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ABSTRACT

Donald Schon (1979) in his article, "Generative Metaphor: A Perspective on Problem-Setting in Social Policy," noted that the main difficulty of analyzing social policy was defining how the problem was "set." By "set" he meant the depiction of "what needs fixing" in the metaphors generated from a troublesome situation. Consequently, for Schon, evaluating social policy meant evaluating not the answer but the question. This dissertation, likewise, has focused on the question, the metaphors which underlay the setting of problems concerning the public policy of schools of choice.

Using the work of cognitive linguists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson as the theoretical framework for the study, I identified and analyzed metaphorical expressions culled from three different groups of academicians who favor schools of choice. Following the taxonomy that James G. Cibulka created to distinguish among the proposal options favoring schools of choice, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the dissertation are divided respectively into representative writings by advocates of 1) public-private schools of choice; 2) private only schools of choice; and 3) public only schools of choice.
Metaphors, according to Lakoff and Johnson "play a constitutive role in the structuring of our experience." They are a link, according to Lakoff and Johnson, to the construction and reproduction of our culture. To understand the conceptions underlying the metaphorical expressions used by schools of choice advocates, the metaphors were grouped into larger categories. These larger categories included "life is a game," "life is a play," "systems are containers," "causation is emerging," "systems are hierarchies," "market competition is a success story," "systems are balancing machines," "education is a structure," "controlled choice is a rational argument," and "choice schools are a link to the community".

The advocates of schools of choice advanced their doctrines within their metaphors. Isolating the metaphors from the debate led to the conclusion that all three groups used the marketplace as their foundational metaphor. Even when the advocates for public schools of choice directly rejected the marketplace as an analogy for education, their metaphors highlighted competition and supply and demand as solutions to the problem of improving the educational system.
METAPHORS WE MAKE SCHOOLS BY:

THE DEBATE ON SCHOOLS OF CHOICE
Chapter I

Introduction

Significance

President Bush, wearing a chef's hat and apron, stands at the stove of his administration's agenda to lift the three pots of education, environment, and economy from the back burner on which they have been simmering to the cold storage of the refrigerator. Not surprisingly, Bush cannot fit the pots into the refrigerator; it is already filled. So there he stands, balancing the pots of education and environment on the tipped cover of the economy. In his political cartoon from January 1991, Thomas G. Toles, of the United Press Syndicate, has captured the political scene of the new decade of the nineties: The executive branch of the federal government has chosen to lower the heat on the debate over domestic policy while filling all of the burners of public attention with the ongoing Persian Gulf
Indeed, in early 1991, the onslaught of war had enveloped the nation's attention. And rightly so, given the reality and potential for destruction of lives and property in any war. The political scene of the early 1980's, however, would probably have motivated Toles to draw a different cartoon of domestic politics, one that showed a then newly elected President Reagan, dumping the contents of all three pots onto the table as his administration worked to spoil existing federal domestic programs and stir the debate on new ways to serve domestic policy. When Reagan scattered the contents of the pot of domestic education issues, he not only sought to reduce funding of some national education programs but also attempted to change the locus of educational policy-making from the federal government to state departments and local districts. One of his reform ideas, schools of choice, remained on the educational burner of school reform all through the decade of the 1980's. The "public-choice" theorists, still very much a part of the school reform scene of the 90's, advocate that all pupils, regardless of their families' financial means or
place of residence, choose which schools they will attend.

This dissertation focuses on the language of the public policy debate on schools of choice by examining the written metaphors used by representative academics. Just as cartoonist Toles' metaphor of chef Bush frames an interpretation of President Bush as a powerful actor who can move issues off the "front burners" of political debate, the metaphors used in the rhetoric on schools of choice offer a means of understanding how academics conceive of schools of choice policy. To understand how academicians, who by virtue of their profession are in the forefront of school reform debates, write about schools of choice is to understand their assumptions about this reform idea and what the resulting implementation of the policy may become.

As Lakoff and Johnson state in their 1980 book, Metaphors We Live By,

What is at issue is not the truth or falsity of the metaphors but the perceptions and inferences that follow from it and the actions that are sanctioned by it. In all aspects of life, not just
in politics or in love, we define our reality in terms of metaphors and then proceed to act on the basis of the metaphors. We draw inferences, set goals, make commitments, and execute plans, all on the basis of how we in part structure our experience, consciously and unconsciously, by means of metaphor (p. 158).

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1987), the metaphors about cooking and setting priorities for domestic policy used in the opening paragraphs of this dissertation are a part of discourse that we read and listen to automatically, almost unconsciously. I began this chapter using metaphors deliberately to introduce to the reader images similar to those that will be analyzed in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of this dissertation. Just as Lakoff and Johnson argue in Metaphors We Live By for the primacy of metaphor in defining our reality and determining our actions, I will argue in this dissertation that metaphors used in the schools of choice debate "play a constitutive role in the structuring of our experience" (Johnson, p. 73); hence, they are liable to become metaphors we make schools by. Metaphors can
aid our understanding of the issues surrounding the public policy proposal of schools of choice because metaphorical systems, according to Lakoff and Johnson, define how we see and experience the world (p. 73).

Prior to explaining further other arguments for using metaphorical analysis, I will first attempt to justify why the school of choice reform idea merits analysis. Even though the worth of the idea is still being debated and the effectiveness of experimental schools of choice programs has not been empirically established (Raywid, 1989), more than twenty state legislatures are considering the implementation of choice plans (Boyd & Walberg, 1990, p. ix). According to Nathan (1989), editor of Public Schools by Choice, the ideals behind the reform brings together three concepts with wide public appeal among the public: "1) Expansion of opportunities for educators, families, and students; 2) Recognition that there is no one best kind of school for all students or teachers; and 3) Use of controlled competition to help stimulate school improvement" (p. 5).

Without a doubt, the ideals of the concept have spread to a variety of audiences. In 1990 and 1991, at
least three extensively reviewed books, basically favorable to the idea, were published on the topic (Boyd and Walberg, Chubb and Moe, Lieberman) and it has been recommended as a major reform initiative in the educational report of the National Commission of Governors (1986). Additionally, the United States Department of Education in early 1991 established the "Center for Choice in Education" and set up a toll-free choice "hotline" as resources for information and assistance on choice. And this in the budget year 1991 when hardly any new educational initiatives were funded.

The inclination toward the schools of choice reform, entails a particularly American notion of solving problems by leaving one institution and joining another. This idea adds a cultural perspective relevant to why the schools of choice policy has become attractive to politicians and the American public. Hirschman (1970), in his book, Exit, Voice, and Loyalty argues that the society of the United States was founded by men and women who fled to America from the oppression of European life (p. 106). From their European exit to their progressive settlement of the frontier, Americans, according to
Hirschman, have had a "preference for the neatness of exit" (107). He observes further,

Even after the closing of the frontier, the very vastness of the country combined with easy transportation make it far more possible for Americans than for most other people to think about solving their problems through 'physical flight' than either through resignation or through ameliorating and fighting in situ the particular conditions into which one [sic] has been 'thrown' (p. 107).

Like other American historians in the tradition of Frederick Jackson Turner, Hirschman understands that American history continues to be forged through the creation and exploration of new frontiers (Wise, 1980, p. 187).

Another cultural implication of the choice policy is proffered by Coleman (1973) in a study he conducted for the United States Office of Education. He concluded that "the extent to which an individual feels that he has some control over his destiny appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than do all the 'school'
Unlike most other reform ideas, schools of choice cannot be implemented without changing the governance and style of leadership used in schools. Kerchner (1988) in his article, "Bureaucratic Entrepreneurship: The Implications of Choice for School Administration," speculated "on the implications of choice as a defining value for school administrators" (p. 385). He argued that, if schools operated under a choice system, administrators' first priority would be to their clients (students and their parents), not to the politically-potent interest groups of earlier days. Rather than responding to group demands, administrators would be required to "define the market" and, once the "market" were defined, to organize and lead programs so that clients or students remained with the school as satisfied consumers.

Chubb and Moe (1990) in Politics, Markets, and America's Schools, cite the present governance of schools as the problem and offer choice of either public or private schools as the solution (p. 3). Kirchner, Chubb and Moe imply that the implementation of schools of
choice would not just replace existing programs but would change the structure of school organizations. Before the mechanics of such a reform idea are debated, it is most important to assess the assumptions upon which this idea is based. In my preliminary reading of articles, newspapers, books, studies, and government documents on the schools of choice policy, I found a profusion of metaphorical expressions: Free-market approach, consumers voting with their feet, monopolistic indifference, the student is the client, magnet schools, entrepreneurial colleagues, demand-side choice versus supply-side choice, excellence via 'brand-name' structures, community democracy, truth in marketing, formula to free the hostages, get better or go out of business, rebuild the schoolhouse, etc. At first glance, the individual words and phrases group around metaphors which, among other things, infer school is a business, school choice policy is release from school as a prison, students are consumers, teachers are producers, and education is competition.

The large number and prevalence of these and other metaphorical statements raise questions about the
relationship of these statements to the ideas behind the public policy. The ease with which these expressions can structure our thinking and influence the inferences we draw make us almost automatically accept the inherent reasoning of each well-constructed metaphor. As Lakoff and Turner point out in their 1989 book, More Than Cool Reason: "Because they [metaphors] can be used so automatically, and effortlessly, we find it hard to question them, if we can even notice them" (p. 65). This dissertation sets out to notice the metaphors and the conceptions underlying them. The main research question becomes, What primary conceptions about schools of choice are revealed by interpreting the metaphors used by academicians?

Theoretical Framework

To ask about the primary conceptions of the schools of choice debate is to ask about the debate's fundamental metaphors. Fundamental metaphors, which are part of everyday language, cluster into more general or generic-level metaphors, called conceptual metaphors by some cognitive linguists (Levin, 1988; Lakoff and Johnson,
They are implicit organizers of the linguistically-expressed metaphors, and they frame how we understand experience and may be a guide for future action. Levin, in his book *Metaphoric World*, argues that the role of conceptual metaphors is to fashion, in ways that we are largely unconscious of, our view of reality, a view to which our linguistic behavior in the form of satellite metaphors [the linguistically-expressed ones] bear testimony (p. 156).

An example of a metaphorical concept that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) use is "argument is war." They claim that we conduct ourselves in argument as though we were in fact waging war. Arguments have winners and losers, strategies, lines of attack, indefensible positions, counterattacks, and verbal battles. Their point is that we do not just talk about argument in terms of war, but that the war metaphor "structures the actions we perform in arguing" (p. 4). Our conception of the war metaphor determines our reality. If we could imagine a culture, such as traditional Balinese culture described by anthropologist Clifford Geertz, in which argument is seen
as a dance, the participants performers, and the goal of the argument an aesthetically-pleasing performance, Lakoff and Johnson state that we could begin to see the distinctiveness of our own cultural constructs and actions.

Lakoff and Johnson demonstrate that metaphors derive from more abstract preconceptual categories called "image schemata." They define a schemata as "a recurring, dynamic pattern of our perceptual interactions and motor programs that give coherence and structure to our experience" (Johnson, p. xiv). The source-path-goal schema, for example, which we know from an early age by how we physically move from a starting point to an ending point, structures certain parts of our experience as a narrative with a beginning, middle, and end. In brief, by interacting with our physical and cultural environments, we construct schematic images to make sense of our experience.

Building on their knowledge of image schemata, Lakoff (1987) and Johnson (1987) advocate an approach to analyzing metaphors which runs counter to the classical objectivism used by most other linguists. They would not
define a metaphor in terms of a set of its inherent properties, for instance, as the educational philosopher Scheffler (1960) would propose. Unlike objectivists, who see meaning as deriving from rational concepts, Lakoff and Johnson base their epistemology on image schemata, which are preconceptual gestalts. They contend that "any adequate account of meaning and rationality must give a central place to embodied and imaginative structures of understanding by which we grasp the world" (Johnson, p. xiii).

In interpreting Lakoff and Johnson's work [Levin (1988)], explains:

Metaphors We Live By consists of arguments attempting to show that the question of truth — what the world is really like — depends on taking toward it an 'interactional' approach, an approach that sees reality as something that happens to people and that people participate in making, rather than as some objective state of affairs which one tries to account for by means of abstract, depersonalized theories (p. 5).
For Lakoff and Johnson, there is no split in human
experience between the mind and the body. The physical processes of sensation and perception combine with image schemata to make meaning. When we make a statement, we, in essence, choose a category that corresponds to the properties on which we have focused. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) assert that "every description highlights, downplays, or hides" (p. 163). Each large metaphorical concept has a coherent system of satellite metaphoric linguistic expressions that support a particular schema of reality.

In this study, I will be able to state the underlying metaphorical concepts once I have identified the linguistically-expressed ones. I will primarily search for the conventional -- those which structure the ordinary conceptual system of our culture.

New metaphors, or metaphors that are imaginative and creative, will also be identified and analyzed. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), "Much of cultural change arises from the introduction of new metaphorical concepts and the loss of old ones. For example, the Westernization of cultures throughout the world is partly a matter of introducing the ‘time is money’ metaphor"
[metaphorical concept] into those cultures" (p. 145). Metaphors provide "a partial understanding of one kind of experience in terms of another kind of experience" (p. 154). Therefore, new metaphors can create new understandings and, consequently, can create new realities.

Identifying and analyzing the metaphors used in the discourse on schools of choice promises to open up and extend the current debate on the schools of choice policy. Katznelson and Weir (1985) observed in their book, Schooling for All,

Language neither simply precedes other human activities nor just reflects material realities . . . . Our conversations define possibilities and probabilities. They focus attention on some issues rather than others. The noise and silence of language shape our political consciousness (p. 210).

At an April 1991 Virginia Commonwealth University Educational Policy Seminar entitled "Two Perspectives on School Choice", Vacca stated that we [educators and political scientists] are still only at the stage of identifying and analyzing the issues in the policy
analysis continuum on schools of choice. He asserted that, at this early stage of analyzing the policy, we should only be asking what choice promotes and not what it will change. This dissertation will add to that contextual knowledge.

Purpose

If the linguistically-expressed or specific-level metaphors could be ordered into meaningful conceptual categories, these categories and the metaphorical content of them may be indicative of the dominant conceptions of the schools of choice debate. These conceptions can help us understand better the point of view taken by each group of researchers toward education.

Questions

The metaphors that are part of the schools of choice debate are deeply rooted in various soils of American culture and society. They are part of conventional expressions, beliefs, values and assumptions about American educational aims. It is unclear, however, that they appeal equally and include all segments of American
society. As an undercurrent to the dissertation's main research question, the following questions about audience appeal guided my analysis of metaphorical categories found in Chapters 3, 4, and 5: Are there some Americans excluded from this discourse, because the espoused ideas, though appealing, would make it more difficult for a segment of society to succeed educationally? Do these metaphors draw on experiences shared more commonly by rich or poor Americans? Males or females? Rural or urban populations?

It was important to study a range of opinions on the debate. Once I studied the metaphors' general features, I grouped them into categories using the schemas that George Lakoff (1987) and Mark Johnson (1987) identified in each of their major studies on uses of metaphors and cognitive linguistics. Upon analysis, these categories revealed the views of education expressed and the conceptions implied. Not only was it important to know what was being addressed by the metaphors, but also what was being marginalized or excluded. How did the metaphors limit the debate? To which audiences did the metaphors appeal? Lakoff and Johnson (1980) believe
that, especially in politics and economics, ideologies are framed in metaphorical terms and can hide aspects of reality. Therefore, it is imperative that analysts be aware of what is hidden or highlighted because of the metaphor's potential for influencing social processes and locking users into inflexible and often inappropriate frames of reference.

Did the assumptions revealed by an analysis of the metaphors in the schools of choice debate confirm or oppose a shift away from the traditional educational paradigm as espoused in the report, "A Nation at Risk"? (1983). I surmised that most advocates of schools of choice seek local control and smaller school sites to increase accountability and higher student achievement; whereas, the authors of "A Nation at Risk" support stronger state regulations and more top-down supervision of teachers to raise student achievement and increase accountability. However, some of the staunchest supporters of the Report's conclusions and recommendations are school choice advocates. Can these apparent contradictions be resolved? What story or stories did the metaphors used in the schools of choice
debate tell?

Schon (1980) suggests an approach to answering the question raised above. He sees metaphorical 'stories' as part of the problem-solving aspect of policy formulation. He postulates that policy issues are framed in metaphorical language and that the metaphorical framework is used to solve the policy problem. Stories become the raw material for what he calls generative metaphors (p.255). He defines stories as "written or oral narratives concerning perceptions individuals have about a socially-derived situation that they perceive as problematic and therefore in need of some type of solution" (p. 255).

Lakoff and Johnson's work with metaphorical concepts adheres to the same principles as Schon's. When Lakoff and Johnson ask what aspects of the argument are hidden or highlighted by the metaphors used, they are, in essence, asking what Schon is asking when he queries, What story do the metaphors communicate?

Design of Inquiry

In order to make sure that my research umbrella
open as wide and as high as necessary to cover all aspects of the schools of choice debate, I included representative works of three groups of academicians who support schools of choice; each group, however, reflects different ideas on the policy's basis and/or how it should be implemented.

