In V. Richardson (Ed)
Handbook of Research on Teaching.
4th Edition. Washington, DC: AERA
(2001)

45.

School–Community Connections: Strengthening Opportunity to Learn and Opportunity to Teach

Meredith I. Honig
Stanford University

Joseph Kahne
Mills College, Oakland, California

Milbrey W. McLaughlin
Stanford University

Introduction: Why Consider School–Community Connections?

Schools today exist in very different social, economic, and political contexts than they did a century ago. Communities have changed, families have been reconfigured, and workplace demands are radically different from what they were when public schools were founded (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Graham, 1995; Heath & McLaughlin, 1987; Schorr, 1989). As a result, teaching and learning occur in fundamentally different social and economic contexts than in previous decades.

Despite these changes in social institutions and conditions, education reformers generally fail to examine and challenge old assumptions about institutional relationships and roles that have defined and supported teaching and learning in policy and practice. Specifically, education's century-old institutional frame casts the school as a social institution that is complementary to but separate from other institutions and agents of the community. For example, content and performance standards tend to focus on narrow academic measures. Much of the current standards debate—including discussions of rewards and sanctions for teachers, students, and schools—concerns what these academic standards should be; few have questioned the narrow academic scope of these standards and how students and teachers can achieve them (see, e.g., the discussion in Ravitch, 1995).

In particular, public discourse about opportunity to learn[1]—the resources, supports, and occasions students need to achieve at higher levels—has been especially school-centric and process-oriented. The same can be said about conversations regarding what we call "opportunity to teach"—the resources, supports, and occasions teachers need to teach so that students achieve at higher levels. Notions of opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach generally have been school-centric because they focus on programs, staff, and other resources that schools, school districts, and state educational agencies should provide if students are to meet challenging content and performance standards (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995). This focus assumes that schools alone—teachers and students—can achieve these high standards. The conversations are process-oriented because they focus on the availability of resources, supports, and occasions rather than their use. For

A grant to Shirley Brice Heath and Milbrey W. McLaughlin from the Spencer Foundation contributed to the preparation of this chapter.

[1] The legislation introducing the federal Goals 2000 initiative acknowledged the importance of students' opportunity to learn and designated the idea as "school delivery standards." This name subsequently was changed to "opportunity to learn" in response to congressional concern that school delivery standards would mean federal involvement in the business of curricula and texts, and would signal a new era of federal control of the schools (Ravitch, 1995, p. 13).

example, they assume that the availability of new funding or technology will mean that teachers and students are able to use the funding and technology to enhance learning. This focus presupposes that the cursory exploration of the means for achieving high standards in the current policy debate is adequate.

On the contrary, many of the factors that shape students' opportunities to learn and teachers' opportunities to teach are beyond the purview of schools. For example, teachers comment that too many students come to school fatigued from family or job responsibilities and, figuratively, are not present for them to teach. Other students are not present in a more literal sense: Some teachers say student absenteeism is their single greatest teaching challenge (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993). Also, for example, many of today's students say they see few community role models that attribute their success to formal education. Others say they have few incentives to work hard in school, because neither the workplace nor higher education seem to place premiums on taking challenging courses and doing well (Cohen, 1994; Dryfoos, 1990; McLaughlin, Irby, & Langman, 1994; Phelan, Davidson, & Yu, 1998).

In short, the current reform movement in education appears conceptually and strategically incomplete. It has triggered an avalanche of initiatives to reform how schools do business, but these initiatives, generally, reconsider neither the institutional assumptions nor the policy frameworks within which schools operate. If they did, they would recognize an important dilemma: Today's schools alone cannot provide the opportunities and support that America's students require to learn and achieve at the high levels that reformers expect and the public demands (Cahill, 1993; Pittman & Cahill, 1992). Patricia Graham advises, "The battleship, the school, cannot do this alone. The rest of the educational flotilla must assist: families, communities, government, higher education, and the business community. Only then will all of our children be able to achieve that which by birthright should be theirs: enthusiasm for and accomplishment in learning" (Graham, 1995, p. 22).

Students' opportunities to learn and, by extension, teachers' opportunities to teach in contemporary America require that schools and communities join in new ways—and in some old ways—to accomplish the objectives our society assigns to public education. To meet contemporary education goals, we must expand our notions of the resources, occasions, and supports for teaching and learning. We must also broaden our understanding of how students and teachers might make effective use of them.

The Importance of a Youth's and Teacher's View to Defining Opportunity to Learn and Opportunity to Teach

What definition of opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach should undergird policy, practice, and research agendas? We argue in this chapter that education reformers currently use the wrong analytic frame for a meaningful examination of students' opportunities to learn and teachers' opportunities to teach. Policymakers, practitioners, and researchers tend to focus narrowly within the formal educational system on what schools can do to raise students' scores on measures of academic achievement (that is, academic means to academic ends). They identify generic students and teachers without considering the variety of resources, supports, and occasions available for both in particular contexts.

If we view resources, supports, and occasions for learning, not from the top of the policymaking system down, but from a student's-eye view, we can see that youth have many opportunities for learning in and out of school. These opportunities include occasions for exercising leadership, developing a range of skills to solve their own problems and concerns, and establishing relationships with peers and adults. They include a time and place to do homework, assistance with that homework, access to resources (such as computers and libraries), and occasions in their homes and neighborhoods to work independently and to practice, reinforce, and extend the skills and perspectives presented in and out of the classroom. An essential aspect of many out-of-school opportunities for learning is that they are not extensions of the academic day. Rather, they are often nonacademic occasions, resources, and supports that develop in youth a range of competencies (e.g., academic, social, emotional, vocational, civic, physical, per Pittman & Cahill, 1992) that are important to success in school.

If we consider where learning takes place from the perspective of a student, then, we can see that students have many teachers throughout their day in youth organizations, families, school classrooms, and other settings. It reminds us that young people are more than students; they are youth[2] with many affiliations in addition to their school. A youth perspective on opportunity to learn highlights that the availability of youth organizations, adult role models, and leadership experiences, for example, are not sufficient for improving learning. Beyond that, researchers, policymakers, and practitioners need to be concerned with the various barriers that prevent youth from taking advantage of these resources, supports, and occasions for learning. Keeping a youth perspective in mind, we must, for example, ask these questions: Are resources located in parts of the community that are accessible to youth? Do adults and peers whom the youth know and trust provide activities to youth?

Likewise, from a teacher's-eye view, opportunity to teach, in practical terms, means more than adequate texts, classroom space, and materials to support their work. If youths' experiences out of school are essential parts of their opportunities to learn, then teachers' opportunities to teach would be enhanced if they had the time and occasions to become familiar with their students' families and neighborhoods and with other contexts for learning out of school. Long-term relationships with other professionals who work with students—not only teachers but also youth workers, mentors, coaches, and social workers, among others—can help to expand teachers' own capacities for working with youth. By this statement, we do not mean only that teachers should be able to access social services and other

[2] Throughout this chapter we use the term "youth" to refer to all young people of school age.

nonacademic supports for students to remove barriers to learning. Beyond that expectation, youth workers and others who work with youth outside school may use strategies and what we might consider formal and informal curricula for teaching youth in ways that can inform classroom teaching. Likewise, classroom teachers can inform the work of youths' teachers outside school. Connections among youths' various teachers can enhance school performance by building on the strengths that are offered through these various learning opportunities, both in and out of school.

Opportunity to teach, then, refers to the occasions, resources, and supports that multiple teachers, both in and out of school, can use to enhance their own practices through consultation and other connections with one another. The opportunity to teach depends in part on whether the context in which they work—the school climate, the broader policy environment—provides the flexibility and support they need to enter into these relationships with professionals and students.

Opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach in their fullest senses, then, incorporate and depend upon more than the resources found in the school. They implicate a broad array of community-based resources and supports as well as youths' and teachers' abilities and willingness to use them.

To summarize, we argue that expanded notions of opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach mean more than improved academic means to improved academic outcomes. Opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach mean recognizing three important circumstances:

- What happens to youth outside school affects their performance in school in many positive ways. In particular, youth learn throughout their day—both in and out of school—and many of their nonacademic experiences in and out of school can be important to their academic success in school.
- Youth have multiple teachers in and out of school. These teachers include schoolteachers, youth workers, mentors, coaches, social workers, and parents.
- Youths' multiple teachers, both in and out of school, together can use these in-school and out-of-school resources, occasions and supports to strengthen teaching and learning in ways that exceed what schools or community agencies could accomplish alone.

Chapter Overview

This chapter outlines a framework for further research and discussion about how we can redefine opportunities to learn and teach, both conceptually and in practice, to improve youths' performance in school. We base our argument on the premise that the mission and work of schools and "communities"—agencies, organizations, individuals, resources, and occasions outside school—can and should be joined. The primary question we address at the heart of this chapter is as follows: How can we connect schools and communities to improve youths' performance in school?

At the end of the 20th century, few ongoing or well-developed examples of school–community partnerships around teaching and learning exist. (We identify exceptions to this general statement in section III.) Most previous work on this topic focuses on improving health or social outcomes for students and on removing barriers to learning. It has not focused on what school–community connections mean for teachers and how such links might benefit teachers' work and enable students' learning (Cahill, 1996; Lawson & Briar-Lawson, 1997). We highlight throughout the chapter that removing barriers to learning and enabling learning are two related but distinguishable sets of activities. Most of our analysis is concerned with how out-of-school settings and school–community collaboration might enable learning.

Thus, our review necessarily moves beyond the scope of a traditional research review to consider more broadly what we know from theory and practice about how school–community connections might best be used to enhance opportunities to learn and teach. Our research framework suggests how future research on teaching and learning can examine more specifically what school–community connections might look like in practice for opportunity to learn and teach.

In section I, we discuss how education reform policy, including plans that address opportunity to learn, has taken a narrow view of the occasions and resources that learning and teaching require. In particular, education policy and research generally ignore out-of-school factors that affect learning and teaching—both those that present barriers to learning and teaching and those that might enable it. In section II, we review four bodies of research —family, neighborhood, peers, and work— that are generally used to explain which out-of-school factors affect students' performance. Also in section II, not only do we identify *which* factors matter, but also we begin to suggest *why* they matter for youth and teachers.

In section III, we turn to the empirical literature on planned (as opposed to spontaneous or incidental) supports for teaching and learning outside school. Building on section II, we examine experience with and research on a range of programs, policies, and initiatives that are aimed at connecting schools and communities in diverse ways. We conclude this section with our research framework, school–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach, that begins to specify how school–community connections might enhance opportunities to learn and, by extension, opportunities to teach. In section IV, we extend this review to consider the limits and barriers to linking schools and communities, and the implications of this review for policy, practice, and research.

I. The Problem for Practice and Policy

A Limited Target for Reform in Current Policy Initiatives

Although an elaborated view of students' opportunity to learn and teachers' opportunity to teach might seem sensible, at the start of the 21st century, most educational reforms underway in American schools are school reforms. These reforms tinker inside the box of traditional institutional roles and relationships within schools and assume that improved academic performance can result from extended and intensified academic instruction in school classrooms. From merit pay to technology, from new literacy curricula to new pedagogical forms for classroom interaction, and from site-based management to class-size

reduction, reforms presuppose that the school alone can realize ambitious expectations for teaching and learning (see Tyack, 1995; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). These reforms tacitly assume that schooling can and should provide more or less the same experience for every student and that school-focused reform could work if reformers could only get it right. Such a school-centric frame assumes that schools are the primary influences for learning in the lives of children and youth rather than one part of students' broader developmental contexts.

Paradoxically, many of the reforms that do look outside school walls also take a limited view. Consider the example of parent involvement programs. Many so-called "parent involvement" efforts engage parents, not as partners with schools and teachers, but as adjuncts to the school's work (e.g., helping with homework, supporting extracurricular activities) rather than as primary teachers for youth. Most major public and private sources of funding for schools require or encourage these forms of parental involvement, particularly for schools with high concentrations of low-achieving or at-risk students. However, little evidence shows that such requirements lead to closer substantive ties between communities and schools or to enhanced learning for students either in or out of school (Knapp & Shields, 1991). Perhaps as a consequence, links between parents and schools have been erratic and uneven, and not much rethinking has taken place either of adult roles in schools and families (Blase, 1987; Lightfoot, 1978; Smrekar, 1996) or of the types of learning experiences (academic and nonacademic) that many parents already provide and that can be essential to academic success in school.

Exceptions to limited parental involvement occur in some charter schools where parents determine school goals and monitor progress toward them (Wohlstetter, 1997). However, experience suggests that the parent-school partnerships in many charter schools focus on school governance and broad curricular content within schools, not on questions of learning and teaching in and out of school. Likewise, some school-choice strategies engage parents as consumers, but typically not as partners or resources in teaching and learning (see, e.g., Schneider, Teske, Marschall, Mintrom, & Roch, 1997). Even reformers who have a broader agenda for parents and who assume that schools must change usually work within traditional institutional frames. For example, James Comer and Henry Levin see parent involvement as essential to meeting students' and teachers' goals, but, generally, they confine learning, teaching, and opportunities to learn and teach to students' academic experiences within the school walls.

The literature about extracurricular activities, project-based learning, and experiential education contains some examples of nonacademic activities designed deliberately to enhance students' performance in school. However, this literature provides examples of weak linkages between school and community around teaching and learning. That is, most researchers in these extracurricular activities, project-based learning, and experiential education agree that these three traditions are important ways to expand classrooms beyond their four walls and to ground curriculum in practical applications (Calabrese & Schumer, 1986; Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Larson, 1994; Westheimer, Kahne, & Gerstein, 1992; Wigginton, 1985; Wood, 1992). However, these approaches in research and practice tend to focus on what classroom teachers can do to use the community as a setting for learning. In this way, they do not always consider how teachers and schools can engage educators who already work with youth outside the formal educational system (e.g., youth workers, mentors, religious leaders, and coaches of athletic teams) as partners to enhance the educational experiences of youth in and out of school. Nor do they consider how these teachers, in and out of school, might enhance their respective practices through observation of and deliberate planning with one another.

Other exceptions to academic, school-centric reforms include certain efforts to link schools with social services (e.g., Gomby & Larson, 1992). These reformers base their arguments on the changed social conditions of students and their concerns that the "excellence movement" overlooks many social purposes of schooling (Sedlak, 1995).[3] They treat conditions outside school as sources of risk that must be ameliorated before students can learn. Many posit that if we locate social resources in the "universal institution," the public school, we will be in a better position to mediate the effects of these poor conditions outside school. However, like many of the parent involvement initiatives, these strategies generally link their efforts to otherwise unchanged schools.

Recent research suggests that unless schools restructure—that is, unless schools rethink roles and relationships around teaching and learning—additional social services will have only a limited effect on learning outcomes (Wehlage, Smith, & Lipman, 1992). Put another way, this research suggests that the focus of many efforts to create school-linked services has been to fix students (Pittman & Cahill, 1992) so teachers can really teach and to remove barriers to learning, rather than to rethink the learning and teaching that occurs for students—all day, in and out of school—and to rethink the conditions, resources, and supports that enable it.

Finally, an emerging strand of education reform focuses on after-school programs (e.g., 21st Century Learning Centers) and the use of schools as community centers after hours. Many of these initiatives respond not primarily to concerns about teaching and learning but, rather, to recent statistics that most crimes and violence involving youth (either as perpetrators or as victims) occur in the hours immediately after school. Accordingly, an unfortunate focus of many of these initiatives is on keeping youth busy during these hours or on providing more academic instruction after school. Few of these programs and initiatives seek to expand or connect with the out-of-school re-

[3] Sedlak observes that many who issue this call to action are ignorant of the long history of the integration of school and social services: "Health services advocates Ernest Hoag and Lewis Terman drew one of the most expansive visions for the social services movement when they claimed that 'the public school has not fulfilled its duty when the child alone is educated within its walls. The school must be the educational center, the social center, and the hygiene center of the community in which it is located—a hub from which will radiate influences for social betterment in many lives'" (Sedlak, 1995, p. 60).

sources, occasions, and supports for learning that already exist in many communities through youth organizations, mentoring programs, and others—many of which are not primarily academic but, again, can strengthen the performance of youth in school (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1994; Dryfoos, 1998; Schorr, 1997).

The Persistent Limitations of Policy in Connecting Communities and Schools

Our arguments about the limits of a school-centric view of learning and teaching are not new. For example, the earliest theories of adolescent development recognized the importance of the community and its resources to child development and, less often, to children's learning. Between the turn of the century and World War II, educators and social activists responded with a vision of "the school as social center" (Dewey, 1902/1976). Many worked in explicit and powerful ways to connect learning in school with resources, occasions, and supports for learning out of school. Jane Addams's Hull House, for example, provided health care, health education, job training, courses in English, and a variety of artistic, vocational, athletic, and intellectual opportunities for youth and adults. In part, through her partnership with John Dewey, she envisioned settlement houses as essential formal and informal settings for academic and nonacademic learning and for the expansion and deepening of youths' relationships with each other and adults.

In the early part of the 20th century, Leonard Cavello, a New York City teacher, principal, and community activist, developed community advisory committees for schools and curricular components linked to students' cultural heritage. He worked with students, teachers, parents, and the community to reform housing and community services, in part, to create a neighborhood deliberately structured to support child development and learning. In short, he transformed the institution of his school into a center of community life that included recreation, academic pursuits, and collective social action—a jumping off point for lifelong learning (Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

In the 1930s, Elsie Ripley Clapp made her rural West Virginia school a "center for the entire community" to learn and develop. To help parents enrich the learning that occurred at home and on the farm, the school provided health care, technical support for farmers, and classes on nutrition for mothers. The school encouraged older students to support the education of younger students both during and after school hours. Participation in and study of Appalachian folk traditions provided one strategic link between in-school and out-of-school learning (Clapp, 1939; Perlstein, 1996).

These early reformers were committed to school–community links to support teaching and learning.[4] Perhaps as a consequence of this explicit focus on learning in these examples, "school–community" connections meant connections that linked already existing teaching and learning resources for youth and their many teachers (both in and out of school) in ways that could reinforce both teaching and learning.

