A Question of Resistance to Home Education and the Culture of School-Based Education

Blane Després

A Question of Resistance to Home Education and the Culture of School-Based Education

Blane Després

Ripple Deep Consulting

Public educator resistance to home education is not a definitive or deliberate offense but part of the culture of teaching, schooling, and the grand culture in which schooling functions. Such resistance, especially at higher bureaucratic levels, stems from a faith stance that might very well be misinformed, misguided, and perhaps even blindly biased. A reading of the roles of teachers and resistance to change from a systems thinking framework informs this work. The main purpose of this article is to present findings from a review of the literature in an effort to expose the critical factors that might inhibit home education growth, acceptance—especially by educators—and greater inclusion as a mainstream education practice. Systemic thinking application in combination with the topic of home education offers multiple strands of understanding home education, systems thinking, and resistance. This article furthers the discussion on home education and prompts educators and researchers alike to reconsider home education and educator roles for the 21st century not as utilitarian functions for local and global economies but as coworkers toward a perceived common goal for children.

INTRODUCTION

School-based educator resistance to homeschooling has been a question that has arisen in a variety of circles, especially in the experiences of some home educators. Is such resistance a reality or legitimate, I wondered—as I had heard occasionally from homeschoolers and teacher education students about some of my fellow colleagues' antipathy toward anything but public education? What is the basis for resistance, and what is the nature or root of educators' stance on the topic? Ironically I was unable to conduct a pilot study to generate hard data to at least bolster some of the literature due to closed doors by a few school districts in my area. The unwillingness of the contacted school districts to participate is in itself an unresolved issue.

A variety of sources have attempted to argue a balanced view between critics of and advocates for home education (e.g., Education Commission of the States, n.d.; Hammer, 2011; Romanowski, 2001). Others have offered general discussion about push-back against or concerns about homeschooling (Education Week, 2012; Goldstein, 2012; Martin, 2007; Reich, 2002; Rotherham, 2012), though most of the discussions are in need of corroborating evidence. Still

others have made bald attempts to quash or severely regulate home education altogether (e.g., Badman, 2009; Clabough, 2011; National Education Association, 2007). Wenders and Clements (2005, 2007) presented compelling evidence that supports homeschooling and concerns about funding for public schools (see also Ray & Weller, 2003); however, they noted, "Nevertheless, homeschooling has its detractors—primarily public school officials. They decry the loss of per-pupil funding that occurs when children are homeschooled. It is a complaint that could be made about all privately schooled students" (2005, p. 5).

On Wenders and Clements's claim about school funding, in an earlier article in *Time* magazine Cloud and Morse (2001) spoke about the perception that government funding for education is greatly impaired because of homeschooling. The authors suggest that parental choice to home-school corresponds also to dwindling satisfaction with public schooling.

If Cloud and Morse are correct, resentment and resistance to home education are understandable as detractors from adequate funding for schooling purposes. Indeed, a brief review of the literature reveals that the focus of educator resistance tends to center mostly around issues of philosophical ideals, such as the social purpose of schooling as part of societal normalization, or functionality problems, such as affecting funding or enrollment numbers (see Arai, 2000; Aurini & Davies, 2005; Brabant, 2004; Jones & Gloeckner, 2004; Luffman, 1997; Reich, 2002). What these few examples suggest is that homeschooling research could greatly benefit from a systemic or "big picture" examination of home education and its relation to teacher resistance as one aspect of the whole of home education. Although I speak of resistance, it must be noted that it has not been proven. The "problem" is raised here to heighten research interest in the topic and to determine more definitively the purposes of education for citizens and how that education might be understood to extend beyond the bounds or trappings of the monopolistic mentality of public schooling advocates.

I offer that a part of understanding resistance to home education—or to any external organizations entering schools for anything more than financial or in-kind support (Després, 2003)—has to do with the culture of school-based education. That is resistance appears to be part of the function and environment of teaching, schooling, and the grand culture (see, e.g., Knight, 2009; Smith, 2008). To better determine if such resistance were universal or at least admitted, I used a matrix based on a systems thinking framework I have been developing that provides a "big picture" of related variables or the components of an event or problem (Després, 2007a, 2007b, 2008). That is, I used a literature review on educator resistance and on related homeschool issues to populate a systems thinking matrix entitled the Family of Related Systemic Elements (FoRSE) matrix.

