of these directions toward student-centeredness. Most

1. have small numbers of students
2. involve middle class students (because of their tuitions)
3. do not have classes
4. are set up with interests areas wherein
   the student can pursue his own interests
   at his own pace
5. have students somewhat involved in the
   decision-making processes
6. evaluate students individually
7. are striving for cooperation, sharing and
   a sense of belonging together.

But the free schools in this study have turned the
most corners.¹ Most

1. usually have heterogeneous student bodies,
   in spite of having tuitions
2. do not have classes and/or do not have
   compulsory classes
3. emphasize the needs of individual students
   and thus have a variety of ways for students
   to learn--interest areas, tutorials, con-
   tracts, individuals doing/learning what they
   want, group activities, etc.
4. allow the student to pursue his own needs/wants
   at his own rate
5. have students rather significantly (some
   totally) involved in the decision-making
   processes
6. evaluate students individually or do not
   evaluate them at all
7. have achieved a sense of belonging, togetherness, sharing, trust--community.

The main focus in many free schools is not on learning
subjects but on people learning and growing, on personal

¹The schools for "disturbed" students and those for
minority groups are peripherally involved in this movement,
but they do show a tendency to be student-centered, especially
the schools for "disturbed" children.
relationships, on trust and honesty and sharing. Some of these free schools are evolving into non-schools or communes similar to the one discussed by Jerry Friedberg.

The most interesting thing about the free schools is their variety and their flexibility. Perhaps this is best summarized by Robert Greenway and Salli Rasberry in The Rasberry Exercises when they list a grand set of "Cosmic Super Goals" coalesced from many free schools:

WE WANT OUR SCHOOL TO ...

Build or increase skills, in order to be able to--
Survive (in wildernesses, "dying environments," or in "a revolutionary future")
master the culture ("basics," "the three R's")
protect oneself from culture attack and change the culture
put things together ("problem-solving," "reasoning," "creating," "learning how to learn")
share, live in groups, be responsible for yourself, talk straight

Be Therapeutic

promote health, personal growth
allow "integration of mental fragments into gestalts"
clear the decks of bad debris
help fulfill children's needs (i.e., holding them, etc.) entertaining, fun

Be Anarchistic

an adventure
free to do whatever comes up
discover stuff, explore
Increase Perception

of the senses
of the child's sense of the world, of nature
of other cultures

Foster Spiritual Growth

be a ground for rituals
a place for engendering myths "unique to us"
allowing a sense of the holy to flow.

The loosening-up, "deschooling" process noted above is not necessarily anti-learning or anti-education. Illich, other writers, people in some of these places, etc., challenge the assumptions that children belong in school, that children learn only in school and that only children can be taught in school. They are against the ritual of schooling, of having children in a place over a long span of age where they are subjected to a required, graded curriculum.

There are various efforts, begun in the last two or three years in this country, to loosen-up the schooling process:

1. Two years ago, there were a hundred or so alternative schools and their average life was about eighteen months. There are now about 1600-2000 alternative schools. More are growing and less schools are dying now. Mike Rossman's predictions (quoted earlier) are that there will be 25-30,000 alternative schools by 1975.
2. There are now well over 2,000 communes in this country:

It is now becoming clear that the commune phenomenon, which began most recently in the late nineteen-sixties with the hippie movement, is growing to such proportions that it may become a major social factor in the nineteen-seventies. Nearly 2,000 communes in 34 states have been turned up by a New York Times inquiry seeking to determine how many permanent communal living arrangements of significant size could be found in the country, why they existed and who lived in them.

The number is believed to be conservative because it no doubt missed some smaller communes and does not include hundreds of small urban cooperatives and collectives.

The average size of a communal group ranges from 5 to 15 persons, usually in their late teens or early 20's, but increasing numbers of groups whose members are over 30 are being reported. All involve sharing space and finance and most go beyond this to share common work, goals or ideas. Others share themselves.

3. There are now at least 40-50 public school systems that have set up alternatives within themselves. (This does not include the hundreds of integrated day and "open classrooms" now functioning in public schools.) A resolution adopted by the recent White House Conference on Children was that all public school systems make alternatives available

---

to their students.

4. The U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity's Voucher Plan is now in effect in three cities and is about to go into effect in three more cities. One of the goals of the plan is to make educational alternatives available to parents and their children by providing the necessary financial assistance.

5. Several alternative school groups are petitioning for financial assistance from their states. For example, The Children's Community Workshop School in New York City and The New School's Network in San Francisco have law suits against their respective states trying to compel them to give per diem financial support as "independent public schools."

6. There are several law suits in several states about to be started against compulsory education.

7. There are five or six apprenticeship programs similar to the following operating successfully in this country:

If you're in high school, and your courses have nothing to offer you, there's an option. You can get into an apprenticeship program and learn something you want to learn with people who want you to be there. Here's how it happens: You write what you'd like to learn, what living
conditions you could adjust to, what you can and cannot live without. TRAVELERS' DIRECTORY will list your name, address and your little blurb. It also lists names, addresses and similar statements of people who are set up working on what you and other teenagers want to learn and who need someone like you. When you see a listing that interests you, write them and set up the apprenticeship--talking it over first in as much detail as you or your parents want. The apprenticeship family covers living expenses and your family pays travel and extras. When you want to learn something else, you move on.

If/When you or your parents want credit for your work, transcripts and a diploma (if you're 17 or more) are available through the Apprenticeship Service Program of Pacific High School, Box 311, Palo Alto, California.

