

THE MEDIA AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: WHAT WE KNOW VS. WHAT THE PUBLIC HEARS

**By Alex Molnar
Professor and Director
Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee**

**Presented at the 2001 AERA annual meeting, Seattle, Wash.
April 11, 2001**

ABSTRACT

News reports of education research frequently do not appear to take account of whether such research is peer reviewed. Various education research journals and research organizations that release research on education topics were surveyed to determine whether they subject their research to external peer review. While journals responding consistently employed peer review processes, only some research organizations did. Of four organizations widely perceived as having an ideological stance, only one reported subjecting its research to outside peer review. Research organizations, whether their work was peer-reviewed or not, employed a variety of media strategies to draw attention to their work. Journals with rigorous peer review processes did not report sophisticated strategies to draw media attention to their findings. The absence of consistent peer review in education research that succeeds in winning public attention creates a risk that sound policy may be subverted by the promotion of priorities that are not founded on solid social science research or that do not rely the best available research knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

In February 2001, The Manhattan Institute and researcher Jay P. Greene released a report on Florida's "A-Plus" education reform program. In the report, "An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program,"¹ Greene calculated that "schools receiving a failing grade from the state in 1999 and whose students would have been offered tuition vouchers if they failed a second time achieved test score gains more than twice as large as those achieved by other schools."² He concludes that the threat of vouchers motivated the poorest-performing schools to improve.³ The report was written under a contract with Florida State University as part of a grant from the Florida Department of Education to evaluate the A-Plus Program.⁴

Greene's report received extensive publicity.⁵ At least one account, published in the nationally circulated daily *USA Today*, presented no dissenting point of view.⁶ Within a few weeks, however, two articles were published challenging the initial report's methodology and conclusions. Both articles called into question the statistical methodology of Greene's original study, and presented alternative explanations for his findings.⁷ Unlike the Greene report, the two critical articles were published in a refereed academic journal. Those articles received no publicity in the general interest press.⁸

The Greene report and its reception in the media illustrate a larger challenge that education researchers, policymakers and the general public face. Over the past two decades, reports produced by national and state private think tanks and policy organizations have played an increasingly important role in shaping education policy. Examples of reports on education policy issued by private organizations over the past couple of years include: "Report Card on American Education: A State by State Analysis, 1976-1999" (American Legislative Exchange Council, April 2000); "The State of State Standards" (Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, January 2000); "Choice and Community: The Racial, Economic, and Religious Context of Parental Choice in Cleveland" (Buckeye Institute, November 1999); "Why a 'Super' Ed-Flex Program Is Needed to Boost Academic Achievement" (Heritage Foundation, March 1999).

To increase their impact, private policy organizations often disseminate and promote each other's work. For example, the "Super Ed-Flex" program (later renamed "Straight A's") advanced by the Heritage Foundation in its March 1999 report was followed by "Why We Need 'Straight A's'," issued by the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation in May 1999. The Fordham document is the text of testimony by Chester E. Finn, Jr., given before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and the Workforce, May 20, 1999. The testimony subsequently provided the basis for op-ed articles that appeared in the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *Washington Times*, among other publications.

Yet amid the welter of such reports and media coverage of them, there seem to be few guideposts for readers to measure the quality of the information that they are receiving.

To publish the results of research in academic journals, social scientists must subject their findings to outside review by others in their discipline. This system of external review is generally regarded as an important tool for quality control in scientific research. Certainly, peer-reviewed work may become subject to disputes over conclusions or methodology. Even so, subjecting research to outside review can help ensure that it is well founded and that its findings are the result of sound, reliable and tested methods. Indeed, external review and subsequent professional publication can be generally regarded as prerequisites for a piece of research to be taken seriously enough for others to follow up and attempt to replicate its findings.

Because much of the work produced by public policy organizations is not published in recognized, refereed academic journals, however, the general public and policy makers alike lack any sort of yardstick by which they can measure its quality. This fact raises the

question of whether the research produced by these organizations, so successful in gaining media attention, is in fact subject to objective outside review at all.

The question is important because the distribution of policy reports not subject to a peer review process carries with it a risk that sound policy may be subverted. Such reports may promote priorities that are not founded on solid social science research or that do not rely the best available research knowledge. Often policy reports issued by private think tanks are prominently featured in media stories, whereas any scholarly response normally occurs much later and is commonly little noticed by either the press or by policy makers.

