

# A LOOK AT CENTRAL ALABAMA’S K-12 EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS THROUGH THE PRISM OF EYAL’S TWO-DIMENSIONAL MODEL OF SCHOOL ENTREPRENEURISM

Jessie Robinson Frierson  
Ronald Lindahl

## ABSTRACT

*Educational entrepreneurship is a topic that has generated considerable interest over the past decade in the United States. Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman (1997) concluded that “the quality of schooling is far worse today than it was in 1955” (p. 342) and advocated the radical reconstruction of the system through the creation of a voucher system that would allow for competitive free enterprise to energize the system. Similar calls for the need for educational entrepreneurship have been voiced by Chubb and Moe (1990), Cuban (2006), Hess (2002, 2006), Hill, Pierce, and Guthrie (1997), Hunter (1995), Levin (2006), Lubienski (2003), Murphy (1986), and Smith and Petersen (2006), among many others.*

*Eyal (2008a) proposed a two-dimensional theoretical model of school entrepreneurship based on the extent of governmental regulation and the absence or presence of choice. That model is displayed in Figure 1. The purpose of this study was to examine the validity of that model as it relates to entrepreneurship of K-12 schools in a tri-county region of central Alabama.*

		Governmental Regulation	
		High	Low
Choice	Absent	No Entrepreneurship	Radical Entrepreneurship
	Present	Manipulative Entrepreneurship	Popular Entrepreneurship

*Figure 1. Two-dimensional model of school entrepreneurship. Adapted from “A Two-Dimensional Model of School Entrepreneurship” by O. Eyal, 2008, *Educational Planning*, 17, 3, p. 30. Copyright 2008 by the International Society for Educational Planning.*

## BACKGROUND TO EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

With strong acknowledgment of Peter Drucker’s work, Hess (2006) defined educational entrepreneurship as a “process of purposeful innovation directed toward improving educational productivity, efficiency, and quality” (p. 2). Smith and Petersen (2006) expanded on this, noting that “entrepreneurs have a vision for a better way of doing things, thinking beyond the constraints of current rules and resources. Perhaps more importantly, they have the passion and the sense of urgency that literally compels them to take the risks necessary to realize that vision” (pp. 22-23).

Why is entrepreneurship such an important issue in U. S. public education? Historically, according to Hess (2006), it has been most notable for its absence (p. 3). Yet, since the halcyon cry of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence, 1983), there has been a mounting concern that America’s public schools are incapable of improving their performance and that new paradigms are needed (Hunter, 1995, p. 169).

Public schools are generally viewed as bureaucratic, monopolistic, dominating, inefficient, and sometimes corrupt (Murphy, 1996). Chubb and Moe (1990), Cuban (2006), Hess (2002), Hursh (2007), and Lubienski (2003) found public schools to be bureaucratic, to inhibit innovation, and to enforce uniformity. Economies of scale are developed through the use of highly standardized curricula (Lubienski). Hill, Pierce, and Guthrie (1997) noted that they face conflicting communities, values, individual moralities, and civic responsibilities, while needing to respect minorities, distribute economic opportunities, and produce competent graduates. To address these conflicts and challenges, Lubienski concluded that public schools adopt a one-size-fits-all approach. To combat this, the call is for greater

entrepreneurship and greater school choice (Boyd, 2007).

In addition, public schools have been underfunded for many years (Johnson, 2001). However, the absolute level of funding is only one issue. Coulson (1996) pointed out that funding per child was not equivalent to performance (p. 4). Henig (1994) explained that “public monopolies can be even more insidious than private monopolies” because they “obscure the relationship between price paid and value received” (p. 59). However, as Boyd (2007) noted, the high-stakes standardized testing mandated under *No Child Left Behind* has increasingly made school failures more apparent to the public, who, in turn, have demanded greater accountability for their tax dollars invested in public schools. These accountability demands spur calls for increased choice, e.g., voucher systems, magnet schools, and charter schools, surface as a primary means of school reform and improvement.