I used the taxonomy which James G. Cibulka (1990) described in his article, "Choice and the Restructuring of American Education," to divide the writings of the academicians into Chapters 3, 4, and 5. Cibulka separated the proposal options favoring schools of choice into 1) public schools of choice only; 2) public-private schools of choice; and 3) private only (p. 55). The Minnesota Open Enrollment Plan which gives students and parents access to public schools across the state is an example of a public schools only plan. Public-private plans such as the Milwaukee Enrollment Experiment permits certain parents and students access to private as well as public schools inside and outside of regular school attendance zones. The final type of schools of choice plan in Cibulka's taxonomy, private only, designates privately-operated school systems that, as part of choice
plans, would receive public subsidy.

The first study I analyzed dealt with public-private plans for schools of choice. *Politics, Markets, and American Schools*, written in 1990 by John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe has been reviewed extensively and has been cited by federal and state education officials and politicians as offering a viable alternative to our present structure of schools. Chubb and Moe call for the abolition of the present system of governing schools in favor of autonomous schools with volunteer and paid personnel free to design their own organizations and programs. Under a market system of free choice and subsequent competition among schools for students, parents and students would have the legal right to choose among these public and/or private alternative schools.

Representative writings of researchers Dennis Doyle, co-author of *Winning the Brain Race* (1986), Myron Lieberman, author of *Privatization and Educational Choice* (1989), James R. Rinehart and Jackson F. Lee, authors of *American Education and the Dynamics of Choice* (1991), and other academicians favoring private-only plans for schools of choice are included in Chapter 4 of this
dissertation. This group of academicians advocates abolishing public schools in favor of subsidizing the privatization of American education with public funds.

They base their arguments not only on the importance of reducing excessive bureaucratization and increasing competition amongst all groups of schools, but also on the need to guarantee the First Amendment rights of parents and students. According to the authors' views, each family will be able to choose a school which most closely resembles its espoused values and beliefs; the school's educational mission will match its own.

The final group of researchers included favor public schools of choice only. Chiefly represented by Joe Nathan, editor of a 1989 book, Public Schools by Choice, this group of academicians is the most centrist of all three groups of researchers. For example, Nathan served as one of the researchers and advisers on the Minnesota Schools of Choice Plan, a statewide plan to implement schools of choice. The authors included in Chapter 5 advocate only public schools of choice because they believe that schools must be regulated under controlled competition. Including only public schools makes that
recommendation enforceable. Some of the other academics and educators whose writings are analyzed in Chapter 5 include Charles Glenn, Mary Anne Raywid, and Charles V. Willie, all proponents of schools of choice within a public school setting.

In the process of critiquing each of the three viewpoints in support of schools of choice, I also included views of academicians who are opposed to the policy's implementation and/or its assumptions to further understanding of the issues raised and hidden in an analysis of the metaphors.

**Process of Inquiry**

Following my methodological approach, I identified the primary groups of metaphors and analyzed their textual and cultural significance.

The following steps indicate the procedure I used to categorize the metaphors, determine their dominance, and analyze their features:

1. Identified the specific-level metaphors. That is, those that have a fixed source and target domain.
2. Clustered the specific-level metaphors into
groups of generic-level metaphors.

a. That is, these more general metaphors guide but do not precisely specify the ontological mapping. Life is a journey is an example; there is movement, but at the generic level. We do not know if the movement will be on a path, road, or skyway.

b. Metaphors, following Lakoff and Turner's methodology, can be related to one another in the following ways:
   1) They can be special cases of some more general metaphor;
   2) They can map onto the same target structure (For example, journey is the target of the source domain in the generic metaphor, life is a journey);
   3) and/or, Metaphors can be grounded in everyday experience or common knowledge (p. 84, 1989).

3. Discussed the general features of each group of metaphors in terms of what the content and the structure of the metaphor revealed. Also, asked what aspects of
the public policy of schools of choice were highlighted by this category of metaphor? What aspects were hidden?

4. Finally, I analyzed which groups in American society have been included or excluded by the metaphorical arguments.

**Definition of Terms**

Many of the following definitions of terms which are critical to the success of the metaphorical analysis come from three works, *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) by Lakoff and Johnson, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things* (1987) by Lakoff, and *More Than Cool Reason* by Lakoff and Turner (1989):

**Causation Metaphors:** Metaphors which show a person acting or a thing occurring to produce a result (Example: Education has stolen my youth).

**Conventional Metaphors.** Metaphors that structure the ordinary conceptual system of American culture, which is reflected in our everyday language -- Example: I'm feeling up. That boosted my spirits -- (Lakoff and Johnson, p. 139).

**Generative Metaphors.** Imaginative and creative
metaphors which give us a new understanding of our experience. (Example: President Carter defined the energy crisis as a war.)

Generic-level Metaphors. Lack specificity in two respects: They do not have fixed source and target domains, and they do not have fixed lists of entities specified in the mapping (Example: Events are actions).

Interactional Properties. "The properties we directly or indirectly experience an object or event as having are products of our interaction with them in our environment. That is, they may not be inherent properties of the object or experience, but, instead, interactional properties" (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 177).

Metaphor. The application of a word or phrase to an object or concept it does not literally denote, suggesting comparison to that object or concept, as in "A mighty fortress is our God" (p. 851, Webster's 1991). "Understanding one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff, 1987).

Metaphorical Concept. The human thought processes undergirding the metaphorical statement. (Example of
concept: Anger is heat. Examples of statements: Those are inflammatory remarks. He did a slow burn. She was breathing fire.)

**Ontological Metaphors.** Metaphors which view events, activities, emotions, and ideas as entities or substances (Examples of generic-level ontological metaphors: Life is a game, life is a play, containers are systems. Example of a specific-level ontological metaphor: life is a bowl of cherries).

**Orientational Metaphors.** Metaphors which have certain relationships, either spatial or temporal, relative to the environment (Example of a generic-level orientational metaphor: Hierarchies are systems. Examples of specific-level orientational metaphors: Things are looking up. She'll rise to the top. He fell into the abyss of depravity).

**Personification.** The attribution of a human nature or character to inanimate objects or abstract notions, especially as a rhetorical figure (Webster's, p. 1008, 1991). (Example: Inflation is eating up our profits.)

**Prototypes** The original or model on which something is based or formed; pattern (Webster's 1991, p. 1086).
Subcategories or category members that have a cognitive status of being a 'best example' (Rosch as quoted by Lakoff, 1987, p. 41).

**Satellite Metaphors.** Linguistically-expressed metaphors which cluster around metaphorical concepts. (Example of satellite metaphors around concept, sad is down: I'm feeling down. I'm depressed. He's really low these days.)

**Schema.** An underlying organizational pattern or structure; conceptual framework (Webster's, p. 1199, 1991).

**Schools of Choice.** A policy that allows pupils, regardless of their families' financial means or place of residence, to choose which school they will attend.

**Specific-level Metaphors.** Specified in two respects: they have a fixed source and target domain, and they have a fixed list of entities specified in the mapping (Example: His toes were like the keyboard of a spinet).

**Story in Metaphor.** Written or oral narratives concerning perceptions individuals have about a socially-derived situation that they perceive as problematic and
therefore in need of a solution (Schon, 1980).

**Tuition Vouchers.** Government payment to consumers or on behalf of consumers who may use the payment at any institution approved by the government for the purpose specified on the voucher.

**Limitations**

This study focuses on the internal dynamics of the public discourse on schools of choice. I did not examine the many ways this discourse connects with other social realities. For instance, my major themes do not extend the metaphorical analysis to the declining economy or the political status of American education today. Certainly I launched peripheral forays into these areas, but I did not draw conclusions on a grand scale about the relation of this discourse to other social realities. One could say this study makes some micro-connections.

The purpose of this dissertation is to apply a realistic approach to metaphors occurring in discourse on public policy. The study yields insights and clues as to the stated intent and the implicit conceptions of the policy.
Chapter II

Review of Literature

Connotations of Choice

choice (chois) n., adj., -n. 1. an act or instance of choosing; selection: a wise choice of friends. 2. the right, power, or opportunity to choose; option. 3. the person or thing chosen or eligible to be chosen; Blue is my choice for the rug. 4. an alternative. 5. an abundance or variety from which to choose; a wide choice of styles. 6. something that is preferred or preferable to others; the best part. --adj. choice words. 9. (of meat) of or designating a grade between preferred: the treatment of choice [1250-1300; ME choisOF der. of choisir to perceive, choose < Gms; see choose] (Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 1991).

The above definition touches on assumptions of selection, power, alternatives, evaluation, and a careful process of choosing -- all included in pro-choice arguments. The dictionary definition of choice, straightforward though it is, reinforces the word's significant positive connotation. This fact has not been lost on proponents of the school choice policy, including Charles Glenn (1987), Director of the Massachusetts Bureau of Educational Equity, who argues that choice alone will achieve results:

The educationally and morally incoherent schools so common today have been produced by a
public education system that calls on each to find a lowest common denominator of commitments and convictions to avoid giving offense to any parent. What a futile and finally unnecessary restriction!

In the context of choice, of freely made commitments to a particular school on the part of parents and staff alike, it is possible to develop the distinctiveness that alone can support the development of virtue. (p. 55).

For John and Jane Q. Public, as well, choice means control, options, and the chance to evaluate several schools from top to bottom before deciding which one is right for his or her child. The word gives off 'good vibes' to the public; it is one step away from images of liberty and freedom. Mr. and Mrs. Public know they can already choose who to vote for in the next election; why should they not also get to choose the best school for their son or daughter, regardless of whose neighborhood it is in? (Finn, 1990, p. 4).

John and Jane Q. Public's thinking is not lost on politicians nor on educational leaders. If choice connotes a degree of freedom and control simultaneously,
it is indeed a difficult concept to argue against. Even a critic of the public policy of choice, such as Keith Geiger (1990), president of the National Education Association, does not come out against choice per se. He just applies the word to a different context, despite the fact that his usage of the word is exactly the opposite of the usage intended by the proposed public policy:

Free-market economics works well for breakfast cereals, but not for schools in a democratic society. Market-driven school choice would create an inequitable, elitist educational system. Mere school selection does nothing to improve 'mediocre' and 'poor' school programs. Moreover, it would create winners and losers as some students attend 'choice' schools and others are left behind. Americans cannot afford educational losers.

The mission of public schools in a democracy is to educate every child to his or her fullest potential. This requires making every school a quality school so that every parent has a meaningful choice (Advertisement in Washington Post, 9/30/90). Well, which is it? The moral equivalent of deciding
which breakfast cereal to eat? Or the opportunity for distinctiveness which alone will bring moral virtue back to the schools? Sifting through the discussion to find, first, what is meant by the word itself and, then, to find out what educators and politicians mean when they use the word is a complicated task. Merrow (1988) reminds us that understanding the idea of choice is made even more difficult because of its use in the 1960's as a code word to stop the integration of schools in the South. Back then, "'Freedom of choice' was the rallying cry" (p. 111).

Murnane (1986) defined family choice in public education as:

Institutional arrangements that permit a student, in consultation with parents, either to choose among or apply for admission to alternative academic programs, staffed by identified teachers and located at identified sites. I implicitly assume that parents play the dominant role in choosing programs for elementary-school-aged children, and that high-school-aged students play the primary role in their program choices. (p.
Implicit in Murnane's definition, as he explains later, is that school programs be free to all participating families and that there not be a concern for the gain of personal profit or the loss of jobs. Murnane's definition adheres in intent to several other mainstream definitions of schools of choice found in the literature (Lines & McGuire, 1984; Riddle & Stedman, 1989; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990).

Murnane's and other more centrist school choice advocates' proviso concerning the desirability of job security is not shared by all proponents of the policy, however. Finn (1990) argues, as do several other choice advocates, for an unconstrained marketplace promoting the growth of popular schools and permitting the unpopular ones eventually to close down:

Accountability for results is indispensable to the proper functioning of any enterprise. Choice can introduce such a dynamic into education just as it already does in every other domain where it is practiced. Imagine going to an attorney you'd
rather not use, attending a summer camp that you find revolting, buying a suit that doesn't fit. If enough others share your judgment, in time the camp will improve or close, the suit-maker will shape up, and the attorney may seek work as a bricklayer (p. 12).

History of Ideas Behind School Choice

In 1980, Tyack, Kirst, and Hansot, in an article they wrote for Teachers' College Record, predicted that the 1980's would bring an onslaught of reform in response to the unprecedented conditions of declining enrollments, tax revolts, and shaky public support. They believed that the public was turning away from seeing "public education as a common good" and was turning to seeing "education as a consumer good to be purchased in the market" (p. 254). Harris, Ford, Wilson, and Sandidge (1991) confirm Tyack, Kirst, and Hansot's prediction about education in the 1980's and 90's. In their article, "What Should Our Public Choose?" they cite the results of a Children's Defense Fund Study which characterized American education as posing "a greater
threat to American security, prosperity, and ideals than the threat from any external enemy" (p. 159). The conclusion of this 1991 study echoes the conclusions of the 1983 study, *A Nation at Risk*. The authors cite the educational system's "dwindling academic productivity" and believe that "school choice has emerged as a major remedy for solving these problems [high dropout rate, declining academic achievement] for many educators" (p. 160).

For the last decade, the Gallup Poll has shown a steady decrease in public support for education and an increase in the number of parents supporting school choice (Harris et al., 1991). An inherent struggle between private and public education and who should have ultimate responsibility for schooling, parents or local school boards, has been part of the educational scene since the last century. In response to the development of the Protestant-influenced common schools in the 1840's, the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church instituted religious schools in communities with sufficient Catholic children and parents to support those schools (Lines, 1984). The common schools, organized by
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educational reformer Horace Mann, were bourgeois in economic outlook and status and heavily influenced by "Victorian opinion-shapers who were largely British-American in ethnic origin" (Tyack, 1973).

In addition to the extensive development of private Catholic schools, there were Supreme Court decisions through the years that challenged the authority of public school systems and their school boards and confirmed parents' rights in matters of their children's education: 1) Meyers v. Nebraska (1923) established parents' rights to have German taught in the public schools; 2) Pierce v. Society of Sisters (1925) permitted parents to have their children attend nonpublic schools; and 3) Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972) reversed a lower court order and permitted Amish parents to withdraw their children from school after only an eighth-grade education. In contrast to these cases, certainly there have been other cases restricting parental rights, usually in matters involving a "compelling state interest" (Hansen, 1985), but those decisions do not diminish the impact of the three cases I cited.

In 1954 the Supreme Court led by Chief Justice
Warren declared segregated education "inherently unequal" (Walberg, 1990). This decision ultimately led to private school growth in the South and the movement of whites to the suburbs away from the forced integration of the city schools. It was also during the Civil Rights era of the 1960's that freedom schools were begun by blacks in the South to escape the ravages of racism.

It was during the 1960's that the alternative school movement grew in response to demand for more individualized education and recognition of students' rights. Raywid (1989) estimates that there are now over 10,000 alternative schools operating in the United States. Magnet schools, which began, according to Raywid (1989), as a means of desegregation, revitalization, and dropout prevention, were probably the most prevalent schools of choice in the 1980's.

If Americans began the Century and moved into the 1950's with all of their questions answered about educational governance, curriculum, and finance, they moved into the 1970's and 80's in a very different frame of mind. Tyack, et al. argued in their 1980 article for a "renegotiation of the ideological contract Americans
made long ago to use the common school to realize democracy" (p. 254). They were worried about the effects on public education if increasing numbers of vocal parents pulled their children out of public schools and increased their support for implementation of tuition vouchers. Basically, twelve years later, this is what has happened. Although we hear less of tuition vouchers these days, the support for schools of choice continues to grow.

**Arrangements and Possibilities**

Viewed categorically, the definition and implementation of school choice falls into three kinds of systems: 1) Intradistrict; 2) Interdistrict; and 3) Inner Institutional (Pisapia, 1991). Magnet schools, such as those presently operating in Prince Georges County, Maryland, and other controlled choice plans operating within one school district fall within the purview of the first system listed. An example of the interdistrict plan is the Minnesota Plan of School District Enrollment Options; it permits all elementary and secondary students to attend any public school in the state providing
education at their grade level (Riddle & Stedman, 1989, p. 5). Students attending private, nonsectarian schools on state school money, as 1000 low-income Milwaukee students began doing in the school year 1990-91, is one kind of an inner institutional choice plan (Raspberry, 1990, p. A25).

The structures and scenarios for schools of choice are one way to begin exploring the various models and their possibilities. Another way to look at the possibilities and definitions of schools of choice is to address what can be changed within public school organizations/institutions. Elmore (1986), in a study he completed for the Rand Corporation, identified school finance, attendance, staffing, and content as major elements of school organizations which, when manipulated, can change relationships between students and educators. He concluded in his analysis of policy options (with choice as the design) that the present existing system of local centralization of school divisions represents only a very limited view of how students' schooling interests can be served. In the area of finance alone, he identified a variety of ways schools could contract for
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services: A group of teachers could form a school; Groups of parents could organize a school and then hire the people to staff it; Or neighborhood groups could take over the operation of a school (21). He points out that contracting is a common form of financing for many public human services today--"day care, community mental health, employment training, etc." (p. 21).