This report summarizes the findings of two brief studies. The first is a case study in the media treatment of a particular research report on education policy, the Greene report on Florida's voucher program noted above. The second is a brief survey of the peer review procedures employed by representative organizations and journals.

THE FLORIDA VOUCHER REPORT CASE STUDY

Searches on Lexis-Nexis and Education Abstracts were conducted for the period between Feb. 15, 2001, when the Greene study was released, and April 11, 2001, when the searches were conducted, using various search terms appropriate to the Greene report on Florida's plan. In addition, articles were retrieved through links from the Web site of the Manhattan Institute, which published the Greene paper. Details of the search methods and findings are set forth in Appendix A.

Articles retrieved in the search were read and categorized by the author as follows: Items that reported the Greene-Florida study's findings uncritically, with little or no comment from authoritative sources calling its findings into question, were designated "Pro." Items that appeared to balance discussion of the study's findings with other points of view, including critical assessments, were designated "Neutral." Items that consisted largely of comments or arguments questioning the findings were designated "Con."

As might be expected, the large volume of reports on the study appeared in the first few days after its publication, which was promoted by a press release nationally distributed by a public relations news service and funded by an organization openly established to promote private school vouchers. News coverage tapered off significantly thereafter.

Among news stories that were turned up during the search, 11 were rated as "Pro" and 10 as "Neutral" using the above criteria. A single news story was rated "Con." Among commentaries, six were rated "Pro" and two "Con." It should be noted that all three of the "Con" items appeared in a single publication, a newspaper in Palm Beach, Fla.

As already noted, none of the mainstream print media that turned up in the search covered either of the academic articles that questioned the Greene report's methodology and conclusions. Both articles were published after the wave of publicity surrounding the Greene report.

THE PEER REVIEW SURVEY

To examine the quality of research currently produced by various organizations and publications, the Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation undertook a survey of peer review procedures employed by several such entities. The survey also inquired about media strategies and methods of making the public aware of research findings produced or published by these organizations and journals.

METHODOLOGY

Sixteen organizations or journals were selected for structured interviews. The content of each interview was the same, with appropriate changes made depending on whether the interview subject was the editor of a journal or a designated representative of a research organization. (See interview form, Appendix B.) Varying follow-up questions were asked to clarify responses to the initial questions.

Interview subjects were chosen to reflect a cross-section of publications and research organizations whose work bears on issues in education and education policy. (See lists of respondents and non-respondents, Appendix C.) Subjects included academic journals; academically based research organizations; and independent research organizations established primarily to influence policy-makers.

RESULTS

Of the 16 organizations or publications selected for the survey, nine had provided responses by April 2, 2001.

The remaining seven did not respond to at least three contacts by telephone or e-mail, or else indicated they would not participate in the survey. It is hoped that this report can be updated in the future with responses from previously non-responding organizations or publications, and by extending the survey to other organizations or publications not previously contacted.

A table of the survey results from organizations that responded follows:⁹

Respondent	Category	Peer review? Details	Media Strategy
<i>Education Policy Analysis Archives</i>	Journal	Yes. Blind copies of submissions go to editorial board members for review and comments.	None. Some education journalists are subscribers.

Respondent	Category	Peer review? Details	Media Strategy
<i>Journal of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>	Journal	Yes. Blind copies of submissions are submitted to outside reviewers, selected by subject matter.	None. Education journalists are assumed to be subscribers.
Rand Corp.	Research organization	Yes. Copies of submissions are submitted to at least two outside reviewers for technical review and then are reviewed by two internal officials of the institution.	Varies with work product. May range from simply publishing on the Web to more formal press-notification strategies.
Consortium for Policy Research and Education	Research organization	Yes. Reports are reviewed internally, then submitted to two or three outside reviewers for evaluation of technical matters, methodology, assumptions and other matters.	None.
Brookings Institution	Research organization	Yes. Each submission is reviewed by three people selected on the basis of topic from inside or outside the institution.	Varies with work product. Include public forums for press and policymakers, press releases, and paid advertising.