If, on the other hand, you are out of your teens, no matter how far out, and you have skills or learning you'd like to communicate, rescue a teenager from the system by sharing your home and your trade, art or craft with him. Somebody somewhere wants to learn everything there is to learn anywhere. Get listed in the TRAVELERS' DIRECTORY as an apprenticeship family or individual...

8. Another concept is a local learning resource exchange. Several are now functioning in this country, ones similar to the following "market-place of education in St. Louis":

3 Teacher Drop-Out Center Newsletter, March 9, 1971.
An alternative to school is an information system which provides a learner access to people competent in any desired field, and to other members of the community who share a common educational interest.

To this end we have organized the Learning Resources Exchange. Listed inside this booklet are some of the many skills and fields in which people have offered to teach.

In their brochure, the St. Louis Learning Resources Exchange describes an idea (originally Ivan Illich's) that they have made a reality:

Skill instruction and teaching are only a part of education. We are establishing a fluid system of "peer matching" according to common educational interests. This would enable you to meet someone (who may know more or less than you about a particular topic) who is interested in common exploration. No obligation is assumed. A telephone call or shared cup of coffee can decide whether you are interested in pursuing a particular discussion further. Take a chance and try this out—deep educational merit and socialibility may result.

This loosening-up movement is a wrenching process that is just beginning to happen: After one wrenches oneself loose from the paralyzing and constricting posture that all true education must be programmed, planned, compulsory, competitive, public, and it must all happen in groups in schools, then one's imagination trips over a host of exciting ways for youth and adults to learn by themselves and in association
with one another.

It is not so very long ago that there were no schools, and for a long time many Americans had thought of the development of their schools as perhaps their finest achievement. They are having great difficulty now in admitting that the schools and public education may have become the country's sorriest mess. Why, for example, is there so much spontaneous rejection of the schools by the young? People are asking: What alternatives to our present schools are there? Could there be learning without schools? What would become of democracy without compulsory education?

The answers are few, but hopefully, some answers have been provided by this study--tentative, positive, germinal answers to how people can learn and grow without loss of self, alone and in concert with others, with dignity and pleasure.