Although conclusive studies are lacking, proponents of school choice cite many potential benefits, primary based on the premise that only those operating in a competitive market system optimize their work (Murphy, 1996; Hill, Pierce, & Guthrie, 1997). Lubienski (2003) asserted that choice and competition lead to greater student achievement, administrative innovations, more options for parents, and new ways of educating students, particularly for those students traditionally marginalized in the public schools. However, McCombs’ (2007) study found that in districts providing public school choices for students in chronically failing schools, it was the students with the highest scores in reading most likely to transfer and that White students were far more likely to transfer than Blacks.

Chubb and Moe (1990) posited that in order for private schools to attract parents despite their significantly higher costs than public schools, they must demonstrate improvements in such areas as personnel, incentives for staff, goals, leadership, practice, performance, the measurement of performance, and autonomy. They concluded that students in effectively organized schools achieve approximately one-year more over the course of high school than their peers in ineffectively organized schools. Lubienski (2003) expanded on this, noting that in entrepreneurial schools, the coherence of mission leads to an alignment of parental preferences. This may include reduced class sizes, innovative scheduling, new age or ability groupings, the use of technology, or the use of individualized education plans.

Yet, there are alternative positions on why entrepreneurial schools may be perceived to out-perform traditional public schools. As Hess (2002) and Hursh (2007) noted, when standardized exams are key measures of success, one means of demonstrating superiority is merely to select the most capable students and to leave the lowest performing students behind. Levin (2006) took this a step further, noting that “many charter schools set stringent requirements on student behavior, parental responsibilities, and daily and Saturday schedules that only the most dedicated parents and students will aspire to” (p. 172). When high tuitions, fees, and expenses are charged in private schools, yet another socio-economic screening factor is added.

As Mann (1974) questioned decades ago and Coulson (1996) questioned more recently in regard to the educational marketplace, there is considerable question about to what extent parents and students make rational, informed choices. Lubienski (2003) noted that the educational market is a quasi-market, not a pure market due to a lack of valid and reliable information on the school choices, which lead decisions to be made on matters of image (p. 426).

Best-selling business guru, Jim Collins (2001), asserted that “if you cannot be the best in the world at your core business, then your core business cannot form the basis of a great company” (p. 13). That does not apply to educational entrepreneurship, though, for K-12 education markets are almost exclusively local markets. Parents look to their own community, not even to neighboring communities, for the education of their children. Furthermore, unlike businesses, in which maximization of profit is generally assumed to be the primary underlying goal, schools may have varying primary goals. Admittedly, some may seek to maximize profit, but others may not. For example, a Catholic school might have access to greater profits if it became non-denominational; however, many choose to promote their religious identity over such profits. Even the tri-county region of this study cannot be considered to be a single market. Few parents are willing, or feasibly able, to transport their children to schools outside their immediate community. Beyond that, as noted previously, parental financial means may limit their access to many of the seemingly available choices. Against this social and educational background, the next task is to examine Eyal’s theoretical model.

## BACKGROUND TO EYAL'S THEORETICAL MODEL

Eyal's model is based upon Barabasi's (2003) network model, which posited that hubs link to a large number of nodes in a network and that the fitness of the nodes is a function of their ability to attract links. As applied to education, the hubs are the major values, concepts, or practices which underlie specific school choices. The schools are the nodes, which are competing to attract links (students). However, the model also recognizes the *Pareto* principle, which proposed that only 20% of the factors present have significant effects on the results, and the *Power Law*, which noted that "many small events coexist with a few large events" (p. 67). Consequently, it is important to identify the key 20% of the hubs and ignore the smaller effect hubs. Nodes are self-organizing around the high-impact concepts, values, or practices, in order to avoid chaos. Barabasi contended that many nodes may be removed without disturbing the system, but the removal of a few hubs can destroy the system. Consequently, this study's focus was on the key hubs, the shared values, concepts, and practices, rather than on the nodes (schools) or links (students).