Taking a different approach, Raywid, in her 1985 review of the literature, found four possible areas of choice: curriculum and content, methods, teachers, and schools (p. 441). Of these four elements, the choice of a school or of a school-within-a-school has been the most practiced. As she explains it:

First, it provides a practicable means of extending curricular and content choice well beyond what usual practice permits. . . . Second, the possibility of choosing among several types of schools enables more families to maximize their preferences and at the least cost to others who do not share them. . . . Third, deliberately diversified schools (or units within schools) also provide a feasible mechanism for combining the
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values of family choice and professionalism. (p. 445).

According to Raywid, for political, professional, and ideological reasons, parents of public school students have had little demonstrated success in choosing curriculum and content, methods, or teachers for their children. First, according to Raywid's findings, the very arrangement and organization of the school had to be changed.

Effectiveness

The empirical data on the effectiveness of schools of choice remain limited. Raywid states in her 1989 article, "Public Schools by Choice," that most of the research done on the academic achievement of students in alternative schools has not been published in major research journals, but remains undissemintated as local and state studies. One notable exception to Raywid's observation is the 1981 Rand Corporation Study sponsored by the National Institute of Education. One of the study's volumes, as well as its concluding volume, focuses on how schools of choice affect student outcomes.
Rand's purpose in measuring student outcomes in the four participating school divisions was to look at features of the demonstration as potential determinants of student outcomes in a system of alternatives, rather than to determine the specific educational features that a better program would have (p. 57).

Overall, they found no appreciable or consistent differences in students' reading achievement or social, self, or peer perceptions. Obviously, as advocates of the glass being half-full, the researchers surmised from these findings that "experimenting with educational programs does not necessarily interfere negatively with student outcomes" (p. 59).
Chapter III.
An Analysis of the Metaphorical Concepts Used by John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe in Their Major Study, Politics, Markets, and America's Schools

Background
During the 1980's, the political and educational communities experienced many studies and reports criticizing public schools and the introduction of many reform initiatives. Although the reports and studies of the 1980's commonly cited schools' deficiencies, they did not provide a consistent picture of what should be changed or how the changes should occur. Consequently, reform initiatives across the country ran the gamut from tighter restrictions imposed from state houses to provisions for the use of more local site-based management techniques. Some state legislatures, through their departments of education, espoused both approaches simultaneously,
providing little financial resources for the implementation of either. The Commonwealth of Virginia, for example, raised graduation requirements, increased mandatory testing, and raised the compulsory attendance age while directing school superintendents to put more decision-making power at the school-building level.

In 1990, John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe of the Brookings Institution released their study, *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, into this educational and political circus ring. Their book touted schools of choice as the answer to improving American education: "We think reformers would do well to entertain the notion that choice is a panacea. This is one way of saying that choice is not like the other reforms and should not be combined with them as part of a reformist strategy for improving America's public schools" (p. 217). If choice is to work, then, according to researchers Chubb and Moe, it must be adopted without the reforms that have been put forth by other researchers. To do differently, according to Chubb and Moe, would counter the effects of choice which require completely deregulated school systems operating in a market setting (p. 218).
At the time of its publication, the book received widespread attention not only because it called for the dissolution of democratically-controlled public education by establishing schools of choice, but also because the authors were two researchers of the liberal think tank, the Brookings Institution. Heretofore, schools of choice, proposed for private as well as public schools, had been a policy option supported mainly by conservatives affiliated with the Reagan and/or Bush administrations. The book and its arguments continued to receive attention in 1992; in February, all of the contenders for the 1992 presidency supported some form of choice and at least one Democratic candidate and both Republican candidates supported vouchers for both public and private schools (Washington Post, February 15, 1992).

Chubb and Moe based their study on the "High School and Beyond Survey" of a random sample of American public and private high schools (p. 22). They collected data from 500 schools and 20,000 principals, teachers, and students to find which characteristics of schools promote school "effectiveness" (p. 22), concluding that student ability, school organization, and family background are the most
significant causes of student achievement as measured on standardized tests in reading and math. When student ability and family background are equalized, then a student in an effectively organized school can expect to gain more than a year of achievement over the normal four year high school experience, according to Chubb and Moe's study (p. 234).

The statistical conclusions they reached were criticized extensively in an unpublished paper by John Witte, a professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin. Albert Shanker, in an advertisement for the American Federation of Teachers printed in the New York Times (1990), and Abigail Thernstrom, in a review of the book published in the Public Interest (1990), cited aspects of Witte's statistical critique. Witte claimed that if one used Chubb and Moe's test results unchanged, and in the form of students' correct answers, one finds that "there is almost no learning going on in public or private high schools" (p. 7). Students from both kinds of schools gained an average of only 6.6 more correct answers between their sophomore and senior years (p. 7). Witte surmised that Chubb and Moe turned the data of correct answers
received into years of learning and from this statistical change showed a difference of 2.25 years of learning between high and low performing schools.

According to Witte, Chubb and Moe stipulated statistically what would happen if an average student moved from a low-performing school to a well-organized school, presumably one that was market controlled. They claimed the average student would gain a half year in achievement. What Witte revealed, as reported by Shanker and Thernstrom, was that the half-year academic gain translated into only one more correct answer on an 116 item test (p. 7). In a perusal of all writings by Chubb and Moe from the time of the book's publication to February 1992, I did not find a response from Chubb and Moe to Witte's conclusions about their methods of statistical analysis.

In addition to Witte's critique which focused on the misleading use of some statistical techniques, *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools* has been criticized by other reviewers for ignoring aspects of arguments and oversimplifying complex societal issues. Peter Cookson stated that the book was written in a "statistical monotone" (p. 157) and Harold Howe asserted that the book
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ignored the interrelationships between schooling and society and proposed simple-minded solutions to "complicated social problems" (p.168). Howe, writing in the journal, Teachers College Record, stated, "My guess is that such problems require slow, steady work over time to try out incremental approaches, and to develop support for changes" (p. 168). Cookson's main point, in his review of Chubb and Moe's book, was that the study was based on the wrong assumptions about "how markets operate and the culture of private schools" (158).

Chubb and Moe theorized that private schools succeed more easily, not due to the students they select, but due to their streamlined organization and autonomy from central bureaucracies. Their study concluded that what made public schools organizationally ineffective was the excessive bureaucratization that naturally evolved in democratically-controlled schools.

Seeing each institution as only able to represent the interest of either the private or public sector respectively, Chubb and Moe put market-driven schools on one end of a spectrum and democratically-controlled schools at the other. "Through American society, democratic
control and markets are the two major institutions by which social decisions get made and social resources get allocated, and they rather consistently distinguish the public and private sectors" (p. 27).

In their system, parents would receive "scholarships" equal to the amount the state and local districts have allocated for each pupil. Parents would then be free to choose which school their children would attend and schools would be freed in this new market system, so the argument follows, of unnecessary state oversight (p. 219). To disperse the funds, "school choice offices" would be established and "parent information centers" would also be set up to consult with parents about which school choices were available. "At-risk" students would receive larger "scholarships" than other students: "At risk students would then be empowered with bigger scholarships than the others, making them attractive clients to all schools (and stimulating the emergence of specialty schools)" (p. 220). Schools would succeed or fail based on the number of students who enrolled and stayed enrolled. The ultimate accountability for whether schools were good or not would be determined by the "consumers" or the school's
"clientele" (p. 34).

Chubb and Moe's work argues for replacing the existing democratic control of school systems with a market mechanism. This is a sweeping educational reform which they themselves believe has little chance in the decade of the nineties of being implemented in toto, given the influence of educators and politicians who wish to preserve the status quo (p. 228). Nevertheless, they offer their public policy proposal as a viable option for "genuine" reformers to consider. Given the widespread appeal of this proposal and the political debate it has generated, undertaking an analysis of the language used by Chubb and Moe in their book can yield insights into the values and conceptions underlying their proposed policy and possible reasons for the policy's appeal to certain audiences.

Using the methodology I described in Chapter I of this dissertation, my analysis of their language focuses on Chubb and Moe's metaphors. The following are many examples of specific-level metaphors arranged into more generic-level metaphor groups or metaphorical concepts. In grouping the specific-level metaphors, I relied on Lakoff and Turner's method of 1) finding the special cases of some
more general metaphor; 2) looking for a common target structure; and (3) asking if the metaphors had some grounding in everyday experience or common knowledge. Virtually none of the metaphors listed could be considered as unique statements differing from the main thrust of Chubb and Moe's overall argument. (For a list of other metaphors found in the work but not contained within the text of this chapter see Appendix I.)

Life Is a Game

Lakoff and Johnson would categorize the concept, life is a game, as a generic-level metaphor in which the elements of one concept, life, are systematically mapped onto the elements of another, game. Life is understood then to be a contest with winners and losers; players and spectators; some who follow the rules of the game and some who purposely do not. Listed below are representative examples of some of the life is a game metaphors found in Chubb and Moe's book, *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*:

Democracy is essentially coercive. The winners get to use public authority to impose their policies
on the losers (p. 28).

Yet there are intrasystem squabbles among the established players, none of whom ever seriously suggests that, to promote more effective schooling, the system as a whole might possibly require an overhaul (p. 12).

As a result, who wins and loses in politics is not necessarily representative of what ordinary citizens actually want (p. 31).

The schools are agencies of society as a whole, and everyone has a right to participate in their governance. Parents and students have a right to participate too. But they have no right to win. In the end, they have to take what society gives them (p. 32).

The American political deck is stacked against institutional reform (p. 227).

The life is a game metaphor appeals to a broad spectrum of Americans who have an avid interest in sports and put a high value, at least publicly, on fair play. Chubb and Moe, in their use of the metaphor, define the debate on how to reform schools as an unfair contest
because one side has all the power and always wins. Even when there are "intrasystem squabbles among the established players" (p. 12), the parents and students are relegated to a secondary role and cannot fully participate and "have no right to win" (p. 32). Chubb and Moe assert that given the rules of politics and democracy, parents can never win at this game and must accept the results of the political contest even when it "is not necessarily representative of what ordinary citizens actually want" (p. 31).

The metaphors suggest that the game of politics is separate from real life and the players are not part of the general American public but are the "established players", who we learn from the book are the dominant interest groups and members of the educational establishment. The metaphors imply that educational reform without changing the status of the players and hence the rules of the game does not stand a chance; "the deck is stacked" against institutional reform.

Changing the game by getting rid of the "stacked deck," democratically-controlled schools, is the way to change who the winners are. This kind of metaphor appeals to the traditional American businessman, who may
occasionally enjoy a game of poker himself. The argument may also appeal to the traditional American businesswoman as well. Though, I may say, stereotypically, she may not play poker, she knows how to maintain a poker face, and, like the other gender, knows the difficulties of increasing profits if the "cards have been cut" to the competitor's advantage.

In their book, Chubb and Moe talk about how in the past business interests relied on politicians and social science research to keep them informed about the state of the high school graduate and how ready he or she was to enter the work force. This reliance changed, according to Chubb and Moe, when business found itself spending increasing amounts of money to retrain its high-school-educated work force. Chubb and Moe suggest in their book that the research community and politicians deliberately ignored the larger institutional questions of who controls the schools: "Political power and social science research had combined to ensure that the reform movement would see the problem of academic performance entirely in terms of the schools, leaving the traditional system of public education in place as the institutional vehicle through
which reform would be channelled and pursued" (p. 17). This narrowing of the frame of information available to business made the business community very interested, according to Chubb and Moe, in the new paradigm of reform involving choice: "Business pressure and generalized public dissatisfaction had pushed academic excellence and educational reform to the front burner of national and state politics" (p. 17).

Support this policy idea and you will be a winner and American business will be a winner, they imply. Chubb and Moe seem to recognize the importance of business when they redefine and narrow the purpose of schooling to one of only satisfying business interests: "How was the United States supposed to compete effectively against economic powerhouses like Japan or Germany when its schools, by comparison to theirs, were so poorly geared to the human capital requirements of productivity and innovation in the modern age" (p. 8).

The following game metaphor applied by Chubb and Moe to private schools counterpoints and affirms the argument for the nonaccountability in the governance of public schools: "No one makes decisions for society. All
participants make decisions for themselves" (p. 29). The spectator section designed for the game, as described by Chubb and Moe in their depiction of democratically-controlled schools, has been removed and, very appealingly, everyone gets to play. Whether the playing field is level and all players have the same protective gear is an issue that Chubb and Moe do not address in their book.

Peter Cookson, a critic of Chubb and Moe's public policy proposal for choice, sees the game of politics quite differently, not as a "stacked deck" arranged to keep parents and children at a distance but as a necessary safeguard against the potential for market injustice. In his 1991 review of Chubb and Moe's book, Cookson argues that these Brookings researchers lack "a comprehensive theory of the relationship between school and society" (p. 158). According to Cookson, though they espouse the marketplace as the best means to organize schooling, Chubb and Moe do not ask whether or not markets are just: "(1) Markets are not benign, but are usually indifferent to the needs of the disadvantaged and can be manipulated through fraud and false advertising and (2) markets do not operate naturally, but are socially constructed" (158).
Obviously, Cookson thinks that Chubb and Moe's game to put schools in the market place will result in a changed deck but not necessarily one that is no longer stacked.

**Life Is a Play**

The generic-level metaphor, life is a play, continues the idea established by the metaphorical concept, life is a game: Parents and students can only be center stage or full participants when the hired cast of political interest groups, educational reformers, and the educational establishment are relegated to secondary roles by instituting a market system of schools: "When markets prevail, parents and students are thrust onto center stage, along with the owners and staffs of the school; most of the rest of the society plays a secondary role" (p. 35).

Education is understood as a system in the life-is-a-play metaphor. Education is not defined as a journey or process of learning but as a product, in this case, a play:

And this is a primary lesson. It is a lesson about the pervasive ways in which institutions shape the organization and performance of all schools, about the value of understanding schools from an
institutional perspective -- about the crucial role that institutions and institutional reform ought to play in the thinking of those who want to improve America's schools (p. 67).

If education is a theatrical production, with already assigned roles and the set already built, then the introduction of fresh actors or reforms with new speeches or intentions cannot shape the play's outcome. The outcome is inevitable unless the structure of the production or institution is changed. Chubb and Moe's discussion of education stops at the governance level. Educational problems, then, are institutional problems which can only be solved through replacing the institution.

Thomas A. Shannon criticizes Chubb and Moe's leap of logic from identifying organizational weaknesses to promoting wholesale redesign of schools' governance structure:

The way to cure this ill, they contend, is not through the American institution of representative democracy at the ballot box, nor by demanding midterm accountability from federal, state, or local elected officials, nor by calling the superintendent to task,
nor by working directly with the principal and teachers, either individually or in coalitions with other parents and citizens (p. 61, January 1991).

Assuming a different perspective on organizational deficiencies within education, Shannon argues further that to move automatically to dismantling one form of governance and replacing it with another form comprised of parent information centers, scholarship offices, and state accountability centers to enforce school accountability risks creating even more bureaucracy than existed before the change from democratically-controlled schools (1990, p. 62).

When markets do not prevail but the democratically-controlled schools continue, then the "one best system" becomes the culprit that murders the school and the school is the victim of the system: "If ineffective schools are truly products of their environment, it hardly makes sense to view the 'one best system' as a savior. It ought to be the prime suspect" (p. 20). Chubb and Moe juxtapose much of their argument for a system of vouchers or what they call "scholarships" against the metaphor of the "one best system" which David Tyack first used in his 1974 book of
the same title.

Each of these metaphors moves the argument along to favor the establishment of market schools over the present system of democratic schools. Once the change has been made to market schools, the players, the parents and students, can move to center stage. Lakoff (1987) would describe this metaphor's schema as "essence is central": What is important is understood as being central; the periphery depends on the center, but the center is not dependent on the periphery (p. 283). In their use of the play metaphor, Chubb and Moe suggest that the main actors, parents and students, are not dependent for their performance on the supporting cast of players, nor on the technical support of the director, set designer, costumer, or producer. The metaphor assumes that the flow of information and resources is one way, to the center. This precludes notions of partnerships and/or reciprocal creative arrangements from the center stage to the outer areas of the theater. This, of course, is not how play performances work.

*Systems Are Containers*
Lakoff (1987) describes container metaphors as a generic group of metaphors consisting of boundaries which distinguish the interior from the exterior (p. 267). The metaphors define the most basic distinction between in and out. We understand our own bodies as containers and as things in containers or rooms within the boundary of our visual field.

Chubb and Moe use container metaphors to draw clear distinctions between the outsiders and the insiders. Their use of container metaphors parallels systems theory which recognizes the internal and external influences on organizational systems (Owens, 1981, p. 61). Rather than using metaphors which might highlight the relationships among the participants, their use narrows the view to what is in or out of the container. In the following metaphors, schools and education are viewed as objects which can be lifted up, "placed in other hands," "filled to capacity," or "freed from disabling constraints":

The system they created was bureaucratic and professional, designed to ensure, so the story goes, that education would be taken out of politics and placed in the hands of impartial experts devoted to
the public interest. It was the 'one best system' (p. 4).