Respondent	Category	Peer review? Details	Media Strategy
Heritage Foundation	Research organization	Submissions are reviewed internally but not sent to outside reviewers.	Varies with work product. Some reports become the basis of events or press conferences; all reports are delivered to media lists kept by individual departments in the foundation, as well as to members of Congress and others.
Hoover Institution	Research organization	No, except for work submitted by an outside researcher (a rarity).	Press releases, book tours and a public relations contractor.
Thomas B. Fordham Foundation	Research organization	No, although sponsored research may be submitted to peer-reviewed journals after release.	Quarterly mailings to lists that include journalists; press events as warranted by specific projects.
Economic Policy Institute	Research organization	Yes. Research is sent to at least three outside reviewers chosen for technical expertise in the subject, and may be sent to organizations and individuals whose interests bear on the subject.	Individual strategies are constructed for all research projects and may include press releases, conferences, and book tours.

Of the nine organizations responding, two were journals and seven were independent research organizations. Of the research organizations, three are generally viewed as non-ideological in nature (Rand, Brookings, and the Consortium for Policy Research and Education [CPRE]), while four are generally considered to reflect a political or ideological outlook (The Heritage Foundation, the Hoover Institution, the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, and the Economic Policy Institute [EPI]). Heritage, Hoover and Fordham all may be fairly characterized as conservative, while the EPI may be fairly characterized as liberal.

Both journals, as well as the three non-ideological organizations, Rand, Brookings, and CPRE, all reported having mechanisms for peer review or outside review of research. Of the other four research organizations, only one, the Economic Policy Institute, reported mechanisms for outside peer review.

Media strategies could be found both in organizations with peer review and in those lacking peer review. The two journals, responding to the survey lacked media strategies, beyond simply assuming that education journalists received the publications. CPRE also reported no strategy targeting the general media. Other research organizations' strategies varied, but whether categorized as ideological or non-ideological, and whether or not they required external review, their media strategies were considerably more sophisticated than those of the peer-reviewed journals.

DISCUSSION

While this initial survey was limited in its scope, its results were not surprising. It is clear that at least three organizations whose reports on education subjects are the subject of media attention – and in many cases have produced broad-based declarations of what does and does not work in education reform – have no process for conducting the kind of peer review and expert scrutiny of their work that is an important benchmark of social science research and that is a requirement for publication in journals such as *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* or *American Educational Research Journal*.

Meanwhile, the journals where the most rigorous policy analyses are published may convey their findings to the education press routinely, but lack any formal strategies to draw their findings to the attention of such opinion leaders.

The danger posed by widely publicized non peer-reviewed reports has been the subject of considerable discussion. Recent articles and essays addressing the issue include: “Oops, Sorry: Seems That My Pie Chart Is Half-Baked,” Patricia Cohen, *New York Times*, April 8, 2000; “Reckonings: How to Be a Hack,” Paul Krugman, *New York Times*, April 23, 2000; “They Blinded Me with Political Science: On the Use of Non peer-Reviewed Research in Education Policy,” Ed Muir, *PS*, December, 1999; and “Without Peer,” Christopher Shea, *Lingua Franca*, April 2000.

This state of affairs might best be understood by analogy. Each week, news organizations publish articles about some of the newest findings of medical researchers. Among the principal sources for these articles are the two most influential medical journals, the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and the *New England Journal of Medicine*. Like virtually all other scientific journals, both publications require submissions to undergo peer review.

We do not see routinely published in the mainstream media unscrutinized claims for novel or “fringe” medical treatments or practices that have not been subject to such peer review. When such treatments are covered in news or feature stories, they are almost

always in a context that includes at least some references to the findings of peer-reviewed research pertaining to the topic at hand.

Yet such discrimination does not seem to be in evidence in coverage of education research. Its absence is reflected in the case study of coverage of the Greene paper. “Peer review” of the paper came in the form of two academic articles that were themselves subject to peer review. These were published three and four weeks, respectively, after the Greene report’s release. This is extraordinarily quick for an academic response; nevertheless, the two follow-up reports did not themselves receive media attention, except for a single article in *Education Week*.

There remain several avenues for further inquiry. First, the survey of peer review practices would benefit from a larger sample, by extending its reach to additional respondents and by encouraging non-respondents to participate. Second, these findings suggest two potentially fruitful other surveys, both directed at the news media themselves. One would be a review of all articles in select news publications, on broadcast news shows, or both, over a representative time period to establish the relative volume of coverage of education research from peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed sources. Another would be to survey editors and journalists to learn what standards they employ in assessing whether to cover particular research reports, and whether the presence of peer-review standards enters into that consideration.