However, current discourse about educational reform suggests a general inattention to how opportunity to learn or opportunity to teach could incorporate broader conceptions of what teaching and learning are and where they take place. Educators and reformers who are concerned with community occasions, resources, and supports for learning often proceed without a theoretical basis or a clear definition of what it means to connect community and school, specifically around teaching and learning. Most current efforts to connect communities and schools in the ways that concern us in this chapter (like the examples described above) are efforts of single schools or a few schools acting alone, often outside or in spite of the resources, occasions, and supports provided by broader education policy.

The current status of school–community ties may reflect deeper pitfalls in education policy. The many targets of education policy—budgets, curricula, teachers, standards, teacher education, parent involvement, and so on—have not reformed schools in any consistent, predictable, or sustained fashion (National Research Council, 1993). Teachers and youth are not surprised by this absence of meaningful change. Education reformers generally have not considered the changed conditions for schools and the social realities of youth when they fire their salvos.

Thus, those responsible for policy and practice face two challenges when creating the school–community links that contemporary students and teachers require to support their work. Conceptually, we must first define out-of-school resources for teaching and learning. Then, strategically, we must find ways to join schools and communities to strengthen the resources, occasions, and supports for learning in and out of school. The latter point requires not that opportunities for learning simply be available in and out of school but that people have the resources and supports necessary to take advantage of them.

II. The Effect of Out-of-School Factors on School Performance: What Matters About Family, Neighborhood, Peers, and Work

The importance of the time youth spend out of school is obvious: Development and learning do not stop at the end of the school day. Moreover, out-of-school experiences and conditions affect participation in school (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1994; Grubb & Lazerson, 1982). However, the haphazard track record that documents efforts to forge effective school–community links suggests that we need a clearer rationale for why community occasions, resources, and supports are important to teaching and learning. The record also suggests that we need more systematic knowledge of how communities and schools can work together to enhance teaching and learn-

[4] To a greater degree than is currently the case, these reformers also emphasized a democratic rationale for their efforts. These reformers agreed with Dewey when he wrote in *School and Society* that participation in activities that mirror community life provided excellent opportunities for developing "a spirit of social cooperation and community life" (Dewey, 1902/1956, p. 16) needed to inform democratic civic life. These reformers worked to add common and productive activity to the content of schooling because, as Dewey put it, "We have lost a good deal of our faith in the efficacy of purely intellectual instruction" (Dewey, 1902/1956, p. 84).

ing. In this section, we take up the first issue: What do we know about how out-of-school contexts affect youths' opportunities to learn? What aspects of community should be marshaled in a partnership with schools to expand teachers' opportunities to teach?

Traditionally, research on out-of-school contexts for youth has focused on the effects that community conditions and influences have on development and learning. These factors include, in a broad sense, the primary institutions and avenues for associations among youth and adults—families, neighborhoods, peers, and work. Similarly, in this section, we review the extensive research on the effects that these factors have on youth's development and learning, emphasizing trends and the most recent empirical work.

Though the effects are often intertwined, research in this area can be divided into these four broad categories: families, neighborhoods, peers, and work. Our interest in reviewing this broad and diverse set of literature is to understand how each of these nonschool elements create, support, or frustrate young people's opportunity to learn and so, too, their teachers' opportunity to teach. In other words, we are interested not only in *which* out-of-school resources, occasions, and supports matter for youth development and learning but also in *how* they matter.

We find that virtually all of this research highlights the ways that nonschool influences in students' lives affect their attitudes about themselves as learners, their motivation and ability to engage in school work, and their expectations for adulthood. In this way, this literature provides a rationale for considering that community is important to learning and teaching, and it begins to provide a rationale for linking school and community. However, we find that it provides few clues about how youth and their teachers might connect day to day to these out-of-school resources, occasions, and supports to enhance learning and teaching.

How Families Affect Youth's School-Related Attitudes and Outcomes

Much of the literature on the relationship between family and developmental and educational outcomes for youth stems from James Coleman's 1966 study of racial and ethnic segregation, inequality, student and family characteristics, and student achievement (Coleman et al., 1966). Using surveys of superintendents, principals, teachers, and approximately 645,000 students in more than 3,000 schools nationwide, Coleman found that such family factors as household composition, socioeconomic status, and parents' education are stronger predictors of educational progress than are school-related factors.

The publication of *Equality of Educational Opportunity Report* (Coleman et al., 1966) triggered more than three decades of quantitative studies on so-called "family effects." Some studies involved reanalyses of Coleman's data (e.g., Bowles & Levin, 1968) or attempts to test explicitly Coleman's theory and conclusions (e.g., Summers & Wolfe, 1977). Other data-intensive efforts evaluated the association between various family-related characteristics (e.g., family poverty, length of time in poverty, socioeconomic status) and education-related outcomes (e.g., academic achievement, graduation, and attendance). The studies generally agreed that parents in poor, low-income families are more likely to have both low levels of formal education and children who do not perform optimally in school than are families with higher socioeconomic status (see, e.g., Jencks et al., 1972).[5]

Studies of such family effects on school performance were particularly prominent in the 1980s, partly in response to demographic data on the perceived increase of children born in single-parent, Black families between 1970 and 1980 (Milne, Myers, Rosenthal, & Ginsburg, 1986; Thompson, Alexander, & Entwisle, 1988).[6] Accordingly, many such studies in the 1980s and early 1990s focused on family structure in relation to such outcomes as drop-out rates (Coleman, 1987), social and emotional adjustment, standardized test scores (Entwisle & Alexander, 1995), and school behavior and discipline (Featherstone, Cundick, & Jensen, 1992; Heiss, 1996; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Generally, these studies found that the children in two-parent families fare better than those from families otherwise structured. These analyses concluded that youth growing up in single-parent families generally were at greater risk of dropping out of school, achieving at lower levels in school, and not attending college.

However, concern for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach directs us to look beyond the coincidence of family status variables and educational variables and ask more specifically, What day-to-day experiences of youth in families lead to the observed outcomes? What features of family relationships are essential to youth development and learning, and may explain the conditions under which certain factors enable or inhibit teaching and learning? For example, the fact that two-parent families are correlated with higher educational outcomes in the aggregate neither tells us whether two parents are actually present day-to-day in the individual households nor what transpires day-to-day between parents and children that may contribute to particular learning or developmental outcomes. A nuclear family may provide a nourishing environment where children are cherished, a "haven in a heartless world," or it may be the place of hidden abuse and neglect (Larson, 1994). Similarly, most correlational studies do not address what happens in single-parent families with high-achieving children that enables them to buck the trends. In fact, looking across studies of family effects, we learn that family both can ameliorate risk

[5] This continued analytical focus on the effects of family poverty, in part, reflects the emphasis of Great Society programs on low-income children and families. Many of the federal initiatives of the Great Society period were responses to early research on associations between poverty, family characteristics, and school achievement. This analytical focus also reflects the availability, for the first time, of large data sets (e.g., High School and Beyond, National Educational Longitudinal Survey) that enabled broad-scale analyses of such self-reported family factors as parents' education and income (Buehler et al., 1997).

[6] Some studies note that the total number of children born to Black households did not increase during this period. Rather, the percentage of children born to two-parent, White households decreased, raising the percentage of Black children in the overall population. This change in percentage contributed to the perception that we were witnessing a greater total number of children born to single Black households (Jarrett, 1997).

(Garbarino, 1992; Harnish, Dodge, & Valente, 1995; Hashima & Amato, 1994; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994) and exacerbate it (McLeod, 1990; Sampson & Laub, 1994).

In response to such apparently contradictory findings, quantitative researchers have probed variables that may mediate other variables to expand developmental and educational opportunities for youth. For example, McLanahan & Sandefur (1994) used data from four national surveys to investigate more specifically why single parenting in the aggregate generally correlates with poor outcomes for youth. They found that youth tend to do well, regardless of family structure, when their parents regularly provide significant supervision of homework and out-of-school time. Youth tend to achieve in school not only when their parents say they have high levels of aspirations for academic and future achievement but also when parents translate these aspirations into enriching opportunities for learning from day to day—independent of family structure.

In addition, higher achievement across different family structures is associated with parents who have strong roots in their neighborhoods—roots that can provide additional support and supervision for youth and networks for personal and professional advancement (Entwisle & Alexander, 1995, 1996; Heiss, 1996; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994) Bianchi and Robinson also found that, in terms of youth's day-to-day experiences, family structure may not be as consequential as studies that are less nuanced suggest. They argue that the most powerful influence on how children spend their time is not simply their parents' education, but the expectations that parents communicate and the opportunities they are able to extend in part because of their own higher levels of education (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997).[7] Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Wahlen (1993) found that parents tend to foster talent, academic success, and creativity in their children when they prod them to do their best and give them unconditional support in their efforts to succeed in challenging situations.[8]

Ethnographers and other qualitative researchers have long focused on the experience of many youth and families who succeed despite the odds. Many of these studies enrich our understanding of how, on a day-to-day basis, families matter to the improved educational performance of youth. For example, Robin Jarrett (1995) reviewed qualitative studies that explore an array of family strategies that buffer the effects of poverty, as summarized in the work of such scholars as Carol Stack (1974), Elijah Anderson (1989, 1990), and Reginald Clark (1983). Jarrett concludes that families expand developmental and educational opportunities for youth regardless of income by using some type of "community-bridging" strategy to link their youth with mainstream institutions and opportunities. Jarrett's synthesis describes five family activities that are associated with community bridging:

- Development and maintenance of a supportive adult network structure that enables parents to provide broader opportunities for youth
- Restricted family-community relations that establish a limited scope of relationships within the local neighborhood and "defend" the family
- Strict parental monitoring strategies that keep track of the time, friendships, and activities of adolescents
- Involvement with "mobility-enhancing" institutions such as churches that offer youth social and academic activities, and link them to broader social networks
- Adult-sponsored opportunities for youth to develop adult roles and responsibilities such as fund-raising for a sport team or club project

Families who engage in these activities use their broader community to find opportunities for their young people to develop the skills, attitudes, and experiences that would help them move successfully into mainstream roles and institutions (Jarrett, 1995; see also Anderson, 1978; Clark, 1983; Stack, 1974).

In summary, research demonstrates that the interest and support parents provide to their children can expand opportunities to learn and teach—regardless of family structure and status. Of particular importance is the supervision and structure that parents and guardians give children outside school and the connections families or adult caregivers make to broader opportunities and occasions for development. Families that engage in these activities protect and focus youths' out-of-school time not only around the concrete responsibilities of school but also around the social and other activities essential to their development as learners. When the family functions as an advocate, inspiration, teacher, and coach, it can motivate youths' interest to do well in school, support a positive vision of the future, and otherwise extend and reinforce teachers' classroom efforts.

Our review also suggests that other factors influence the challenges families face as they engage in these activities and relationships. In particular, various conditions within their neighborhoods clearly are formidable direct influences on such activities and relationships. Accordingly, we turn now to a brief examination of selections from the literature on how neighborhoods affect school attitudes, learning outcomes, and possibilities for development—hence, how neighborhoods boost or constrain opportunity to learn and to teach.

How Neighborhoods Affect Youth's School-Related Attitudes and Outcomes

The significance of neighborhoods for youth development and learning is not news to psychologists and educators. Systematic studies of the effects of neighborhoods on youth and families

[7] Several other parenting studies are based on typologies of parenting styles, use surveys, and large sets of data about students' school success to identify relations between "ideal types" of parenting (e.g., authoritative, permissive) and various educational and developmental outcomes (Dornbusch, Ritter, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Steinberg et al., 1994; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). Although these studies are somewhat limited in their depiction of the day-to-day relationships between youth and their parents (the conditions under which various parenting styles may be beneficial or detrimental is not always clear), these studies do find positive relationships between parents who set clear goals and guidelines for their children and who consistently enforce rules for the family and for children's school performance.

[8] Clearly, certain conditions impede the ability of families to provide such expanded opportunities to learn. For example, a common theme in studies of the relationship among parenting styles, family environment, and school performance is the struggle that many low-income parents have to provide safe, educationally rich environments for youth and many of the day-to-day resources youth need to succeed in school.

were particularly prominent during the Great Society period in the 1960s when political and research-related resources focused on identifying neighborhoods in poverty for targeted public assistance and evaluations of such efforts. This research included rich ethnographic studies of youth and their neighborhoods (Liebow, 1996; Stack, 1974; Whyte, 1955) and a significant body of empirical work that was based on large data sets (e.g., Banfield, 1970). Both strands of research were central to debates during the 1960s and 1970s about causes and consequences of neighborhood poverty as related to school performance (Newman, 1997).

William Julius Wilson's *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987) shifted the discussion of neighborhood effects on youth and families from the discussion of neighborhood cultures and demographics to the discussion of neighborhood economic conditions as significant factors in youth's attitudes, activities, and achievements. Wilson argued that changes in the American economy (e.g., deindustrialization, transition to a service economy) led to the flight of white middle- and working-class families out of central cities and the concentration of poor, often African-American families within them. These ghetto neighborhoods became increasingly isolated from the kinds of social networks necessary for adults' success or children's healthy development, a point also illustrated in the family effects literature (Wilson, 1987).[9]

A number of theoretical models elaborate how neighborhood characteristics do or could influence youth's relationships with school and concepts of themselves as students.[10] Although these research traditions use different analytical lenses, together they reveal some remarkable similarities and limitations.[11] First, of critical importance for youth and families is the availability of social networks within and between neighborhoods that can provide a web of support to parents and other adults (see, e.g., Anderson, 1978; Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Bronfenbrenner, Moen, & Garbarino, 1984; Caplan & Killilea, 1976; Garbarino, 1992; Sorin, 1990). High levels of social support mean opportunities for youth development, even in hostile circumstances (McLaughlin et al., 1994).

Second, social coherence and neighborhood stability (Sampson, 1991) seem strongly correlated with positive developmental and learning outcomes for youth. Researchers find that social disorganization (litter, boarded buildings, disorderly behavior) that persists over time, regardless of the turnover of individual residents, predicts such negative outcomes as high crime rates and, by extension, other poor developmental conditions for youth (see, e.g., Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1996; Garbarino, 1992; Murphy & Moriarty, 1976).[12] However, Bernard and other researchers investigating sources of resilience in children and youth found that a socially coherent community with strong relationships among adults and between adults and children can do much to overcome the otherwise debilitating effects of poverty (Bernard, 1990; Werner, 1992).[13]

---

[9] One significant synthesis of major research on the effects of concentrated poverty in neighborhoods is the recently published *Neighborhood Poverty*, edited by Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Greg J. Duncan, and J. Lawrence Aber. This two-volume set of studies is the product of the Working Group on Communities and Neighborhoods that was appointed by the Social Science Research Council in 1989 (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, & Aber, 1998a, 1998b). See Volume 1, *Context and Consequences for Children* (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1998a), for a comprehensive review of literature on the effects of neighborhood poverty on children and families and for additional data on the concentration of poverty from the 1950s to the present. Our review also considers this research.

[10] For example, studies in the Wilson tradition that are based, in part, on an epidemiological model (Granovetter, 1978; Schelling, 1971) argue that neighborhood residents are "carriers" of behaviors that can "infect" others depending on their degree of susceptibility (Crane, 1996). Residential crowding in low-income neighborhoods thus becomes a source of risk (Ensminger, Lamkin, & Jacobson, 1996). Similarly, others use the presence of affluent neighbors as a proxy for a wide range of factors, such as higher prevalence of role models, social influence on parenting style, social isolation, and institutional strengths and resources of the neighborhood itself (e.g., Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Klebanov, & Sealand, 1993). Other studies are largely centered on neighborhood-related causes of crime and delinquency, and often identify structural factors—ethnic heterogeneity, residential mobility, high unemployment, high proportion of female-headed households, high proportion of households on welfare –that disrupt the social organization of local communities (Gottfredson, McNeill III, & Gottfredson, 1991; Sampson, 1993).

[11] Many researchers of social disorganization are engaged in a debate about how to account for factors that mediate opportunity and risk and how to link youth with mainstream opportunities and institutions (Jarrett, 1995). The number of qualitative studies of success stories has reached a critical mass, and a more systematic synthesis of these individual studies may now be possible (Jarrett, 1995). However, the focus of this research is not always of primary interest to educators (e.g., crime and delinquency rates among primarily adult neighborhood residents in Sampson & Laub, 1994).

[12] We found certain studies more helpful than others for informing opportunity to learn and teach. As we explained with regard to the family effects literature, large data sets may not define other variables in ways that are meaningful to youth and families in actual neighborhoods. For example, studies of social disorganization that rely on large surveys generally define disorganization by concentrated characteristics of individual families and other neighborhood residents (e.g., socioeconomic status, number, and percentage of female-headed households). By contrast, an ethnomethodological study found that residents of a given neighborhood define disorganization by such factors as litter, boarded buildings, unkempt yards or homes, and loitering or disorderly behavior (Coulton et al., 1996). Such studies are significant because they are based on residents' conceptions of actions or behaviors that they experience from day to day rather than on researchers' categories of individual characteristics. Significantly, the definition offered by residents indicates actions or behaviors that can be discouraged or deterred rather than individual characteristics that are impossible or not easy to manipulate. In this sense, "local knowledge" may be more useful to policymakers, practitioners, and others interested in how to improve community and school conditions for expanded opportunities to learn and teach.