The crucial difference is that direct democratic control of the schools—the very capacity for control, not simply its exercise—would essentially be eliminated (p. 226).

The whole point of a thoroughgoing system of choice is to free the schools from these disabling constraints by sweeping away the old institutions and replacing them with new ones (p. 217).

If school institutions are containers, then they can be filled with things to make them free or surrounded with things to constrain them. Chubb and Moe view school boards, public hearings, and state accreditation standards as some of the schools' disabling constraints.

To Chubb and Moe, the policy of schools of choice represents freedom and a decentralized base of control which originates and ends with individual school populations: "Effective authority within market settings, then, is radically decentralized" (p. 29). The power of this metaphor connotes the opposite of the standard schema that essence is central. What becomes central is the
individual school and its power to attract "clientele" or "consumers", two terms for students and parents used by Chubb and Moe. The focus of their argument defines education in almost service-delivery terms: If the product, the education, is good, then, the clients, the parents and students, are satisfied. What is hidden from this argument is the reciprocal nature of education espoused by many sociologists that both home and school together are crucial to learning.

Use of the container metaphors and Chubb and Moe's definition of educational ineffectiveness as one of poor governance promote a structuralist approach to education; the reformer stands outside and from a distance surveys the research problem. This institutional or systems perspective stands opposite the approach of an educational reformer such as John Goodlad who states that improved education will occur school by school and classroom by classroom. Goodlad's ideas focus on teacher and student empowerment from within the structure and on education as a dimension of human development. He does talk of empowerment through increasing the possibilities of personal motivation, initiative, and stronger relationships
(1084, p. 278). Chubb and Moe speak of power in terms of competition, freedom to choose, and responsiveness to individual needs.

Similarly, Chubb and Moe use personification to lend human characteristics, attributes, and motivations to their containers. This strategy gives the reader the sense that educational reform, be it the good or bad kind, is closely aligned with real individuals with real concerns. Because Chubb and Moe personalize the abstract by relating it to something common and universal, these metaphors can be effective in persuading others that a particular view of education is the only correct one.

In the metaphor written directly below, the reader better understands the phenomena of how embedded the present public school system is in American culture, because of Chubb and Moe's depiction of it as a human body:

At its heart are the school district and its institutions of democratic control: the school board, the superintendent, and the district office. The school board is the district's legislative body and is almost always elected. The superintendent is its administrative head and is sometimes elected,
sometimes appointed. The district is the bureaucratic organization responsible for carrying out the policies of the board and the superintendent (p. 5).

Without a beating heart, a body does not survive. Following this metaphor, the present American educational system cannot survive without the democratic institutions from which its life blood flows. As I already noted in my analysis of the life-is-a-play metaphor, when Chubb and Moe criticize the "one best system," it bears clear relationship to this container metaphor.

Listed below are other representative examples of container metaphors which personify schools:

Schools cannot be anything they may want to be. They do not choose their goals, leadership, personnel, and practices with complete freedom (p. 141).

Schools give the appearance of substantial autonomy, but what they have is insulation without discretion—which is really not autonomy at all (p. 45).

Schools must be able to define their own mission and build their own programs in their own ways, and they cannot do this if their school population is
thrust on them by outsiders (p. 221).

As public authority is captured and put to use by various interests over time, the discretionary exercise of professional judgment is systematically curtailed, and the practice of education is transformed into an exercise in administration (p. 58).

We believe existing institutions cannot solve the problem, they are the problem—and that the key to better schools is institutional reform (p. 3).

These container metaphors as a group suggest again that the governing structure must be changed and that this must occur from outside the present individual institutions for genuine reform to take place. David Tyack, in his article, "Public School Reform: Policy Talk and Institutional Practice," seconds Chubb and Moe's view of educational reform. He too believes in the importance of changing the institution at a political level to achieve genuine reform: "Educators often have embraced innovation in protective symbolic ways to satisfy the reformers and the public and to advance their own reputations while leaving the core of instruction in the classroom relatively
Causation Is Emerging

If personifying the container metaphors personalized abstract arguments, Chubb and Moe's next group of metaphors gave the reader a schema for following their arguments from their purposes in the beginning to their results in the end. In the following group of complex causal metaphors, certain conditions have brought about a change to a structure. Lakoff and Johnson describe these kinds of metaphors as "the object comes out of the substance" (p. 72). For example, out of the progressive education movement of the early part of the Twentieth Century emerged the present educational system. The following are several examples which illustrate this metaphorical strategy:

The path America has been trodding for the last half century is exacting a heavy price -- one the nation and its children can ill afford to bear, and need not (p. 229).

We believe that excessive bureaucracy and centralization are no historical accident. We believe they are inevitable consequences of America's undisturbed" (p. 4, 1991).
institutions of democratic control (p. 142).

The nation is experiencing a crisis in public education not because these democratic institutions have functioned perversely or improperly or unwisely, but because they have functioned quite normally. Democratic control normally produces ineffective schools. This is how it works (p. 227).

As we understand the experience of birth, agricultural growth, or bread rising, we view the end product as a different kind of thing as a result of its emergence, according to Lakoff and Johnson (p. 72). For Chubb and Moe, the failed result of public schools is not due to "improper functioning" or "historical accident", but because democratic institutions "have functioned quite normally" and the result has been "excessive bureaucracy" and "ineffective schools".

The failure of democratic institutions, as Chubb and Moe see it, could not have been avoided by choosing different leaders or providing a different organizational scheme. In fact, the words, "highly sensitive and responsive", are used in the following metaphor to describe democratically-run schools: "Although everyone wants good
schools, and although these institutions are highly sensitive and responsive to what people want, they naturally and routinely function to generate just the opposite — providing a context in which the organizational foundations of effective performance cannot flourish or take root" (p. 2). The metaphor implies that the actual functioning of the institutions "generates just the opposite", mainly ineffective performances. "Schools give the appearance of substantial autonomy" only (p.45). One can forgive these "simple-minded" schools, just as one forgives an erring uncle who always breaks the dishes while trying to help out in the kitchen, but for only so long. Even blood ties wear thin when the erring relative overstays his welcome.

While "emergence" generally implies organic development, Chubb and Moe use this metaphorical construct to put forth a mechanistic view of schooling and its purposes. In this example they describe how their schools of choice will "emerge" and "match the population of parents and students": "The dynamics of entry, success, and failure, driven by the requisites of parent-student support, all tend to promote the emergence of a population
of schools that matches the population of parents and students" (p.34). Dynamic social processes, powered by parents and students, produces an object, and the object is the school; this is a school with an on-off state, a level of efficiency, a productive potential -- in essence, a machine. Following are several metaphors which depict how out of the effective reform of schooling will emerge the machinery for quality education:

Educational reform, if it is done right, is essentially an exercise in harnessing the causes of effective performance (p. 185).

The key to effective education rests with unleashing the productive potential that is already present in the schools and their personnel (p. 187).

It is one thing to know what kind of organization promotes effective education. It is quite another to know how to use public policy to engineer that kind of organization (p. 17).

In their use of these metaphors, Chubb and Moe imply that educational problems are the result of not "engineering" the "right organization." That, indeed, if the right environment is set up, then "productive
potential" can be "unleashed." The assumption about education behind their use of these causal metaphors is that all the "machinery" for effective education is available to use now. No new educational techniques or methodologies are needed, only new ways of governing schools.

Chubb and Moe suggest that faltering market schools, through attrition and subsequent loss of tuition, would close (p. 190); just as when a machine breaks down, it simply ceases to function. In this regard, Chubb and Moe do not address the specific problems of how long it would take for an operating school to close or how the students in these "faltering" schools would fare academically and psychologically in such an environment (p. 190). The argument only highlights the machine's outer structure, not its inner workings nor the ideas behind the machine's design: "A market system is not built to enable the imposition of higher-order values on the schools, nor is it driven by a democratic struggle to exercise public authority" (p. 189).

If out of government-run schools come excessive bureaucratization, centralized power, and
nonresponsiveness, then emerging from market-setting schools are organizational success, school autonomy, and voluntary exchanges of accountability. The following causal metaphors -- some mechanistic, some organic -- illustrate Chubb and Moe's assumptions about market schools:

If we are correct, different institutions give rise to different relationships between schools and their environment, and in turn to different school organizations (p. 141).

The market alternative then becomes particularly attractive, for it provides a setting in which these organizations can flourish and take root (p. 191).

In a market setting, then, there are strong forces at work -- arising from the technical, administrative and consumer-satisfaction requirements of organizational success -- that promote school autonomy (p. 37).

They try to achieve their ends through voluntary exchanges with others, and the benefits they receive arise from these transactions. The key to success for schools, parents, and students alike--is having
something to offer [that] other people want (p. 30).

Here is an appeal to individual self-interest using the terms of economics and the marketplace. Landy and Plotkin in their article, "Limits of the Market Metaphor," argue that individual choice garners an audience in a society experiencing limited resources and increasing social problems: "In a world where collective decisions about the allocation of scarce resources seem so complex, appeals to individual choice through the free market are especially congenial" (p. 17). In this world view, prevalent in societies under advanced capitalism, societal success narrows and becomes equated only with economic success. Economics, then, becomes more important than politics, according to Landy and Plotkin (p. 17).

As Chubb and Moe state in another metaphor which uses jogging as the source domain, "Market signals run counter to higher-order values" (p. 38). In the competitive market place, the for-profit dollar sign of paid tuition vouchers replaces the ambiguity of collective action and political will of the people. The "blank check of public authority" which Chubb and Moe criticize for fostering excessive bureaucratization and unaccountability will be gone and in
its stead will be rational individuals seeking to maximize their own self-interest.

Abigail Thernstorm believes Chubb and Moe's argument runs counter to a major message of most of the twentieth century. Most citizens believed that an education was to provide the means for students to get out of the "crippling confines of a family's culture". School systems have often been "at war," according to Thernstorm, with immigrant groups who either wanted a different kind of education for their children or wanted their children working and out of school altogether (p. 127). These arguments for educating youth for societal needs, as well as familial needs, are not entertained in Chubb and Moe's major study.

Chubb and Moe highlight a client-centered message which encourages parents and students to see the schools as good if their individual needs are met. The market, then, "allows and encourages its schools to have distinctive, well-defined 'missions'" (p. 55). Choice offers an array of institutional possibilities, not a determinate formula. Thernstorm criticizes the rhetoric that emphasizes schools' missions: "[Chubb and Moe] confuse distinctive schools with good ones, and it is the latter that we should want"
Joseph G. Weeres, whose views also differ from those of Chubb and Moe's, argues in his article, "Economic Choice and the Dissolution of Community," that school districts already function as markets. The municipal reform movement created an environment in which citizens from neighboring communities, mainly suburbs, competed with each other to attract businesses and individuals to their communities. According to Weeres, individual choice rather than collective political decisions drives the present governing system. To carry this process and to endorse the privatization of educational services further would "rob the individual", according to Weeres, of a vehicle for expressing a public interest:

Creating an individual client choice will not allow the one out of five children now being raised in poverty in the United States to alter their circumstances very much, because the economic vote for education which they would receive through a voucher would not materially affect their other surroundings (p. 126).

Chubb and Moe do not address Weeres' argument. Their use
of the market metaphor would appear to mask the notion of societal responsibility for the well-being of children beyond the school house's outer walls and past the school dismissal time.

**Systems Are Hierarchies**

The following group of metaphors from Chubb and Moe, which Lakoff would identify as classification metaphors, puts freedom at the top of the hierarchy and control at the bottom (p. 150, 1990). This classification system induces Chubb and Moe's readers to believe that if one is controlled, then someone else has power over you. Being controlled is being kept down:

Bureaucracy is both a means of control and a means of protection (p. 45).

The notion that these institutions might themselves be undermining academic performance, and thus that the pursuit of excellence in education might call for truly fundamental reforms--new institutions of educational governance--was never truly considered (p. 11).

Being "controlled," "undermined," and "protected" by
others makes educators helpless to withstand the outside forces that would thrust a school population on them, argue Chubb and Moe (p. 221). Behind the use of these metaphors is the assumption that social change and changing social conditions are susceptible to a degree of rational control. These metaphors follow the same logic of the container and causal metaphors cited earlier in this thesis.

Although freedom is up, as noted in earlier metaphors, the metaphors cited below suggest the desirability of controlling one's own property or education, but of not having control over others' property. The real source of power comes from the participants themselves -- who can exit at any time and take their tuition vouchers with them:

They have authority over their own property, not over the property of others (p. 29).

The interest group system is biased in favor of some interests over others (the organized over the unorganized, especially) (p. 31).

Those who own and run the schools have a strong incentive to please a clientele of parents and students through the decisions they make (p. 32).

When it comes to school performance, Chubb and Moe state
through their metaphors that schools ought to be held accountable from below, by parents and students who directly experience their services and are free to choose.

Steven Miller and Marcel Fredericks (1990) cite B. Schwartz' work in their article on analyzing the relationship of metaphors to ideology. Schwartz examined the use of classification metaphors and surmised that the assumptions we make about the structure of our society are influenced by how we view the "nature of vertical classification": "Many of the universals of human experience (i.e., categories such as social stratification and domination) are the products of vertical classification systems that reflect the interaction between cumulative cultural expressions and cognition" (p. 74, 1981).

Chubb and Moe, in their use of the systems-are-hierarchies' metaphors, reject the notion of the power of the majority and the power of an appointed authority in favor of the power of the consumer, parents and students. The voluntary power to join a school or to exit a school constitutes its own hierarchy, a reversed pyramid scheme with the parents and students now at the top. This sense of control over one's environment, they believe, would
elevate consumers to the top of the hierarchy. Clearly, "the interaction between cumulative cultural expression and cognition," spoken of by Schwartz has influenced Chubb and Moe to create a vertical classification system which appeals to Americans who primarily consider themselves to be consumers.

**Summary**

The representative generic-level metaphors found in *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*, paint a picture of Chubb and Moe's major assumptions about education. The categories of these metaphors demonstrate their relation to one another conceptually even when each metaphor had a different source and/or target domain. Overall, it is Chubb and Moe's belief that the ability to choose and/or to exit schools through choice will strengthen the effectiveness of schools' academic programs. Competition amongst schools to maintain their student populations will push educational effectiveness to new levels of accountability.

The metaphors give a view of education as a rational, controllable process confined to schools which
entrepreneurs, if given the opportunity, can engineer to suit the immediate and long-term needs of parents and students. Like in a shopping mall, parents and students can choose the educational options that fit their lifestyles.

The democratically-controlled schools are depicted as machines that cannot be fixed: "System as a whole requires an overhaul" (p.11). Allowing new machines to emerge is more important to discuss and study than making the present ones work. The reformers (the mechanics) who try to fix it can not get to the parts due to a design flaw. Business interests can not fix it even though they are interested, because they are relying on social scientists and the educational establishment to give them the tools and methods.

The schools, as drawn in both the systems-are-containers and systems-are-hierarchies metaphors, show the schools to be an extension of individual and family needs. Societal needs are not alluded to or represented in the metaphors Chubb and Moe use to advance their argument.

The metaphors separate education from society and the larger public which finances it. Chubb and Moe abandon an
educational assumption of the earlier part of this century that saw schools as agents of the state. In their view, cooperation between the community and the schools is no longer necessary to achieve educational excellence.

Finally, Chubb and Moe's use of these metaphors hides the supply side of choice. Who will start the new schools to compete with the old democratically-run and existing private schools? And where will the capital come from to start these new schools? In Chapter 6, I return to a discussion of the larger implications of Chubb and Moe's work as it relates to the educational assumptions found in the metaphors used by other proponents of school choice.
Chapter IV.

An Analysis of the Metaphorical Concepts Used by
Proponents of the Privatization of American Schools

Background

Two events of spring 1992 propelled the debate over schools of choice once again onto center stage in the play of educational reform: First, Benno C. Schmidt, Jr., the president of Yale University, resigned the Yale presidency to lead the Edison Project, a plan to develop a nationwide for-profit system of private schools (Walsh, 1992). Secondly, within two weeks of Schmidt's appointment, the superintendent of the Baltimore School District announced that its school board had hired Education Alternatives, a Minneapolis firm, to run nine of its elementary schools. As reported in the Washington Post, Education Alternatives, Inc. is a publicly traded company which will work to earn a profit by lowering the

This chapter examines the writings of academicians who, like Education Alternatives, Inc. and the former Yale president, support privatizing public education. Unlike Chubb and Moe whose choice plan could be labeled public-private because they endorse permitting consumers to select from a range of "government-run" schools as well as private schools, this group of academicians favors abolishing the nation's public schools in favor of privatizing all schools. The private schools would be publicly subsidized through vouchers but could operate as for-profit schools. The academicians argue for privatizing public education to achieve better academic results for students and/or to protect students whose cultural and religious beliefs are not those of the mainstream.

The writings of five authors were analyzed in this chapter: Myron Lieberman, author of Privatization and Educational Choice (1989), and James R. Rinehart and Jackson F. Lee, Jr., American Education and the Dynamics of Choice (1991) developed the fullest treatises in
support of privatizing education. Lieberman is a college professor who has had substantial experience as a labor negotiator in educational circles. *Privatization and Educational Choice* is Lieberman's second book on educational choice; his first was *Beyond Public Education* published in 1986. For Rinehart, an economics professor, and Lee, an education professor, this is their first book on the schools of choice debate.