Appendix A

Press Coverage of “An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program” by Jay P. Greene and of the Scholarly Response to Greene

February 15, 2001 – April 11, 2001

Greene, Jay. (Feb. 15, 2001). “An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program.” Manhattan Institute. Program on Educational Policy and Governance. Available: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_aplus.htm.

Feb. 15, 2001

Public Relations Service

“New Research Reveals Vouchers Motivate Florida Public Schools to Improve Academic Achievement.” PR Newswire Association, Inc. *** (Press release from the Milton and Rose D. Friedman Foundation, an organization supporting private school vouchers.)

Newspaper/Magazine Article

“Journal: Proof Competition Aids Public Schools.” The Atlanta Journal-Constitution (daily newspaper)* **Pro**

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

Lynch, Michael W. “How Vouchers Passed Their Florida Test.” Reason Magazine (monthly magazine)* **Pro**

Feb. 16, 2001

News Service

“Manhattan Institute Study Finds Voucher Threat Spurred Florida’s Worst Performing Schools to Do Better.” The Bulletin’s Frontrunner*** **Neutral**

Royse, David. “Study: Failing Fla. Schools Improved.” [Associated Press - AP Online]** **Pro**

Newspaper/Magazine Article

Billups, Andrea. “Study Backs Jeb Bush’s Voucher Program.” The Washington Times (daily newspaper)** **Pro**

Brown, Marilyn. “Study Says Fear of Vouchers Drives Fla. Schools to Improve.” The Tampa Tribune (daily newspaper)** **Neutral**

Flannery, Mary Ellen. “Educators: Vouchers Threat Didn’t Spur Schools’ Progress.” The Palm Beach Post (daily newspaper)** **Con**

Greenberger, Scott S. "Voucher Backers Tout Fla. Scores." The Boston Globe (daily newspaper)**
Neutral

Hegarty, Stephen. "Study Finds Voucher Threat Effective." St. Petersburg Times (daily newspaper)**
Neutral

Henry, Tamara. "Florida Schools Shape Up Amid Voucher Threat, Findings Could Boost Bush's National Plan." USA Today (daily newspaper)** *Pro*

Kelly, Pat. "Voucher Program Boosting Scores." Bradenton (Florida) Herald (daily newspaper)***
Pro

Newcomb, Amelia & Rowan, Robin. "In Florida, Lessons on Vouchers." The Christian Science Monitor (daily newspaper)** *Neutral*

Royse, David. "Study: Failing Schools Improved Twice as Much as Other Schools." Tampa Bay Tribune (daily newspaper)** *Pro*

Royse, David. "Study Shows F Schools Make Greater Progress." Tallahassee Democrat (daily newspaper)* *Pro* (AP)

Schemo, Diana Jean. "Threat of Vouchers Motivates Schools to Improve, Study Says." The New York Times (daily newspaper)** *Neutral*

Schouten, Fredreka. "Threat of Vouchers Does Work: State-Funded Survey Evaluates Failing Schools." Pensacola News Journal (daily newspaper)* *Pro*

February 18, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Article

Schouten, Fredreka. "Study Says Voucher Threat Motivated Schools To Improve." The Indianapolis Star (daily newspaper)*** *Neutral*

Manuel, Marlon. "Voucher Schools Fighting to Survive; Being at the Forefront of a National Debate Over Education Takes a Toll on Florida Community." The Atlanta Journal-Constitution (daily newspaper)*** *Neutral*

February 20, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

VerSteeg, Jac Wilder. "A Stretch to Vouch for Vouchers." The Palm Beach Post (daily newspaper)***
Con

February 21, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

Flicker, Aaron. "Good News From... Florida?" The Post. (daily newspaper published by Ohio University, Athens, OH) via University Wire*** *Pro*

Greene, Jay P. "Bush's School Plan: Why We Know It Will Work." New York Post (daily newspaper)* **Pro**

Education Press Article

Sandham, Jessica L. "Study Finds 'Voucher Effect' in Florida Test Gains." Education Week Vol. 20, No. 23, p. 12, 15*** **Neutral**