Eyal's (2008a) model argued that "different levels of deregulation and the presence or absence of competition may interact to produce different niches that may inhibit or facilitate the emergence of radical school entrepreneurship" (p. 28) that is, autonomous schools with minimum state regulation (p. 33). Although Eyal intended deregulation and school choice to be measured on continua (p. 30), for conceptual clarification the model was presented as a two-by-two matrix (see Figure 1). That configuration was used as the data analysis schema for this study.

Of the four entrepreneurial niches of Eyal's model, the first was high governmental regulation with low choice. In the presence of high governmental control and low competition, the state limits responsiveness to consumer demands or preferences and works to maintain the status quo. In other words, the government determines and regulates the hubs, and little competition exists among nodes.

The second niche of Eyal's model posits low governmental regulation with choice, conditions which (2008a) equated with *privatization reform*, or the concept that free markets can best determine the appropriate hubs (values, concepts, and practices). The survival of the nodes (schools) is dependent on their alignment with specific hubs and on their consequent ability to attract links (students). Eyal posited that under such conditions, *popular entrepreneurship* emerges, where schools attach to those major values, concepts, and practices most desired by potential clients. These hubs would not likely be radical in nature.

The third niche of Eyal's model is where high governmental control co-exists with educational choice. Eyal (2008a) termed the entrepreneurial, bottom-up efforts in this niche, *quasi-market reforms*, where choice programs supplement decentralization efforts, which are accompanied by increases in standardization (p. 32). In this niche, parents pressure public schools to provide specific educational services and pedagogical innovations, but within the constraints set by governmental authorities, e.g., outcomes, financing, and regulations. Government-determined hubs continue to be attached to each school Eyal termed this *manipulative entrepreneurship*, again noting its constraints on radical innovation.

The final niche of Eyal's model is the intersection of low governmental regulation with low choice. Eyal (2008a) defined this niche as *communitarianism*<sup>1</sup>, where the government cedes control of schools to local communities, with little state regulation, and cited the Amish schools in the U. S. as a prime example. Only in this niche is radical entrepreneurship likely to occur.

## METHODOLOGY

---

1 Communitarianism is a philosophy that critiques Rawl's liberal individualism by counter-arguing that individuals are social creatures and shaped by their communal identity (Bell, 1993; Caney, 1992). A communitaristic community is a distinct and cohesive community with shared values due to a common heritage, culture, language, and/or religion, and its educational system usually promotes and protects the family or in-groups and community goals (Arthur, 1998; Etzioni, 1993; Etzioni, 1995). Schools serve the communitaristic community as model "small societies" (Lee, Bryk, & Smith), 1993). (Eyal, 2008, p. 33)

Reconciling data from local telephone directories, the Alabama State Department of Education (2008), and the United States Department of Education (2008), the first step was to identify all the relevant nodes, the public, private, and church-related K-12 schools within the tri-county region of central Alabama. For each school other than traditional public schools, the next step was to obtain their promotional and recruitment materials; in most cases, these were web-based materials. The three researchers independently reviewed each school's materials to determine which specific educational, administrative, and social elements (hubs) were being featured to attract students and parents (links). They then formed a consensus matrix of their findings (see Table 1). This process was similar to a thematic analysis conducted by qualitative researchers. The main themes (hubs) that emerged included: *parental involvement; small class size; athletics; religion; demanding academics; safety and discipline; arts, music, and theatre; nurturing, positive culture; accreditation; innovative curriculum; selective admission; and teacher efficacy and motivation.* The researchers examined each school's materials to detect emphasis on any of these hubs. The hubs were then ranked by order of importance or emphasis each school placed on particular values, concepts, and practices. Next, the hubs were divided into primary and secondary hubs. The hubs with the highest ratings of importance were considered primary hubs; those hubs with lower ratings were considered secondary hubs. The researchers first examined the materials from the magnet schools, followed by those of the private schools. This matrix, in turn, was examined through the lens of Eyal's model, with the purpose of determining the extent to which the study's findings confirmed or failed to confirm that model. No school names are reported in this study.

#### OVERVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN CENTRAL ALABAMA

The two dimensions of Eyal's (2008a) theoretical model are the extent of governmental regulation and the absence or presence of educational choices. In central Alabama, the responses to these two dimensions vary greatly between public and private educational institutions. Further, it must be noted that access to private schools, including church-related schools, is generally restricted to the financially advantaged portion of the population, as tuition, fees, and books represent significant expenses per child, generally approaching, and in several cases exceeding, \$10,000 per year. For public schools, there is high governmental regulation and very little choice available. For private schools, there is very low governmental regulation and considerable choice.

As with all U.S. states, Alabama's public schools are highly regulated. For example, the State controls the length of the school year, the certification of teachers and administrators, the curriculum, textbooks, school safety regulations, and the annual minimal progress goals on the State-mandated standardized examination that each school is expected to attain. Many of these regulations do not apply to private schools, particularly if those schools are church-related. There are two types of private schools in Alabama – church-related schools and non-church-related schools, known as independent schools. Church-related schools are required to register with the State Superintendent of Education's office and to record both enrollment and attendance. Teachers in church-related schools are required to participate in in-service training on drug abuse prevention and to include this issue in the curriculum. Other than these requirements and some safety regulations, church-related schools are essentially free of State governance. Independent schools are subject to these regulations and others, including the requirement for all teachers to be State-certified, for their curricula and length of the school year to correspond to those of the public schools, for instruction to be offered in English, and for all students to meet State immunization requirements. In addition independent schools are required to conduct monthly fire drills and have outward-opening doors, to adhere to building code requirements specific to schools, and conduct mandatory sex crime screening for all employees. Independent schools are not required to participate in the State's standardized testing program, nor are they subject to State-enforced annual performance goals (U. S. Department of Education, 2000).

Choice is very limited in the public schools of this region of central Alabama. Alabama is one of the 10 remaining states in the U.S. that does not allow charter schools (Alabama Policy Institute, 2009). Charter schools are public schools that exist through a contract with either the state or local school district, but which basically maintain autonomy over their operation and freedom from most public school regulations (Alabama Policy Institute, 2009).

The only semblance of public school choice found in this region, are in the eight magnet schools, all of which exist in only a single school district. Magnet schools are public schools with specialized curricula. They were originally developed in the 1960s and 1970s to help achieve voluntary racial desegregation of the schools, rather than forced busing to desegregate. Some magnet schools are based on student test scores, whereas others are based on student interest and choice (U. S. Department of Education, 2004, p. 1). Magnet Schools of America (2009) asserted that:

Specific achievements in magnet schools include: improved academic achievement; diverse student enrollments; higher attendance rates, and lower drop-out rates. Magnet schools boast more parental involvement, more personalization through theme-based education, and specialized programs providing a safer environment for learning. Teachers are better prepared through planned professional development. (n.p.)

All eight magnet schools in the area were examined in this study.

The most frequent form of entrepreneurial education in this region of Alabama is private schools, the majority of which are church-related. Private schools began to emerge strongly in this region approximately 50 years ago, largely as a reaction to the abolishment of separate school systems for Black and White students. Although some vestiges of segregation continue to exist in some of the private schools, many of them have now effectively become integrated. It was noted that all the private schools in this study advertised a non-discrimination admission policy. However, the past and current flight of White students to private academies and public schools with higher-socio-economic status is consistent with many parental motivations, including quests for better schools and the avoidance of full racial integration. The researchers have no way of determining if parents are practicing continued racial segregation in this region.

As indicated, the majority of the private schools in this region are church or religion-related. In some instances, these schools operate under the direct egis of a specific church or religious denomination. In others, they merely feature the value systems of a broad range of denominations, e.g., “Christian” schools. A total of 33 private and religious-based schools were examined in this study.

Alabama does not recognize home schooling as a legitimate educational option. Consequently, homeschoolers in Alabama must enroll in private, generally church-related *umbrella* schools, which allows home schooling families to comply with the very benign State regulations pertinent to such schools (State laws and regulations, 2009). Because some of these umbrella organizations are essentially bureaucratic shells with little to no influence on the curriculum or instruction, homeschooled children and their umbrella schools were not included in this study.