All three authors bemoan the ineffectiveness of the 1980's school reform movement and frame their arguments within economic and sociological domains. Rinehart and Lee conclude in their book that public schools should be sold and parents given vouchers for use in private schools of their choice (p. 161). Lieberman analyzes the many ways educational services could be contracted out to the private sector, eventually advocating that the entire public school system could be successfully privatized (p. 4).

The other two authors included in the chapter are Dennis P. Doyle, co-author of *Winning the Brain Race* (1986) and a senior fellow with the Hudson Institute, and Richard A. Baer, Jr., a professor at Cornell University.
Baer's essay, "American Public Education and the Myth of Value Neutrality," from which I drew metaphors, is the lead essay in the book Democracy and the Renewal of Public Education (1987), edited by Richard J. Neuhaus, an advocate of democratic pluralism in the arena of religion and public schools. Doyle's essay, which is adapted from the newly revised first chapter of Winning the Brain Race, appears in the March 1992 issue of Kappan and is entitled, "The Challenge, the Opportunity".

Doyle believes that as long as the public school system remains a "monopoly" and an "exclusive franchise" it will not be responsive to the availability of improved technologies to reduce teaching forces and to the demands, especially from poor youngsters in failing urban systems, for better education (pp. 519-20). In his essay, Baer sets out to examine the place of values and religion in public schools within the mandates of the First Amendment and our country's stated belief in liberty and freedom of conscience (p. 1). He concludes that support for "monopolistic government school systems" (p. 24) makes it impossible for students of cultural and religious diversity to receive an education unbiased by
secular and humanistic values.

After I identified over one hundred-fifty specific-level metaphors in the writings, I clustered them into groups of nine generic-level metaphors or metaphorical concepts. I then chose the five generic-level metaphors under which most of these specific metaphors fit. Each metaphorical category does not have metaphors by all of the authors in it. But my categories do contain representative metaphors used by most of these proponents of privatization. (Appendix II lists the metaphors culled from the writings used in this chapter but not interpreted in the text.)

The five categories of generic-level metaphors I identified and named are drawn, in general, from the schemas Lakoff identified in Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things (1987) and Johnson noted in The Body in the Mind (1987).

**Market Competition Is a Success Story**

Lakoff discusses a source-path-goal schema as being like a story with a beginning, middle, and end (p. 285). Typical metaphors used by the proponents of privatization
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tell the story of students, parents, teachers, and/or private school owners choosing and/or beginning private schools, experiencing new-found freedom of expression or of vocation, and, finally, prospering under the umbrella of open competition and choice to achieve the product of education. The scenario is the whole; the source, the path, and the destination are the elements contained within the story (p. 286).

In the following story metaphor, the parents successfully shop for education for their children, purchasing services from several different schools, all within the course of a week:

Instead of taking whatever a public school board decreed, parents could tailor their children's curriculum to their own tastes! They could spend a part of their certificates on a Monday-morning all-boy art school, another part on a Tuesday-to Thursday-afternoon coeducational science school, and another part on a Friday all-black vocational school (Rinehart & Lee, p. 118).

Underlying this movement from one school to the next is the notion of parents and students purchasing
educational experiences that are prepackaged. Given the language used in the metaphor, schooling and school teaching becomes a process of satisfying individual, consumption-driven needs. In this scenario, parents and students play no role in molding or shaping schools through their commitment to them as institutions with distinctive missions.

David Seeley (1985), in his book, *Education Through Partnership*, believes the present public school systems are beset by a service delivery mentality, "The system is failing and will continue to fail until education is rediscovered as a dimension of human development dependent on personal motivation, initiative, and relationships, not on systems and "service delivery" (p. 4). Seeley's comments could also apply to Rinehart and Lee's story metaphor. The language of the metaphor puts the emphasis on the transaction -- the choice and the delivery of services -- rather than on the relationship among the participants.

In the next two metaphors, teachers in parent-run schools are encouraged to tout the results they can achieve with students. Teachers must be able not only to
work with students but "sell" the job they do to their potential customers, the students and parents:

The private sector satisfies the interests of professionals because they are able to offer their services competitively. . . The consumer is buying knowledge and expertise; the professional is not at the mercy of the client. But neither is the client at the mercy of the professional (Doyle, p. 518).

And even if they choose to teach for other school owners, they will be prized and appropriately compensated for their efforts because the emphasis in a competing deregulated system is on results (Rinehart & Lee, p. 130).

The role of the teacher becomes one of an entrepreneur or private practitioner. The metaphors do not highlight the teacher as a member of a team supported by other teachers, guidance counselors, librarians, etc. The status quo is depicted not as a partnership between parent, student and teacher, but as an adversarial relationship in which one half of the pair is at the "mercy" of the other half. Market competition changes the student-teacher relationship to one of consumer and
provider. An exchange of currency and freedom of choice become the defining features of the learning situation, not the desire to learn nor the ability to make a common core of learning relevant. Also, in this story metaphor of judging teachers by their results, how will these results be judged? Given the increased competition amongst teachers and schools, would teachers begin selecting the students, rather than vice-versa as proponents of privatizing education propose, to obtain more easily those positive results?

Richard Elmore (1990), in his article, "Choice in Public Education," concludes that little evidence exists to support the premise that greater choice for consumers and providers of education will, by itself, dramatically change the performance of schools (p. 80).

The following two source-path-goal metaphors support using unrestrained competition and market forces to determine school populations. They imply that the popularity of a school is synonymous with an excellent school:

In a free society, citizens have the prerogative of making personal choices in ways
compatible with their own desires. There are no right or wrong choices for everyone. Individuals more or less go their own ways, choosing those goods and services that, in their opinions, are right for them. If freedom is to have any meaning, it is to be found in society's toleration of highly divergent lifestyles and consumption behavior (Rinehart & Lee, p. 34).

After all, it is market discipline induced by competitive forces that holds the key to real school reform (Rinehart and Lee, p. 118).

Rinehart and Lee, followers of a libertarian ideology, imply in their use of these metaphors that competition and the freedom to make individual choices define the good life of a free society. They believe that there is only one "key" that will unlock the door to school improvement. The use of the one "key" is disputed by many educational reformers, including Ann Bastian (1990). In her article, "School Choice: Unwrapping the Package," she describes the success of the schools of choice in New York City's District 4 as possible only because choice was one part of an overall school improvement program.
that began fifteen years ago. As she put it, "Choice was an important ingredient, not the motive force, of change" (p. 179).

In addition, Rinehart and Lee's use of the "one key" story metaphor hides other ideas about how to improve America's schools from use of site-based management techniques to improved diagnostic techniques.

The authors believe that students should be as free to choose schools as they are free to choose "other goods and services", the only restraint is the amount of money they have. As Eric Bredo points out in his article, "Choice, Constraint, and Community," choosing a school is very different from choosing goods and services:

Because of ignorance of its long-run consequences, choosing a school may be more like choosing a spouse or choosing to have a child than like choosing a loaf of bread. In choices of this sort some of the most important information is only available long after you have made the choice. A theory based on the rational consumer, which uses the 'markets are responsive' argument, will then be misleading in educational situations because of this
uncertainty and because short and long-run preferences may well be contradictory in practice. Market-oriented approaches are then likely to trade short-for long-run responsiveness, rather than being responsive in a more inclusive sense that considers both. (p. 70).

A metaphor that suggests shopping for a school is like choosing goods hides, following Bredo's thesis, that choosing a school is as much a preparation for the future as it is for the present. Choosing goods does not require the "long-run responsiveness" that education does.

Dennis Doyle also strongly favors the marketplace; he envisions an educational system akin to a private enterprise system and describes school choice within markets: "There is much to be said about markets as they respond to the needs and interests of consumers. But demand is only half the story" (Doyle, p. 518). For Doyle, the other half of the story in this source-path-goal metaphor is supply, and for Doyle, supply means teachers. Doyle's story metaphor is of teachers selling their expertise in a more efficient manner and gaining a
new sense of professionalism (p. 518). But in his writing, Doyle considers only the plus side of teachers selling services, or as he puts it, "offering their services competitively" (p. 518). He does not consider the implications of a contracting situation in which a school could go bankrupt. Thomas A. Shannon, executive director of the National School Boards Association, cautions, "Because private schools historically operate without any financial disclosure or 'sunshine' meeting requirements, there might be no advance warning of the schools' declining economic fortunes" (p. 28, Rist).

And, of course, competition is not always a positive force in instituting change. As Peters and Waterman and other organizational theorists have demonstrated through their work in both the public and private sectors, collaboration among people and collective action are powerful positive forces which competition can negate. Peters and Waterman's stories touch on cooperative groups of workers and managers coming together to design and execute better products for customers.

Not only teachers can be caught without jobs, but students could find themselves without a school to
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attend. For the participating students given vouchers to attend private schools as part of the Milwaukee Public Schools Choice Plan, the market place taught a harsh lesson when the private school they were attending went bankrupt. They ended up back in the public school system and without use of their voucher money (Rist, 1991, p. 28).

The market competition is a success story metaphor sends a message that the strong will prosper and if one fails it is one's own fault and not the system's. Brown and Contrera (1991) in their article, "Deregulation and Privatization of Education," believe the popularity of privatizing schools is influenced by a belief in social Darwinism. They also believe it is fueled by a "desire by politicians to move the debate on school improvement away from increased financial support via taxes to a political solution for reducing social conflict" (p. 145).

Joseph G. Weeres in his article, "Is More Or Less Choice Needed?" argues that if privatization of schools were to occur, it would operate too efficiently. Taxpayers could substitute their own dollars for the
voucher coupon and obtain the same services. The value of the voucher could be lowered through inflation and no incentive would exist to increase the amount (p. 234). Says Weeres, "Once set in motion, it would make educational opportunity virtually coterminous with social class. The inequality would be greater than under the current arrangement because more variability in social class exists among individuals than among school districts" (pp. 234-235).

**Education Is a Structure**

Like the structural metaphors of Chubb and Moe, the following group of metaphors used by proponents of privatization treats education as a building with a foundation, a framework, and outer walls. Typically, their metaphors argue for destroying the present structure and for reerecting its walls following a different design:

This is not to say that payment according to results should or would replace payment for services rendered; "feasible" means that we could structure education so that the producers and consumers of
educational services could decide for themselves what the basis of payment would be (Baer, 10).

Their underlying assumption is that the best way to strengthen parental choice of schools is to strengthen parental ability to pay for education, whether in a public or a private school (p. 118, Lieberman).

The two metaphors listed above focus on how education will be paid for, and how it is paid for, is how it will be "structured" in terms of who will have the decision-making power in the school organization. The argument in favor of vouchers uses the terms "structure" and "underlying" to highlight how the voucher system will be the foundation of educational improvement.

When Marilee Rist argues in her article, "Education, Inc." that breaking up the school monopoly goes beyond letting parents choose their children's schools to "'disaggregating' the whole business of education into its component parts and putting those parts out for competitive bids" (p. 26), she is acknowledging how the arguments for privatizing schools through use of vouchers is beyond changing the structure of individual schools to
changing the entire foundation of education as we know it today in the United States.

In order to deliver the kind of educational system that Lieberman and Baer propose in these two metaphors, school boards would become the purchasers of services as opposed to the providers of services.

In his metaphors, Baer develops the idea of the inherent tension in American society and within our public school system between the freedom of individuals and the rights of the community to promote social and group goals. Libertarian advocates of privatization, like libertarians in all areas of public policy, tend to elevate individual liberty over community rights and responsibilities.

The following two metaphors by Baer highlight that tension. They advocate privatizing education to provide a "foundation of common values and traditions" within each school that cannot be achieved within the "present structures" and "framework of assumptions" espoused by public school educators:

Indeed, it seems more and more obvious to a small minority of educational theorists that
problems such as the censorship of school textbooks and the place of religion and values in public schools simply cannot be resolved adequately within present structures and within the framework of assumptions held by a majority of professional educators (p. 2, Baer).

If we have learned anything from sociology, it is that values are related to communities and that traditions depend on enabling structures to survive and flourish (p. 21-22, Baer).

Baer sees schools as community institutions that must be built within a "framework" of common values and traditions that come not from "professional educators" but from "the parents and students".

These last two structural metaphors conflict with Doyle, Rinehart, and Lee's market metaphors which saw schools as service-delivery centers and employment agencies and not the strong buildings, i.e., community centers, held up by libertarian principles envisioned by Baer. Interestingly, although Baer has a different vision of the purpose and structure of the ideal school from the other three writers, all writers advocate
privatizing education as the means to achieve ideal schooling.

**Systems Are Containers**

In the following category of container metaphors, the values depicted fit into coherent systems or containers. As in the discussion of container metaphors in Chapter III, the idea or value is easier to understand because it is part of the metaphorical concepts by which we live. Doyle and Baer argue here for changing the container in which public education has been placed:

Schools should be viewed as an opportunity, an oasis, a place one wants to go, not a place where one must go (p. 520, Doyle).

It simply is not possible to preserve the First Amendment rights of various religious and ideological minorities in our current government-monopoly system. Furthermore, insofar as our public school system remains geographically exclusive and functionally private, the poor will not fare well within it (p. 16, Baer).

I nonetheless maintain that genuine freedom in
teaching and learning will be possible only when government gets out of the business of actually operating school (p. 16, Baer).

For dissenting minorities, the term only (only that which the state wishes to communicate) may not be of critical concern. Such minorities rather worry that many educators tend to treat students as the closed-circuit recipients "of everything (sex education, values clarification, human values, etc.) the state wishes to communicate" (p. 13, Baer).

In Baer's and Doyle's metaphors, freedom, teaching, learning and opportunity are outside of the container of the "government-monopoly" school system. Students are contained within government schools and are subjected to bombardment of state-sponsored propaganda. From "an oasis" removed from the coercion of compulsory attendance to the "genuine freedom" of encouraging First Amendment rights, Baer and Doyle concur that the present container keeps students "closed-circuit recipients" to state doctrine, mandatory attendance, and geographic exclusivity. It is the voucher that will permit students to break out of the container of public education.
Doyle, who used to favor only public schools of choice, changed his mind because as he stated, "The boundaries of public and private have begun to blur in the school world" (p. 515). The container of public education changed from one that promoted the public good, according to Doyle, to one of self-serving bureaucrats who were not responsive to the public's needs. Interestingly, as he criticized public school educators and moved their boundaries over into private enterprise's boundaries because he concluded their actions were no longer in the public interest, he advocated privatizing all education.

Shannon, executive director of the National Schools Board Association, and a critic of privatizing public schools, used a different container metaphor to highlight the shortcomings of the marketplace metaphor: "Americans hope for a solid future for education in the hands of the people, through participatory, accountable, and representative governance -- not in the vagaries and disorder of the economic marketplace that most recently gave us junk bonds, savings and loan bailouts, and the strange 'regulation' of the cable television industry"
Lieberman, who believes education can be best privatized through contracting out services and changing the school board from a provider of services to a writer of contracts, criticizes the reporting on education that comes out of the container of the educational establishment.

Because the media lack an independent capacity to evaluate educational issues, a significant proportion of what the American people read, hear and see about education is taken directly from news releases (p. 349, Lieberman).

Lieberman knows the importance of changing the container from which the news is released if the story is to be more critical of the existing educational establishment. As it is now, according to Lieberman, the American public, with the help of journalists, reaches into a container filled by public educators to pull out news.

The following two metaphors used by Doyle portray the public schools as "slack and enervated" because they have been encapsulated within a monopoly and have not had to deal with the "rigors of competition." Competition
becomes an energizer, an outside force that alone can penetrates the walls of bureaucracy and increase accountability to parents and students:

But I no longer think that the public schools need or deserve monopoly protection. To the contrary, I believe it is time to end the monopoly, to end the exclusive franchise (p. 514, Doyle).

Moreover, I am convinced that the public school would be better off — over the long haul. We do them no favor by sheltering them from the rigors of competition. Isolation from market forces has left them slack and enervated, unable to respond to the legitimate needs of their students and their communities (p. 518, Doyle).

What is not highlighted in these two container metaphors is the part profit plays within a market setting. Fege, director of governmental relations for the Parent Teachers Association cites what occurred in the Milwaukee voucher schools when money got tight: "Books and bus service were cut back" (p. 29) When profits are low, companies reduce services to recover those profits. Fege argued that, "The market doesn't
care about providing public services. It cares about making money" (p. 28 in Rist).

Alex Molnar, education professor at the University of Wisconsin, put the profit motive in perspective when he stated, "Private schools for profit are bottom feeders. They can exist only because public money is not available for public education" (p. 29 in Rist). Molnar sees for-profit schools in a sea of reduced financial support feeding off the remains of failed or failing financially-strapped public schools. Public schools are bound up in a Catch-22 situation. They don't have enough money to adequately deliver services and, because of that, the public becomes less inclined to increase or even to maintain adequate levels of financial commitment (p. 29).

**Causation Is Emerging**

In reviewing the works of the five authors who favor privatizing education, there were many metaphors which fell under the category of "causation is emerging." Chubb and Moe also used this group of metaphors extensively. As previously described in Chapter III,
Lakoff and Johnson define these kinds of metaphors as "the object comes out of the substance" (p. 72).