February 22, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Article

Lopez, Kathryn Jean. "Bush Ed Plan Rates an 'A': An Interview with Jay Greene." National Review (bi-weekly magazine)* **Pro**

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

"Voucher Study Doesn't Make Case for Vouchers." The Palm Beach Post (daily newspaper)*** **Con**

February 23, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

"Voucher Victories: Florida Program Motivates Public Schools." The Daily Oklahoman (daily newspaper)*** **Pro**

February 27, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Article

Henry, Tamara & Kasindorf, Martin. "Testing Could Be the Test for Bush Plan. The Debate: Are Exams the Way to Hold Schools Accountable for Student Achievement?" USA Today (daily newspaper)*** (Section on Greene Voucher research) **Pro**

February 28, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

Lynch, Michael W. "Vouchers Raise Scores: Challenging Florida's Failing Schools." The Washington Times (daily newspaper)*** **Pro**

March 1, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Article

"The Wonderful Voucher Threat." The New York Post (daily newspaper)*** **Pro**

March 4, 2001

Academic Publication

Camilli, Gregory & Bulkley, Katrina. "Critique of 'An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program.'" Education Policy Analysis Archives, Vol. 9, No. 4. Available at: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n7/>

March 5, 2001

Greene, Jay P. "A Reply to 'Critique of 'An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program' ' by Gregory Camilli and Katrina Bulkley in Education Policy Analysis Archives, Vol. 9, No. 7 March 4, 2001." Available at: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/greenes_reply.htm

March 12, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

Finn, Chester E., Jr. "Bush's Education Semi-Reform: Don't Open the Champagne Bottles Yet." The Weekly Standard (weekly magazine) *** *Pro*

March 16, 2001

Newspaper/Magazine Commentary

"Senate Falls Short on School Reform." The Atlanta Journal-Constitution (daily newspaper) *** *Pro*

March 19, 2001

Academic Publication

Kupermintz, Haggai. "The Effects of Vouchers on School Improvement: Another Look at the Florida Data." Education Policy Analysis Archives, Vol. 9, No. 8. Available at: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n8/>

March 23, 2001

Academic Publication

Camilli, Gregory & Bulkley, Katrina. Review of: "A Reply to 'Critique of 'An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program' ' by Gregory Camilli and Katrina Bulkley in Education Policy Analysis Archives, Vol. 9, No. 7 March 4, 2001" by Jay P. Greene. Available: <http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/CERAI/edpolicyproject/cerai-01-11.html>

March 28, 2001

Education Press

Sandham, Jessica L., "Second Study Questions Research Linking Voucher Threat to Gains." Education Week, Vol. 20, No. 28, p. 22. *** *Neutral*

* Article not found through Lexis Nexis/Education Abstracts but listed on The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research Web site

** Article found through Lexis Nexis/Education Abstracts and listed on The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research Web site

*** Article found through Lexis Nexis/Education Abstracts but not listed on The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research Web site

How Time Line Was Constructed

A search was performed for relevant articles using the Lexis Nexis database, Education Abstracts, and The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research Web site. Articles from Education Policy Analysis Archives and those posted on the CERAI web site (<http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/CERAI/>) were known about prior to searching and were used to help form search terms.

Lexis Nexis, All News Database

Period Searched: February 15, 2001 – April 11, 2001

Search Terms: (Greene) and (voucher*) and (date > Feb. 14, 2001)
(Greene) and (date > Feb. 14, 2001)
(Camilli) and (date > Feb. 14, 2001)
(Bulkley) and (date > Feb. 14, 2001)
(Kupermintz) and (date > Feb. 14, 2001)

Education Abstracts

Search Terms: (Greene) and (voucher) and publication year = 2001
(Greene) or (voucher) and publication year = 2001
(Camilli) and publication year = 2001
(Bulkley) and publication year = 2001
(Kupermintz) and publication year = 2001

The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research Web Site, “An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program - What the Press Said...” Available: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_aplus_press.htm [last visited April 5, 2001]

Each mass media article in the search was evaluated for the tone and slant of its account of the Greene study.

- Items designated **Pro** reported the study’s findings uncritically, with little or no comment from authoritative sources calling its findings into question.
- Items designated **Neutral** appeared to balance discussion of the study’s findings with other points of view, including critical assessments.
- Items designated **Con** consisted largely of comments and arguments calling the findings into question.