[13] Despite this unanimity about the importance of social coherence and neighborhood stability, implications of this research are limited for our purposes. For example, across disciplines, researchers rely on data sets that identify these social networks as "neighborhoods," defined by census tracts and other geographical and jurisdictional boundaries. These boundaries, generally developed for researchers' analytic purposes, often do not correspond with the relevant social unit for youth, families, or teachers. Certain recent ethnomethodological studies attempt to remedy this problem by using the social units and labels constructed by neighborhood residents themselves to define "neighborhood." However, to construct large samples, many researchers use this information to guide their choices of various predefined neighborhood categories; these categories may be closer to but are not entirely contiguous with "neighborhood" as defined by residents (Coulton et al., 1996). Nor are these categories necessarily meaningful to teachers who are interested in the specific conditions faced by the children and youth in their classrooms and schools and in the resources that might be available to expand opportunities for teaching and learning. Also, for example, adopting the poverty line as a measure of neighborhood

In addition, research on resiliency is part of a broader trend in studies of neighborhoods and youth. Instead of dwelling on neighborhood deficits and their debilitating consequences for youth, research on resiliency highlights local assets and supports for development (e.g., Blyth & Leffert, 1995; Kretzman & McKnight, 1993).[14] In particular, resiliency research expands notions of opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach because it emphasizes not what conditions simply should be avoided (many are beyond the control of teachers and even youth and families, anyway) but what supports should be cultivated intentionally to expand teaching and learning.

These researchers stress that every community has assets and strengths upon which to build opportunities and resources for youth. Chief among these, according to many studies, are strong community ties and intergenerational networks (such as those found in ethnic-based community organizations) that provide youth with resources, strong behavior norms, and connections to broader employment and other opportunities (Anderson, 1978; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Sorin, 1990).[15] In these studies, the neighborhood extends the classroom. It also extends the family in the values, supports, and expectations that youth encounter there.

This analysis also suggests that neighborhoods are important settings for interactions among youth that also affect opportunities to learn and teach. More specifically, how do various peer groups operate as essential influences and resources for teaching and learning?

Peer Influences on Engagement with School and Achievement

Researchers have examined peer influences from at least two different perspectives. One line of research addresses the importance of peer relationships—that is, friends—in adolescent development. Erik Erikson, for example, found that peer affiliations are essential to healthy identity development in adolescents, partly, because they provide opportunities for youth to explore new interests, relationships, and ideologies (Erikson, 1968; Swanson, Spencer, & Petersen, 1998).

A second line of research examines how peer groups help youth frame goals, values, and commitments. Early research in this area was somewhat narrow in its conception of peer groups. For example, James Coleman's influential 1961 classic, *Adolescent Society,* depicted peer groups and youth culture as uniform and largely oppositional to adult society. According to Coleman, youth assert their culture to reject connections with parents and other adults. Such studies recognize that asserting a youth culture can be one means for achieving autonomy but that, if this assertion of their culture constitutes full rejection of parental values, then deviant behavior generally results (Coleman, 1961; Parsons, 1942).[16]

However, others have not concurred with this portrait of adolescent society. Some researchers who also have based their work on direct observation and participation find that youth culture is varied rather than uniform and that membership in one or another group has important influence on a youth's choices and sense of identity. Qualitative researchers such as Penelope Eckert identified distinctive youth cultures in the high schools. Eckert studied social categories she named "jocks" and "burnouts" (Eckert, 1989). Black youth in Fordham and Ogbu's study avoided the "brainiacs" in the belief that inclusion would signal "selling out" their ethnic identity and that academic achievement represents "acting White" (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). Eckert's jocks and burnouts likewise were contemptuous of high-achieving youth.

Researchers find that youth select a particular peer group for a variety of reasons. For some, one important consideration is the "social address"—the groups' cultural, economic, and achievement characteristics with which youth may want to be associated (e.g., Elder, 1985). Many youth choose a group on the basis of ethnicity (Phelan et al., 1998). Other youth are not so much pulled by features of a youth group as they are pushed by other aspects of their lives. Researchers investigating gangs, for example, claim that youth are driven to gangs by stress at home, ineffective parenting practices, and search for the care, safety, and support missing at home (Hagedorn, 1988; Padilla, 1992).[17] Some studies suggest that youth, particularly urban youth of various ages, develop strong peer cultures in gangs that foster destructive values and behaviors (MacLeod, 1987). However, reconsiderations of the role of gangs suggests that gangs fill social, economic, and psychological needs for youth that, given certain supports, do not necessarily lead to negative behavior (Padilla, 1992; Vigil, 1993).

Whatever the path to a peer group and whatever the charac-

---

conditions ignores variations in households, resources, and types of poverty that may be particularly relevant to designers of educational policies and programs (Schram, 1995).

[14] This line of research echoes and extends the work of researchers such as Anderson (1978), Lefkowitz (1987), Stack (1974), Werner (1992), Williams and Kornblum (1985), and others who have sought to explain the success of young people from poor neighborhoods. However, this research is largely decontextualized. That is, it provides little information on the conditions under which resiliency factors matter to improved outcomes for youth—specifically, which of them matter under which circumstances for which youth. Therefore, we provide only a brief mention of this literature here.

[15] In a sense, these studies are the bright side of Wilson's 1987 study of employment, which found that the absence of jobs limits youth's motivation to stay in school or to imagine a future of meaningful employment. In part, Wilson said youth are discouraged because they cannot find role models of success nor relationships among people in "ghetto" neighborhoods that lead to broader opportunities.

[16] Later theoretical arguments suggest that peer culture may "coexist with continued commitment to parents and their adult-related values" (Fasick, 1984). However, generally, studies that consider the effects of peers and families on youth are concerned with whether families ameliorate the deleterious effects of peer pressure. For example, Steinberg examined the relationship between family structure and susceptibility to peer pressure and found a correlation between single-parent families and youth engagement in deviant behavior that could be attributed to peer pressure (Steinberg, 1987).

[17] Related to this point, Youniss & Smollar (1989) found that peer relationships are particularly powerful when youth's experiences do not bear out parental teachings.

ter of peer culture, researchers find that the values, expectations, and activities associated with a particular group sway a youth's school attitudes, behaviors, and achievement. Erikson, for instance, recognized that peer "crowds" can vary substantially in terms of their normative attitudes, interests, behaviors, and consequences (Erikson, 1968). Comparing peer groups in nine Midwestern and West Coast high schools, one study found that the average grade point average varied by nearly two full letter grades between groups (Brown, Lamborn, Mounts, & Steinberg, 1993). A meta-analysis of 110 correlations taken from 10 studies conducted between 1966 and 1978 confirmed that peer influence is a small but consistent correlate of educational outcomes (standardized achievement tests, course grades, educational aspirations, and occupational aspirations) (Ide, Parkerson, Haertel, & Walberg, 1981).

Other studies find that having high-achieving peers boosts adolescents' educational expectations, report card grades, standardized achievement scores, and satisfaction with school (Epstein, 1983). In a longitudinal study of 500 ninth to eleventh graders between 1987 and 1990, researchers predicted grade point average and drug use by friends' grades and drug use (Mounts & Steinberg, 1995).[18] Bernard (1990) suggests that peer relations provide such benefits as support, opportunities, and models for prosocial development (e.g., sharing, help, comfort, and empathy). She also argues that these groups teach critical social skills (e.g., impulse control, communication, creative and critical thinking, and relationship or friendship skills). These effects may be strongest when opportunities for peer interaction are structured through extracurricular activities or other planned opportunities for positive, stable engagement with peers and adults (Spady, 1970). Further, stable friendships have been directly correlated with good conduct and self-esteem (Keefe & Berndt, 1996).

In summary, research identifies how peer groups function as a powerful influence on youth development and academic engagement. First, friends can provide youth with safety nets for intellectual, creative, and emotional risk taking that can be essential to healthy development and learning. Second, such friendship groups and other associations can reinforce values, habits, activities, or goals that can lead youth toward healthy development and fundamentally shape their identities as learners. In these ways, peers form an important context that affects how youth respond to their teachers' efforts and expectations. Third, deliberate efforts to structure opportunities for youth to engage in peer groups can enhance outcomes. For example, after-school jobs often provide the location and occasion for peer interactions. Beyond that, work itself can be a significant out-of-school influence on learning. We turn now to an exploration of how work specifically effects learning outcomes.

How Work Affects Youth's Attitudes, Behaviors, and Capacities

Youth's experiences during employment have received little attention from researchers. Only a few studies examine the effects of work on school-related attitudes and performance, despite the significant and growing participation of youth in the labor market. In 1940, only 4% of 16-year-old boys and 1% of 16-year-old girls in school held jobs. By 1970, these rates of employment had increased to 20% and 16%, respectfully (Greenberger, Steinberg, Vaux, & McAuliffe, 1980). This trend continues. By some estimates, 76% of adolescents have begun working by the age of 16 (Mihalic & Elliott, 1997). In one study, 41% of youth in one study worked an average of 18 hours per week while also attending school (Larson, 1994).

Researchers differ in how they assess the value of work for youth development and school success. On the one hand, employment supports personal responsibility and behaviors expected in the workplace, such as punctuality (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux, 1982). Work experience also appears to promote autonomy, especially for girls. On the other hand, some studies are less sanguine about the effects of employment on school-age youth. For example, one study found that working promotes cynical attitudes, comfort with unethical work practices, and increased cigarette and marijuana use. Greenberger et al. speculate that this last effect may be linked to increased stress brought on by working (Greenberger, Steinberg, & Ruggiero, 1981; Greenberger, Steinberg, & Vaux, 1981).

How much time youth spend in jobs outside of school also matters. Working more than 20 hours a week for certain youth appears to lessen the likelihood of dropping out of school—but working more than 20 hours may increase dropout rates for some (D'Amico, 1984; National Research Council, 1993). Working in high school may lower some boys' grade point averages, educational and occupational aspirations, and educational attainments (Mortimer & Finch, 1996). It also may lead to less time on homework and, consequently, lower grades (Lillydahl, 1990; Steinberg & Dornbusch, 1991) and lower academic aspirations (Mihalic & Elliott, 1997). In contrast, work has positive effects in other cases. For example, Marsh finds that employment improves grades, but only for students who are saving for college (Marsh, 1991). Adolescents, especially Whites, may be more involved in school activities when they work (Mihalic & Elliott, 1997). Youth who work tend to socialize with others who work, and these relationships are more positive in terms of school-related outcomes than those with nonworking peers (Newman, 1996).

How do we reconcile these apparently contradictory findings about the value of work for school-related attitudes and outcomes? First, these findings, at a minimum, suggest that youth do work and will continue to work out of either necessity or interest. Second, work experiences do influence youth's academic, personal, and social development, for better or worse. Third, when youth view a work experience as meaningful—when it builds the skills they, their schools, and their employers value—then it tends to promote healthy development, confidence, and academic engagement (Hess, Petersen, & Mortimer, 1994).

Thus, researchers need to distinguish among the quality of

[18] These findings were tempered by parents: The effect of high-achieving friends was stronger if parents were more authoritative; the effect of having drug-using friends was greater if parents were less authoritative.

different types of work and work settings. Researchers tend to lump various types of work together under one variable, such as "holding a job" (Greenberger, Steinberg, & Ruggiero, 1982) and thereby treat employment as a generic experience.[19] Some jobs provide few opportunities for growth; others offer youth opportunities to help others, make decisions, establish relationships, build trust, develop various competencies, and exercise leadership (Stern, Stone, Hopkins, & McLillon, 1990). For this reason, we distinguish between having a job and having meaningful work. Our interest is in work that engages and connects youth with various valuable opportunities for academic, social, and personal development.

Defined this way, work can benefit youth in a variety of ways (Schulenberg & Bachman, 1993). In some circumstances, it creates a track record for future employment and a structured, focused culture that is supportive of continued involvement in education. Through work, youth can become connected to social networks and otherwise develop the social capital that can be essential to future employment. As a result, teenage workers may adopt an identity as a worker, which they see as superior to their unemployed peers. All are important bases for an "honored sense of self," which may be unavailable at school but which is critical to success in it (Newman & Lennon, 1995; Newman, 1996).

In short, a job can provide youth with important relationships, experience, and exposure to the attitudes and behaviors that are necessary to succeed in school and in the workforce. In many instances, employed youth form a peer community that affects attitudes about school, self, and the future—for better or worse. When employment involves youth in meaningful and challenging tasks and when it builds skills valued both by youth and the public, out-of-school jobs can make a critical and particular contribution to a young person's self-esteem, confidence, motivation, and aspirations for academic success. In such instances, it contributes to opportunities for learning and teaching consistent with the goals society sets for schools.

Considering School–Community Connections: Shared Directions and Limitations of the Literature on Out-of-School Effects

Within a chapter that examines school–community connections, we present this abridged review of the literature on various out-of-school effects for two primary reasons. First, researchers have long known that out-of-school conditions in families, neighborhoods, peer groups, and on the job affect students' opportunities to learn and that many of these effects, under certain conditions, can be positive. The rationale for focusing on out-of-school contexts as resources, occasions, and supports for learning seems clear and uncontestable.

Second, the bodies of literature presented here explain how out-of-school conditions affect learning outcomes in strikingly similar ways. Specifically, families, neighborhoods, peers, and work seem to improve opportunity to learn through strong relationships among peers and adults: connections to personal, professional, and other networks throughout and beyond the youths' neighborhoods; strong peer and adult role models; clear identity structures; a focus on youth and neighborhood strengths; and values that acknowledge youths' success in multiple arenas.

At the same time, these bodies of literature provide a limited guide for developing a research and policy agenda around opportunities to learn and teach, because they do not elaborate on how we can think strategically about organizing families, neighborhoods, peers, and workplaces in support of learning. Specifically, they do not suggest how out-of-school contexts for learning might be structured and marshaled in partnerships with schools to expand opportunities for learning and teaching.

This limitation arises, in part, because these lines of research are generally variable based. In variable-based studies, researchers reduce community contexts to factors such as "poverty rates," "incidence of violence," and "number of community-based organizations." Then they correlate these factors with various indicators of youth development and learning. This approach poses five fundamental problems for our inquiry. First, the "risk factors" that are of interest in these studies tend to be individual attributes or are otherwise beyond the influence of teachers, schools, and other youth-serving organizations. Second, researchers usually determine these factors and indicators a priori and, thus, may miss other factors that are important to youths' learning from day to day.

Third, variable-based studies focus on the correlation of resources and relationships to outcomes, not on what enables youth to take advantage of the presence of these resources and relationships in ways that may lead to favorable outcomes. In other words, the presence of resources, supports, and occasions does not itself mean they will be used. Most of this research focuses on avoiding risks and other deficits rather than on developing strengths. Research on family, neighborhoods, peers, and work provides strong evidence of a consistent relationship between a variety of out-of-school factors and poor school performance, but it tells us little about factors that promote successful learning and teaching among children and youth who are disadvantaged, as assessed by conventional categories.

Fourth, these lines of research tend to focus on point-in-time correlations and not on the developmental progress of particular youth over time. This focus on point-in-time correlations means that these data deal on a level of abstraction that does not illuminate day-to-day design features of neighborhoods that have strong school–community connections. Fifth, even when researchers use longitudinal data, they rarely consider changing contextual factors such as a changed youth labor market to explain trends over time, rendering the studies essentially ahistorical and the findings generally incomplete.

In summary, this research on out-of-school factors that influence youth's school performance—families, neighborhood, peers, and work—suggests that for us to understand how to strengthen school–community connections around opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach, we need a framework for policy and practice that does the following:

[19] For many youth, working is an economic necessity. For many of these youth, concern with the quality of the job as a learning experience is a luxury that should not lead to the devaluation of these jobs (Rist, 1981).

- Focuses on relationships, social networks, and other factors that are meaningful to or valued by youth and adults
- Emphasizes the developmental nature of learning including building on youths' strengths
- Recognizes the diversity of contexts in which youth learn that can correlate positively with youths' performance in school

Beyond expanding youths' opportunities to learn—one part of the context of teaching for classroom teachers—the research is less clear about how out-of-school contexts matter for teachers' opportunities to teach.

As the program initiatives and projects that are reviewed in the next section show, school–community efforts that contribute to opportunities to learn and to teach are distinguished by many of the features identified in the literature on effects. An examination of these deliberate attempts to structure out-of-school environments and, in some cases, link them with schools helps us begin to specify the design features of such initiatives that matter for opportunities to learn and teach. We turn now to that review.

III. Prospects for Connecting Schools and Communities for Teaching and Learning: Learning from Experience

We see in the literature on effects that youth's attitudes about school and their performance in school can be and are affected by a variety of contexts and experiences both in and out of school. We also see that, by extension, teachers' efforts could be and are supported and strengthened by actors and opportunities out of school—even when those efforts are not directly connected. Furthermore, from the literature on effects, we can derive qualities of community that can enhance learning. Our questions then become, Why should we connect in-school and out-of-school resources, occasions, and supports for learning? How can we forge such school–community connections to enhance and extend educational and developmental opportunities in and out of school?

Deliberate attempts to connect in-school and out-of-school resources, supports, and occasions for learning are few and far between in the late 1990s. Evidence about them and related efforts is found in a largely fugitive literature that consists mostly of scattered studies of single programs in limited geographic areas, studies that are difficult to find through mainstream sources of educational research. We find relevant evidence of deliberate school–community connections for opportunity to learn from research on five types of programs or initiatives. The first four that we consider are

- Initiatives for school-linked services that provide health and human services and supports at or near schools
- Community service or service-learning programs that engage youth in various community agencies and activities
- School-to-work initiatives that involve local businesses in providing educational experiences for youth
- Community-based organizations that take a developmental perspective on their work with youth and strategically build youths' "social capital"

The fifth group that we consider includes programs that strategically combine certain elements of each of the above groups and link them with schools. We find that the programs and initiatives in this latter group—what we call school–community connections for opportunity to learn and teach—provide an important rationale for connecting in-school and out-of-school resources to enhance learning. They demonstrate that, when these connections are forged in certain ways, teaching and learning are enhanced to levels that seem to exceed what would be possible with either in-school or out-of-school resources alone. An examination of these efforts with a focus on learning suggests that these school–community connections improve opportunities to learn and teach when they

- Improve conditions both in and out of school that may impede learning
- Provide opportunities both in and out of school for youth to succeed and develop academic and other competencies that are essential for learning
- Link teachers and other school professionals with expanded networks for professional support and development that inform the professional practice of youths' various teachers in and out of school
- Continually identify and connect the formal and informal curriculum and pedagogy of youth's in-school and out-of-school learning in ways that allow each to reinforce and inform the other

Finally, we conclude this section with a definition of school–community connections for opportunity to learn and to teach that draws on lessons learned to date from the experiences described below.