Stephen Arons (1983), author of *Compelling Belief: The Culture of American Schooling*, believes it is majority control of the content of public schooling which is at the "root of a series of deprivation of rights of belief and expression" (p. 49). In Lakoff and Johnson's terms, this metaphor states that ineffectual and unsatisfactory schooling comes out of majoritarian control. It is a natural, organic process, endemic to the system. The following two metaphors also use organic terms such as "aspire," "create," and "foster" to highlight the perceived failures of public schooling:

Vouchers would probably create healthy competition for both government and nongovernment schools and thus lead to greater efficiency, but their prime justification would be related to freedom of conscience (p. 17, Baer).

As currently structured, education does not encourage or foster entrepreneurial talent; to be an entrepreneur, teachers are forced to leave the field. If and when this changes, we may see the
emergence of educational leaders oriented more to the creation of value than to the redistribution of it (p. 84, Lieberman).

The remainder of the metaphors in this category highlight the "unnatural" restrictions that public education places on teachers and teaching:

It is the one change that will permit teachers to emerge from the shadow of the bureaucracy and became professionals (p. 518, Doyle).

No one can know what teaching strategies and methods will produce the best results until they are tested in a competitive environment (p. 97, Rinehart & Lee).

Brown, et al. (1991) disagree and would argue that all three of these advocates for abolishing public schools have misinterpreted what emerges from any school organization, private or not private. Private schools, according to Brown, et al. do not respond to competition by changing their missions. In fact, according to Brown, et al., an entrepreneurial approach is antithetical to how private not-for-profit schools operate:

Entrepreneurs seek out new and bigger markets
and cheaper methods of production to maximize profits. Schools, in general, do not seek cheaper methods of production, nor do they seek to expand their markets. Experience in education challenges the public choice notion that marketplace competition common to for-profit institutions exists in not-for-profit institutions" (p. 154).

Systems Are Balancing Machines

The balance schema, as described by Mark Johnson (1987) is a visual projection of an activity that requires an ordering of forces and weights relative to some point, axis, or plane (pp. 98-99). "Balance involves symmetry" and, according to Johnson, "symmetry not only in our perception of symmetrical objects but also in our experience of bodily balance" (p. 96). Trying to maintain balance is a desirable goal and when it is not possible or is difficult to achieve, a tension exists. These metaphors used by proponents of privatization highlight that tension and reduce the perceptual field of the argument to what is being balanced:
And, indeed, any act of selection is simultaneously an act of exclusion. But this has a special significance in the context of a government-monopoly school system, with its captive student audience, for it underscores the fact that the school system in its entirety is a kind of closed forum and not a genuine marketplace of ideas at all (p. 4, Baer).

The government-monopoly system in Baer's balance metaphor is a finite one which cannot expand or receive input from outside, related systems but closes in on itself due to its monopoly status. The balance in this metaphor can have only two weights, selection or inside forces and exclusion or outside forces. The monopoly, in Baer's view, tips the scale against the outside forces and denies opportunity for a genuine discourse of ideas.

Lieberman's balance metaphor follows the same logic as Baer's; there are two distinct forces which effect the system: "For our purposes, the most important conflicts of interests are those involving teacher or owner interests on the one hand and student/parent interests on the other" (p. 311, Lieberman). In this metaphor,
outside and inside forces are not alluded to, but the conflicts of interest between teachers or owners and students and parents become the balance weights. To balance the debate differently would require teachers, owners, parents, and students to be "on one hand" balanced against the "other hand" of taxpayers and politicians.

The next metaphor shifts the balance to one of resources balanced against identified needs and desired services: "The resources or income in our society will never be sufficient to buy all of the education we want without painful sacrifices of other goods and services we also want" (p. 32, Rinehart & Lee). Rinehart and Lee's balance metaphor plays resources of income against costs of other goods and services. Words and phrases such "buy," "we want," and "painful sacrifices," are not appeals to a common sense of responsibility and the need for common sacrifice. Instead, Rinehart and Lee's use of metaphors engages the reader in cost-benefit calculations. Landy and Plotkin in their article, "Limits of the Market Metaphor," criticize this use of language which does not ask citizens to think about
public purpose, "Market imagery transforms the public's view of itself from one of an active, deliberate citizenry to one of a gaggle of consumers shopping for policies from shelves stocked by government experts" (p. 8).

Finally, the last two balance metaphors put the haves on one side of the scale and the have-nots on the other:

Indeed, the closer one looks, the more nearly the not-for-profit world looks like the for-profit world, without the nuisances. In not-for-profits with substantial income streams, the participants suffer not a whit (p. 516, Doyle).

We have what Professor Arons of the University of Massachusetts describes as a "system of public finance that provides free choice for the rich and compulsory socialization for everyone else" (p. 3, Baer).

Both Doyle and Baer want to balance the scale between the poor and the rich by privatizing education and, as they espouse, equalizing opportunities.
Summary

The advocates for abolishing public schools and replacing them with private ones stated their belief in individual liberties over community rights and responsibilities. This idea permeated all of the metaphors noted in Chapter IV.

The writers used the language of consumption in the metaphors and appealed to readers to think as consumers, be it of resources or ideas. Whether it was Doyle who portrayed schools as employment agencies for teacher-entrepreneurs or Rinehart and Lee who envisioned shopping mall school centers or Baer who saw prepackaged value centers, all used metaphors that highlighted the importance of individual freedom over civic responsibility.

Using structural metaphors similarly to Chubb and Moe, these writers stopped at the outer walls of the school and did not delve into teaching and learning relationships. In the metaphors, families were not portrayed as the builders of schools but as consumers shopping for schools.
Chapter V

An Analysis of the Metaphorical Concepts

Used by Proponents of Public Schools of Choice

Background

Just as the essential argument of the proponents of privatizing schools is that market forces will create better and more equitable schools, so it is the essential argument of proponents of public schools of choice that redesigning the present public school system to build in controlled choice and competition will also create better and more equitable schools. One critic of both groups, Peter W. Cookson, refers to each respectively as "privatizers" and "social engineers" (p. 188). He sees all choice as a pseudo-solution offered at a time of reduced financial commitment to education (p. 196).

Cookson's argument against all forms of schools of choice is echoed by other educational policy analysts
such as Eric Bredo, Ann Bastian, and Joseph Weeres (1990, 1990, 1990). Those who favor the privatization of all schools also oppose the positions of public school choice advocates. As Mary Anne Raywid argues in this link metaphor,

Thus, the question of whether choice is a good idea must revolve not solely around the pros and cons of choice but around those of the alternatives as well. Otherwise, we will never be able to understand the wisdom of Churchill's adage that "democracy is the worst form of government--except for all the rest" (Raywid, 1991, p. 5).

This chapter focuses on the metaphors used by advocates of controlled competition who favor schools of choice involving public schools only. A selection of writings from four academicians and educators will be analyzed: Joe Nathan, a senior fellow with the University of Minnesota Humphrey Institute and former principal of an alternative school; Mary Anne Raywid, a professor of education at Hofstra University and author of numerous articles and monographs on schools of choice; Charles Glenn, director of the Massachusetts Bureau of
Educational Equity, and Charles V. Willie, a Harvard professor.

Willie, in his article, "Controlled Choice: An Alternative Desegregation Plan for Minorities Who Feel Betrayed," believes controlled choice is a way of achieving the two goals he believes are paramount to a good educational system, "individual enhancement and community advancement" (p. 205). Working with Michael Alves, he has developed controlled choice plans for Boston, Seattle, Milwaukee, Little Rock and St. Lucie County, Florida. Controlled choice, for Alves and Willie, is a rejection of the market metaphor; they see choice as a useful "equity planning tool" (p. 63) which will only work in concert with other on-site reforms.

Nathan and Raywid see choice as a "tool" to improve schools (1991, p. 11, 1989, p. 254). They also reject the market metaphor with its emphasis on unrestricted competition in favor of establishing systems of controlled choice that permit parents to make decisions regarding the location of and organization of schooling for their children. They cite democracy, not capitalism, as their primary value.
Glenn, the fourth academician whose representative writings I analyzed for this chapter, sees the promotion of choice in public schools as a way of creating "morally-coherent" schools: For Glenn, choice is an "ingredient," a "tool," to increase parental involvement and create communities committed to a particular school philosophy (p. 55, 1987).

I found considerably fewer metaphors, overall, in the seven articles analyzed for this chapter than in the writings used in Chapters III and IV. (Appendix III lists the metaphors culled from the writings but not interpreted in the text.) Of the metaphors found, the majority fell into five categories. Only one of the categories is different from the categories used in Chapters III and IV. That category, described last in this chapter, "Choice is the link to the community," falls under the link schema described by Johnson in The Body in the Mind (p. 118).

Stories of War, Politics, and a Fairy Tale

As noted earlier in this dissertation, George Lakoff (1987) grouped metaphors which begin in a source and
follow a path to an end point into his source-path-goal schemata. An abstraction such as schools of choice or educational reform follows a map or scenario onto locations and/or destinations. In the following two metaphors, the present system of schooling is part of a "war" story in which the battle of public opinion has been lost and the system has "succumbed" to "assaults" that "have been counter-productive":

Those who urge school restructuring incline to the view that with respect to all or most of the dangers, the present system has succumbed, not overcome (Raywid, 1991, p. 5).

Direct assaults on the "neighborhood school" have been counter-productive and certainly are inconsistent with attempts to give parents more direct involvement in educational decisions for their children (Glenn, 1989, p. 48).

These metaphorical stories counter public school critics' arguments that those working within public schools are incapable of reform. Both metaphors express the view that the "assault" on public schools was misdirected and slowed down genuine reform. But the battle of reforming
public education isn't over yet, according to Raywid. Both Glenn and Raywid see parents as potential allies in the war to improve public schools. As she attacks those who would restructure public education by privatizing it, Raywid appeals to public school advocates to consider the policy of public school choice as a fighting measure which can preserve the best aspects of the present educational system.

Thus far, little evidence exists that increasing choice of schools produces educational improvement (ASCD, 1990; Elmore, 1988; Raywid, 1989). Even Raywid, who is a strong advocate of public schools of choice, can go no further than to say that the explanations for success of schools of choice are not based on collected evidence but should be reviewed as hypotheses (Raywid, 1989).

The following two metaphors are also stories, but they are stories of reforms which succeeded, in part, because of the public's support. The issues (stories) became part of our daily lives through media coverage and, indeed, it was the media coverage that changed and/or enlarged the impact of the events:

Several of us have been deeply influenced by
experiences in the civil rights movement. We seek a bit of the success and impact of that struggle. Civil rights activists in the South often were asked why they continued despite personal danger and continued frustration. One of the most eloquent responses was, "My feet is tired, but my soul is rested" (Nathan, 1989, p. 12).

Public school choice will not produce overnight miracles, and the Boston experience—like that of Soviet-bloc economies—shows how very difficult it can be to reform an entrenched institution with a monopoly position and a tradition of top-down decision making (Glenn, 1991, p. 43). Just as advancing civil rights and changing the Soviet-bloc economies were complex, difficult challenges involving high ideals and lofty goals, so too, according to the language of the metaphors, is the path of advocates of public schools of choice a difficult one fraught with "danger" and "entrenched" foes, but promising, according to the advocates, a more democratic future.

Because the public schools of choice policy has been
unsupported by most professional educational organizations such as the National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, National School Board Association, and Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, many advocates for the policy could see themselves as the Medgar Evers or Vaclav Havel of educational reform. And, indeed, there are many examples of school bureaucrats opposed to the policy of schools of choice. Carter and Sandler (1991) in describing Connecticut's foray into incorporating schools of choice in the state's public school system describe an entrenched school bureaucracy, "The discussion on choice as a means of educational reform, is, of course, intertwined with the school bureaucracy, which has a firm hand on the steering wheel of education and appears to resist the imposition of change" (p. 178).

Kerchner and Boyd (1987) in their article, "What Doesn't Work: An Analysis of Market and Bureaucratic Failure in Schooling," explains bureaucratic behavior as it relates to choice, "A bureaucracy threatens choice through inflexibility, a failure to respond to clients that is rooted in the substitution of internal goals that
often have little relationship to the social goals the bureaucracy is supposed to pursue" (p. 100).

When Raywid describes the alternative school movement of the 1960's, she compares it to the fairy tale of Cinderella: "Alternative schools, it is said, appear to be the 'Cinderella' of the current reform movement in education" (1989, p. 32). Cinderella scrubbed the floors, took care of her stepsisters and toiled unnoticed until the prince's emissary discovered her through her perfect-sized foot. The story parallels the scenario in which politicians and educational leaders only noticed the successful achievement of alternative schools once school privatization advocates gained political ground in the early 1980's. As Deborah Meier (1991) points out,

"Those alternatives were on the fringe, as though the vast majority were doing just fine, thanks. We (the progressives) now have a change to make such alternatives the mainstream, not just for avant-garde 'misfits' and 'nerds' or those most 'at-risk'" (p. 266).

In the early 1980's, touting the success of alternative schools was a useful way for mainstream
public school advocates to illustrate how public schools did not all have to fit into the mold of the common school. Never mind, that for years the alternative school movement had struggled largely unnoticed and unsupported by those same advocates of mainstream public schools. The Cinderella of the public schools, according to Raywid, became one of its princesses of success to counter the arguments of some in the Reagan administration who saw the private sector as "more efficient, competitive, and product-oriented than the public sector" (Cookson, p. 188, 1991).

**Controlled Choice Is a Rational Argument**

Just as in the two "war" story metaphors written above, this category of metaphor turns a rational argument into a delimited object. Argument, in these structural metaphors, is not a dance as in other cultures but a war with a defined enemy and clearly drawn battlelines:

The primary adversary of the monolithic State as educator is no longer the monolithic Church as educator, with its rival claims; nor is it
individual families as consumers of educational services who shape the issue (Glenn, 1989, p. 44). The adversary Glenn doesn’t mention in the metaphor is a representative family who needs protection under the First Amendment. Glenn addresses not specific adversaries but two sets of hypothetical adversaries drawn from past educational movements. It is what Lakoff and Johnson call the one-party rational argument (p. 87, 1980). In written academic discourse, a dialogue, complete with appropriate use of quotation marks necessary to carry out a two-way argument, is usually not used; instead, the battle is one-sided.

Glenn’s hypothetical adversary of the monolithic state is parents who "often behave -- to an educational bureaucracy -- in unpredictable ways according to the idiosyncratic logic of their diverse values and priorities, their fears and hopes for their children" (p. 44). The structure of the controlled-choice-is-a-rational-argument metaphor pits one "rival" against the other. Our sympathies must go to the unmentioned parent opposing the enemy "monolith" -- a true David and Goliath story.
The following two structural metaphors which make the argument-into-a-building continue the debate for championing the rights of parents and now includes teachers:

Three beliefs are the fundamental pillars of the choice idea. (1) There is no one best school for everyone. . . . (2) the deliberate diversification of schools is important to accommodating all and enabling each youngster to succeed. . . . (3) youngsters will perform better and accomplish more in learning environments they have chosen than in environments which are simply assigned to them" (Raywid, 1989, p. 14).

Choice creates the space for teachers to shape a school that will please some parents very much, precisely because they won't have to "teach defensively" to avoid displeasing anyone. But only if we give them the elbow-room to do that with real conviction and energy (Glenn, 1989, p. 150). The metaphors include words such as "pillars," "space," and "elbow-room" to connote how public schools of choice will "build" a new system or foster new opportunities.
The metaphor's argument is clearly for choice and does not touch on the risks to the public school system of encouraging systems of choice. The "elbow-room" requires critics and status-quo advocates to step back and permit the experimentation. Members of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's panel on public schools of choice concluded in their analytic document on the policy of schools of choice that experimentation with or without watchful vigilance and extensive prequestioning of any choice experiments could, in itself, undermine other school reforms. In the Association's booklet on the subject, they identified issues which, they believe, must be addressed in a chapter entitled, "How Do You Decide?" (pps. 16-29). The booklet's summary cautions against permitting the "elbow-room" without considering the possible negative impact of choice:

Choice is one largely unproven strategy being offered to meet this challenge. Because of its current popularity, choice seems likely to be an element of our educational system for a long time. District and state decision-makers implementing and
using the choice strategy must therefore consider the concerns raised by its critics (p. 32).

The following two structural metaphors speak of "building" and "raising"; these metaphors use a vertical classification system as they change the question in the choice debate from one of how to promote individual freedom of choice to one of how to equalize opportunities for all within a setting partly determined by choice:

An educational system, according to the philosophy of democracy, is enhanced by building up its weaker units while maintaining those that are strong (Willie, p. 207).

Strangely, while the choice chorus includes voices raising the inequity charge, it also includes voices just as vigorously championing choice precisely for its equity promise (Raywid, 1991, p. 10).