Some of the schools in this study--especially the alternative public schools, the integrated day schools and the free schools--indicate that for the first time since the Progressive Movement failed American education, now at a crisis point and on a fragile brink, has the chance of leaping over the chasm into joy for people yearning to be.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: LIST OF SCHOOLS RESPONDING TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. New Rochelle High School, 265 Clove Rd., New Rochelle, N. Y.
2. Cloquet Senior High School, 1000 18th St., Cloquet, Minn.
3. Alternative Junior High School, 316 W. Court, Ithaca, N. Y.
4. Rough Rock Demonstration School, Chinle, Arizona
5. Discovery Room for Children, 2017 Amsterdam Ave., N. Y., N. Y.
6. Thornton Avenue School, Auburn, N. Y.
7. Interlake High School, 16245 NE 24th St., Bellevue, Wash.
8. Concord High School, 2501 Ebright Rd., Wilmington, Del.
10. Canyon School, Box 141, Canyon, Calif.
11. Abington High School (North Campus), Abington, Penna.
12. Taylor Public Schools, Taylor, North Dakota
15. Akron Neighborhood Faculty Program, 142 Lowry Hall, Kent, Ohio
17. East Hill School, Quarry St., Ithaca, N. Y.
18. Cross Keys Junior High School (The Learning Lab), 14205 Cougar Dr., Florissant, Mo.
20. Parkway Program, c/o Franklin Institute, 20th and Parkway, Philadelphia, Penna.
21. Cherry Creek Senior High School, 9300 East Union, Englewood, Colorado
23. The Clinton Program, 314 West 54 St., N. Y., N. Y.
28. Montpelier Educational Facility, Box 301, Montpelier, Vt.
29. Riverton Senior High School, Riverton, Wyo.
31. George Caleb Bingham Junior High School, 7618 Wyandotti St., Kansas City, Mo.
34. Kailua High School, 451 Ulumanu St., Kailua, Hawaii
35. Andrew Lewis High School, 616 College Ave., Salem, Va.
36. Maryland's Children Center, 5200 Westland Blvd., Baltimore, Md.
38. Providence Free School, P. O. Box 6686, Providence, R. I.
40. Palfrey St. School, 119 Palfrey St., Watertown, Mass. 02172
41. The Children's School, 645 Birch Mt. Rd., Manchester, Conn. 06040
42. Skitikuk, Bennoch Rd., Orono, Me.
43. Arthur Morgan School, Rt. 5, Burnsville, N. C. 28714
44. Lower Eastside Action Project School, 540 E. 13th St., N. Y., N. Y.
45. Salisbury School, Mt. Hermon Rd., Salisbury, Md. 21801
46. Whitby School, 969 Lake Ave., Greenwich, Conn. 06830
47. Highland Community School, Paradox, N. Y. 12858
48. Study-Travel-Community-School, RFD, Box 206, Sheffield, Mass. 01257
49. Montreal Free School, Inc., 4287 Esplanade St., Montreal 131, Quebec, Canada
51. Shaker Mountain School, Box 74, Hinesburg, Vt.
52. Prospect School, North Bennington, Vt.
53. The San Francisco School, 300 Gaven St., San Francisco, Cal. 94134
54. Super School, 260 Marshall Dr., Walnut Creek, Cal. 94598--this is the mailing address, the school is in San Francisco.
55. St. John Co-op School, 298 Portugal Cove Rd., Newfoundland, Canada
56. Nethers Community School, Box 41, Woodville, Va., 22749
57. The Claremont New School, 671 Arrow Hwy., Claremont, Cal. 91711
58. Saturna Island Free School, Box 40, Saturna Island, B. C., Canada
59. The City Hill School, 1536 E. Lake St., Minneapolis, Minn.
60. Baltimore Experimental School, 504 Cathedral St., Baltimore, Md.
61. Us, P. O. Box 473, El Granada, Cal. 94018
62. Albuquerque Co-operative, 606 Candelaria N. W., Albuquerque, N. M.
63. Pepper Canyon School, U.C.S.D. Community, 4067B Miramar St., La Jolla, Cal. 92032
64. Bellingham Community School, 1000 Harris Ave., Bellingham, Wash.
67. Green Chimneys School, Putnam Lake Rd., Brewster, N. Y. 10509
68. Rancho Mariposa School, Rt. 1, Box 160, Redwood Valley, Cal. 95470
69. The New Age School, 217 Pershing Ave., San Antonio, Texas 78290
70. Cortland Children's School, 5 Elm St., Cortland, N. Y. 13045
71. Hyde School, Bath, Me. 04530
72. The Shasta School, 1327 Lincoln Ave., San Rafael, Cal.
73. The Stowe School, RR #1, Stowe, Vt. 05672
74. Pinel, 3655 Reliez Valley Rd., Martinez, Cal. 94553
75. Riverwood School, Box 512, Decatur, Georgia 30031
76. Margaret Sibley Research-Development Center, Rugar St., Plattsburg, N. Y.
77. Windsor Mountain School, 45 West St., Lennox, Mass. 01240
78. Dos Mundos Schools, P. O. Box 4230, Corpus Christi, Texas 78408
79. Atkinson School, 131 Shelbourne Rd., Rochester, N. Y. 14620
81. Second Foundation School, 406 12th Ave. S.E. Minneapolis, Minn.
82. The Griffin, 2615 Buenos Aires, Walnut Creek, Cal. 94596
83. Mind Rangers, P.O. Box 24-Ao7, Los Angeles, Cal. 90024
84. Buck Brook Farm, Route 2, Roscoe, N. Y. 12776
85. New Community, R.D., Coburn, Penna. 16832
86. Roeper City & Country School, Bloomfield Hills, Mich. 48013
87. Village School, New Gloucester, Maine 04260
88. The New School, 3 Burton Woods Lane, Cincinnati, Ohio
89. The Worcester New School, 715 Southbridge St., Auburn, Mass.
90. Live Oak High School, 781 Cotati Ave., Box 338, Cotati, Cal.
91. People's School, 4409 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, Ill.
92. The Educational Circus, 159 State St., Brooklyn Hts., N. Y.
93. Da Nahazli Schools, P.O. Box 1806, Taos, N. M.
94. Bay Community School, South County Rd., Brookhaven, N. Y.
95. Spring, 1602 Grove St., Boulder, Colorado
96. Open Community School, Claverack, N. Y.
98. Archbishop Ryan Memorial High School, 5616 L St. Omaha, Neb.
100. Mountain Grove-New Education Foundation, New Highway 99N, Box 22, Glendale, Ore.
101. Early Learning, 4552 McPherson, St. Louis, Mo.
102. The Kuakoa School, 72 Kapiolani St., Hilo, Hawaii
103. Rockland Project School, 50 Leber Rd., Blauvelt, N. Y.
104. Coast Community School, Box 366, Point Arena, Cal.
105. School of the Arts, Box 114, Stillwater, N. J.
106. The Free School, 40 Franklin St., Albany, N. Y. 12202
107. Stonewall Jackson Academy, Box 1245, Florence, S. C.
108. Schole Ranch, Box IA, Mt. Center, Cal.
110. The Urban School of San Francisco, 2938 Washington, San Francisco, Cal.
111. Symbas Experimental School, 1380 Howard St., San Francisco, Cal.
112. Pacific School, Route 1, Big Sur, Cal.
113. Poughkeepsie Day School, 39 New Hackensack Rd. Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
114. The Chinquagin School, Rt. 2, Box 119, Baytown, Texas
115. Collins Brook School, R.D.#2, Freeport, Maine
116. The City and Country School, 165 W. 12th St., N. Y., N. Y.
117. Woodward School, 321 Clinton Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
118. Modern Playschool/Play Mountain Place, 6063 Hargis St., Los Angeles, Cal.
119. Timberhill, 35755 Hauser Bridge Rd., Cazadero, Cal.
120. The North Shore Country Day School, 310 Green Bay Rd., Winnetka, Ill.
121. Hudson Montessori Center, 7545 Darrow Rd., Hudson, Ohio
122. The Southern School, 4520 N. Beacon, Chicago, Ill.
123. Educage, 33 Church St., White Plains, N. Y.
124. Gateway Montessori Schools, 1733 Vincente St., San Francisco, Cal.
125. Green Valley School, P.O. Box 606, Orange City, Florida
126. The Meeting School, Thomas Rd., Rindge, N. H.
127. The Children's School, 1331 Franklin St., SE, Grand Rapids, Mich.
128. Santa Fe Community School, P.O. Box 2241, Santa Fe, N. M.
129. Pinehenge School, Box #1, Waterford, Me.
130. Learning Place, 2020 Fell St., San Francisco, Cal.
131. Sophia, 3323 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.
132. Colorado Springs Community School, 611 N. Royer, Colorado Springs, Colorado
133. New Directions, P.O. Box 2881, Long Beach, Cal.
134. Free School, Southern Illinois University, Student Government Office, Carbondale, Ill.
135. Montessori Children's House, 1405 Foster Ave. (Box 201), Janesville, Wis.
137. The Lorillard Children's School, 2409-2411 Lorillard Place, Bronx, N. Y.
138. Hillside Farm, 2180 Sardine Creek, Gold Hill, Ore.
139. The Day School, 1 E. 92nd St., N. Y., N. Y.
140. Fayerweather St. School, 74 Fayerweather St.,
    Cambridge, Mass.
141. Free Schools, Inc., 1116 Jackson Blvd., Houston,
    Texas
142. St. Mary Center for Learning, 2044 W. Gresham,
    Chicago, Ill.
143. York Free School, c/o York Movement Center, 247 W.
    Philadelphia, York, Penna.
144. Hampton Day School, Butter Lane, Bridgehampton, N. Y.
146. Christian Action Ministry Academy, 3932 W. Madison St.,
    Chicago, Ill.
147. The Bar 717 Ranch School, Hayfork, Cal.
148. J.F.K. Prep, Box 109, St. Nazianz, Wis.
149. Shady Grove School, 17467 Almond Rd., Castro Valley,
    Cal.
150. Metropolitan School of Columbus; 444 E. Broad St.,
    Columbus, Ohio
151. The Adventure Trails Survival School, Laughing Coyote
    Mountain, Black Hawk, Colorado
152. Fifteenth Street School, 206 West 15th St., N. Y.,
    N. Y.
153. Farm School, c/o University of Calif. at Irvine,
    Irvine, Cal.
155. Community School, 295 Summit, St. Paul, Minn.
156. Mujji Ubu School, 1 Lawson Rd., Kensington, Cal.
157. Skunk Hollow High School, 77 N. Western Highway,
    Blauvelt, N. Y.
158. The New School, 13500 Layhill Rd., Silver Springs, Md.
159. Sherwood Oaks High School, 6725 Valjean Ave.,
    Van Nuys, Cal.
160. Los Angeles Community School, 2035 N. Hyperion,
    Los Angeles, Cal.
161. Upland School, 1825 Upland St., Boulder, Colorado
162. Longview School, 1801 Oak Ave., Davis, Cal.
APPENDIX II: A DISCERNING MIND