School-Linked Services Initiatives

Initiatives for school-linked services have grown more prominent in the past 15 years in both the public and private sectors. These initiatives generally attempt to (a) connect family support services with schools to increase access to health and human services and to recreation for youth and families; (b) provide health and human services more efficiently, effectively, and comprehensively;[20] and (c) improve the status of youth along a range of indicators from health to citizenship to academics. Various nonacademic services, from the hygiene classes of the Progressive era to drug prevention programs in recent decades, have been an important part of schools since the common school movement (Tyack, 1992). Initiatives for school-linked services mark a distinct development: Whereas many Progres-

[20] Definitions of "comprehensive" vary from those that include a broad range of predetermined services (Dryfoos, 1994) to those that provide such services that meet the needs and build on the strengths of target children and families (e.g., California's Healthy Start School-linked Services Initiative).

sive era reforms expanded the services that schools provide, initiatives for school-linked services generally involve partnerships with community agencies that already provide these services and, thus, enhance the performance of both schools and community agencies. In this way, initiatives for school-linked services provide an important source of evidence about the school–community connections of interest here.

Many initiatives for school-linked services are based on the explicit assumption that connections between family support services and schools will improve opportunities to learn and teach in a number of respects. First, if services are located at or near school, youth will be more likely to use them, their health and mental health status will improve, they will become better able to meet their basic needs, and their families will become stronger. Because their nonacademic needs have been met, youth will come to school better prepared to learn. Second, the presence of social workers, health care providers, counselors, parents and others on school campuses will mean that teachers will have the support of other service providers in addressing the nonacademic needs of their students. Consequently, teachers will be able to focus more of their time and resources on teaching and learning in a potentially less stressful classroom environment and will otherwise be free to "really teach."

Initiatives for school-linked services range from single school efforts (Philliber Research Associates, 1994) to statewide efforts to integrate services and connect them with schools (e.g., see Illback, 1997, on Kentucky; SRI International, 1996, on California). For example, a city-level partnership of health and human services and educational agencies in San Diego launched New Beginnings in the late 1980s at Hamilton Elementary School. Through New Beginnings, this city partnership provided additional discretionary funding to Hamilton Elementary and other agencies serving youth in its neighborhood to create an interagency partnership that would deliver a range of health and human services on the school campus including mental health counseling, health services, adult basic education, and recreation.

In Kentucky and California, state educational agencies provide funding for schools and other neighborhood-based agencies to deliver health, social, recreational, employment, educational, and other services in more collaborative and comprehensive ways. In Kentucky, the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1991 requires all schools where at least 20% of the students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunches to establish family resource or youth services centers at or near school campuses to offer a range of family support and employment services. California's statewide Healthy Start initiative provides discretionary funding to school-level interagency partnerships on a competitive basis. These partnerships implement school-linked services that best meet the needs and build on the strengths of youth and families in that neighborhood. Healthy Start collaboratives across California (from kindergarten through Grade 12) currently implement family resource centers, child-care and recreation programs, school-based health clinics, itinerant case management teams, and other services.

In addition to their broader scope, these initiatives differ from the traditional efforts to provide nonacademic services at schools in two significant ways. First, the initiatives are generally governed at the school level by interagency partnerships or collaboratives whose members each contribute various funding and services to the effort. Thus, the school is not the sole provider, funder, or decision maker in the school-linked services initiative. This approach is generally based on the belief that no one agency serving youth can meet its goals alone and that services would be provided more efficiently and effectively if they were delivered collaboratively. Such collaboration is generally believed to require shared governance and funding. Second, these initiatives are usually part of a deliberate strategy to effect broader changes in systems of health and human services. For example, the New Beginnings program at Hamilton Elementary School in San Diego was designed as a demonstration site for a broader effort to redesign the county's social services system (Philliber Research Associates, 1994).

School-linked services initiatives such as these demonstrate results in a number of areas. Early evaluations suggest that these initiatives are meeting families' previously unmet needs for health and human services and are improving access to comprehensive services. Customer satisfaction is generally high (Philliber Research Associates, 1994; SRI International, 1996). Some of the longer-standing initiatives are showing improved school retention, reduced absenteeism, and improvements in grade point averages (Rossman & Morley, 1995). Other studies indicate that gains are greatest in the first six months (SRI International, 1996) and for youth that are worst off at the start (Rossman & Morley, 1995). This finding suggests that connecting health and human services and educational supports may lead to improvements in school performance, at least in the short term, in such areas as school attendance and school climate (e.g., incidence of graffiti, classroom behavior).

However, initial evaluations also suggest that the disconnections between the in-school and out-of-school components of most initiatives for school-linked services limit the capacity of these initiatives to significantly expand opportunity to learn, because many of them involve adding services to otherwise unchanged in-school programs. They suggest that, for school-linked services to contribute to more significant gains in school performance, schools must somehow restructure as part of these initiatives if we expect academic achievement to improve significantly. For example, the Communities in Schools (CIS) initiative has provided discretionary funding and technical assistance to schools to provide a range of largely formal health and human services at or near school campuses. A recent evaluation of CIS found that students who were enrolled in schools that had formed academies—schools within schools or alternative schools—as the primary vehicle for delivering school-linked services through the CIS program showed greater improvements in school achievement than students in CIS at typical schools—schools that had not been restructured or otherwise integrated with the out-of-school supports and occasions for learning (Rossman & Morley, 1995).

The Annie E. Casey foundation launched a multimillion dollar, multicity effort in the late 1980s to stimulate the development of city-level interagency partnerships that would reform the citywide delivery of health and human services in ways that were more closely connected with schools. The evaluation of Annie E. Casey's New Futures initiative found that, in part, because schools failed to restructure when additional services

were added on, prospects for gain in academic achievement were constrained (Wehlage et al., 1992; see also Smylie & Crowson, 1996). These findings suggest that, if the school-linked services were more than merely linked but were integrated into the core of schools for students, perhaps greater gains in academic achievement and other school outcomes would result. Early policy documents on school-linked services emphasize that linking services with schools is important because teachers are then freed from addressing social problems and can focus on teaching. However, these initiatives do not always engage schools similarly in reforming their interactions with youth (Wehlage et al., 1992).

Many initiatives are trying to create stronger connections between the integrated services and the regular school program. However, many noneducational agencies may face significant difficulties in partnering with schools. Some find school staff members averse to collaboration because of bureaucratic barriers such as rigid scheduling and lack of experience (Chaskin & Richman, 1993; McLaughlin et al., 1994). A 5-year study of such school–community integration in 36 states revealed that little integration was in practice at this stage in the development of school-linked services initiatives (Lawson & Briar-Lawson, 1997).

In summary, experience to date with school-linked services suggests a number of lessons that are relevant to the question of joining school and community around opportunity to learn and teach. For one, school-linked services, as presently implemented, may be a necessary precondition for enhancing teaching and learning, especially in high-poverty settings where students and their families may tend to lack access to basic resources. However, these initiatives may not sustain improvements in learning short of fundamentally strengthening the connections between community and school.

School-linked services also can provide opportunities for parents and other adults in the lives of youth to gain important knowledge and develop the kinds of networks that are identified as essential in section II. For example, a number of researchers note that the presence of family support services on school campuses increases the opportunities adults and youth have to establish relationships with professionals connected to schools (Smrekar, 1994; Smrekar, 1996). This increased social capital (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995) can mean improved parental involvement with the school and in their children's education. Nonetheless, most initiatives for school-linked services adopt a school-centric view of where teaching and learning occur. Even though many initiatives are designed expressly to achieve educational goals, few view out-of-school learning environments as settings for learning rather than as barriers to learning. These initiatives focus on removing barriers to learning rather than on identifying where learning takes place in their neighborhoods and linking that learning with schools.

Community Service and Service Learning

For more than a decade, foundation leaders, educational reformers, and policymakers including Presidents George Bush and Bill Clinton have promoted community service and service learning as ways to foster personal growth, civic commitment, and academic competence and engagement (Boyer, 1983; Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, 1988; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1989; Harrison, 1987). School districts, schools, and individual teachers now have substantial new funding opportunities for community service and service learning from foundations, businesses, and government groups at the national, state, and local levels. In 1993–94, approximately 434,000 school-aged youth participated in Learn and Serve America programs.[21] In 1994–95, this number rose to 750,000 (Melchior, 1997). Additionally, many school districts, cities (including Chicago and Atlanta), and the entire state of Maryland now require students to take part in service activities as one prerequisite for high school graduation. A study of data from the National Education Longitudinal Survey (NELS) and from the 1992 follow-up survey indicated that, of 12th graders, nationally 44% had participated in some form of community service within the past 2 years in either their school or their community and 8% had worked in a school-based community service program within the past 2 years (Alt, 1997).

In research and in practice, a fundamental distinction is often made by many between community service and service learning. Generally, community service refers to activities designed primarily to meet community needs. Activities can include peer tutoring or mentoring; recycling; clearing trails and roads; organizing safety patrols; helping out at a hospital, museum, or senior center; and so forth. Service–learning activities often involve similar types of service work, but, in addition, they are deliberately designed to develop skills and deepen understanding of academic content. In other words, service learning, by definition, is a form of community service that connects schools and communities in a deliberate effort to construct learning opportunities for youth.[22]

The best and most consistent data regarding the effect of service learning on academic goals come from studies of cross-age and peer tutoring. Meta-analyses of studies indicate that tutors make modest academic gains when compared with more traditional instructional methods (Cohen, Kulik, & Kulik, 1982; Hedin, 1987). A more recent study that focused on 1,000 students who participated in "high quality" programs (fully implemented programs with links to course content) yielded statisti-

[21] Learn and Serve America is a program of the Corporation for National Service, a government entity that funds community service and service-learning programs. Learn and Serve America refers to service–learning programs, in particular, that are funded through schools, community-based organizations, and other agencies.

[22] The conceptual basis for this approach is most commonly associated with the work of John Dewey (Dewey, 1900/1956, 1916/1966, 1938/1963) and with reformers like William Heard Kilpatrick (Kilpatrick, 1918) and Paul Hanna (Hanna, 1936). The goal of these educators was to create opportunities for students to work together on matters of social value. By linking these efforts to student interests, community needs, and academic subject matter, proponents argued such curriculum could ground and deepen students' understanding of academic content, foster youth development, build capacities for the kinds of collective action needed in a democratic society, and promote students' commitment to civic participation. Overall, studies of these initiatives indicate that such outcomes are often attained, but are not guaranteed.

cally significant gains on measures of academic performance (Melchior, 1997). The Teen Outreach Program, offered in dozens of schools throughout the country, combines structured community service experiences with classroom discussions about life decisions that are related to careers and relationships. Studies using matched comparisons of students at 35 sites (Allen, Philliber, & Hoggson, 1990) and true experimental designs at 25 sites (Allen, Philliber, Hoggson, & Kuperminc, 1997) have found that the program dramatically diminishes rates of school suspension, school dropout, school failure, and teenage pregnancy. Indeed, Allen, Philliber, Herrling, and Kuperminc found that the program cut the risk of pregnancy, school failure, and school suspension in half (Allen et al., 1997). Moreover, Allen, Philliber, and Hoggson found that students at sites that made significant use of a volunteer service component had significantly better outcomes than did students at sites where volunteer service was not much used as a program component (Allen et al., 1990).

How do service–learning activities lead to these positive academic outcomes? First, when schoolteachers, youth workers, and others provide opportunities for learning through service, they expand the kinds of learning environments, resources, and supports available to youth beyond those that schools alone can provide. For example, some youth show greater academic gains when enabled to learn through applied work-related settings such as those available through service–learning activities (e.g., hospitals, child care centers, construction sites). The experiential nature of a service–learning curriculum may increase motivation and deepen understanding.[23] Unlike some of the experiential education programs described in section I, many service–learning programs expand the settings for learning, the variety of adults that serve as youths' teachers and mentors, and the opportunities for success in school beyond those that have been traditionally legitimated by schools. Participation in these programs also means that youth have opportunities to establish meaningful relationships with adults apart from school who can link them with additional occasions for learning and from whom they can learn. In fact, researchers have shown that service–learning experiences for youth tend to promote more positive attitudes toward adults (Conrad & Hedin, 1982).

Second, studies also suggest that service–learning activities may enhance academic achievement, in part, by developing nonacademic competencies—social, emotional, physical, civic, and vocational—which can be essential to academic achievement. Gains in self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-worth are noted in some studies (Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Newmann & Rutter, 1983), though these effects vary by certain factors (see Wade & Saxe, 1996, for a review). Other studies show that service learning can decrease alienation and discipline problems among junior high school students with behavioral difficulties (Calabrese & Schumer, 1986) and can foster gains in moral development (Cognetta & Sprinthall, 1978).

A number of studies also have examined the effect of service–learning experiences on self-report measures of personal and social responsibility. Measures ask students, for example, if they think that having everyone recycle is important or if they try to help others in need. Most of these studies report modest gains in one or more measures (Conrad & Hedin, 1981; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Melchior & Orr, 1995; Newmann & Rutter, 1983). In terms of civic commitments, studies uniformly find that youth who participate in high school government or community service projects are more likely to vote and join community organizations when they are adults than those who did not participate during high school (see Youniss & Yates, 1997, for a review). Yates and Youniss (1996) and Youniss and Yates (1997) have found that service–learning experiences can have a significant effect on political and moral identity development.[24] These studies, like the work with journals done by Conrad and Hedin (1987), and studies by many qualitative researchers highlight the diverse, subtle, and often profound ways service experiences provide opportunities for forms of reflection and growth that are rarely achieved through traditional pedagogy. Students frequently reexamine stereotypes, confront fears, learn about new environments, and recognize personal capacities.

What does research to date tell us about the features of service–learning activities that build in youth these nonacademic competencies that are essential to expanded opportunities to learn? First, high-quality, service–learning activities provide ongoing (at least weekly) structured time for reflection and analysis of the content and process of the service–learning experience. Conrad and Hedin's (1982) national study of 27 experiential education programs, many of which were service–learning programs, found that this design feature was the strongest predictor of positive student change—particularly in measures of social and intellectual development. Similarly, longer and more intensive programs were also associated with meaningful opportunities for reflection (Conrad & Hedin, 1982).[25]

Second, the qualities of programs related to student growth were those that reflected opportunities for personal agency (e.g., students felt "free to develop and use own ideas" or "free to pursue my own interests") and those that reflected collegial relationships with adults (e.g., students "discussed experiences with teachers"). Although some overlap occurred, the characteristics of programs most associated with personal agency were the ones most strongly related to increased self-esteem. Program participants felt that the characteristics most associated with collegial adult relationships were the ones most strongly related to improved prosocial attitudes and reasoning skills.

[23] Consistent with this assessment, service–learning activities in schools are generally rated positively by participating students (see, e.g., Melchior, 1997).

[24] Yates and Youniss's theoretical frame draws on work by Erikson (1968) that emphasizes the sociohistorical components of identity and work by Luckmann (1991) on transcendent identification. Rather than aim directly at measures of personal or social responsibility, Youniss and Yates examine students' writing and the statements that students make during discussions and demonstrate that service provides opportunities for stimulating identity development regarding the ways students think about social, moral, and political issues.

[25] In this study, reflection was unrelated to measures of personal growth such as self-esteem. Conrad and Hedin did not find any significant differences regarding the type of service in which the students were involved.

Third, similar to findings related to school-linked services, some studies of service learning suggest that links to the in-school curriculum are essential to the effect of service learning whether it is provided as part of the school day or after school. The closer the service–learning experiences are to the academic curriculum, the greater the gains (Dewsbury-White, 1993; Hamilton & Zeldin, 1987; Levinson, 1986; Melchior, 1997).

School-to-Work and School-to-Career Initiatives

In connecting work and school in ways that enhance opportunity to learn, schools have a long history on which they might build. Though such efforts have largely focused on preparing youth who are not college bound for work through vocational (nonacademic) programs during the school day, current policies mark a significant shift in orientation, and their emphasis is now on preparing students for high skills jobs (National Center on Education and the Economy & Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, 1990; U.S. Department of Labor, 1991). The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (e.g., the most recent reauthorization of the largest federal education program for vocational education) is theoretically consistent with our concern for school–community connections and the lessons identified in section II. It emphasizes creating a school-to-work transition program that is (a) valued (i.e., a viable option for all students including the college-bound student); (b) work-based and school-based with high-quality, well-planned connecting activities that link in-school and out-of-school learning for youth; and (c) highly structured (i.e., youth have clear expectations and relationships with adults and peers who support their success by providing career counseling and guidance, job shadowing, and mentoring).

Many of the more innovative efforts to connect schools and workplaces around teaching and learning have been developed by Jobs for the Future (JFF), a Boston-based group that designs and supports school-to-career initiatives in both school and community settings. In 1995, JFF launched a 5-year project, the Benchmarks Communities Initiative (BCI), to demonstrate that a comprehensive work-and-learning initiative "could and should be central to a community's core educational strategy" (Martinez, Goldberger, & Alongi, 1996). The BCI is a partnership in five communities: Boston, Massachusetts; Jefferson County, Kentucky; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; North Clakamas, Oregon; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. BCI engages a significant number of employers in work and learning partnerships as part of their strategy to restructure the K–16 education system. BCI's program involves school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities to make learning more active and relevant to students and to provide the kinds of learning experiences appropriate to the contemporary job market.

In contrast to some school-to-work programs that target youth who are either not enrolled in or not succeeding in academic tracks, BCI involves all youth to integrate work-based learning as an integral part of all students' core curriculum. For example, in Milwaukee, teachers and employers collaborated to integrate science courses with hospital apprenticeships. In Boston, schools and employers joined together in the ProTech initiative to offer work-site learning that was integrated with a strong academic curriculum across several industries. ProTech students who are interested in working in area hospitals must first learn about basic operations within hospital units such as the cardiology unit, the pharmacy, the radiology unit, and the medical library. Once there, ProTech students then take on meaningful responsibilities in the hospital departments (Zeldin & Charner, 1996). BCI establishes school–community partnerships through a formal "Compact"—an agreement that specifies goals and responsibilities and that describes strategies for ensuring that any youth's experiences at both the school and the worksite is of high-quality (Martinez et al., 1996).

