

Critique

Leita Kaldi has introduced the readers to little known data on one of America's most interesting and lesser-known ethnic groups. This critique focuses on further development of the material in the article and the implications of such research for the field of ethnic studies.

Because Kaldi presents a model of an alternative school that has met with some measures of success, it would be beneficial to examine in further detail those elements which contribute to the continuation of the Gypsy Alternative School. Of particular importance is the need to specify and clarify what factors in particular make this model successful when compared to factors operative in unsuccessful alternative schools for the Rom.

Although such factors are mentioned in a general way, in-depth explanations, regarding flexibility of funding allocations, characteristics of teachers, curriculum descriptions, and data on student learning styles would provide substantial information.

A second area for development would be a biographical sketch of the school's founder, Ephraim Stevens. Such data would probably prove invaluable in providing inspiration to others interested in departing from traditional approaches to non-traditional problems.

The implications of Kaldi's research for the field of ethnic studies is somewhat related to areas for further development. The interdisciplinary nature of the problem could be studied in terms of the aspects of each *discipline* that contributed toward a solution. Aspects of history, geography, political science, economics, sociology, philosophy, and education combined would make a good blend—a workable solution to a long-standing problem. The task for researchers, then, would be to explore the various disciplines involved and to “tease out” those factors that contributed toward making the endeavor a successful one. Such a determination could be utilized to make this model applicable to similar educational situations.

Shirla R. McClain
Kent State University