One key aspect of the governance structure of public and private schools is school accreditation. Although accreditation agencies are non-profit organizations in which membership is voluntary, they assume governing roles for many aspects of the schools they accredit. All of the public magnet schools are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) (2009), the regional accreditation organization approved by the U. S. Department of Education and by the State of Alabama for accreditation of public schools. SACS accreditation for private schools is only one option among many. Another option is the Alabama Independent Schools Association (AISA) (2009). AISA requires that schools seeking its accreditation be simultaneously accredited by SACS. In addition to providing oversight to academics and accreditation, AISA also provides an athletic association. AISA-accredited schools must subject themselves to State regulations for private schools, but must also follow the SACS requirements for annual standardized testing (in Alabama, this is generally the Scholastic Aptitude Test – 10). Some Alabama private schools are accredited by the Association of Classical Christian Schools (ACCS) (2009). This association promotes, establishes, and equips schools committed to a classical approach to education in light of a Christian worldview grounded in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. It advocates the use of the Trivium philosophy of education, based on the three cornerstones of learning: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. A fourth accreditation body choice is the Alabama Christian Education Association (ACEA) (2009). Schools accredited through ACEA prefer not to be SACS-accredited, but must undergo annual standardized tests. ACEA is a strong lobbyist for Christian education but does not maintain specific, strict regulations for its schools. Some of the private schools in Alabama are accredited by the plethora of private school accreditation agencies that exist nationally. Some have virtually no

guidelines and others are more rigorous. Finally, some private schools in Alabama are not accredited by any accrediting body.

## ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The results of the data analysis are presented in Table 1. The “x”s indicate that the school advertised this item as one of its key hubs (Barabasi, 2003) in an effort to attract students. Under the accreditation column, the numbers presented indicate the primary accreditation agency to which the school belongs. Many of the schools also belong to secondary accrediting agencies.

The overall results appear to confirm the validity of Eyal’s (2008a) conceptual model. The magnet schools conform to the *manipulative entrepreneurship* category. The primary hubs advertised by these schools are strong academic programs and curricula that differ from the typical public schools of the region. Secondary hubs for these magnet schools include increased school safety and discipline, curricular offerings in technology, art, and music, and selective admission policies. These hubs clearly respond to the predominant concerns of parents of public school youth in the region.

The private schools of the region appear to correspond to the *popular entrepreneurship* category of Eyal’s (2008a) model. The primary hubs advertised by these schools were: an emphasis on religion; strong academic programs; increased school safety and discipline; a positive, nurturing school climate; and a more innovative curriculum than exists in the typical public schools of the region. Secondary hubs included: small class sizes, the potential to participate in athletic programs, and curricular offerings in art and music.

This region is noted for its strong religious focus. It is also noted for its emphasis on athletics, especially at the secondary school level. Because public secondary schools in the region tend to be very large, participation on their athletic teams is limited to a small, select portion of their population. Because the private schools are much smaller, a greater proportion of their student body is able to participate in competitive athletics, which is a major positive factor in recruiting students.

Yet, when the hub of *school accreditation* is examined, a new pattern emerges, giving further validation to Eyal’s (2008a) model. All of the magnet schools are accredited by SACS and by the Alabama State Department of Education. In addition, SACS is the primary accreditation agency for 11 of the private schools in the region. However, this figure understates the importance of SACS accreditation on the private schools in this study, for 11 additional schools maintain SACS accreditation as a requirement of their accreditation by AISA. In short, 54% of the private schools and 100% of the magnet schools are SACS accredited. Because SACS is generally recognized in the region as the gold seal of approval for academic quality, this represents a significant hub.

Of the non-SACS-accredited schools in the study, three are accredited by ACCS, one by ACEA, and six by miscellaneous other agencies. Of these, only the ACCS accreditation seems to be a significant hub in relationship to Eyal’s (2008a) model. The parents and students in these schools are pursuing a highly specific educational curriculum not available elsewhere.