Preliminary evaluation and anecdotal evidence about the consequences of BCI for school outcomes are promising. Students report excitement about their work-based learning and, as a result, high levels of engagement with school. The documented experience of the most established JFF program, Boston Compact's ProTech program, shows that students' grades and attendance improved, as did graduation rates (Martinez et al., 1996).

Career Academies have proliferated in urban districts since the 1970s and provide another promising example of school–community connections around school and work (Stern et al., 1990). Career Academies began as a strategy to motivate underachieving students and connect their high school experience directly to the workplace (and to respond to employers' complaints that high school graduates are poorly prepared). Career Academies are schools within schools that simultaneously aspire to train students for an occupational field and prepare them for college. Career Academies thus are designed to bring both increased relevance and rigor to the high school experience of youth who have been traditionally turned off or tuned out and who, too often, have been slogging through dreary "low track" classes. Connections with the community are key to the operation and success of Career Academies. These community connections mean students are engaged in real-life work settings while they learn. Business managers, medical professionals, and other adults outside schools serve as primary teachers, mentors, and bridges to other networks and opportunities for development and learning.

Evaluations of Career Academies regarding their effective function as an opportunity for learning and teaching are encouraging. For example, California's Peninsula Academies for tenth through twelfth graders prepare youth for careers in electronics, finance, health, and other fields by providing an integrated vocational and academic curriculum, mentoring, summer internships, and a family-like structure that personalizes the environment. Although programmatic effect varied significantly, with some schools showing no effect, one evaluation found that academy students overall had half the dropout rate of a comparison group as well as better attendance and grades (Stern et al., 1990). Connections to meaningful work and caring adults in and out of school were key sources of motivation and engagement for Academy students. By their own reports, also important to their success was the peer group created in the Academy, one that transformed peer norms from those that opposed academic achievement to those that essentially supported it (see, e.g., Pauly, Kopp, & Haimson, 1995).

Taken together, the experiences of JFF and Career Acade-

mies offer some common evidence about why and how such examples of school–community connections expand opportunities to learn. First, high-quality school-to-work programs—those that achieve the positive outcomes indicated above—help youth develop the skills to identify and take advantage of opportunities to learn in their work experience. Similar to high-quality service–learning programs, these programs engage youth in reflecting on their work experience, challenge them to identify challenging situations or analyze the skills they will need to address those challenges, and develop strategies for enhancing those skills. Research shows that when youth are so engaged, they show evidence of greater commitment to quality performance in school and on the job, expanded capacity for coping with difficult situations that require new knowledge, and less cynicism about the world of work and their future in it (Kopp & Kazis, 1995; Stern et al., 1990).[26]

Second, high-quality school-to-career programs engage youth in the types of work they are likely to find meaningful and the types of work that offer avenues for future advancement. Although many youth have opportunities to hold jobs, the connections between employment opportunities and schools may be essential to ensure that their employment is meaningful work. Youth who work outside school (and also attend school) generally work in the secondary labor market—in nonunion jobs with low skill requirements, high turnover, and few opportunities for advancement. Most of these jobs are service sector positions such as restaurant, retail, clerical, and janitorial work. Youth who participate in school-to-work transition programs or other work situations that are enabled by school–community collaborations such as those found in BCI and Career Academy initiatives typically are engaged in such industries as health care, electronics, hotel management, construction, and other high-skills work settings. Although the actual qualities of these programs vary, overall, evaluators have found that the work opportunities students find through these initiatives are of higher quality than those they find on their own.

"Higher quality" includes links to youth's expressed career interests, significant time for learning and practicing skills, and structured opportunities for training and ongoing development (Hershey, Hudis, Silverberg, & Haimson, 1997). These opportunities and orientations include connections to broader networks within and across specific industries and the development of transferable skills. Accumulating evidence finds that young people who have opportunities to work at more complex jobs not only have higher wages but also have lower levels of unemployment 3 years later (Stern et al., 1990; see also Goldberger & Kazis, 1996).

The school-to-work or school-to-career programs that connect schools with community employers around learning and active engagement also are distinguished from earlier vocational education or career education efforts in that they expressly move beyond a limited list of job-focused youth outcomes to consider motivation, self-esteem, cognitive complexity, and sense of responsibility and belonging (Zeldin & Charner, 1996). Likewise, the program elements identified as essential to these broader successful youth outcomes implicate more than narrow factors of curriculum, job placements, and the like. They consider school-to-work programs in terms of opportunities: active and self-directed learning, new roles and responsibilities, ongoing emotional support from adults and peers, high standards, and ongoing access to supportive social networks (Zeldin & Charner, 1996).

Third, high-quality school-to-career programs connect learning in school and on the job. This connection between in-school and out-of-school learning means that the skills developed in the classroom are directly applied on the job. Experiences on the job are seen as an extension of the classroom, and success on the job is validated as a part of school success. In this process, teachers and employers engage in ongoing dialog and strategizing about how to apply their respective expertise to enhance youth's experiences in school and on the job.[27]

Fourth, when schools and work are connected in ways that can enhance opportunities to learn and teach, teachers, employers, and other adults have expanded opportunities to develop as professionals and, accordingly, to teach. The Benchmark Community Initiative, for example, provided important professional development opportunities for teachers. Professional learning communities came together in ways that, as teachers reported, provided effective ways for them to rethink their practices, assumptions they had made about the youth with whom they worked, and enhanced opportunities to teach in very real terms. BCI also provided job shadowing and internships for teachers in local industry—experiences that gave teachers direct experience with the kinds of skills and competencies their students would need to succeed in the workplace (Martinez et al., 1996). Jobs for the Future has seen that successful apprenticeship programs can provide important education for employers, too. Employer's positive experiences with JFF programs amended the stereotypes they held about youth and contributed to more trusting and positive relationships on both sides (Kazis, 1993). Evaluations of both JFF and Career Academy programs also comment on the important learning about the abilities and promise of youth that occurs for employers as a result of their participation (Kazis, 1993; Pauly et al., 1995; Stern et al., 1990).

Youth Development Programs and Youth Organizations

Approximately 4,000 national youth service organizations operate in this country including Boys and Girls Clubs, 4-H programs, YMCAs, neighborhood drop-in centers, after-school clubs, Departments and Offices of Parks and Recreation, churches, and others. More than 17,000 U.S. nonprofit organizations classify themselves as "youth development organiza-

[26] Grubb (1995) remarks on the promise of such school-to-career initiatives to turn the city itself into a learning place for youth.

[27] Kazis and Kopp (1997) observe that these positive outcomes appear to contradict findings from many school-to-work demonstration programs such as the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project and other vocational education or jobs programs, which show either uneven academic or career benefit to participants, or sustained involvement with the program. The difference, in their view, lies in the quality of the work experience and in the extent to which community employers and schools integrate and support youth's experiences.

tions," and 70% of eighth graders in a recent large-scale study report that they participate in the activities of such organizations (Pittman & Wright, 1991).[28]

Youth organizations embrace multiple purposes and goals. Central among these goals are those of providing safe, positive recreational opportunities for young people. Youth organizations also vary in the type and quality of programs they offer. For example, some youth organizations such as Little League focus solely on sports; others such as Boys and Girls Clubs or Girls, Inc. are club programs that offer a range of activities in the arts, sports, citizenship, service, and education. Some YMCAs are primarily "gym and swim,"—providing supervised recreation—whereas others offer an array of structured, explicitly developmental opportunities for young people. Some neighborhood-based organizations, or local affiliates of national organizations such as the YMCA, operate primarily as drop-in centers, with the purpose of providing a safe place for various youth to come after school. Others are "24–7"—open 7 days a week for extended hours—to serve as a haven for a core group of neighborhood youth and to engage them in a variety of activities and long-term relationships with peers and adults (see, e.g., Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1994; McLaughlin et al., 1994).

Many of these youth organizations provide a broad range of formal and informal academic and nonacademic supports for learning and growth. These supports include the expectations they raise and hold for their young members, the role models they offer, the nurturing environments they provide, and the structures they provide for youth to explore their own interests. Evaluation and anecdotal evidence show that youth organizations that take this broad developmental approach have important effects on young people's achievement and school performance (e.g., Kahne & Bailey, 1999; Posner & Vandell, 1994; Villarruel & Lerner, 1994).

Important social and developmental outcomes for youth including improved behavior in school, raised academic expectations, better social skills and improved self-confidence also are associated with many of these programs (McLaughlin et al., 1994; Villarruel & Lerner, 1994). For example, youth responses to items from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey 1988 (NELS: 88) showed that, when compared to the "typical" American youth, low-income, urban youth who were participating regularly in youth organizations were more likely to receive recognition for good grades in high school, plan to go to college, feel good about themselves, feel like they could make plans and achieve them, and express commitment to work in the community (McLaughlin, 2000). Participation in a community-based youth organization, in other words, appeared to mediate the detrimental aspects of other aspects of their environment—most especially, struggling neighborhoods, inadequate institutional supports, and, often, poor schools.

Much of the available data on the effects of youth organizations come from studies of mentoring relationships that are usually part of a broader set of programs at a youth organization. In one study, participants in the mentoring program of a youth organization were three times more likely than a comparison group to attend college. They had higher grade point averages in the tenth and eleventh grades (Johnson, 1996). In a large-scale comparative study of 959 10- to 16-year-olds who applied for Big Brother and Big Sister programs in 1992 and 1993, participants in the programs, when compared to a control group, were 46% less likely to start using drugs, 27% less likely to start using alcohol, and more than 30% less likely to hit someone. Participating youth showed improvements in school attendance, school performance, and attitudes toward completing schoolwork. These gains were strongest among minority Little Sisters (Tierney, Grossman, & Resch, 1995).

Yet all youth organizations do not have the same effect on opportunities to learn and teach. Some youth organizations affect opportunities to learn directly by providing additional academic supports (e.g., homework assistance, after-school classes, tutoring). However, evidence suggests that, beyond the provision of direct academic supports, the high-quality youth organizations also engage youth in a less formal curriculum that builds their multiple competencies—including social, emotional, vocational, civic, and physical competencies—that can be essential to academic success (Pittman & Cahill, 1992; Pittman & Wright, 1991). These high-quality youth organizations engage youth in varied activities that build on their strengths and provide them with strong relationships with peers and adults.

The curricula within high-quality youth organizations include identity structures such as rituals, systems of loyalty, and identity markers such as uniforms (Fine & Mechling, 1993). These curricula allow youth choice in whether to participate and in how to participate. Such curricula appeal to an array of interests and abilities, are readily usable and accessible, engage the young person in an active learning stance, and challenge participants to stretch their skills and build new competencies (Martin & Ascher, 1994; McLaughlin et al., 1994; U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Justice, 1998).

Relationship structures also facilitate a high rate of personal interaction between youth and adults. The mere encouragement of relationships is not enough to ensure positive outcomes. Rather, high-quality youth organizations deliberately structure these relationships by stringently screening volunteers, requiring intensive training for and supervision of adults to ensure they are strong role models, and continually monitoring and re-

[28] The 1998 review of after-school programs, prepared jointly by the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice (U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Justice, 1998), contains many diverse examples of projects run by youth development organizations around the country that enhance students' interest in school, achievement, and engagement in academic work. For example, more than one-half of the students participating in The 3:00 Project, a statewide network of after-school programs in Georgia, improved their grades in at least one subject; students participating in Los Angeles' BEST program made academic gains far beyond those in a comparison group; students in Louisiana's Church-Based After-School Tutorial Network increased their grade point averages in math and language arts by 1.5 to 3 points, depending on the number of years they participated. One-half of the teachers of students participating in the Los Angeles 4-H after-school program rated the students' homework completion as improved or much improved. Coca-Cola's Valued Youth program, a cross-age tutoring program, finds not only that tutored students' grades and school attitudes improve but also that participation in the program has reduced school drop-out rates for the older student tutors.

evaluating progress by staff and youth (Fine & Mechling, 1993; Furano, Roaf, Styles, & Branch, 1993; Johnson, 1996; Tierney et al., 1995). Long-term relationships are particularly important to positive outcomes. The average length of matches for one successful mentoring program is 1.5 years (Furano et al., 1993); in another it is 5 years (Johnson, 1996).

Many evaluations and reports stress the importance of providing mentors and facilitating other relationships either within the context of a program that involves broader supports and a robust peer culture (Fine & Mechling, 1993) or through relationships with a community of participants (Hanks & Eckland, 1978). Program supports beyond the scholarships and mentoring were the class coordinator, academic support coordinator, summer enrichment program, and cultural events (Johnson, 1996).

Evaluations also indicate that for relationships in these organizations to facilitate opportunities to learn and teach, they should be developmental rather than prescriptive. In a review of 82 mentoring matches by eight Big Brother and Big Sister organizations, two-thirds of all relationships were found to be developmental rather than prescriptive (Tierney & Grossman, 1995). Developmental relationships were defined as follows: Adult volunteers "held expectations that changed over time in relation to their perceptions of the needs of the youth; focused on building trusting relationships" (Tierney & Grossman, 1995); and involved youth in decision making processes. Prescriptive relationships were defined as ones in which adults set the goals, focused shared time on achieving those goals, and required youth to share responsibility for maintaining relationships. In general, prescriptive relationships tended to set expectations too high and were, therefore, not developmentally appropriate. They also did not build on the strengths of youth (Gambone & Arbreton, 1997).

Organizations that engage youth on a consistent basis share common features. Although they are "place neutral"—that is, their effectiveness does not depend on their location—the environment created for youth within them is key. Effective youth organizations all had (a) consistent, caring adults who involved themselves in many aspects of youth's lives; (b) clear rules for membership and safety; (c) a "whole" youth approach; and (d) activities that were valued and assessed by youth and community—real responsibilities, real work (McLaughlin et al., 1994; U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Justice, 1998; Villarruel & Lerner, 1994).

In conclusion, cumulating evidence identifies curricular and organizational features of youth organizations that do and do not promote youths' opportunities to learn. For example, centers that function as little more than drop-in locations do little more than provide a place off the streets. Older youth typically shun these programs in favor of the streets, where they can find engaging activity and a consistent peer group (McLaughlin et al., 1994). Older youth, given the chance to do so, also reject out-of-school educational opportunities that are too much like school. Youth and children alike dislike program settings that are designed to "fix" them—programs to which they are assigned to remedy problem behaviors. Such programs, too often, only reinforce youth's view that something is wrong with them, that they are somehow deficient, and that they are a problem (McLaughlin, 1993, p. 59).

Although many community-based youth programs and organizations function as powerful supports for youth development and success in school, they, with few exceptions, provide this support for learning (and, by extension, support for teaching) effectively in isolation from schools. In Heath and McLaughlin's 10 years of field research in community-based programs and organizations that were judged effective by youth, not one had any formal affiliation with local schools (e.g., McLaughlin, 2000). When links did exist, they existed between individuals (e.g., between the middle school teacher who e-mailed students' homework assignments down the hill to the neighborhood Boys and Girls Club and her friend who worked there after school) not organizations. However, a growing number of exceptions to this separation between youth organizations and schools are demonstrating how such connections can powerfully expand opportunities to learn and teach. These strong examples of connections between youth organizations and schools usually also involve relationships with other community organizations—providing youth development activities in and out of school as part of a broader web of supports for youth and families, teachers, and youth workers. We discuss these school–community efforts to support learning and teaching at the end of this section.

Crosscutting Lessons for Opportunity to Learn

In summary, schools and communities that are connected in the various ways described here—through school-linked services, service learning, school-to-work initiatives, and community-based organizations—reinforce and extend youth's opportunity to learn in a number of important ways. For example, they provide the following supports.

Improved health and social support. Enhanced social services enable young people to come to school with the energy and health that is essential to engage in classroom activities and goals as learners.

Places and spaces to learn. Many youth lack places to do homework and resources to support their learning. In neighborhood youth-organizations, youth may find quiet spaces to work, helpful tutors, technology, and other resources to support their work.

Involved, caring adults. The literature on out-of-school influences consistently highlights the importance of a caring adult to mentor, support, guide, and motivate young people in consistent and ongoing ways. Community-based youth organizations, school-to-work initiatives, and service–learning projects can provide these adult resources and role models to young people who may lack them in their home environments. These adults expand youths' horizons and expectations and help young people find the connections and resources they will need to achieve their goals.

Positive peer groups. Peers who define productive goals for themselves and value education and learning depict a most fundamental sort of opportunity to learn, because they influence other youth's choices about how to spend time and ideas about possible futures. Organizations and activities such

as service–learning efforts, community organizations, and school-to-work programs provide structures and activities for the development of positive peer environments.

Expanded occasions for learning and success. Community-based organizations, school-to-work initiatives, and many service–learning efforts extend learning in a number of important ways. For one, they focus on many of the nonacademic skills that young people need to succeed in school and as adults—among them, leadership, persistence, entrepreneurship, and civic responsibility. They also equip youth with the soft but essential skills of eye contact, a firm handshake, habits of punctuality, and even table manners. These out-of-school contexts offer opportunities for youth to practice the skills, roles, and relationships that are essential to their success as students and adults. They provide engagement in real-world enterprises such as business or community work. These community classrooms are often more meaningful and motivating than those found in school, and the engagement with learning that is generated in community classrooms often carries back to school.

Crosscutting Lessons for Opportunity to Teach

The literature on the programs described here in this section, like the effects literature in section II, is generally silent on the value of these initiatives for classroom teachers. However, our analysis suggests a number of ways that these deliberately structured out-of-school contexts can enhance teachers' opportunities to teach, particularly when they are linked with schools.