The purposes of this appendix are two-fold: one, it shows a typical response to the questionnaire from a private school and the type of data received—the dimensions, factors and categories that this paper is concerned with; and, two, it is the questionnaire itself that was sent out to several hundred innovative and alternative schools.

NAME OF SCHOOL: LEAP (Lower Eastside Action Project) School
PERSON TO CONTACT: Michelle Cole or Chuck Hosking
ADDRESS OF SCHOOL: 540 East 13th St., New York, N.Y. 10009

I. CIRCLE OR FILL-IN THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWING:

A. THE SCHOOL IS (1) Public (2) Private.
B. THE SCHOOL IS (1) Day (2) Boarding.*
C. THE SCHOOL IS (1) ACCREDITED (2) NOT ACCREDITED.
D. THE FIRST GROUP OF STUDENTS WAS ADMITTED ON __9____ (MONTH) 1968 (YEAR).
E. THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS ATTENDING THE SCHOOL IS 20 BOYS AND 8 GIRLS.
F. THE AGE RANGE OF THE STUDENTS IS FROM __14__ TO __19__.
G. THE YEARLY TUITION CHARGE IS ______nothing_____

*"Both, depending on the student."

II. WHAT ARE YOUR SCHOOL'S PHILOSOPHICAL PREMISES, BIASES AND/OR VALUES?

Our basic premise is that people are resistant to going through changes, and that the ability to break down those resistances in yourself and others is the key to real and lasting social and personal change. Our biases
are for honest communication, for a breakdown of personal manipulations in relationships, for action over thought or talk, for resilience in times of crisis, and for the serious revolutionary over the rhetorical liberal. Our values are a combination of "street" ingenuity and frankness with a view of education that is mind-training and not mind-cramming. A discerning mind is prophetic; a crammed is stagnant.

B. WHO DETERMINED THESE PREMISES, BIASES AND/OR VALUES?

Larry and Michelle (the founders of LEAP) have seen their original ideas modified and molded with those of the rest of the community because they dared to open themselves to changes by sharing those ideas.

III. WHAT KINDS OF STUDENTS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR SCHOOL? (ARE THERE ANY PSYCHOLOGICAL, ETHNIC, COGNITIVE, RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL, ETC. BACKGROUNDS THAT TYPIFY STUDENTS IN YOUR SCHOOL?)

When the school began 2 1/2 years ago it was a somewhat homogeneous group of 15 Puerto Rican guys from the Lower Eastside. At present we are intergeneracial (spanning ages and races) and are united in a dislike of the public schools, the social workers, survey-takers and others who leach off the ghetto-slum or use it as a "guinea pig" (pun intended). The whole community is psychologically alienated from the society we see around us and is actively trying to find meaning in a viable alternative. Those with any religious backgrounds and questioning them and our backgrounds run the gamut.

IV. A. DO YOU HAVE CLASSES? (1) YES (2) NO.

B. IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION A IS YES, ARE THESE CLASSES COMPULSORY? (1) YES (2) NO.

C. IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION A IS NO, EXPLAIN HOW SUBJECT MATTER, CONTENT AREAS AND/OR INTERESTS ARE PURSUED BY THE STUDENTS.

*Depends on type and "contract".
We have various types of "classes." "Information Sessions" are small groups of students who seek out and hire a teacher and set up a personal attendance and standards contract to hold class in the traditional manner. "Feeds" are 1-3 hour concentrations by the whole community on one topic, tape, record, or other single interest of any member of the community. "Crashes" are 5-72 hour, extended Feeds involving multi-media, guest speakers, etc. All three are considered "internal education." "External education" is gained through involvement in either the newspaper project or the after-school program run for kids on the block.