One purpose of this project was to present findings at the American Education Research Association annual meeting in San Francisco in 2010. Another purpose was to determine the viability of the FoRSE Matrix as research tool that could help to expose factors that might inhibit home education acceptance and greater inclusion as a legitimate education practice irrespective of credentials, prior training, or parental choice of education models. Systemic thinking applied in this case offers multiple strands of understanding home education, resistance, and the role of education in culture. My approach is to move from general information about the culture of school-based education to a more focused discussion of school-based educators' resistance to homeschooling education followed by a brief look at a systemic thinking application on the topic.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE CULTURE OF SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATION

> Reluctance of the majority of people to move from a known to an unknown condition, combined with a myriad of traditions, habits, and fearful concerns, has thus far been enough to keep education systems on a slow evolutionary track of development. (Milner, 1994, p. 147)

That change is a difficult endeavor in school-based education is nothing new. Taylor (1838) wrote about the advantage of home education over public schooling (p. 15) and even the difficulty to change, or the entrenchment of, public schooling (pp. 24–25). Building upon this, Evans (1996) challenged the status quo in his study on change:

> Organizational change—not just in schools, but in institutions of all kinds—is riddled with paradox. We study it in ever greater depth, but we practice it with continuing clumsiness. *Change itself proves Protean, its implementation Sisyphean. We try to define it, analyze it, plan it—management experts speak of "mastering" it—all in vain* [emphasis added]. It remains elusive, mutable, never what it seems. (p. 4)

Evans spoke of first- and second-order changes. The former consist of efforts to "improve efficiency or effectiveness of what we are already doing," such as textbook adoption for a subject discipline or policy statement for a program. The latter "are systemic in nature and aim to modify the very way an organization is put together, altering its assumptions, goals, structures, roles, and norms" and includes the necessity of participants "to change their beliefs and perceptions" (p. 5).

The difficulty in establishing sustainable change in school-based education is also in part due to what Elliott (1993) referred to as, "the power of the occupational culture in schools to limit, circumscribe and restrict the development of personal capacities for in-depth reflection about practice" (p. 5). Hodas (1996) likewise associated the problem of resistance with the institution and culture of education, as do Howley and Howley (1995). This is not surprising if we accept that the culture of education is structured such that it perpetuates a status quo in which its programs are completely related to, and developed for and within, that systemic structure (Hodas, 1996; Marshall & Tucker, 1992; Welker, 1992).

Change, whether through orchestrated alterations to the status quo or alternative models, also brings resistance. Resistance to change may be an expected outcome of schooling, as an extension of the educator's character in the school-based setting. Cuban (1984) noted writes that one interpretation of teaching practice as it is/has been is the

> occupational ethos of teaching that breeds conservatism and resistance to change in institutional practice. This conservatism, i.e., preference for stability and caution toward change, is rooted in the people recruited into the profession, how they are informally socialized, and the school the dominant culture of which teaching itself is a primary ingredient. (p. 243)

Bacharach and Shedd (1989) provided this explanation for this resistance to change:

> Time schedules, physical structures, one-teacher-per-class staffing patterns and high teacher/ administrator ratios make day-to-day contact with other adults haphazard. . . . Norms of "non-interference" discourage the asking and offering of advice. . . . Curriculum policies, [including efforts to reform education] if they do not square with a teacher's judgment of what his or her students need or are capable of learning, often go unobserved and unenforced. (p. 146)

Sarason (1990) offered this perspective on school change:

> Like almost all other complex traditional social organizations, the schools will accommodate in ways that require little or no change. . . . The strength of the status quo—its underlying axioms, its pattern of power relationships, its sense of tradition and therefore what seems right, natural, and proper—almost automatically rules out options for change. (p. 40)

To help understand the psyche of teachers and the difficulty of change, Evans (1996) broke down the ways people can respond to change into three groups: those who actively wish to change and who are involved in the process; those who are unintentionally resistant or the "practitioners of false clarity, of cooperative listening, those who actually believe they are innovators but don't really get it . . . they are stuck but potentially responsive to unfreezing"; and those who are "cryogenic" or unrepentantly recalcitrant, perhaps self-interested, sometimes exhibiting "blanket negativity or contrariness . . . in others selfish laziness; in still others, malice or vengefulness" (p. 274). This latter group refuses to change, which strains collegiality and even democratic principles. He elaborated, "Unprincipled resistance is not amenable to rational explanation or equitable give-and-take. . . . From virtually any perspective, cryogenics are beyond help. (In corporate America leaders save themselves the trouble of even trying to help cyrogenics; they fire them.)" (p. 279). This is not to imply that teachers are more prone to hardcore resistance but only to synthesize the perspectives on school-based education, its resistance to sustainable change, and the possible link to resistance to home-based education. In the next section I examine the root of education as providing another possible link to understanding the conflict between schooling and home education.