Academic articles, including the original report, the two responses to it, Greene’s reply to one response and the subsequent rejoinder, are listed but were not rated as Pro, Con, or Neutral

APPENDIX B

THE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Words or phrases in bold were used when the subject of the interview was a research organization. Words or phrases in italic were used when the subject was a journal. Otherwise, questions were phrased identically.

1) What are your **organization's/publication's** written guidelines pertaining to methodology and standards for research going out **under your imprimatur/in your publication**?

2) Topic selection

Institutes/Foundations: **How do you decide on, and set priorities for, those topics you will research?**

Publications: *How do you decide whether a topic falls into your publication's sphere of interest?*

3) Qualifying researchers

What sort of credentials, backgrounds, or qualifications do you look for in people submitting research for your consideration (**or, where research is done by staff, ditto for people whom you hire to conduct research**) ? (For journals only: *Would you accept well-done research that passed peer review from someone without a doctorate or without an academic affiliation?*)

4) Evaluating research design

What are your standards for sound research -- what must be present in the research design for it to be published **under your organization's name/in your publication's pages** ?

5) What is your process for external or peer review of research?

6) How do you disseminate the findings that you're reporting? Do you have a media strategy? What is it?

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Organizations and publications that participated (in alphabetical order):

Brookings Institution

Interview March 15, 2001, with Tom Loveless, director of Brown Center on Education Policy.

Consortium for Policy Research and Education

Interview March 29, 2001, with Robb Sewell, communications manager.

Economic Policy Institute

Interview March 21, 2001, with Eileen Appelbaum, director of research.

Educational Policy Analysis Archives

Interview March 21, 2001, with Gene V Glass, Editor.

Heritage Foundation

Interview March 29, 2001, with Thomas Timmons, Director of Publishing Services

Hoover Institution

Interview March 29, 2001, with Richard Sousa, Associate Director

Journal of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis

Interview March 19, 2001, with Barbara Schneider, Editor.

RAND Corporation

Interview March 20, 2001, with Dominic Brewer, Director of Education Research

Thomas B. Fordham Foundation

Interview March 21, 2001, with Marci Kanstoroom, Research Director

Organizations and publications that did not participate (in alphabetical order)

American Education Research Association

E-mail on March 19, 2001, from William J. Russell, Executive Director, declining to respond before AERA national meeting.

Center for Education Reform

Interview scheduled for March 29, 2001, with Chris Braunlich, vice president for policy and communications, who declined to continue after hearing the first question, and said Director Jeanne Allen would call; no further response as of April 5, 2001.

Educational Researcher

Voice mail message March 29, 2001, from feature editor Evelyn Jacob declining to participate unless copy of survey was sent by mail; copy of survey sent March 29, 2001, by e-mail; no response as of April 5, 2001.

Education Matters: A Journal of Opinion and Research

No response to e-mail request sent March 20, 2001, and again on March 28, 2001.

Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University

No response to e-mail request sent March 19, 2001; telephone call March 28, 2001, was referred to Editor Sally Vietor; no responses to voice mail messages left March 28 and March 29, 2001.

Manhattan Institute

No responses to voice-mail messages left March 21, March 22, and March 28 with Henry Olson, Executive Director, Center for Civic Innovation

Urban Institute

Survey requested for Public Affairs Director Susan Brown via e-mail March 14, 2001 and sent same date.

E-mail message March 30, 2001, from Karen McKenzie, public affairs assistant, declining to participate.

NOTES

¹ Greene, J.P. , *An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program*. New York: The Manhattan Institute. Feb. 15, 2001; available at http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_aplus.htm

² *Ibid.*, Executive Summary

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ See Appendix A.

⁶ Henry, Tamara, "Florida schools shape up amid voucher threat: Findings could boost Bush's national plan," USA Today, 2/16/2001

⁷ Camilli, P., and Bulkley, K., "Critique of 'An Evaluation of the Florida A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program,'" *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Volume 9 Number 7, March 4, 2001, available at: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n7/>

Kupermintz, H., "The Effects of Vouchers on School Improvement: Another Look at the Florida Data," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Volume 9 Number 8, March 19, 2001, available at: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n8/>

⁸ See Appendix A.

⁹ Data compiled from structured interviews conducted between March 13, 2001, and March 30, 2001. See Appendices for details.