Both of these metaphors play off two positions, the weak and the strong and inequity and equity. Each argument is framed within the larger social purpose of equity for students. The effect on the reader is to
credit the writer for a virtuous position far removed from an argument of self-interest or personal gain. Although the metaphors highlight the importance of decreasing inequity for students in public schools, the evidence cited by educational researchers shows, "In fact, an examination of the limited body of research on how parents and students choose schools provides daunting evidence that deregulated freedom of choice will once again translate into the freedom to segregate" (Wells, 1991, p. 142).

**Systems Are Containers**

The following container metaphors, as in Chapters III and IV, delimit an abstract idea within our visual field by enclosing it within something or removing it from an object or a location. Container metaphors can take an abstract idea such as values and contain them within a conventional metaphorical system (Johnson, p. 21-23).

"Parents must have a right to select out of as well as into a truly distinctive public school of choice" (Glenn, 1989, p. 300). The contained objects, parents,
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are fixed in location and become accessible or inaccessible to the viewer by the observer's visual field (p. 22, Johnson). The argument is limited to what is within the container -- in this first metaphor a public school of choice is one container within the larger container of a system of public schools of choice.

The next metaphor portrays the container of neighborhood schools as something to break out of because neighborhood schools hold poor children "hostage," and "lock" them into unsatisfactory containers filled with other "poor children": "The 'neighborhood school' is too often a means of locking poor children into schools populated entirely by other poor children" (Glenn, 1989, p. 47).

How to help poor children "break out of" the cycle of poverty must be done by helping them "break out of" their neighborhood schools. In the next metaphor, good education is contained: "When students are guaranteed attendance in specific schools because of their residence in specific neighborhoods, then educational interests are held hostage by real estate interests" (Willie, p. 206). The "real estate interests", the "hostage" takers, are
stopping their "educational interests."

Paul E. Heckman (1991), in an article he wrote challenging the establishment of public schools of choice because he believes they foster further stratification of students, states that revitalizing public schools requires a good deal more than the one tool of choice, "The creation of democratic governance structures that contend well with today's new realities of pluralism and ambiguity may be more important than using existing economic principles to change schools in a manner that only replicates current social structures" (p. 15).

**Controlled Competition Is Organic and Natural**

Like the metaphors in Chapters 3 and 4, whose writers envisioned causation as emerging, this group of metaphors structures choice as occurring naturally, much like watching a garden grow when the plants emerge from the soil.

There has by no means been an open market in Massachusetts public education; that would almost surely result in further advantages for those whom our schools are already servicing better. The role
of the state is not to prescribe the details of how schools of choice operate but to watch for emerging patterns that suggest that educational justice is not being well served (Glenn, 1989, p. 48).

To the extent that there is something like a market for different types of education, a school of choice can flourish with a relatively small but committed "market share" (Glenn, 1989, p. 156). In the metaphor, the state does not "prescribe": that would be unnatural and inorganic, much like the social engineering programs of the 1960's. Given these metaphors, the public school choice advocates are more like gardeners than doctors.

When things occur organically and naturally, then one can't stop them, short of killing them off. One must simply stand back and do what one can to accommodate the "growing": "Parents are a growing educational market" (Nathan, 1989, p. 219). The good gardener needs to weed regularly, plant the right seeds, and watch for tornadoes, otherwise the garden could "degenerate" into uselessness and actually do damage to neighboring sidewalks: "It does, however, mean that choice systems
must recognize and confront the particular risks to which they are subject, or else, in Aristotle's terms, degenerate into corrupt forms" (Raywid, 1991, p. 5).

Using a causal metaphor, Maier (1991) would agree with Raywid's argument:

The two (education as a tool and democracy) go together, and never has this been clearer than it is today. If we cannot make a convincing case for this, we will see our public schools dismantled in one way or another, either by a misused choice or by erosion and neglect as funds dry up for public education and private schooling becomes the norm for those who can afford to opt out. The status quo plus cosmetic changes won't save public education, at least not in our major urban areas (p. 270).

Choice Schools Are a Link to the Community

Johnson (1987) describes the link schema and the category of metaphors which fit under this schema as basic to our understanding of the world, "We understand our world as a connected and coherent expanse held together by networks of causal connection" (p. 118).
In the following metaphor, the school staff reaches out to the community to improve the operation of choice in public schools:

In this way, controlled choice drives school improvement as a requirement of the school site staff. Controlled choice also requires parent information centers and other outreach methods to give all parents and students a genuinely informed choice (Willie, p. 204).

The schools are linked to all segments of the community, especially poor and minority peoples who in the past have been disenfranchised from public school systems. The use of the link metaphors suggests that establishing controlled choice will cause school staff to engage in outreach programs. But why this must occur, without an infusion of new resources, is not evident. The other concern about controlled choice linking to parent information centers is the bureaucracy that these centers would require to exist. If a basic characteristic of choice is autonomy, then this link metaphor negates or reduces possibilities of achieving and/or maintaining it.

In the following metaphor, school personnel extend
their arms beyond the school walls to strengthen the link to all of the community:

A good desegregation plan can embrace choice only if choice is controlled by the requirement of diversity, and if diversity is for the purpose of improving education (Willie, p. 204).

Glenn argues in the following link metaphor that where one lives as a child determines one's future opportunities: "Geography is destiny for millions of American children; where they live affects profoundly the kind of education they will receive and what they will learn about life in our society" (Glenn, 1989, p. 47). Geography determines the kind of education that will be received in the school house. Neighborhood school attendance zones are linked to the perpetuation of societal inequities. The metaphors highlight the view that school choice is the link to a more equitable society in which all children can choose their schooling, not just those with parents who can afford to either move or pay for private schools.

Finally, the following link metaphor also supports public education's link to a more democratic society:
"Certainly one can view choice as threatening the balance between the public and the private good -- but it can also be examined just as defensibly in such other terms as bringing a public institution under more democratic control" (Raywid, 1991, p. 6). This metaphor establishes the dichotomy of the different camps supporting various forms of the schools of choice policy: Are they arguing for the public or the private good or for both the public and the private good? Is it logically possible to achieve both private and public good within the implementation of one public policy?

Summary

Schools of choice, for these writers, is not a panacea, but a tool to achieve equity, school improvement, or value-coherent schools. The key approach advanced through their use of metaphor is that schools must be linked to the broader community and that schools of choice can not only promote the "good" schools but also help the "poor" ones to improve, all while promoting principles of democracy.
Chapter VI

Conclusion: Tossing Education into the Marketplace

In this concluding chapter, I discuss the major metaphor used by advocates of schools of choice and the contrasts and similarities amongst the ideologies within it.

The advocates of schools of choice advanced their ideological beliefs, or doctrines that guided their public policy proposals, within their metaphors. Illustrations of the term ideology as used in this dissertation are Rinehart and Lee's advocacy of abolishing compulsory attendance, Chubb and Moe's vision of schools as an extension of family and individual needs, and Willie's belief that schools of choice will help poor schools perform better. I did not find in my research that specific metaphorical schemas could only be used with certain ideological positions. Metaphorical
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form, in this case, did not dictate ideological content. It did, however, aid the proponents of schools of choice in advancing and disguising certain aspects of their social policy.

In isolating the metaphors from the debate, I was able to interpret the advocates' schematic structures and understand the aspects of their content that were highlighted or hidden. Without this metaphorical analysis, the power of the metaphors as building blocks of our cultural beliefs may have gone unnoticed. In explaining the power of metaphors, Lakoff and Turner (1989) state,

Anything that we rely on constantly, unconsciously, and automatically is so much part of us that it cannot be easily resisted, in large measure because it is barely even noticed. To the extent that we use a conceptual schema or a conceptual metaphor, we accept its validity. Consequently, when someone else uses it, we are predisposed to accept its validity. For this reason, conventionalized schemas and metaphors have persuasive power over us" (p. 63).
Schon (1979) in his article, "Generative Metaphor: A Perspective on Problem-Setting in Social Policy," recognized the persuasive power of metaphors in framing public policy. He defined the essential difficulty of analyzing social policy by how the problem is "set." By "set" he meant the depiction of "what is wrong" and "what needs fixing" in the story generated from a troublesome situation. Schon theorized that in those stories "the framing of problems often depends upon metaphors underlying the stories which generate problem setting and set the direction of problem solving" (p. 255).

Consequently, for Schon, evaluating social policy meant evaluating not the answer but the question. This dissertation, likewise, has focused on the question, the metaphors which underlay the setting of problems concerning the public policy of schools of choice.

The foundational metaphor contained in this analysis of the language used by proponents of schools of choice was the metaphor of the marketplace. All three groups -- Chubb and Moe, the public-private advocates; the supporters of privatizing schools; and the public schools of choice proponents -- relied on a supply and demand
metaphorical structure. These school reformers believed that parents and students should have the freedom of consumers to switch from one alternative to the next; there ought to be a process of selecting and sorting. Schools, overall, were conceived as purveyors of private goods geared to individual interests, even when the writers used metaphors that acknowledged social issues such as equity.

For all the proponents of schools of choice, competition was seen as a motivator, a catalyst which would compel bureaucracies to change or be dismantled. Chubb and Moe and the advocates of privatizing education believed the discipline of supply and demand would cause unpopular schools to close. In their metaphors, there were winners and losers in the educational game. Competition would be basically uncontrolled; it would be alright for market forces to eliminate the entire government-run monopoly of school systems. For Chubb and Moe and the advocates of privatizing schools, no agency should stand in the way of an individual school's demise.

For the advocates of public schools of choice, uncontrolled competition, even though they portrayed it
as a motivator of reform, is an evil which must be controlled or modified to reduce the risk of making disenfranchised and underrepresented parents victims of unequal educational opportunity. In their metaphors, parents and students were the reformers' allies against not only an intransigent school bureaucracy but also the imposition of uncontrolled competition. Choice, along with controlled competition, became the foundation of their policy.

All three groups championed the teacher as entrepreneur who could better control his or her teaching environment because of the competition engendered by schools of choice. The private-only group went the furthest, envisioning teachers' advertising the results they achieved with students. Chubb and Moe believed that the competition fostered by schools of choice would put teachers more center stage and separate them from the bureaucracies which had hampered their ability to work with parents and students to create schools with distinctive missions. The public school choice advocates espoused teacher empowerment to enable them to shape their own spaces and curricula, a possibility facilitated
by the inherent competition integral to a controlled choice system.

All three groups used structural and container metaphors to criticize public places. It would only be possible to put learning back into the container of school when democratically-controlled bureaucracies were removed from it. In effect, however, the economics of the marketplace overrode the politics of democracy. All, even the advocates for public schools of choice, expressed a disdain for the democratic processes which govern public school systems today.

The container of public education cannot go to the outside for resources as it did in the past when federal monies were available. It also cannot appeal on a large scale -- as public institutions of higher education appeal -- to alumni and foundations for massive amounts of aid. Unlike hospitals, both private and public, it also cannot restrict the number of students it serves or raise patient costs to make up for the nonavailability of public monies despite the higher cost of educating many students. The container of monetary support is almost empty; therefore, advocates for privatizing education
argue school improvement can occur without increasing monetary support. "Meanwhile, proponents of school choice, perhaps understandably, insist that no time is better than now to convince policy makers that school choice is a good political substitute for a lack of financial support of education" (Harris, et al., 1991, p. 163).

In the proponents' view of the world the fundamental unit of analysis was the individual. Individual choice became more important and valid than collective political action. The advocates for public schools of choice, however, came the closest to desiring collective action in their use of the link metaphors which emphasized the importance of "embracing" all of the community and guaranteeing equality of opportunity, especially for the poor and minorities.

Although the advocates for privatizing education used container metaphors to bemoan the plight of the poor stuck in neighborhood schools, their libertarian ideology manifested in the drive for the abolishment of mandatory school attendance and of a common core of learning reflected a philosophy of the survival of the fittest
without regard for societal safety nets.

Although Nathan, Raywid, Glenn, and Willie, as representative academicians arguing for public schools of choice, directly rejected the marketplace as an analogy for education, their metaphors indirectly embraced competition and supply and demand as solutions and, therefore, the marketplace metaphor.

The public schools of choice proponents stated that their schools would be more democratic due to the increased involvement of parents and students. Amy Gutmann (1987), in Democratic Education, argues that school of choice plans based on this premise rest on the unprovable calculation: "that schools will improve -- they will better serve their democratic purposes -- if the guardians of their clients are less captive" (p. 66). As she argues, citizens cannot agree on which consequences count and, it is not likely they ever will.

Gutmann also points out that controlled choice in public schools would decrease the very autonomy which leads to the distinctive missions of those schools. When the proponents of public schools of choice point out both the potential for injustice and instances of past
injustices in choice systems operating in a marketplace scenario without regulation and control, they are indeed setting the stage for the restriction of autonomy to which Gutmann refers. Their arguments, as illustrated in their metaphors, favor autonomy but then point out the inherent dangers of autonomy. Which is it?

The advocates of public schools of choice sidestep a thorough delineation of the political risks involved in undermining an already weakened public education system and further reducing monetary support for education, particularly in urban schools. Apparently, they believe the turmoil and further loss of political responsibility for supporting all public schools are worth the benefit to be gained from encouraging individual families to choose the public schools they will attend.

Although the choice advocates for public schools did not use the term "regulated capitalism" to describe their controlled choice position, I can only compare the probable manifestation of their policy to the implementation by the federal government of the Pure Foods and Drug Act. After 1907, manufacturers were free to produce foods and drugs for marketplace competition,
but they had to be truthful about their products' ingredients and the benefits to be gained by consuming them. The products, by law, must be safe and the manufacturers must adhere to standards of quality from the time of the product's production to the time it is consumed. Nonetheless, they may be withdrawn from the marketplace when their popularity dwindles and the manufacturer no longer makes a profit. In comparing the advocates' argument for controlled choice of schools to our regulated system of capitalism, one begins to see how minimal the common standards of controlled choice might be. Beyond keeping our students safe and insuring fair-entry policies, do we not have standards which seek higher achievement for our students and the schools which serve them?

Unlike the public-private group represented by Chubb and Moe and the private-schools-only group, the advocates for public schools of choice use metaphors that turn them into gardeners who will foster the growth of schools of choice and encourage their healthful maintenance. They are ready with guidelines which foster equity, but they are not ready to increase the supply of schools from
which to choose. On the other hand, the public-private and private-only groups are like doctors ready to prescribe treatment and perform the major operations necessary to rid society of a monolithic bureaucratic institution, as they see it, which reaps all the collected public monies for education.

The proponents of schools of choice made the assumption that public schools and their bureaucracies controlled by the democratic process could not work and must be replaced by a system which permits parents and students to choose from among schools within a competitive, marketplace system. This system "sets" schools as purveyors of goods and services which, to be successful, must appeal to parents and students, "set" as consumers. These proponents "set" the problem, to use Schön's terminology, and, through the metaphors underlying their stories described "what needs fixing" and "what is wrong."

In summary, what sense can one make from an analysis of the metaphors of proponents of schools of choice for the direction of future school reform? If all three groups, who comprise the full spectrum of the advocates
of choice, think of education as a marketplace and derive their ideas for reforming America's schools from economic principles, what lost opportunities of school reform have not been addressed? Is it the case, after a decade of immersion in free enterprise dogma, that school reformers have lost sight of the possibilities for creating new democratic social structures and can only propose reforms which replicate our present economic structures?

Or is it possible to "reset" the public policy problem, to borrow Schon's terminology, to envision the development of new social structures that will promote the use of improved technologies and strategies for working with an increasingly diverse student population?

Instead of schools of choice to equalize opportunity and to reduce school bureaucracy, can not new means of financing schools be envisioned? Is it not possible to amend state constitutions to promote new sources of educational funding which shift the burden from local, residential taxes to state and federal funds? Rather than the marketplace metaphor and the economic principles from which it springs framing the debate on school reform, should we not "reset" the public policy problem
of school reform around the implementation of policies which challenge schools to focus on identified outcomes linked to the new realities of pluralism and changing technologies within a growing, rather than diminishing sphere of public democracy?
Appendix A
Metaphors from Writings Analyzed in Chapter 3
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Life Is a Game

In a political environment permeated by diverse, threatening interests and powerful opponents, bureaucratization was the key to the Progressives' strategy of imposing their own values and protesting them from future subversion (p. 46).

Reformers are right about where they want to go, but their institutions cannot get them there (p. 191).

Systems Are Containers

Democratic control and markets are the two major institutions by which social decisions are made and social resources get allocated, and they rather consistently distinguish the private and public sectors (p. 27).

In sum, the politics of democratic control promotes the piece by piece construction of a peculiar set of
organizational arrangements that are highly bureaucratic (p. 44)

The market allows and encourages its school to have distinctive, well-defined "missions" (p. 55).

Causation Is Emerging

If we want to get to the root of the problem of school performance, then, we cannot stop with school organization (p. 141).

The extent to which schools are granted the autonomy they need to develop more effective organization is overwhelmingly determined by their sector and the niceness of their institutional environments (p. 191).

A market system is not built to enable the imposition of higher-order values on the school, nor is it driven by a democratic struggle to exercise public authority (p. 189).

America's traditional institutions of democratic control cannot be relied on to solve the schools' bureaucratic problem -- for it is not the school but the institutions which are the real problem. They inherently breed bureaucracy and undermine autonomy. . . It is
deeply anchored in the most fundamental properties of the system (p. 188).