When the strong hub of accreditation is examined in relation to Eyal’s (2008a) model, the pattern of entrepreneurship in this region’s schools becomes somewhat more complex. Magnet schools and those schools jointly accredited by AISA can be classified as manipulative entrepreneurship schools. They are somewhat independent but are under a double layer of governmental regulation, either by the Alabama Department of Education and SACS or by both AISA and SACS. Because AISA follows all general Alabama Department of Education requirements except some of the teacher qualification requirements (but including the standardized testing requirements), regulation of these schools is relatively stringent. The parents selecting these schools are looking for some aspects of the curriculum to be different or more rigorous than the general public schools, but they are expecting many of the curricular and co-curricular offerings of the general public schools, e.g., athletics, spelling bees, science fairs, technology classes, student government organizations, and formal staff development. This meets Eyal’s criteria of being choice programs which supplement decentralization, but which have substantial standardization.

Those private schools whose primary accreditation agency is SACS are largely exempt from some of the public school regulations and are not under the strict scrutiny of AISA. As such, they have moderate governmental oversight, but some choice. These could be placed somewhere on the continuum between

popular entrepreneurship and manipulative entrepreneurship.

There is a small, but discernable set of private schools that move further along the continuum, with less governmental oversight and more radical entrepreneurship. These do not by any means approach the epitome of Eyal's (2008a) radical entrepreneurship model. They include the ACCS-accredited schools featuring the Trivium curriculum, a Montessori school following the multi-age group philosophy of Maria Montessori, a religious school with a curriculum designed to develop "the whole being" for "the whole period of existence possible to man," and an academy designed to serve the unique educational needs of bright children with unique learning differences which cause them not to be successful in typical public school classrooms.

In addition to providing some validation to Eyal's (2008a) theoretical model of educational entrepreneurship, these results also confirm Lubienski's (2003) premises that parents express preferences for strong academic programs (see also Hess, 2002, and Hursh, 2007), reduced class sizes, and innovative curricula. Unlike Lubienski's premise, the hubs advertised by the private and magnet schools of this region gave relatively low emphasis to the increased use of instructional technology.

This study also confirmed the concerns of Coulson (1996), Lubienski (2003), and Mann (1974) that education is a quasi-market, because there is a lack of valid and reliable information on school choices. Although a few of the private schools had extensive, informative web sites, surprisingly limited academic achievement data was available on the majority of the private and magnet schools. Most of the information available was promotional in nature.

Finally, this study confirms Eyal's (2008b) contention that educational entrepreneurship is more likely to yield products that closely resemble the status quo rather than offering radical innovations. Citing Cibulka (1997), Adnett and Davies (2000), and Lubienski (2005), Eyal posited that even entrepreneurial schools are likely to adopt conservative, well-established practices. The complex system components of all entrepreneurial and non-entrepreneurial schools, e.g., stability, redundancy, and degeneracy, hinder radical change. Consequently, even the greater freedom of choice and competition introduced into Alabama's educational system by magnet and private schools has not produced radical differences among schools. Parents' desire for stability leads them to choose hubs such as strong academic programs, including the Trivium and Montessori curricula, and school accreditation, especially by the established regional accrediting agency (SACS) and the even more rigorous AISA. This has caused these hubs to become very resilient, thereby helping to institutionalize much of the education system.

## CONCLUSIONS

This analysis of the promotional materials of the private and public sector entrepreneurial schools of a tri-county region of central Alabama supports the validity of Eyal's (2008a) model of entrepreneurship in education and his contention (2008b) that educational entrepreneurship does not provide appropriate conditions for radical educational changes. Under conditions of high government regulation and limited choice, the entrepreneurial (magnet) schools greatly resembled their non-entrepreneurial counterparts but gave emphasis to a very limited range of parental interests and concerns. For the private educational sector, characterized by low government regulation and presence of a relatively wide choice of schools, the entrepreneurial schools focused on a selected set of hubs attractive to parents and students. Predictably, these schools differed relatively little from their non-entrepreneurial counterparts in the public sector other than offering a focus on religion. Entrepreneurial schools showed considerable similarity among themselves and even with their non-entrepreneurial counterparts, with the major shared hubs being strong academic programs and adherence to meaningful accreditation guidelines. Although not a focus of this study, the schools demonstrating the most radical entrepreneurship were some of the *umbrella* schools providing services to homeschool families. These schools sought to fill highly specific needs which those families might incur, e.g., on-line instruction in core high school subject areas, tutorial and testing services, and even athletic programs. Further study into these schools could shed further light on Eyal's theoretical work in the area.