V. WHAT SUBJECTS OR AREAS OF LEARNING DO YOU OFFER?

Feeds and Crashes are on all topics imaginable from snakes to Charles Ives to the Berrigan brothers to Muhammad Ali. Information Sessions include: math, music, art, reading, creative writing, U. S. history, possibly sky-diving and any other course for which 3 or more students can find a teacher. Practical learning comes from laying out and printing a paper, and working with younger kids after school.

VI. IN WHAT WAYS ARE STUDENTS INVOLVED IN PLANNING AND REGULATING THE SCHOOL'S ACTIVITIES (INCLUDING CLASSES AND/OR LEARNING ACTIVITIES)?

Students (with help from the Core Group when asked) hire and fire all teachers, and accept all new students into the school. Class content and standards of attendance and work load are decided by student-teacher agreement. The "Core Group" is a collection of 6-7 staff and 4-5 students who make major decisions, decide new directions of change and structure them, and ultimately decide on all referrals from any other group or individual in the school. "Group Rap" is a meeting of the entire community and a chance for airing grievances or bringing to the group conflicts between two individuals which they cannot resolve alone. Regulation of day-to-day events can also be changed in Group Rap, where everyone votes equally.
VII. HOW ARE STUDENTS IN YOUR SCHOOL EVALUATED?

In projects, students and teachers are evaluated by their project group and problems are brought to the Core Group. In Information Sessions, evaluations of students, teachers, and courses have been done each 2 weeks. No "grades" are issued; only comments, pro and con, on ability, style, etc., are given. Standards for graduation are stringent and include being able to run a Group Rap.

VIII. DESCRIBE ANY EVIDENCE YOU HAVE WHICH DEMONSTRATES THAT STUDENTS LEARN MORE, LEARN "BETTER" AND/OR LEARN MORE JOYFULLY IN YOUR SCHOOL THAN IN MORE TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS.

Some of our students occasionally return to their former high schools and talk about LEAP. The abilities in self-expression surprise them as being far and above those of their peers, and much more outstanding than they were a year before in public school. Although the atmosphere of LEAP School is not as joyful as many schools (because we spend long hours problem-solving issues most schools ignore or resign to administrators or arbitrary rules), our students are never bored, and frequent outbursts of ecstasy make up for the "down" feeling of trying to solve interpersonal frictions.

IX. HAVE YOU DONE FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF YOUR GRADUATES? (1) YES (2) NO. IF YES, WHAT ARE YOUR FINDINGS?

Our school is as yet quite young and has only a handful of "graduates." One former LEAPer has been at Franconia College this past year. Another is on the staff of Odessey House (a drug center on the Lower Eastside). Our students are not usually as traditionally success-oriented as most high school students and consequently short-circuit traditional paths to fortune in favor of local community work.
X. HOW DO YOU DIRECTLY AND CONSCIOUSLY STRIVE FOR COMMUNITY--FOR BELONGING, TOGETHERNESS AND SHARING?

Besides about 1/5 of the community actually living at the school, most live on the Lower Eastside and see each other often outside of school socially. An average school day runs from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Often weekend trips, special events, and late meetings (til 3:30 a.m. yesterday) tie us even more closely. The school year begins with 2 1/2 weeks together at an old resort motel upstate to get to know one another and plan for the school year. This area (nicknamed LEAPfrog) will be used by some during the summer as a farm-commune and possible summer camp/retreat for city kids run by LEAP students and staff. Crashes, feeds, raps and visits to political and education meetings are done as a group and help tie us together and force us to face one another as People.

XI. PLEASE ADD ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE ABOUT STUDENTS IN YOUR SCHOOL:

Students come to LEAP dissatisfied with the public schools, but not knowing what to do about it. While at LEAP we face all the issues involved in creating a viable alternative school, and that helpless, hopeless feeling changes to an active awareness of the means and methods of social change. The education is broadly sociological and very practical in comparison to most alternative schools. Future trends promise to see more emphasis on "Information Sessions" for those who want them than in the past.
APPENDIX III: THE ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

This appendix is a typical response to the questionnaire from a public school. Included here are only the responses and not the questions--see Appendix II for a list of the questions.

William J. Failey, Principal, CONCORD HIGH SCHOOL, 2501 Ebright Road, Wilmington, Delaware 19810

I. A. Public
   B. Day
   C. Not accredited--in the process of being accredited.
   D. September, 1967
   E. 672 Boys and 673 Girls
   F. 15 to 18
   G. None.

II. A. Our first consideration is that students feel good about coming to school. We have tried to establish a student-centered school, and students receive top priority. The instruction has been individualized and customized as much as possible. We believe in a great deal of student involvement, responsibility and decision-making.

III. The typical student tends to be middle class, fairly bright and articulate. The great majority are white and it is a fairly typical suburban atmosphere.

IV. A. Yes.
   B. Yes.

V. We offer most of the traditional secondary comprehensive school subjects from the basic areas of English, social studies, foreign languages, fine and practical arts, health and physical education, science, math, business courses, etc. We have made every attempt to make these subjects relevant. For example, we now teach a course in Urban Problems in lieu of the traditional World History.
VI. The Student Cabinet has a great deal of responsibility and makes decisions regarding group activities including finances, assemblies, dress code (there is none), and special behavioral problems. They are becoming increasingly involved in curriculum decisions with students being represented in departmental meetings, the Curriculum Board, and other administrative matters. Many students are on individual study where they have planned their own programs.