Improved in-school climate for teaching. Teaching and learning are two sides of a single coin. Expanded opportunities for youth to learn can mean expanded opportunities for teachers to teach, in part, because youth may come to class better prepared, eager to learn, and motivated to do well. Youth might come to school with a stronger base of social supports and assistance to cope with the myriad factors that compete with teachers for energy, attention, and time.

Extended space and time for teaching. Connections between schools and community-based organizations that are organized around learning can extend teachers' space and time for teaching by providing opportunities for youth to continue their school projects or expand them into new activities. The work of a youth newspaper group, for example, can provide important practice in literacy skills and concrete rewards for good writing and analysis. A basketball team's calculations about their nutritional needs lend relevance to the work of math teachers. Boys and Girls clubs, YMCAs and YWCAs, and local churches have critical assets of space and adult support to provide places for studying, assistance with homework, and access to important learning tools such as computers and books. Through connections with such community-based organizations, teachers can extend their teaching into youth's nonschool time in ways that compliment and reinforce instructional goals.

Access to funds of knowledge about their students. Insufficient knowledge about the circumstances, neighborhoods, and supports of their students hampers teachers' effectiveness with many students, most particularly, with students who come from backgrounds different from the teacher's. Many teachers say they "just don't know how to relate to students today" (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993, 2001). School–community connections give teachers access to new knowledge about youth's learning and effective settings for it. That is, parents, youth workers, athletic coaches, and youth's other teachers each have knowledge about youth's learning that is generally unavailable to classroom teachers unless they have opportunities to collaborate and build trusting relationships and social networks. Thus, closer connections between teachers and their students' communities can provide important information that teachers need to make their practices substantively student-centered. For example, through school-to-work initiatives, teachers have learned about the kinds of employment opportunities for which their students will compete.

Teachers' collaborations with community social service workers can also provide valuable information about family conditions that teachers should consider. For example, on learning from a school-site social worker that several students in her classroom had no place to do homework, a California teacher revised her classroom activities to be sure that the most important "home" work was done in school. In the same vein, a project in Arizona's Mexican communities shows that when teacher-researchers visit households as learners, establish connections with parents, and base instruction on these observations, the subsequent teaching that is based in these local "funds of knowledge" enhances the school performance of nonmainstream students (Moll, 1992). Collaboration between schools, community organizations, and caring adults in the neighborhood can provide a bridge between school and community, between youth and mainstream institutions.

Partners in teaching. The community contains many teachers—from "old heads," to adults wise about life and the community, to parents, to staff members of the various community-based organizations. If these adults could meet at intervals throughout the year with teachers of local youth, they could work jointly toward achieving the learning activities and goals of particular students or groups of students. A YMCA- or YWCA-based drama group, for example, could build upon the English curriculum; a "Weed and Seed" effort sponsored by a church or youth organization could collaborate with science teachers to generate ways youths could develop particular skills in their science classes that would enhance their work in the community. In addition, schools and community organizations that work together have more opportunities to match adults' teaching styles with youths' learning styles in ways that can build on the strengths both of youth and of their multiple teachers in and out of school.

Expanded professional networks and supports. When schools and communities are connected in ways that realize improved opportunities to learn, the scope of school extends beyond the resources available on campus to those throughout the neighborhoods of which the school is a part. For teachers, this extension beyond school can mean expanded access to professional networks and supports that include other classroom teachers, youth workers, social workers, parents, and others.

These interdisciplinary professional networks can expand the types of professional practice with youth that teachers have available to them. For example, as part of an after-school arts program, teachers may work alongside visiting artists and have opportunities to observe these adults working with their students in ways that may inform their classroom teaching.[29] One finding from the literature on program effects suggests that, unless adults see the benefit of enriching youth's learning out of school and somehow link it with youths' experiences in their classrooms, the effect of these "community" efforts on academic achievement is not likely to be significant, at least, in the short term (Morrow & Styles, 1995; Wehlage et al., 1992). Professional networks and supports may provide the necessary opportunities for teachers and other adults to consider what these linkages between communities and classrooms might look like for themselves and for their youth.

School–Community Connections for Opportunity to Learn and Opportunity to Teach

As indicated above, these crosscutting lessons for opportunity to learn and teach collect design features of school–community partnerships from across the four types examined above—school-linked services, service learning, school-to-work programs, and community-based youth organizations. In practice, we find that these lessons are embodied in a fifth type of school–community initiative—efforts that fit neatly neither into any one of the categories used above nor in the program effects literature. For example, these efforts might provide social services linked to schools that include opportunities for work and service learning and a strong role for youth organizations. We consider initiatives of this fifth group to be best examples of school–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach because, either explicitly or implicitly, they embody the lessons regarding features most essential to opportunities for learning and teaching that we derive from the effects literature presented in section II and from the program evaluations in section III. Accordingly, we call them "school–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach." Two examples follow.

EL PUENTE ACADEMY FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE

In the heart of the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn, El Puente Academy for Peace and Justice links in-school and out-of-school learning through projects, themes, and skill building that extend throughout the youths' day. For example, as part of their math and science classes, students spent afternoons and weekends turning vacant lots into community gardens—planning, budgeting, choosing suitable plants and equipment, and so forth—and designing ads opposing pollution and cigarettes. Also, the youth-written newspaper at El Puente is a primary vehicle for the development of writing skills. These are not simply examples of project-based learning—extensions of traditional classrooms. Rather, the El Puente Academy and the El Puente community organization (whose directors founded the Academy for Peace and Justice that shares the same church building) work in close partnership to infuse all activities of both organizations with opportunities for youth to contribute to their community and build their leadership skills. For example, students assessed community needs and decided to organize an immunization drive for young children. With support from their classroom teachers and youth workers, they designed and implemented this project. During a recent summer, building on skills developed in the classroom, students researched their neighborhood and developed a walking tour of the south side of Williamsburg including an historic, economic, and environmental analysis of the neighborhood. As part of this research, youth surveyed 500 residents.

At El Puente, where the youth organization ends and school begins is difficult to determine. School teachers and staff members of the youth organization work collaboratively with one another and with youth both during and after traditional school hours. Students build skills in class that they apply to their projects after formal school hours; their shared projects after school provide important contexts for lessons in civics, English, math, and other classes. In the first graduating class (1997) of 33 seniors, 92% attended college.[30]

El Puente Academy for Peace and Justice was founded in 1993 by the El Puente community organization with assistance from New York City's New Visions initiative. An explicit goal of El Puente is to build social capital. As expressed by Luis Garden Acosta, founder of El Puente, "What is needed in schools are human relations. People must realize that these are our children. We're all one family and that transcends our homes, the street, and the public institutions. When we bond with each other and build the realization that nurtures our humanity, that is when education happens" (Gonzalez, 1997). El Puente clearly makes the child's-eye view essential to its work. "We must respond to the unique challenges every child, every school provides and not think of them as abstractions that do not fit into an assessment, a budget, a union contract" (Rose, 1995, pp. 225–226; see also Burg, 1998; de Pommereau, 1996; Gonzalez, 1995; Gonzalez, 1997).

ST. JOHN'S EDUCATIONAL THRESHOLDS CENTER: THE BUILDING OF A BEACON

In the summer of 1993, school-age youth participating in St. Johns Educational Thresholds Center decided that they wanted to feel safer in their neighborhood—the North Mission in San Francisco, California. First, they surveyed 12 street corners and found that 10 of the 12 were "dangerous." Then they mapped their neighborhood, indicating the dangerous and safe places for youth, and presented their maps to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. They enlisted the help of local shop and restau-

[29] The potential strength of these interdisciplinary professional networks is suggested not only by the research presented here but also by related research that suggests professional networks improve school climate by improving teachers' perceptions of the school as a workplace (SRI International, 1996).

[30] This percentage is well above the city and state averages. Of seniors at other New Visions schools, 81% were accepted to college during that year.

rant owners and launched Quick Calls. Today, if you walk down 16th Street in the North Mission, you will see signs for Quick Calls in many storefront windows. These signs signal to youth that they can use the phone in any participating business to call home if they feel unsafe. St. Johns works with elementary school-age youth to maintain the signs and otherwise continue and expand their relationship with business owners in their school neighborhoods. In these ways, Quick Calls not only provides resources to youth at a time of need but also works to change the relationship between youth and adults in this densely populated commercial neighborhood.

Quick Calls is one example of several programs and activities developed by St. Johns Educational Thresholds Center (a community-based youth organization) and neighboring schools. For example, St. Johns, Everett Middle School, and Sanchez Elementary School were primary partners in a school-linked services program (funded through California's Healthy Start School-linked Services Initiative) that brought together 25 agencies at each school site to provide a range of formal and informal services and supports for youth. These collaborations laid the basis for Everett becoming the first Beacon School in San Francisco. Although the idea for Beacon Schools originated in New York City, San Francisco has become one of several cities across the country providing grants to community-based organizations to partner with schools and transform schools into community centers. Drawing on the resources of their various partners, the Community Bridges Beacon resource center (CBB) at Everett offers after-school tutoring and case management. Neighborhood youth of all ages participate in after-school clubs and service learning at Everett and at St. Johns. CBB is also the home of BOSS—Beacon Office Student Servers. Through BOSS, students receive credit for their extracurricular activity requirement, a paycheck, and training in job skills as they answer phones, greet visitors, prepare materials for meetings, and perform other office jobs. Recently, BOSS has evolved into a school-to-career awareness initiative in all classes at Everett that includes a week-long speaker series organized by youth who participate in BOSS.

The work of St. Johns literally bridges the gap between in-school and out-of-school learning. In math class at Everett Middle School, students learned how to design and tally surveys to be used in the community assessment for their Healthy Start grant application. In language arts class, they wrote and practiced speeches that they delivered to the San Francisco school district about conditions in their community and their school. In Kid Power, a weekly elective for Everett students and the youth advisory board to the Healthy Start site and CBB, students wrote and practiced their speeches for the San Francisco Youth Summit. Also through Kid Power, they designed and practiced a 2-hour lesson that they provide to Stanford University students on how to construct community maps and use them to assess the quality of neighborhoods for youth. The Urban Institute, a project of St. Johns, partners with the San Francisco Unified School District to run a summer school for neighborhood students in Grades 5–9. The Urban Institute facilitates conversations among summer school teachers about how to provide a varied and integrated educational experience for youth in the summer around a theme that is based on students' concerns and interests. For example, through the language arts component, students might write poems that they will use in art class as the basis for illustrations and other projects.

Through these links with classroom teachers and its other activities, St. Johns essentially facilitates and otherwise participates in formal and informal interdisciplinary professional networks for various teachers both in and out of the classroom. At St. Johns and through its various partnerships with schools and other organizations, youth are not clients; they are active participants in constructing solutions to their own concerns (Honig & Fiore, 1997; Wagner, 1996).

The Community Bridges Beacon at St. Johns, the El Puente programs, and others do not identify their mission by the categories of services they provide (see Cahill, 1996). Rather, their mission is to provide the resources and supports that their particular youth need to have expanded developmental and educational opportunities. Although resource constraints may mean these organizations make choices about when and how to work with their youth, they recognize that all youth need supports for learning. They engage youth in activities that build on their strengths—often engaging the youth in leadership roles and other activities to generate solutions to problems. Importantly, they identify where youth already look for support and education, and seek to engage those places and people in collaborative efforts to improve youth's experiences in their neighborhoods. In this way, they are developmental or strengths-based and youth-centered. They view all the resources in a youth's neighborhood from a youth's-eye view to determine what boundaries delineate "school" and "community" for the youth with which they work and what connections can be made between the two that are meaningful for those particular youth.

A FRAMEWORK FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

From the categories of school–community connections explored above, we have identified major design features of school–community connections that enhance opportunities to learn and opportunities to teach. School–community initiatives that have these features generally provide the resources, occasions, and supports that youth need to achieve at high levels and that teachers need to help students reach those high levels. Table 45.1 outlines these design features. As indicated, we find that when schools and communities are connected in ways that enhance opportunities to learn and opportunities to teach, they can be described as (a) focused on whole youth; (b) focused on all youth; (c) strengths-based, prosocial, and developmental; (d) responsive to specific youth and neighborhoods; (e) youth-centered; (f) with expanded funds of knowledge available to youths' multiple teachers in and out of school.

Not all examples of effective school–community connections can be described as high impact all the time. Creating connections is a difficult, developmental process and partnerships will grow at different rates along various dimensions over time. The nature of the daily challenge to connect communities and schools is that school and community partners must continually devise strategies to engage changing neighborhoods and youth. Therefore, we define school–community connections that support opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach as a series of

continua to reflect their developmental nature. These continua deliberately outline largely conceptual dimensions. With this approach, we intend to emphasize that we are still learning what school–community connections look like when they expand opportunities to learn and teach. Accordingly, we are just beginning to specify, in general terms, what these connections mean for teachers and students. Thus, Table 45.1 is intended as a broad research framework that requires further specification of its elements through additional examination of practice and policy. We turn to specific recommendations for practice, policy, and research in the subsequent section.

IV. Limitations and Barriers to Joining Schools and Communities in Support of Teaching and Learning: Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

> A traditional school asks teachers to think about what happens to their students in the classroom; a school linked to a social service delivery system asks teachers and administrators to go further, to think about what happens to their students when they go home. Linking schools with social services demands a reorientation for both families and schools, which exceeds the tenuous, negotiated parameters that demarcate professional and private spheres. (Smrekar, 1994)

The arguments for the importance of school–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach seem obvious. Schools, social service agencies, youth organizations, families, or any other single institution alone cannot ensure that youth and teachers have the opportunities necessary for youth to achieve at the high levels that reformers and the public increasingly demand and expect. The evidence from and experience with various efforts to join schools and communities around support for teaching and learning offer promising support and direction for education reform.

However, schools and their community partners face numerous barriers when creating school–community connections, particularly, connections focused on teaching and learning. School–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach call for a fundamental rethinking of the roles and relationships between schools and communities, a reframing of educational policy so it incorporates more than school reform, and a reconsideration of education policy from the eye-view of students and teachers. In this concluding section, we explore some of these challenges and suggest several overall implications of this chapter for future research on teaching practice and policy.

The Challenge of School–Community Connections in Practice and Policy

ORGANIZATIONAL BARRIERS: THE PROBLEM OF TURF

Many researchers who study various types of school–community connections generally characterize the problem of connecting communities and schools as an organizational challenge: how to facilitate interagency collaboration. Barriers to interagency collaboration include concerns with turf. That is, schools and their collaborative partners have difficulty sharing responsibility, funding, and resources, in part, because they do not want to lose control, power, or prestige (e.g., Crowson & Boyd, 1993). Some researchers characterize this protection of turf as a typical reaction to change.

Others recognize that organizations and schools serving youth may be reluctant to collaborate with agencies if collaboration, at least in the short term, may lead to interruption of services or supports for youth and families. One director of a youth organization recalls a time he arranged for students at his organization to swim once a week at another youth organization: "'We'd come over there and they [would have] just fired this guy or he didn't show up or the pool was locked. Here I was, I made this commitment to these kids that they'd go swimming. If I said we're gonna do something, we're gonna do it. It was like, now what I the hell do I do? I became so frustrated and angry being dependent upon another institution'" (McLaughlin et al., 1994, p. 195).

Schools may present special barriers to collaboration. Schools are places where many parents feel isolated. They are places where many youth do not succeed. Schools are sources of red tape. In fact, one often-cited benefit of community organizations as sites for development and learning is that they have the organizational, financial, and institutional flexibility to respond to the needs of youth in ways that schools do not always have. Community partners, thus, may be concerned that, if they are connected with schools, particularly, with schools that are not the most trusted organizations in a given neighborhood, they may compromise their ability to serve their youth. These organizations see certain benefits in maintaining clear separations between in-school and out-of-school opportunities for youth (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1994; Pittman & Wright, 1991).

Schools themselves may also protect their turf in an effort to better serve youth and families. At one school-linked service site, principals felt threatened by the presence of family advocates at a school-based family resource center. Concerned that the family advocates were collecting information about families that was important to the work of the school, the principals generally attempted to assume authority over the advocates to ensure that families were well served. This response by the principals created a paradox for the family advocates. On the one hand, the presence of the resource centers on school campuses made services more accessible to youth and their families and gave them new opportunities to participate in school. On the other hand, family advocates found that, at times, they needed to set themselves apart from schools to maintain their accessibility and effectiveness in the community (Smrekar, 1996; Smylie & Crowson, 1996; Smylie, Crowson, Chou, & Levin, 1994).

INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS

Organizational barriers may be symptoms of more profound barriers to reconceptualizing the roles, norms, and beliefs that underlie our current systems of support for teaching and learning. Significant segments of the cited literature suggest that, by connecting communities in their various forms with schools, schools will be transformed, and teachers will have expanded opportunities to teach. However, a number of researchers have

Table 45.1 School-Community Connections for Opportunity to Learn and Opportunity to Teach: A Framework for Research and Practice

LOW IMPACT	⟷	HIGH IMPACT
Focused on discrete needs • Specific services are provided based on the particular needs of youth (e.g., youth with poor mental health receive counseling services)	⟷	**Focused on whole youth** Youth need academic and nonacademic supports to reach high academic standards. Youth learn throughout their day—on their athletic teams, in their community service projects, and in less formal interactions with adults and peers—in ways that can and do improve youths' performance in school. Accordingly collaborations: • Provide youth with an array of supports to succeed and multiple ways to access learning resources and develop new competences • Strengthen the quality of nonacademic supports as primary vehicles to strengthen students' school performance
Targeted for youth "at risk" or "in need" • Services and supports are provided to certain youth considered in need of additional academic and nonacademic supports to participate successfully in school • Programs tend to be added on to otherwise unchanged regular school programs	⟷	**Targeted to all youth** All youth need appropriate supports for learning. Accordingly collaborations: • Provide supports to all participating youth, even if youth appear "high achieving" by various standards • Move beyond add-on approaches for certain youth and strengthen core aspects of schools and community agencies for all students
Deficit-oriented • Partners fix problems, meet needs, and avoid risk as a precondition to learning • Youth are clients and recipients of services	⟷	**Strengths-based/Prosocial and developmental** All youth, schools and communities have strengths. Accordingly collaborations: • Meet youth's need by building on their strengths • Engage youth as co-constructors of solutions to their own problems and concerns
Generic standardized programming • Programs and/or program models developed by national headquarters or another outside source; carried out without consultation with or reference to the youth they are to benefit	⟷	**Responsive to specific youth and neighborhoods** Youths become more engaged in activities when activities stem from their particular needs and interests. Accordingly collaborations: • Use programs—whether brought in from the outside or developed locally—that are designed with the specific interests and needs of local youth in mind • Implement programming changes as the needs and interests of participating youth change
Organization-centered/Adult-centered • "School-community connections" means integration or a linking of organizations • Efforts focus on meeting the needs of adults (including parents) as a primary strategy to improve student outcomes	⟷	**Youth-centered** "School-community connections" means the experiences of youth in and out of school are connected and used to strengthen the other. "Connection" occurs at the level of the youth. Accordingly collaborations: • Feature social networks among adults and peers within and beyond the school as essential aspects of the partnership
Expands access to information for various professionals who work with youth • Efforts provide opportunities for teachers, youth workers, and others to learn about youths' experience in their school and their various communities • Partners tend to focus on expanding the information available to classroom teachers about why their students may not be achieving	⟷	**Expands funds of knowledge for youths' multiple teachers in and out of school** Youth have multiple teachers throughout their day, each of whom brings essential and different knowledge, experiences, and expertise to bear in their relationships with youth. Accordingly collaborations: • Build trust and shared values • Move beyond the provision of services at or near a school campus and strengthens the day-to-day interaction among youth and the various adults at a school-community site • Provide multiple opportunities for these teachers to learn from one another's practice and to enhance and expand their own professional practice

suggested that these expanded opportunities are not always used by schools. That is, schools do not always reform roles for teachers, students, and school administrators that might enable expanded opportunities to learn and teach (Jehl & Kirst, 1992; Mawhinney & Smrekar, 1996; Smylie & Crowson, 1996; Smylie et al., 1994; Wehlage et al., 1992).

In several respects, it is not surprising that roles are not always reshaped or recast. First, practitioners who try to forge school–community connections have few guides. What, for example, is the role of a school principal or a classroom teacher in a school that is connected with its community in the ways described in section III? In most studies of leaders at school–community sites, the leaders tend not to be members of the school staff. When school staff personnel are considered, they are generally depicted as barriers to school–community connections (Chaskin & Richman, 1993; Kahne et al., 2000; McLaughlin, et al., 1994; Smrekar, 1996).

Second, we do not find significant reconsideration of roles for school staff members, in part, because school–community partnerships tend to occur at the margins of school systems. Discretionary grant programs, waivers, or other regulatory relief provide the support for most of the examples of school–community connections cited above. Many of the schools are chosen to participate because of their one-of-a-kind leaders and staff members. Such conditions set these examples apart from typical schools. Although these special schools provide examples of what school–community connections might look like, they offer few guides to typical schools about how to overcome constraints and redefine activities and roles, because they operate in different institutional contexts (Honig, 1998). Even within schools, the community partnerships are often on the periphery, focused primarily on youth who are in need or at risk. During these times of limited resources, such targeting may be a wise use of resources in the short term. However, if we are interested in effecting the institutional shifts that may make school–community connections for opportunity to learn and teach more than extraordinary events, then such marginal changes reflect, at best, early progress.

Viewing the problem of school–community connections with an institutional lens, we can see that schools and community organizations may face certain challenges as they redefine their roles in partnership with one another, in part, because they operate in different institutional contexts that may constrain such changes (Chaskin & Richman, 1993; Pittman & Wright, 1991). Community-based organizations, for example, tend to have broader missions than schools and may view learning opportunities for youth as situated in a youth development perspective from the outset. These organizations tend to (a) be backed by strong traditions and philosophies that undergird this approach to supporting youth, (b) have more diversified funding sources than schools, and (c) operate under fewer constraints. Schools, in contrast, have persisted as strictly hierarchical organizations. Most funding for public schools comes from public sources, and little of that funding is discretionary. These different institutional contexts may afford community-based organizations the flexibility necessary to work responsively with youth in the ways suggested by the research reviewed in this chapter, whereas schools may face greater challenges.

THE PROBLEM OF POLICY

Public policy concerning schools largely assumes a narrow frame, focusing on issues of finance, administration, curriculum, and pedagogy within schools. However, meaningful opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach as described here require education policy that operates on a community level and, thus, engages the multiple resources and supports available in a school's neighborhood.

Policymakers have few guides for this kind of cross-sector policy. First, the scope of educational policy itself has become increasingly narrow. As discussed in section I, debates about standards focus almost entirely on academic content, with little consideration for the range of competencies that youth will need to develop in order to achieve these high standards. Second, the model on which public policy is designed at various levels remains largely unchanged from that used during the Great Society period when categorical mandates dominated the political agenda. Today, we see more examples of local government (e.g., school district, city, county) being allowed greater discretion in return for increased local accountability for improving the status of youth. However, these accountability systems remain largely prescriptive and may more accurately be considered a variation on the familiar top-down mandates that focus on particular students and needs strictly within the formal educational system. Thus, they tend not to take a student's- or teacher's-eye view of the relevant supports necessary for improving teaching and learning.

One benefit of the current policy context for school–community connections is that we have several examples of successful school–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach. However, many of these initiatives operate at single schools as isolated projects, not as part of comprehensive strategies (Fine & Mechling, 1993; Gomby & Larson, 1992). In state-initiated efforts, local coordination is encouraged often without parallel development among the state agencies and policymakers themselves (Crowson & Boyd, 1993, p. 148). The irony is that modest projects may be more successful than larger-scale initiatives. However, unless we figure out how to take these initiatives to scale, they will continue to operate on the margins of the educational system and will not engage educators throughout the system in redefining their roles (Mawhinney & Smrekar, 1996).

Various literatures on school–community connections suggest that we have enough examples of successful school–community practice; the policy challenge now is to cull and disseminate this knowledge (Schorr, 1989, 1997). Sometimes this line of debate leads researchers to list characteristics of schools that are linked with communities or to identify models of school–community connections that can be replicated. However, creating meaningful connections is not merely a matter of listing what a "full-service school" contains or of sharing information among community agencies and schools. School–community connections require a deliberate effort to profoundly restructure roles and expectations throughout the formal and informal education systems. We must reconsider the role of schools in communities, and, specifically, we must reconsider the roles of teachers and other educational leaders as

people who operate not only in a school but also in a community (neighborhood). This new perspective may require corresponding shifts in the roles of policymakers at various levels that allow them to build policy that enables school–community connections for opportunity to learn and teach.

Policy to support such shifts in roles for schools and community agencies may lag behind practice. Although education policy continues to tinker inside schools, the day-to-day demands on principals and teachers may mean that they do, in fact, operate on a community level. Some have argued that the new context for school principals is a school–community context in which school principals are increasingly engaged in issues of neighborhood renewal and change and community members are increasingly enlisted in school governance (Fullan, 1996). Without policy to support these shifting demands on schools, the success of school–community connections may continue to rest on the backs of extraordinary leaders who are able to succeed despite otherwise constraining conditions (Elmore, 1996; Honig, 1998).

Toward a Research Agenda on School–Community Connections for Opportunity to Learn and Opportunity to Teach

The implications of this chapter for research on teaching primarily relate to the frame within which we have traditionally viewed problems of teaching and learning. Specifically, researchers who focus on teaching and learning generally do not examine and have not examined contexts for teaching and learning that extend beyond the work of classroom teachers and the purview of schools. Education research, like education policy, tends to be school-centric in its consideration of opportunities for learning and teaching.

An expanded understanding of opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach, as suggested in this chapter, asks researchers to redefine their terms and rethink their research tools. To help enable effective school–community connections, education researchers and policymakers would do well to enact the following five strategies.

1. *Develop a broader conception of what learning is and where it takes place.* One clear implication of this research review is that out-of-school resources, occasions, and supports—academic and nonacademic, formal and informal—affect youths' performance in school. One challenge for research is to identify these out-of-school contexts and explore in more detail how they affect learning—both when they are and when they are not connected with schools. The research framework suggested here, school–community connections for opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach, suggests certain categories that may provide a useful first guide for this research. Specifically, this framework can be used to identify promising school–community efforts, describe them in terms of teaching and learning, and analyze them along common dimensions. The latter will be particularly important for comparisons across school–community efforts. A promising line of inquiry would focus directly on the elements of this framework to explore specifically what these elements look like for youth and their multiple teachers in day-to-day practice.
2. *Focus on what enables school–community connections for opportunities to learn and teach.* As we have indicated throughout this chapter, resources, occasions, and supports for teaching and learning not only must exist but also must be used. We know significantly more about barriers to collaboration than we know about the factors and conditions that enable school–community connections. Further research on the implementation challenges of school–community connections for opportunities to learn and teach should focus not only on constraining conditions but also on enabling conditions. This line of research will require that we not simply describe efforts that seem to embody principles of best practice (Schorr, 1997) but that we consider the contexts in which these models might be successful day-to-day for particular teachers and students. This line of research may also require that we focus on typical schools that are attempting various forms of school–community collaboration, not on only those flagship schools that often boast significant discretionary funding and extraordinary leadership.
3. *Examine specifically the roles of classroom teachers and principals at schools engaged in school–community collaborations.* What is the role of a classroom teacher and a principal in a school that is connected with community in the ways suggested in our research framework? What do curriculum and pedagogy look like—and what can they look like—when classroom teachers are connected to networks of youths' formal and informal teachers in and out of school? Under what conditions within schools are teachers enabled to use lessons in their own classrooms that are learned from youths' teachers out of school? Although available research on these issues is limited, various studies that used institutional theory to examine factors that constrain changes in the roles of teachers and principals suggest promising directions (e.g., Mawhinney & Smrekar, 1996; Smrekar, 1994; Smrekar, 1996; Smylie & Crowson, 1996; Smylie et al., 1994).
4. *Recast the frame for research on education policy.* The research agenda proposed in this chapter suggests that education policymakers, too, must expand the types of information and sources of knowledge that are considered relevant to policy analysis in education. This expansion includes information about the limitations of schools and teachers attempting, alone, to meet high academic standards. In addition, this approach includes, for "low achieving" schools, the ways that certain remedies—such as those that require extensions of the academic day—may strain relationships between schools and community agencies and otherwise paradoxically limit the ability of schools to marshal the resources, occasions, and supports necessary to improve their performance.
5. *Reconsider traditional relationships between researchers and practitioners to expand knowledge about opportunity to learn and opportunity to teach.* This new research agenda suggests that we need to rethink traditional relationships between researchers and school–community partnerships.

The line of research suggested here puts a premium on local knowledge and on sharing it in ways that support local action. Local partners can help researchers identify which school–community connections and which results may be meaningful in their particular communities. Overall, schools and communities must be engaged meaningfully in investigations of school–community connections.

REFERENCES

Allen, J. P., Philliber, S., & Hoggson, N. (1990). School-based prevention of teenage pregnancy and school dropout: Process evaluation of the national replication of the Teen Outreach Program. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(4), 505–524.

Allen, J. P., Philliber, S., Herrling, S., & Kuperminc, G. P. (1997). Preventing teen pregnancy and academic failure: Experimental evaluation of a developmentally based approach. *Child Development, 64*(4), 729–742.

Alt, M. (1997). How effective an educational tool is student community service? *NASSP Bulletin, 81*(591), 8–16.

Anderson, E. (1978). *A place on the corner.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, E. (1989). Sex codes and family life among inner-city youths. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 501,* 59–78.

Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Banfield, E. C. (1970). *The unheavenly city: The nature and future of our urban crisis.* Boston: Little Brown.

Bernard, B. (1990). *The case for peers.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Bianchi, S., & Robinson, J. (1997). What did you do today? Children's use of time, family composition, and the acquisition of social capital. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59,* 332–344.

Blase, J. J. (1987). The politics of teaching: The teacher-parent relationship and the dynamics of diplomacy. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(2), 53–60.

Blyth, D. A., & Leffert, N. (1995). Communities as contexts for adolescent development: An empirical analysis. *The Journal of Adolescent Research, 10*(1), 64–87.

Bowles, S., & Levin, H. M. (1968). The determinants of scholastic achievements—An appraisal of some recent evidence. *The Journal of Human Resources, 3*(1), 1–24.

Boyer, E. (1983). *High school: A report on secondary education in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22*(6), 723–742.

Bronfenbrenner, U., Moen, P., & Garbarino, J. (1984). Families and communities. In R. Parke (Ed.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. 7). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., & Aber, J. L. (Eds.). (1998a). *Neighborhood poverty: Vol. 1. Context and consequences for children.* New York: Sage.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., & Aber, J. L. (Eds.). (1998b). *Neighborhood poverty: Vol. 2. Policy implications in studying neighborhoods.* New York: Sage.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., Klebanov, P., & Sealand, N. (1993). Do neighborhoods influence child and adolescent development. *American Journal of Sociology, 99*(2), 353–395.

Brown, B. B., Lamborn, S. L., Mounts, N. S., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and peer group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development, 64,* 467–482.

Buehler, C., Anthony, C., Krishnakumar, A., Stone, G., Gerard, J., & Pemberton, S. (1997). Interparental conflict and youth problem behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 6*(2), 6, 2, 223–247.

Burg, S. (1998). El Puente: The real deal. *New Designs for Youth Development, 14*(1), 10–16.

Cahill, M. (1993). *A documentation report on the New York City Beacons Initiative.* New York: The Youth Development Institute, Fund for the City of New York.

Cahill, M. (1996). *Schools and community partnerships: Reforming schools, revitalizing communities.* Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform.

Calabrese, R. L., & Schumer, H. (1986). The effects of service activities on adolescent alienation. *Adolescence, 21,* 675–687.

Caplan, G., & Killilea, M. (Eds.). (1976). *Support systems and mutual help: Multidisciplinary explorations.* New York: Grune & Stratton.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1994). A matter of time: Risk and opportunity in the out-of-school hours. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Chaskin, R. J., & Richman, H. A. (1993). Concerns about school-linked services: Institution-based versus community-based models. *Education and Urban Society, 25*(2), 201–211.

Clapp, E. R. (1939). *Community schools in action.* New York: Viking.

Clark, R. M. (1983). *Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cognetta, P. V., & Sprinthall, N. A. (1978). Students as teachers: Role taking as a means of promoting psychological and ethical development during adolescence. In N. A. Sprinthall & R. L. Mosher (Eds.), *Value development as the aim of education.* Schenectady, NY: Character Research Press.

Cohen, D. L. (1994). Working in harmony: A community school supports the whole family. *Education Week,* 28–29.

Cohen, P. A., Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C.-L. C. (1982). Educational outcomes of tutoring: A meta-analysis of findings. *American Educational Research Journal,* 237–248.

Coleman, J. S. (1961). *The adolescent society.* New York: The Free Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher* (August-September), 32–38.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(Suppl.), S95–S120.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship. (1988). *The forgotten half: Pathways to success for America's youth and young families.* Washington, DC: William T. Grant Foundation.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1981). *Assessment of experimental education: A final report.* St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Youth Development and Research.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services, 3,* 57–76.

Coulton, C. J., Korbin, J. E., & Su, M. (1996). Measuring neighborhood context for young children in an urban area. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24*(1), 5–32.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1989). *Community Service: Learning by doing.* Washington, DC: Author.

Crane, J. (1996). The epidemic theory of ghettos and neighborhood effects on dropping out and teenage childbearing. *American Journal of Sociology, 96*(5), 1226–1259.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. *American Journal of Education, 101*(2), 140–179.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K., & Wahlen, S. (1993). *Talented teenagers: The roots of success and failure.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

D'Amico, R. (1984). Does employment during high school impair academic progress? *Sociology of Education, 57*(3), 152–164.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

de Pommereau, I. (1996, April 24). It takes the community to educate the child at this urban school. *The Christian Science Monitor,* 15.

Dewey, J. (Ed.). (1956). *The child and the curriculum and the school and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1900)

Dewey, J. (1976). The school as social center. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.),

John Dewey: The middle works (Vol. 2, pp. 80–93). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1902)

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education.* New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1916)

Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier Macmillan. (Original work published 1938)

Dewsbury-White, K. E. (1993). *The relationship of service-learning project models to the subject-matter achievement of middle school students.* East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development, 58*(5), 1244–1257.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). *Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1994). *Full-Service schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1998). *Safe passage.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Elder, G. H., Jr. (Ed.). (1985). *Life course dynamics: Trajectories and transitions, 1968–1980.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Elmore, R. (1996). Getting to scale with good educational practice. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 1–26.

Ensminger, M. E., Lamkin, R. P., & Jacobson, N. (1996). School leaving: A longitudinal perspective including neighborhood effects. *Child Development, 67*(5), 2400–2416.

Entwisle, D. R., & Alexander, K. L. (1995). Family type and children's growth in reading and math over the primary grades. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*(2), 341–355.

Entwisle, D. R., & Alexander, K. L. (1996). A parent's economic shadow: Family structure versus family resources as influences on early school achievement. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*(2), 399–409.

Epstein, J. L. (1983). The influence of friends on achievement and affective outcomes. In J. L. Epstein & N. Karweit (Eds.), *Friends in school* (pp. 177–200). New York: Academic Press.

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis.* New York: Norton.

Fasick, F. A. (1984). Parents, peers, youth culture and autonomy in adolescence. *Adolescence, 19*(73), 143–157.

Featherstone, D. R., Cundick, B. P., & Jensen, L. C. (1992). Differences in school behavior and achievement between children from intact, reconstituted, and single-parent families. *Adolescence, 27*(105), 1–12.

Fine, G. A., & Mechling, J. (1993). Child saving and children's cultures at century's end. In S. B. Heath & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Identity and inner city youth* (pp. 120–143). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "Burden of 'Acting White.'" *Urban Review, 18*, 176–206.