## REFERENCES

Adnett, N., & Davies, P. (2000). Competition and curriculum diversity in local schooling markets:

- Theory and evidence. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15(2), 157-167.
- Alabama Christian Education Association. (2009). *Alabama Christian Education Association*. Retrieved on April 3, 2009, from <http://www.alabamachristianed.com>
- Alabama Independent Schools Association. (2009). *Alabama Independent Schools Association*. Retrieved on April 3, 2009, from <http://aisaonline.org>
- Alabama Policy Institute. (2009). *Charter schools*. Retrieved on January 5, 2009 from <http://www.alabamapolicy.org/issues/gti/issue.php?issueID=140&guideMainID=5>
- Alabama State Department of Education. (2008). *Alabama education directory*. Montgomery, AL: Author. Retrieved on April 2, 2009 from [http://www.alsde.edu/general/SDE\\_Directory.pdf](http://www.alsde.edu/general/SDE_Directory.pdf)
- Association of Classical Christian Schools. (2009). *Association of Classical Christian Schools*. Retrieved on April 3, 2009, from <http://www.accsedu.org>
- Barabasi, A. L. (2003). *Linked*. New York: A Plume Book.
- Boyd, W. L. (2007). The politics of privatization in American education. *Educational Policy*, 21(1), 7-14.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Cibulka, J.G. (1997). Two eras of urban schooling: The decline of the old order and the emergence of new organizational forms. *Education and Urban Society*, 29(3), 317-341.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Coulson, A. (1996). Markets versus monopolies in education: The historical evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 4(9). Retrieved November 6, 2008, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v4n9.html>.
- Cuban, L. (2006). Educational entrepreneurs redux. In F. M. Hess (Ed.), *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, possibilities* (pp. 223-242). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Eyal, O. (2008a). A two-dimensional model of school entrepreneurship. *Educational Planning*, 17(3), 28-37.
- Eyal, O. (2008b). Degeneracy, resilience, and free markets in educational innovation. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, DOI: 10:1002/sres. Published online.
- Eyal, O., & Inbar, D. E. (2003). Developing a public school entrepreneurship inventory: Theoretical conceptualization and empirical examination. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 9(6), 221-244.
- Friedman, M. (1997). Public schools: Make them private. *Education Economics*, 5(3), 341-344.
- Henig, J. R. (1994). *Rethinking school choice: Limits of the market metaphor*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hess, F. M. (2002). *Revolution at the margins: The impact of competition on urban school systems*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Hess, F. M. (2006). Entrepreneurship, risk, and reinvention. In F. M. Hess (Ed.), *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, possibilities* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hill, P., Pierce, L., & Guthrie, J. (1997). *Reinventing public education: How contracting can transform America's schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hunter, R. C. (1995). Privatization of instruction in public education. *Education and Urban Society*, 27(2), 168-194.
- Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 493-518.
- Johnson, B. L., Jr. (2001). Micropolitical dynamics of education interests: A view from within. *Educational Policy*, 15(1), 115-134.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1997). *How markets work: Disequilibrium, entrepreneurship and discovery*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