VII. "Starting 1972-73, students will be evaluated based on their individual achievement with two basic categories of sufficiency and mastery. They will not be compared to each other in norm-based evaluations. We currently do not give E's nor have honor roll, honor society, top ten students, etc."

VIII. "Student morale is high. Vandalism is low. Attendance is average. Grades and achievement are above average; less failures than previously. Informal follow-up of graduates shows students quite happy with their high school education."

IX. Yes. "A formal follow-up study is in the process but has not been completed."

X. "We have a very active PTA. Parents have been involved on various committees. We have a Lay Advisory Committee from the community-at-large. We have activities such as two-day drug abuse workshop which involved students, teachers, and parents with some sensitivity-type training."

XI. "They tend to be noisy but happy."
The seven-part Question I deals primarily with facts and statistics about the responding schools. These facts are important, both in themselves and in how they relate to discussions of each of the succeeding questions. For example, the number of students in a school effects how much influence they can have in school affairs, whether a true spirit of community can be established, how styles and methods of learning are established, etc.

This chapter is concerned with establishing facts: the significance of these facts are established in the body of this study.

Question I-A simply asks if the school is public or private, so the categories and data are simple:

1. Public - 37 schools
2. Private - 125 schools

Question I-B has three categories and the tabulation of the data received is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Day School</td>
<td>Public - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private - 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Boarding School</td>
<td>Public - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The one public school that is Day and Boarding is the Rough Rock Demonstration School. It is an experimental school for Navajo Indians that is "community controlled on government contract."

There are 33 private schools that board students, a fairly large percentage of the schools in this study, and these are given separate attention when each question is considered in the body of the paper.

Question I-C is concerned with whether or not the schools are state accredited; the categories and data are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accredited</td>
<td>Public - 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private - 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not accredited</td>
<td>Public - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private - 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the public schools not accredited noted they were in the process of seeking accreditation. The fact that 85 private schools are not legally accredited is rather amazing. The question that arises is: How can they function then as
schools? Several of the schools—in New Jersey, California, Washington, etc.—said that this question does not apply to them. For example, there are really no significant laws governing private elementary schools in New Jersey and no process of state accreditation for these schools. Some states require a school to be in existence for several years before they can be accredited and many of the private schools in this study are only one or two years old. It is a known fact that some of the new alternative schools just ignore accreditation policies in their states and they sometimes get away with doing this. Also, there are often loopholes in state laws that private, especially "free," schools take advantage of. In several states, a group can call itself an educational organization (not a "school") and have students (usually of high school age) learning there as if it were a school. Several states just require that a certified teacher be present with a group of students (even without a building) and that constitutes a school and it can legally function.

Question I-D deals with when the school was established. The categories for this question and the data are the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1900-1949</td>
<td>Public - 6, Private - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1950-1959</td>
<td>Public - 3, Private - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1960-1964</td>
<td>Public - 6, Private - 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the fourteen schools listed in category 1, there were no data received to indicate if they have been innovative from their inception or if they have recently become innovative.

Interestingly, 73% of the schools were established in the last six years, 84% in the last eleven years. The schools in this study are obviously a new phenomenon and this has several implications: They are probably not widely known; they probably have a better chance of implementing the latest knowledge of children and how they learn than do longer established schools; they are probably changing and growing; their newness will effect some of their responses to the questionnaire.

Question I-E deals with the number of students in each school. It was designed to have a separate number for each sex but many schools responded with just total enrollments.
So the categories established here are concerned only with total enrollment. Those schools that did list enrollment by sex showed that the number of boys and the number of girls in most of the schools are about equal. Of the schools in this study, four are for boys only and one is for girls only. The categories and data for this question are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 11-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 50-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 101-200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 201-500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 501-3000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest total enrollment in a public school is 2985; the highest number of students in a private school is 1006. (The two private schools listed in category 6 are Catholic high schools.) The lowest enrollment in a public school is 27; the lowest number of students in a private school is 5. These are rather wide extremes.
More than half of the public schools have enrollments of 200 or more students, 12 of these with over 500 students.

Sixty-two percent of the private schools have less than 50 students and eighty-three percent of them have less than 100 students. Most of the private schools listed in category 5 are the more exclusive, expensive, prep-school types of schools, ones that have been in existence more than 5 years.

Obviously, one alternative that the private schools are vitally concerned with is that of numbers. In their concern and in their comments, they say that they are purposely small so that individuality can become a reality, so individuals can interact on human, personal levels that seem impossible in the larger, consolidated, Conant-like public schools that are forced to deal with children in groups.\(^1\) The number of students in a school is a major issue in this study and the

\(^1\)See Allan Glatthorn's pamphlet, "Students, Schools, and the Tides of Change," which deals with ten major areas of how public schools adversely effect students. Mr. Glatthorn is principal of an innovative high school and a responder to a questionnaire. In personal conversations with this writer he stated that much current research points out that the optimum number of students in a school is 150. He is in the process of helping to establish three alternative public high schools that will enroll between 100 and 150 students.
issue is raised in several places in the body of this paper.

This concern with the number of human beings in one building and the resulting consequences has led several public school districts to set up small alternatives within themselves: the 3 I's Program at New Rochelle High School, The Parkway Program, the Murray Road School, the Learning Lab at Cross Keys Junior High School; Cherry Creek High School proposes to subdivide its 3,000 students into "sub-schools" or "schools-within-schools." The Abington School District (and two adjoining districts) will set up three small alternative high schools, each autonomous, for the fall of 1971; Ernest, Righetti High School has set up a school-within-a-school, as has Meadow Brook Junior High School (four, in fact); and Kanawha County Schools in West Virginia are setting up a series of small "Lighthouse Learning Centers." This is a trend that is just beginning in public education--about fifty school districts have done this or are planning to set up small alternatives within themselves.