Fullan, M. (1996). Leadership for change. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 701–722). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Furano, K., Roaf, P. A., Styles, M. B., & Branch, A. Y. (1993). *Big Brothers/Big Sisters: A study of program practices.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Gambone, M. A., & Arbreton, A. J. A. (1997). *Safe havens: The contributions of youth organizations to healthy adolescent development.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Garbarino, J. (1992). The meaning of poverty in the world of children. *American Behavioral Scientist, 35*, 220–237.

Goldberger, S., & Kazis, R. (1996). Revitalizing high schools: What the school-to-career movement can contribute. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(8), 547–554.

Gomby, D. S., & Larson, C. S. (1992). Evaluation of school-linked services. *The Future of Children, 2*(1), 68–84.

Gonzalez, D. (1995, May 23). A bridge from hope to social action. *The New York Times*, A1, B4.

Gonzalez, D. (1997, June 28). Going ahead, grounded in reality. *The New York Times.*

Gottfredson, D.C., McNeill III, R. J., & Gottfredson, G. D. (1991). Social area influences on delinquency: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28*(2), 197–226.

Graham, P. A. (1995). Assimilation, adjustment, and access: An antiquarian view of American education. In D. Ravitch & M. Vinovskis (Eds.), *Learning from the past* (pp. 3–24). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Granovetter, M. (1978). Threshold models of collective behavior. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(6), 1420–1443.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D., & Ruggiero, M. (1981). The workplace as a context for the socialization of youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10*(3), 185–210.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D., & Ruggiero, M. (1982). A job is a job is a job . . . or is it? Behavioral observations in the adolescent workplace. *Work and Occupations, 9*(1), 79–96.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D., & Vaux, A. (1981). Adolescents who work: Health and behavioral consequences of job stress. *Developmental Psychology, 17*(6), 691–703.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D., Vaux, A., & McAuliffe, S. (1980). Adolescents who work: Effects of part-time employment on family and peer relations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9*(3), 189–202.

Grubb, W. N. (1995). Reconstructing urban schools with work-centered education. *Education and Urban Society, 27*(3), 244–59.

Grubb, W. N., & Lazerson, M. (1982). *Broken promises.* New York: Basic Books.

Hagedorn, J. (1988). People and folks: Gangs crime, and the underclass in a rustbelt city. Chicago: Lake View Press.

Hamilton, S. F., & Fenzel, L. M. (1988). The impact of volunteer experience on adolescent social development: Evidence from program effects. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 3*(1), 65–80.

Hamilton, S. F., & Zeldin, S. R. (1987). Learning civics in the community. *Curriculum Inquiry, 17*(4), 407–420.

Hanks, M., & Eckland, B. K. (1978). Adult voluntary associations and adolescent socialization. *The Sociological Quarterly, 19*(Summer), 481–490.

Hanna, P. (1936). *Youth serves the community.* New York: Appleton Century.

Harnish, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Valente, E. (1995). Mother-child interaction quality as a partial mediator of the roles of maternal depressive symptomatology and socioeconomic status in the development of child behavior problems. *Child Development, 66*, 739–753.

Harrison, C. (1987). Student service: The new Carnegie unit. Princton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Hashima, P. Y., & Amato, P. R. (1994). Poverty, social support, and parental beliefs. *Child Development, 65*, 394–403.

Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1987). A child resource policy: Moving beyond dependence on school and family. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*(8), 576–580.

Hedin, D. (1987). Students as teachers: A tool for improving school climate. *Social Policy, 17*(3), 42–47.

Heiss, J. (1996). Effects on African American family structure on school attitudes and performance. *Social Problems, 43*(3), 246–267.

Hershey, A., Hudis, P., Silverberg, M., & Haimson, J. (1997). *Partners in progress: Early steps in creating school-to-work systems.* Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Hess, L. E., Petersen, A. C., & Mortimer, J. T. (1994). Youth, unemployment, and marginality: The problem and the solution. In A. C. Petersen & J. T. Mortimer (Eds.), *Youth unemployment and society* (pp. 3–33). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Honig, M., & Fiore, K. (1997). *Working with young people as partners.* Davis, CA: Healthy Start Field Office.

Honig, M. I. (1998, April 17). *Opportunities to lead for school–community connections.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Ide, J. K., Parkerson, J., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1981). Peer group influence on educational outcomes: A quantitative synthesis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 73*(4), 472–484.

Illback, R. (1997). *Bridges over barriers: Kentucky's family resource and youth services centers: A summary of education-related evaluation findings.* Louisville, KY: R.E.A.C.H. of Louisville

Jarrett, R. L. (1995). Growing up poor: The family experiences of socially mobile youth in low-income African-American neighborhoods. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 10*(1), 111–135.

Jarrett, R. L. (1997). African American family and parenting strategies

in impoverished neighborhoods. *Qualitative Sociology, 20*(2). 275–288.

Jehl, J., & Kirst, M. (1992). Getting ready to provide school-linked services: What schools must do. *The Future of Children, 2*(1), 95–106.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effects of family and schooling in America.* New York: Basic Books.

Johnson, A. (1996). *An evaluation of the impacts of the Sponsor-A-Scholar program on student performance: Final report to the Commonwealth Fund.* Philadelphia: Institute for Research on Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Kahne, J., & Bailey, K. (1999). The role of special capital in youth development: The case of "I Have a Dream." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis, 21*(3), 321–343.

Kahne, J., Nagaoka, J., Brown, A., O'Brien, J., Quinn, T., & Thiede, K. (2000). School and after-school programs as contexts for youth development: Qualitative and quantitative assessment. In M. Wang & W. Boyd (Eds.), *Improving results for children and families by connecting collaborative services with school reform efforts.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Kazis, R. (1993). *Improving the transition from school to work in the United States.* Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.

Kazis, R., & Kopp, H. (1997). *Both sides now: New directions in promoting work and learning for disadvantaged youth.* Boston: Jobs for the Future.

Keefe, K., & Berndt, T. (1996). Relations of friendship quality to self-esteem in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 16*(1), 110–129.

Kilpatrick, W. H. (1918). The project method. *Teachers College Record, 19*(4), 319–335.

Knapp, M. S., & Shields, P. M. (1991). Better schooling for children of poverty. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Kopp, H., & Kazis, R. (1995). *Promising practices: A study of ten school-to-career programs.* Boston: Jobs for the Future.

Kretzman, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets.* Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research.

Larson, R. (1984). Youth organizations, hobbies, and sports as developmental contexts. In R. Silbereisen & E. Todt (Eds.), *The interplay of family, schools, peers, and work in adjustment* (pp. 46–65). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Lawson, H., & Briar-Lawson, K. (1997). *Connecting the dots: Progress toward the integration of school reform, school-linked services, parent involvement, and community schools.* Oxford, OH: The Danforth Foundation and the Institute for Educational Renewal at Miami University.

Lefkowitz, B. (1987). *Tough change: Growing up on your own in America.* New York: The Free Press.

Levinson, L. (1986). *Community service programs in independent schools.* Boston: National Association of Independent Schools.

Liebow, E. (1996). *Tally's corner.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). *Worlds apart.* New York: Basic Books.

Lillydahl, J. (1990). Academic achievement and part-time employment of high school students. *Journal of Economic Education*(Summer), 307–316.

Luckmann.T. (1991). The new and old religion. In P. Bourdiev & J. S. Coleman (Eds.), *Social theory for a changing society* (pp. 167–188). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

MacLeod, J. (1987). *Ain't No Makin' It.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Marsh, H. (1991). Employment during high school: Character building or a subversion of academic goals. *Sociology of Education, 64,* 172–189.

Martin, L., & Ascher, C. (1994). Developing math and science materials for school-age child care programs. In F. A. Villarruel & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Promoting community-based programs for socialization and learning* (pp. 11–24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Martinez, M., Goldberger, S., & Alongi, A. (1996). *A year of progress in school-to-career system building.* Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.

Mawhinney, H. B., & Smrekar, C. (1996). Institutional constraints to advocacy in collaborative services. *Educational Policy, 10*(4), 480–501.

McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). Embedded identities: Enabling balance in urban contexts. In S. B. Heath & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Identity and inner-city youth* (pp. 36–67). New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W. (2000). *Community counts.* Washington, DC: Public Education Network.

McLaughlin, M. W., Irby, M. A., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Shepard, L. A. (1995). *Improving education through standards-based reform.* Stanford, CA: National Academy of Education.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (1993). *Contexts that matter for teaching and learning: Strategic opportunities for meeting the nation's educational goals.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

McLaughlin, M. W. & Talbert, J. E. (2001). *Communities of practice and the work of high school teaching.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLeod, V. C. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on black families and children: Psychological distress, parenting, and economic development. *Child Development, 61,* 311–340.

Melchior, A. (1997). *National evaluation of Learn and Serve America school and community-based programs.* Waltham, MA: Center for Human Resources, Brandeis University.

Melchior, A., & Orr, L. (1995). *Overview: National evaluation of Learn and Serve America.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates and Brandeis University Center for Human Resources.

Mihalic, S. W., & Elliott, D. (1997). Short and long-term consequences of adolescent work. *Youth and Society, 28*(4), 464–498.

Milne, A. M., Myers, D. E., Rosenthal, A. S., & Ginsburg, A. (1986). Single parents, working mothers, and the educational achievement of school children. *Sociology of Education, 59*(July), 125–139.

Moll, L. C. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(1), 132–141.

Morrow, K. V., & Styles, M. (1995). *Building relationships with youth in program settings.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Mortimer, J. T., & Finch, M. D. (1996). Work, family, and adolescent development. In J. T. Mortimer & M. D. Finch (Eds.), *Adolescents, work, and family: An intergenerational developmental analysis* (pp. 1–24). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mounts, N. S., & Steinberg, L. (1995). An ecological analysis of peer influence on adolescent grade point average and drug use. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(6), 915–922.

Murphy, L. B., & Moriarty, A. E. (1976). *Vulnerability, coping, and growth: From infancy to adolescence.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

National Center on Education and the Economy, & Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. (1990). *America's choice: High skills or low wages!* Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy.

National Research Council. (1993). *Losing generations: Adolescents in high-risk settings.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Newman, K. (1999). No shame my game: The working poor in the inner city. New York: Knopf/Sage.

Newman, K. S. (1996). Working poor: Low-wage employment in the lives of Harlem youth. In J. A. Graber, J. Brooks-Gunn, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.). *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context* (pp. 323–343). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Newman, K. S. (1997). Culture and structure in the truly disadvantaged. *City and Society,* 3–25.

Newmann, F. M., & Rutter, R. A. (1983). *The effects of high school community service programs on students' social development.* Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, University of Wisconsin.

Padilla, F. M. (1992). *The gang as an American enterprise.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Parsons, T. (1942). Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. *American Sociological Review, 7,* 604–616.

Pauly, E., Kopp, H., & Haimson, J. (1995). *Homegrown lessons: Innovative programs linking school and work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perlstein, D. (1996). Community and democracy in American schools: Arthurdale and the fate of progressive education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(4), 625–650.

Phelan, P., Davidson, A. L., & Yu, H. C. (1998). *Adolescents' worlds: Negotiating family, peers, and school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Philliber Research Associates. (1994). *An evaluation of the Caring Communities program at Walbridge Elementary School.* Accord, NY: Author.

Pittman, K., & Cahill, M. (1992). Pushing the boundaries of education: The implications of a youth development approach to education policies, structures, and collaborations. In Council of Chief State School Officers (Ed.), *Ensuring student success through collaboration: Summer Institute papers and recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Pittman, K. J., & Wright, M. (1991). *Bridging the gap: A rationale for enhancing the role of community organizations in promoting youth.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

Posner, J. K., & Vandell, D. L. (1994). Low-income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs? *Child Development, 65*(2), 440–456.

Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65–78.

Ravitch, D. (1995). *National standards in American education.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Rist, R. C. (1981). Walking through a house of mirrors: Youth education and employment training. *Education and Urban Society, 14*(1), 3–14.

Rose, M. (1995). *Possible lives.* New York: Penguin Books.

Rossman, S. B., & Morley, E. (1995). *The national evaluation of Cities in Schools.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Sampson, R. J. (1991). Linking the micro- and macrolevel dimensions of community social organization. *Social Forces, 70*(1), 43–64.

Sampson, R. J. (1993). Family management and child development: Insights from social disorganization theory. In J. McCord (Ed.), *Facts, frameworks, and forecasts: Advances in criminological theory* (Vol. 3, pp. 63–93). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1994). Urban poverty and family context of delinquency: A new look at structure and process in a classic study. *Child Development, 65*(2), 523–540.

Schelling, T. C. (1971). Dynamic models of segregation. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology, 1*, 143–186.

Schneider, M., Teske, P., Marschall, M., Mintrom, M., & Roch, C. (1997). Institutional arrangements and the creation of social capital: The effects of public school choice. *American Political Science Review, 91*(1), 82–93.

Schorr, L. B. (1989). *Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage.* New York: Anchor Books.

Schorr, L. B. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America.* New York: Doubleday.

Schram, S. (1995). *Words of welfare.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.

Schulenberg, J., & Bachman, J. G. (1993, April). *Long hours on the job? Not so bad for some adolescents in some types of jobs: The quality of work and substance use, affect, and stress.* Paper presented at the Society for Research on Child Development, New Orleans, LA.

Sedlak, M. W. (1995). Attitudes, choices, and behavior: School delivery of health and social services. In D. Ravitch & M. Vinovskis (Eds.), *Learning from the past* (pp. 57–96). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Smrekar, C. (1994). The missing link in school-linked social service programs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16*(4), 422–433.

Smrekar, C. (1996). The Kentucky Family Resource Centers: The challenges of remaking family-school interactions. In J. G. Cibulka & W. J. Kritek (Eds.), *Coordination among schools, families, and communities* (pp. 3–26). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Smylie, M. A., & Crowson, R. L. (1996). Working within the scripts: Building institutional infrastructure for children's service coordination in schools. *Educational Policy, 10*(1), 3–21.

Smylie, M. A., Crowson, R. L., Chou, V., & Levin, R. A. (1994). The principal and community-school connections in Chicago's radical reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(3), 342–364.

Sorin, G. (1990). *The nurturing neighborhood: The Brownsville Boys Club and Jewish community in urban America.* New York: New York University Press.

Spady, W. G. (1970). Lament for the letterman: Effects of peer status and extracurricular activities. *American Journal of Sociology, 75*(January), 680–702.

SRI International. (1996). *California's Healthy Start school-linked services initiative: Results for children and families.* Menlo Park, CA: Author.

Stack, C. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community.* New York: Harper & Row.

Steinberg, L. (1987). Single parents, stepparents, and the susceptibility of adolescents to antisocial peer pressure. *Child Development, 58*, 269–75.

Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Negative correlates of part-time employment during adolescence: Replication and elaboration. *Developmental Psychology, 27*(2), 304–313.

Steinberg, L., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., Ruggiero, M., & Vaux, A. (1982). Effects of working on adolescent development. *Developmental Psychology, 18*(3), 385–395.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, M., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 63*(3), 754–770.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*(5), 1266–1281.

Stern, D., Stone, J. R., Hopkins, C., & McLillon, M. (1990). Quality of students' work experience and orientation toward work. *Youth and Society, 22*(2), 263–282.

Summers, A. A., & Wolfe, B. L. (1977). Do schools make a difference? *The American Economic Review, 67*(4), 639–652.

Swanson, D. P., Spencer, M. B., & Petersen, A. (1998). Identity formation in adolescence. In K. Borman & B. Schneider (Eds.), *The adolescent years: Social influences and educational challenges. Nineteen-seventy yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 18–41). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Thompson, M. S., Alexander, K. L., & Entwisle, D. R. (1988). Household composition, parental expectations, and social achievement. *Social Forces, 67*(2), 424–451.

Tierney, J. P., Grossman, J. B., & Resch, N. L. (1995). *Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Tyack, D. (1992). Health and social services in public schools: Historical perspectives. *The Future of Children, 2*(1), 19–31.

Tyack, D. (1995). Reinventing schools. In D. Ravitch & M. Vinovskis (Eds.), *Learning from the past* (pp. 191–216). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820–1980.* New York: Basic Books.

U.S. Department of Education, & U.S. Department of Justice. (1998). *Safe and smart: Making after-school hours work for kids.* Washington, DC: Authors.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1991). *What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000.* Washington, DC: Author.

Vigil, J. D. (1993). Gangs, social control, and ethnicity: Ways to redirect. In S. B. Heath & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Identity and inner-city youth* (pp. 94–119). New York: Teachers College Press.

Villarruel, F. A., & Lerner, R. M. (Eds.). (1994). *Promoting community-based programs for socialization and learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wade, R. C., & Saxe, D. W. (1996). Community service-learning in the social studies: Historical roots, empirical evidence, critical issues. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 24*(4), 331–359.

Wagner, V. (1996, April 21). Shining a beacon on community needs. *San Francisco Examiner,* B-1, B-5.

Wehlage, G., Smith, G., & Lipman, P. (1992). Restructuring urban schools: The new futures experience. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(1), 51–93.

Werner, E. E. (1992). Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Westheimer, J., Kahne, J., & Gerstein, A. (1992). School reform in the nineties: Opportunities and obstacles for experiential educators. *Journal of Experiential Education, 15*(2), 44–49.

Whyte, W. F. (1955). *Street corner society* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wigginton, E. (1985). *Sometimes a sharing moment: Twenty years at Foxfire.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Williams, T., & Kornblum, W. (1985). *Growing up poor.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wohlstetter, P. (1997). *First lessons: Charter schools as learning communities.* Philadelphia: Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Wood, G. (1992). *Schools that work: America's most innovative public education programs.* New York: Dutton.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1996). Community service and political-moral identity in adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*(3), 271–284.

Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1989). The role of peer groups in adolescents' adjustment to secondary school. In T. J. Berendt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Peer relationships in child development.* New York: Wiley.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zeldin, S., & Charner, I. (1996). *School-to-work opportunities through the lens of youth development.* Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development.