- Levin, H. M. (2006). Why is this so difficult? In F. M. Hess (Ed.), *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, possibilities* (pp. 165-182). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Lubienski, C. (2003). Innovation in education markets: Theory and evidence on the impact of competition and choice in charter schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(2), 395-443.
- Lubienski, C. (2005). Public schools in marketized environments: Shifting incentives and unintended consequences of competition-based educational reforms. *American Journal of Education*, 111(4), 464-486.
- Magnet Schools of America. (2009). *What are the benefits of magnet schools?* Retrieved on January 5, 2009, from <http://www.magnet.edu/modules/content/index.php?id=1>
- Mann, D. (1974). Public understanding and education decision-making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 10(2), 1-18.
- McCombs, J. S. (2007). The school choice provisions of No Child Left Behind: An examination of access, information, and impact. *Proquest Dissertations*, 68(08). (RMI no. 3274434)
- Murphy, J. (1986). *The privatization of schooling: Problems and possibilities*. New York: Corwin Press.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.
- Smith, K., & Petersen, J. L. (2006). What is educational entrepreneurship? In F. M. Hess (Ed.), *Educational entrepreneurship: Realities, challenges, possibilities* (pp. 21-44). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- State laws and regulations – Alabama. (2009). *Home Education Magazine*. Retrieved on January 5, 2009, from <http://www.homeedmag.com/lawregs/Alabama.html>
- Trent, W. T., Braddock, J., H., II, & Henderson, R. D. (1985). Chapter 8: Sociology of education: A focus on education as an institution. *Review of Research in Education*, 12, 295-336.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2000). *State regulation of private schools -- Alabama*. Retrieved on January 5, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/RegPrivSchl/alab.html>
- U. S. Department of Education. (2004). *Creating successful magnet schools programs*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement.
- U. S. Department of Education (2008). *Search for private schools*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Sciences, National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved on April 2, 2009, from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pss/privateschoolsearch/>

Table 1

*Key Hubs of Entrepreneurial Schools in a Tri-County Region of Alabama*

	Parental Involvement	Athletics	Religion	Demanding Academics	Safety and Discipline	Arts and Music and Theatre	Nurturing, Positive Culture	Accreditation	Innovative Curriculum or Structure
<b>Magnet Schools</b>									
School A				x				1	x
School B				x	x			1	
School C				x				1	
School D	x				x	x		1	x
School E								1	x
School F				x	x	x		1	x
School G		x		x				1	x
School H		x		x		x		1	x
<b>Private Schools (Not Religious-Based)</b>									
School I		x		x	x	x	x	1	x
School J		x		x	x	x	x	1	
School K	x					x		1	x
School L	x	x		x			x	2	
School M		x		x	x	x		2	
School N		x		x	x		x	2	
School O	x	x					x	2	x
School P				x	x		x	5	x
School Q	x				x			5	x
School R	x						x	6	x

Note: Accreditation Codes are: SACS = 1; AISA and SACS = 2; ACCS = 3; ACEA=4; Other = 5; None =6

Table 1 (continued)

*Key Hubs of Entrepreneurial Schools in a Tri-County Region of Alabama*

	Athletics	Religion	Demanding Academics	Safety and Discipline	Arts and Music and Theatre	Nurturing, Positive Culture	Accreditation	Innovative Curriculum or Structure
<b>Private Schools (Religious-based)</b>								
School S	x	x	x	x		x	1	
School T	x	x	x	x	x		1	x
School U		x	x	x		x	1	
School V	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	
School W		x	x	x	x	x	1	
School X		x	x	x		x	1	
School Y	x	x	x		x		1	
School Z	x	x	x	x	x		1	
School AA		x				x	2	
School AB	x	x	x	x		x	2	x
School AC		x		x	x	x	2	
School AD	x	x	x	x		x	2	x
School AE	x	x	x	x	x		2	x
School AF		x	x	x		x	2	x
School AG	x	x	x		x	x	2	x
School AH	x		x	x			3	x
School AI		x					3	x
School AJ		x	x				3	x
School AK		x	x	x			4	
School AL		x		x		x	5	x
School AM		x		x		x	5	x
School AN		x					5	x
School AO		x		x			5	x

Note: Accreditation Codes are: SACS = 1; AISA and SACS = 2; ACCS = 3; ACEA=4; Other = 5; None =6