Question I-F is concerned with the age range of students in the schools in this study. The categories and data for
The categories in this question correspond, in traditional terms, to: 1. pre-school to Grade 2; 2. pre-school to high school; 3. pre-school to Grade 8; 4. junior high school; 5. high school; and 6. all ages.

Of interest are the schools in categories 2 and 6. These schools are attempting an alternative to what most schools do: segregate and separate students by age and/or by classes. Many alternative schools seek to integrate students of all ages (especially the 4 to 18 age group), often having no distinction by age on who can be in a class or in a learning situation. Interest and ability are the
important factors, rather than age or class. Also, some schools prefer to have older students associated with younger ones because, they argue, students learn best from each other.

The four public schools listed in these two categories are special cases: The Rough Rock Demonstration School mentioned earlier; the Taylor School District is in a remote area of North Dakota and has all of its students in one building; the Maryland's Children Center is a diagnostic referral center for "disturbed" children; and the Akron Neighborhood Faculty Project is a one-year course for Kent State students who live and learn and work with people of all ages in the Black community. These are discussed in more detail in the body of the paper.

Question I-G deals with tuition. The following are the categories and data for the question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $0</td>
<td>Public - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $100-$500</td>
<td>Private - 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $501-$1000</td>
<td>Private - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $1001-$2500</td>
<td>Private - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $2501-$7500</td>
<td>Private - 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are three schools that are exceptions to the above categories: The Discovery Room for Children which is a Welfare Department-funded day care center and early childhood school that charges parents "$1 to $2 a week." The Green Valley School and its subsidiary, Buck Brook Farm, both Summerhillian schools that deal with "disturbed" children, have astounding yearly tuitions of $12,000.

This study does not provide any data on how much money is needed to educate students in the public schools that responded to the questionnaire. But it does reveal that a few of the private schools are able to run schools on very small budgets. Thirteen private schools have no tuition; 29 charge less than $500 a year. Most of these are "free" schools and they are relatively small ones, most with less than 50 students. How are they able to function? In addition to tuitions, some of them operate businesses to support the schools--one operates a bar, one a gas station, several are farms. One school, Educage, contracts with local school districts and charges them $1000 for each of their "disruptive" children that they educate. Some schools sell items made in the schools--art, leather goods, pottery, etc. Several are parent cooperatives and the parents share expenses
on a percentage of income basis. Several are church-supported, several are lab schools supported by universities, some are supported by individual or foundation grants or are federally funded, some charge for each class attended. Also, some of these schools are operated in church basements, renovated warehouses, private homes, storefronts, etc., and do not have expensive buildings to buy or build and maintain. The number of administrators is less in most private schools (usually just one, a director) and some have no administrators because all the staff share in administrative duties. Also, the salaries for most alternative school staff is much lower than the average public school scales. For example (and a ridiculous one), the Green Valley School noted above pays its teachers $7.00 a week plus room and board. For these various reasons, the cost of running some of the alternative schools is low.

The figures for these private schools are not quite accurate because just about every school noted that they have a sliding tuition scale (ability to pay, percentage of family income, etc.) and some available scholarships. Yet it is still amazing how some schools can operate on such little money.
The above paragraph should not be allowed to hide a hard truth: most of the radical new private schools do charge rather high tuitions. The schools in this study have tuitions that average from $800 to $900. It has been this writer's experience that the national average for such schools is higher: between $1000 and $1500. These schools are necessarily elitist and, as some writers have noted, are a white middle class phenomena. This study tends to bear out this observation.

It also should be noted here that money is the biggest concern now of many alternative private schools. Because they are radical departures from tradition education, they have difficulties in raising money from government and private sources. The average life of these new schools is 18 months and the main reason why they fold is a lack of money. At a recent Konference on Alternatives in Education, held at Bensalem in New York City, the over-riding issue was the practical concern for money. The Saturday Review, reporting on the conference in its May 22, 1971, issue,

noted: "The free schools have reached a difficult stage. For the last few years, they have depended upon foundation support, qualifying as experiments. But now they're beyond that, and few schools can live off their tuitions."

Yet new schools continue to spring up daily—approximately 10 each week. The following is an example of such a school, a letter from a woman who advertised in the April, 1971, Teacher Drop-Out Center Newsletter for teachers for the new school she is starting in Maine:

I wish to thank everyone who expressed an interest in answer to my ad. I was absolutely flooded with replies. Consequently, the position I advertised for is filled. I cannot possibly answer each ad separately, so I wish now to say No Thank You to everyone and I appreciate your writing. I suggest that individuals join together and form more schools. They certainly are needed. And it's amazing what people can do on minimum funds, if they set their minds to it. There are a million ways to beat the system.
APPENDIX V: CATEGORIZED DATA

All of the categorized data for each question is contained in this appendix. Each column here is a separate question and the question is designated at the top of the column. The numbers in the column correspond to the categories that were established in the chapters of the body of the paper. The numbers in the column to the far left correspond to the schools in Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IB</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IVA</th>
<th>IVB</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>IXA</th>
<th>IXB</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVF</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>IXA</td>
<td>IXB</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI: TABULATED DATA

All of the tabulated data—frequency counts for the categories to each question and all cross-tabulations—are contained in this appendix. The numbers in the columns to the left are the categories for the questions established in the body of the paper and the numbers in the columns to the right are the number of schools in the categories.