These desirable properties of organization turn out to be largely incompatible with the way the system works, and they are unlikely to take root except under rather special circumstances (p. 21).

But when it (choice) is designed to get to the root of the problem -- when it seeks to liberate the schools by means of a thorough transformation of public institutions -- it generates fierce opposition from every nook and cranny of the educational establishment (p. 226).

The way to get effective schools, rather, is to recognize that the problem of ineffective performance is really a deep-seated institutional problem that arises from the most fundamental properties of democratic control (p. 191).

But those (schools) that falter will find it more difficult to attract support, and they will tend to be weeded out in favor of schools that are better organized (p. 190).

In our view, these institutions are more than simply
the democratic means by which policy solutions are formulated and administered. They are also fundamental causes of the very problems they are supposed to be solving (p. 18).

While the sheer numbers and varieties of reform might somehow seem impressive and while they certainly do call for serious changes in school organization, personnel and practice, virtually all reforms, including those in the much-touted second wave, are cut from the same institutional mold (p. 11).

It is our view that all schools are shaped in pervasive and subtle ways by their institutional settings, and that the kinds of organizations they become and how effective they perform are largely reflections of the institutional contexts in which they operate (p. 2).

**Systems Are Hierarchies**

This means that citizens everywhere, whether or not they have children in school and whether or not they live in the local school district or even the state, have a legitimate hand in governing each and every local school. They are all controllers (p.31).
In the private sector, schools do not have to be all things to all people (55).

Standard state of affairs for most social problems of the time ... they only take precedence over all the deserving social problems and attract the special attention of policy makers when the political stars line up just right (7).

A theory of effective performance is the analytical basis for designing public policy, as well as for judging which kinds of reforms are likely to succeed and which are likely to fail (p. 185).

The educational system, responsible for shaping America's "human capital," understandably attracted close scrutiny -- and with scrutiny came severe criticism (p. 8).

Political institutions are the key to understanding why the public school system is not doing its job (p. 27).
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Market Competition Is a Success Story

They (classical libertarians) maintained that we all ought to be free to pursue our own goals and choose things to read or listen to that reflect our own value or values we want to learn about. All individuals in this market should be free to "sell" ideas by saying or printing what they want, and others should be free to "buy" these ideas or not, just as they choose (Baer, 4).

At bottom, choice within public schools is an effort to incorporate the features of a market system in government provision of service (Lieberman, p. 240-41).

To make matters worse, by catering to a wide range of choice, public schools end up trying to be all things to all parents. Inevitably, they cannot provide choices as attractive as those available in schools which focus on particular choices. Anyone who doubts this should
consider what choice of automobiles would be available if limited to those made by a single monopolistic automobile manufacturer (Lieberman, 241).

Franchising is a major source of economic growth in our economy; the reasons are just as applicable to education as to other franchised services (Lieberman, 271).

Eventually, we may conclude that parent purchase of educational services from parent funds is preferable to either the existing system or the alternatives currently receiving the most attention (Lieberman, 309).

Instead of competing on educational criteria, educational producers would compete on contractual criteria: Who offers the best contract? (Lieberman, 342).

Similarly, education will accept the risks for some objectives with some types of students at some agreed-on price, whereas they will not be willing to do so in other situations (Lieberman 344).

Indeed, a major advantage of a market system over a political one for delivering educational services is that the former would be more likely to avoid reliance on
haphazard media and political treatment of education (Lieberman, 350).

Throughout the world, government-run enterprises are a drag on their individual economies. What they are able to produce is produced at a very high cost. Governments can never really know what people want; and if they could know, they cannot respond effectively because of the ponderous weight of the bureaucracy and the self-interest pursuits of government employees (Rinehart & Lee, 12).

If you ever need to remind yourself of just how different we all are as individuals, a quick trip to the local Wal-Mart or K-Mart will serve nicely (Rinehart & Lee, 33).

Since each individual has a unique set of values and preferences that produce satisfaction for him or her, the best option is to leave the choice up to each individual (Rinehart & Lee, 42).

Lasting and significant improvement in public schools can never come unless educators begin to incur more of the risk and cost when they make decisions. They must also be able to gain personally from any successful efforts to help students achieve important learning
objectives (Rinehart & Lee, 82).

Schools produce education in much the same way private firms produce the many items sold in the market place. Both use labor, capital, and raw materials to produce their own products (Rinehart & Lee, 83).

Since education is given away, we tend to overspend and make grossly inefficient use of taxpayers' money (Rinehart & Lee, 83).

Since education is given away and school revenues come exclusively from taxpayers, schools can continue with existing programs regardless of levels of inefficiency and parental dissatisfaction (Rinehart & Lee, 97).

Any difference between tuition charged and the dollar value of the coupon would be made up by parents and perhaps private scholarships. Competition between schools would control overall tuition levels and thus any additional cost charged. If parents felt that one school charged too much, they would be free to change schools the same way they change supermarkets when they think one is becoming too expensive (Rinehart & Lee, 127).

With the phenomenal growth of computerized
networking, students anywhere in the country could have access to almost any expert or resource. Chemistry students in rural Iowa could receive special lectures from and interact with an expert in Boston. Students in South Carolina could take a "live" tour of the Rocky Mountains via VCR or computer with CD ROM (Rinehart & Lee, 129).

Nothing could prevent, for example, a shopping mall school in which students move from place to place to be taught by specialists much as they do now with private music, dancing, or art lessons (Rinehart & Lee, 129).

The government would have the responsibility to maintain competitive markets here in the same way it does for all businesses. Current laws regarding unfair trade practices (false advertising, for example) would also apply (Rinehart & Lee, 133).

A school's profit would be tied more directly to the performance of the teacher in the classroom (Rinehart & Lee, 136).

Education would thus be no different than a department store that knowingly sold damaged or unsafe merchandise (Rinehart & Lee, 157).
The best we can do is make an optimum selection by trying to find the one best alternative from all possible options (Rinehart & Lee, 158).

**Education Is a Structure**

And while we know this to be true, while we know that the foundations of the modern economy are rooted in knowledge, while we know that in the later Twentieth Century human is more important than physical capital, we do not yet have the technologies at our disposal to create human capital as readily as we create physical capital. But at some point we will (p. 515, Doyle).

We originally argued that the public schools needed time to get their house in order; we supported a level playing field, one that treated public and private providers equally (p. 514, Doyle).

Mistake to call schools public or private, they are government or nongovernment schools (Baer, 3).

Just as in an earlier age, Americans decided against the establishment of a single national church by the federal government (a principle later extended to the individual states) so today we can decide to relinquish
our system of government established schools in favor of educational freedom (Baer, 21).

But it (education) can also be understood mainly in terms of the freedom of the human spirit, in connection with the rights of people of diverse traditions to survive and flourish, and in light of America's historic commitments to religious liberty and freedom of conscience (Baer, 23).

In the modern era, school should not be compulsory any more than the military should be—not because school is unimportant, but precisely because it is so important that no one can do without it (Doyle, 520).

Competition and client control must be incorporated into the educational system before any meaningful changes can be achieved, because, as with all monopolies, public school monopolies generally operate in the best interest of those who run them (Rinehart & Lee, 159).

Container Metaphors

But I no longer think that the public schools need or deserve monopoly protection. To the contrary, I believe it is time to end the monopoly, to end the
exclusive franchise (p. 514, Doyle).

We can no longer afford a factory-model school, in which the student is seen as the product and teacher as the worker. In the school of the future, the teacher must be seen as the manager of instruction, and the student must be seen as the worker. The product is education; it can be no other way. Education is not a passive process of pouring facts and attitudes into an empty vessel; it is an active, dynamic, interactive process (Doyle, 520).

As in the case with voucher proposals, there is a danger of identifying the concept with special arrangements that can be drastically modified (Lieberman, 236).

Their (AFT, NEA) support for choice within public schools should be viewed as a blocking maneuver, not as an incremental step toward family choice plans (Lieberman, 242).

At the least, choice must be expanded to include private schools. But to realize its full potential, choice must be coupled with the privatization of public schools. The current public school monopoly must
disappear in the wake of intense competition and change (Rinehart & Lee, 12).

Society is, of course, loaded with people who enthusiastically attempt, and often succeed, in forcing us to make choices in line with their values and interests (Rinehart & Lee, 41).

Causation Is Emerging

Meaningful reform has not emerged from this situation [lack of in depth reporting], and it will not in the future (p. 350, Lieberman).

The current public school monopoly must disappear in the wake of intense competition and change (Rinehart & Lee, p. 12).

The natural limits handicap us, but the artificial constraints cripple us. As we shall see, many of the proposals for educational improvement deal only with symptoms rather than root causes (Rinehart & Lee, p. 25).

The real power rests with students and parents who can vote with their feet if the school does not satisfy them (Rinehart & Lee, p. 133).

Attempts to overthrow firmly entrenched
bureaucracies always run head long into political and practical monsters. Every argument in support of privatization causes the bureaucracy to conjure up new objectives (Rinehart & Lee, p. 161).

**Systems Are Balancing Machines**

America's public school system is a government monopoly with a captive student audience (Baer, p. 2).

To be more precise, the education of the public is the public's business, but I do not believe that American youngsters should be restricted to those schools owned and operated by government (Doyle, p. 517).

Most educators see technology as bells and whistles and treat it as most of us do a car radio--it doesn't affect performance or direction but makes getting there more pleasant (Doyle, p. 519).

It is essential to note some significant differences between products and services. Products can be accumulated and stored somewhere until they are sold or needed. Educational technology aside for the moment, services cannot be stored; they must be delivered to consumers (Lieberman, p. 346).
As a consequence, human welfare is higher than it would be under any other arrangement, yet decisions are often restricted, sometimes painfully so (Rinehart & Lee, p. 35).

All our decisions are made based on what we anticipate to be the relative gains and losses (Rinehart & Lee, p. 42).

Benefit-cost decisions are just as necessary in education as in the supermarket. Students constantly weigh the costs of their behavior against the benefits they hope to receive (p. 58, Rinehart & Lee).

Choice systems seem to fall into three distinct levels. At the lowest level, parents and students could select only from public school options...At a higher level, parents and students could be permitted to choose between public and private alternatives. At the highest level, public schools would be privatized; that is, public schools would either be sole to private investors or abandoned (Rinehart & Lee, p. 112).

A private school system is the optimum way of handling education. It will deliver the most education for the money allocated. Some schools will undoubtedly
cut corners, and some students will fall through the cracks (Rinehart & Lee, p. 158).

No longer should we assume that all educators consistently do their best for all their students simply because they are dedicated to that purpose. We must face the fact that educators are no more called to their profession than plumbers are called to theirs or used-car salesmen to theirs (Rinehart & Lee, p. 160).

In the final analysis, we all make our choices by weighing benefits and costs consistent with our preferences and values in an attempt to maximize our own individual welfare (p. 41, Rinehart & Lee).

Better decisions could be made if a better alignment of costs and benefits was developed. What is needed is to make certain that parents, students, and educators weigh more completely the real costs and benefits of education (p. 83, Rinehart & Lee).

We must recognize the fact that to spend more money on education is to spend less on something else (p. 32, Rinehart & Lee).

Whether in or out of school, every behavior we exhibit is a balancing act (p. 40, Rinehart & Lee).
I do contend, however, that such complementarity as exists in public education is almost entirely on producer instead of consumer terms (p. 347, Lieberman).

**Cause and Effect**

Parents would become better consumers of education (p. 133, R & L).

Technology has one purpose — to enhance productivity. And its effective use will transform not just what a school accomplishes, but how it does so (p. 519, Doyle).

The purpose of a market is to put heat on owners and managers to make them perform to the satisfaction of consumers (p. 519, Doyle).

Other, less successful schools would find their pupils and revenues evaporating and would have to conform to the consumers' choice or go out of business! (p. 119, Rinehart & Lee).

Missing altogether is the hard-nosed system of competition seen in the private sector with its checks and balances keeping expenses in line and products selling at competitive prices (p. 97, Rinehart & Lee).
The crucial issue is what compromises voucher constituencies are willing to make to achieve a voucher plan that can be enacted (p. 256, Lieberman).

They are not against books for the library or enriching the academic side of the school's education program, but they are voting their own individual interest, and the consequence is less money for books (p. 48, Rinehart & Lee).

Media incompetence explains why politicians and educational leaders can establish reputations as educational statesmen on the basis of trivial and transparent educational initiatives. It also explains why the educational reform movement was a basket case from the beginning (p. 349, Lieberman).

They realize that radical subjectivism paralyzes ethical discussion (p. 14, Baer).

In the final analysis, we all make our choices by weighing benefits and costs consistent with our preferences and values in an attempt to maximize our own individual welfare (p. 41, Rinehart & Lee).

Better decisions could be made if a better alignment of costs and benefits was developed. What is needed is
to make certain that parents, students, and educators weigh more completely the real costs and benefits of education (p. 83, Rinehart & Lee).

We must recognize the fact that to spend more money on education is to spend less on something else (p. 32, Rinehart & Lee).

Whether in or out of school, every behavior we exhibit is a balancing act (p. 40, Rinehart & Lee).

I do contend, however, that such complementarity as exists in public education is almost entirely on producer instead of consumer terms (p. 347, Lieberman).
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Container

Under conditions of controlled choice student assignments, none is betrayed and all are glorified together (Willie, p. 207).

A good desegregation plan can embrace choice only if choice is controlled by the requirement of diversity, and if diversity is for the purpose of improving education (Willie, p. 204).

Public school options expand opportunity, a central thrust for progressive reformers (Nathan, p. 254).

But just adding more and more programs and schools is not a good idea if there is little difference among them. Who cares about the opportunity to pick among shoes, if they are all the same color, made of the same material, and cost the same? (Nathan, p. 9)

Education Is a Structure
Not only are large-scale organizations resistant to structural change, but its immanence is likely to remind all the individuals within the organization of their own particular stake-holder interests (Nathan, p. 32).

The power of choice to strengthen public education is brought to bear only if it is guided by a combination of incentives and reasonable constraints (Glenn, p. 157).

We believe that schools can help build a more just and equitable country. After many years of experience with kids, parents, and fellow educators, we've concluded that providing choice is central to equal educational opportunity (Nathan, p. 260)

**Source-Path-Goal**

The debate is not about whether educational choice is a good idea. The real question is whether state and local policy makers will narrow affluent families' educational advantage. This society accepts educational choice for the rich (Nathan, 285).

We believe that true equality of opportunities demands that different kinds of programs be available. We think providing identical programs to all students
guarantees unequal results (Nathan, 9).

A system of choice among public schools, if centrally organized and monitored in the interest of equity, can permit diverse responses to the concerns and goals of parents, different ways of achieving excellence, without losing its common purpose (Glenn, p. 43-44).

The response of public schools to conflict over values and over the goals of schooling has tended to be "defensive teaching," with "the bland leading the bland." Much that gives flavor and excitement to American life, much that could nurture conviction and responsibility is excluded (Glenn, p. 46).

Parent choice can co-exist with high requirements for what students will learn, but not with top-down specification of how they will learn it. After all, parents aren't going to out of the their way to pick a school if it's exactly like every other school (Glenn, p. 150).

We are not proposing an unrestricted market for public education in this state, and we need to make that clear from the very start or the anxieties and resistance
will be tremendous (Glenn, p. 154).

Strangely, while the choice chorus includes voices raising the inequity charge, it also includes voices just as vigorously championing choice precisely for its equity promise (Raywid, p. 10).

As Boston moves into the second year of controlled choice, it is clear that there is nothing simple or automatic about harnessing choice to school improvement (Glenn, p. 41).

Choice Is a Link to the Community

For me, and for several other authors in this book, expanding educational options is part of progressive movements over the last two hundred years which have increased opportunities in voting, housing, health care, and employment (Nathan, 12).

It is not just an umbrella haven for the non-successful that is needed, since it seems clear that one alternative to the conventional program does not suffice. The needs of youngsters vary sufficiently that a variety of learning environments is necessary if all are to succeed (Nathan, p. 15).
Even more importantly, if we continue to hold Horace Mann's generous vision of the purpose of education, all student should be exposed to the diversity of our society in a way that encourages friendship and mutual respect (Glenn, p. 47).

Parent choice is no magic solution to the problems of public education (Glenn, p. 52).

Choice is the best catalyst we know for improving the schools (Raywid, p. 3).

A state or school system seeking to implement a policy that puts the energies of choice to work to strengthen public education must find a way to balance these important considerations against one another (Glenn, p. 149).

If expanded parent choice is not to become an anxiety-ridden rat-race, you and the Board will have to stand as guarantors of the basic quality of every school. (Glenn, p. 151).

We believe that providing choice among public schools is central to solving these problems. By itself, choice won't overcome all of education's problems (Nathan, p. 260).
In weighing the desirability of choice, however, one needs to look not only at its risk list but also at the dangers of alternative systems (Raywid, p. 5).
1. To verify Raywid's conclusion, I read abstracts for all journal articles, research studies, conference papers, and government documents from 1976-1990, using the ERIC system's computerized index of document resumes. Silver Platter software lists each article from the major educational journals as well as other refereed journal and research conference papers presented at such conferences as American Educational Research Association meetings.
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