TABLE 1: Question II-B Categories Number of Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2: Question II-B Categories Number of Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: II-A Categories II-B Categories Number of Schools

This table shows the number of schools in each of the categories for Question II-B cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Question III Categories Number of Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4: Question III Categories Number of Public Schools

1. 18
2. 10
3. 5
4. 4
5. 0
6. 0
TABLE 5: **Question III Categories**  
Number of Private Schools

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6: **II-A Categories**  
**III Categories**  
Number of Schools

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7: Question IV-A Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8: Question IV-A Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9: II-A Categories IV-A Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10: IV-A Categories Number of Private Boarding Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV-A Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Boarding Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11: IV-A Categories I-E Categories Number of Public Schools

This table shows the number of public schools in each of the categories for Question I-E (enrollment) cross-correlated with the categories for Question IV-A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV-A Categories</th>
<th>I-E Categories</th>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0</td>
<td>2. 5</td>
<td>1. 3. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 2</td>
<td>2. 0</td>
<td>2. 3. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 2</td>
<td>2. 0</td>
<td>3. 3. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12: IV-A Categories I-E Categories Number of Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV-A Categories</th>
<th>I-E Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 23</td>
<td>2. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 3. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13: IV-B Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14: IV-B Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 15: II-A Categories  IV-B Categories  Number of Schools

This table shows the number of schools in each of the categories for Question IV-B cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16: IV-C Categories Number of Private Schools

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 17: II-A Categories IV-C Categories Number of Private Schools

This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question IV-C cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

1. ---

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18:  **Question V Categories**  Number of Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 19:  **II-A Categories**  V Categories  Number of Public Schools

This table shows the number of public schools in each of the categories for Question V cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20:  **Question V Categories**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21:  **II-A Categories V Categories Number of Private Schools**  

This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question V cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question VI Categories</th>
<th>Number of Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 24: II-A Categories VI Categories Number of Public Schools

This table shows the number of public schools in each of the categories for Question VI cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 25: Question VI Categories Number of Private Schools

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26: II-A Categories  VI Categories  Number of Private Schools

This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question VI cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

1. ----
   1. 1
   2. 2
   2. 3. 6
   4. 7
   1. 6
   2. 10
   3. 3. 7
   4. 5
   1. 0
   2. 4
   4. 3. 1
   4. 1
   1. 0
   2. 7
   5. 3. 11
   4. 57
   1. 0
   2. 0
   6. 3. 1
   4. 3
   1. 0
   2. 1
   7. 3. 2
   4. 0

TABLE 27: Question VI Categories  Number of Private Boarding Schools

1. 0
2. 2
3. 11
4. 33
TABLE 28: VI Categories | I-E Categories | Number of Private Schools

This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question I-E cross-correlated with the categories for Question VI.

| 1.  | 0   |
| 2.  | 1   |
| 3.  | 0   |
| 4.  | 0   |
| 5.  | 0   |
| 6.  | 0   |
| 1.  | 1   |
| 2.  | 12  |
| 3.  | 6   |
| 4.  | 4   |
| 5.  | 1   |
| 6.  | 0   |
| 1.  | 2   |
| 2.  | 13  |
| 3.  | 5   |
| 4.  | 4   |
| 5.  | 3   |
| 6.  | 1   |
| 1.  | 4   |
| 2.  | 45  |
| 3.  | 15  |
| 4.  | 1   |
| 5.  | 4   |
| 6.  | 1   |

TABLE 29: Question VII Categories | Number of Public Schools

| 1.  | 20  |
| 2.  | 6   |
| 3.  | 4   |
| 4.  | 0   |
| 5.  | 7   |
| 6.  | 0   |
TABLE 30: II-A Categories VII Categories Number of Public Schools

This table shows the number of public schools in each of the categories for Question VII cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

1. 0
2. 4
3. 2
4. 0
5. 5
6. 0

1. 18
2. 0
3. 3.1
4. 0
5. 1
6. 0

1. 2
2. 0
3. 3.1
4. 0
5. 0
6. 0

4. ----- 

5. ----- 

6. 3.0
7. 3.0

1. 0
2. 1

1. 0
2. 1
3. 0
4. 0
5. 1
6. 0
TABLE 31: Question VII Categories Number of Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 32: II-A Categories VII Categories Number of Private Schools

This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question VII cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 33: **Question VII Categories**  **Number of Private Boarding Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 34: **Question IX Categories**  **Number of Public Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 35: **II-A Categories**  **IX Categories**  **Number of Public Schools**

This table shows the number of public schools in each of the categories of Question IX cross-correlated with the categories for Question II-A, types of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 36: **Question IX Categories** | **Number of Private Schools**
--- | ---
1. 28
2. 97

TABLE 37: **II-A Categories** | **IX Categories** | **Number of Private Schools**
--- | --- | ---
This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question IX cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

1. 1
2. 2
3. 5

1. 1
2. 0
3. 4

1. 0
2. 0
3. 2

1. 3
2. 5
3. 3

1. 0
2. 0
3. 2
1. 0
7. 2. 0
3. 1

TABLE 38: **Question X Categories**  **Number of Public Schools**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 39: **II-A Categories X Categories**  **Number of Public Schools**

This table shows the number of public schools in each of the categories for Question X cross-correlated with the categories for Question II-A, types of schools.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 40: Question X Categories  Number of Private Schools

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 41: II-A Categories  X Categories  Number of Private Schools

This table shows the number of private schools in each of the categories for Question X cross-correlated with the seven types of schools.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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