PURPOSES OF EDUCATION

Perhaps at the heart of the question of resistance in public education is the discussion of purposes of education in the first place. Bruner (1996) viewed education as "a major embodiment of a culture's way of life, not just preparation for it" (p. 13). In a study of Canadian schools and their culture, Contenta (1993) said this about the country's educational purposes:

> While the home environment is a factor in reproducing inequality, schools themselves are working hard to teach children at the bottom how to stay there while teaching those at the top how to hang on to what their parents already have. The process is skewed by a cultural bias that permeates schooling—from teachers to textbooks—and it is legitimized by the myth of meritocracy. Invisibly they combine to shape the self-image of young people, a message with the soul that spares no one, including the middle class. (p. 96)

As a challenge to education stakeholders, Bruner (1996) wondered,

> If . . . school is an entry into culture and not just a preparation for it, then we must constantly reassess what school does to the young student's conception of his own powers (his sense of agency) and his sensed chances of being able to cope with the world both in school and after (his self-esteem). In many democratic cultures, I think, we have become so preoccupied with the more formal criteria of "performance" and with the bureaucratic demands of education as an institution that we have neglected this personal side of education. (p. 39)

The architecture of state-directed learning cannot entertain the liberal spirit embodied in and en-joyed by homeschooling parents and their children. Notice the language: homeschooled *children* and not *students*. I suggest there is a humanness that remains with the designation of home that runs divergent to the culture present in schools. Furthermore I argue there can be tension only between state education and home education, because, between these two, only home education is capable of achieving the purposes of state education. That is also the paradox of formalized education.[1]

Testing, for all intents and purposes, appears to be a primary end of schooling (see Sarason, 1996, p. 258), evidenced in many states and provinces by standardized tests and, in some cases, state or provincial exams. Without the common standard assessment in such testing, educators have little means of determining the achievement level of students in their classroom. Unfortu-nately, homeschool children re/entering a school system might have only anecdotal descriptions or a portfolio of their achievement level rather than formalized assessment records. Some areas provide formalized assessment recording for homeschooled children. For example, in British Columbia, specially designated homeschool "contact teachers" (i.e., state-credentialed teachers) coordinate individual reporting of homeschooled children on a specific online site where the level of achievement in the British Columbia curriculum learning outcomes are recorded. That is to say, student achievement of the provincial standards are verified and recorded as part of the reporting requirement for the government. This record "follows" the homeschooled child and enables other educators to determine if that child is reasonably ready for the next grade level.

Another aspect of the culture of education, and another problem related to change in education, has to do with the articulation and understanding of the purpose or purposes of education. Sarason (1996) believed that education suffers because there is no overarching purpose. This coupled with the intensification of the curriculum (i.e., increasing or diversifying curricular offerings) along with crisis curriculum initiatives (e.g., increased math or reading in response to low scores on international tests, such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), plays a debilitating role in a climate of suspicion and resistance within a culture that is already regarded as fragmented and busy.

UNDERSTANDING RESISTANCE

Sarason (2002) said, "Resistance may be to the reform, but it is also powered by social-interpersonal factors in the pre-reform era. Resistance has diverse sources" (p. 34). His perspective about resistance to change is that this resistance is a development with such causal links as federal funding, the role of science–technology, criticism of educators, and the failure of reform initiatives as well as social changes that have an impact on schooling (e.g., p. 257). Resistance may result spontaneously as part of human nature from negative external causes or arise as a willful decision. Consider that resistance springs from the heart. An event in one's life precipitates a reaction. If that event is perceived to threaten or perturb a core belief or assumptions about accepted practices,

---

[1]Although I am speaking about North American education, it seems this same paradox exists globally, although I cannot say universally, which I have gleaned from speaking, teaching, discussions, and consulting east to west from China through Europe to Bahrain, and from Canada to South America. It is also another discussion about the purposes of education, which range from the practical to state and economic needs.

the resulting challenge, in turn, might cause physical discomfort or challenge preconceived ideas or convictions. These are further troubled by compromise inferred or demanded from the event. The sense of disequilibrium leads to a reaction, which we designate as resistance.

In educational practice, resistance shows itself throughout the various levels of the system.[2] Primarily this resistance is evident in entrenched teaching (styles, modes, delivery or philosophy), in hierarchical management styles, in top-down "reform" projects, and in community or parental expectations. Implementers of change must struggle with some or all of these strategic areas. With this in mind, resistance appears to be a normal function.

Home-Based Education

Alternative models of education present challenges to school-based education in terms of funding and resources, as well as socialization and community values, which include public school-based education as the norm.[3] Home-based education—or homeschooling—as much as it is an alternative education model, is equally conceived as a social movement and as a counter culture or a resistance. Collom and Mitchell (2005), for example, noted,

> McAdam and Snow (1997) . . . see "social movements as collectivities working with some degree of organization and continuity to promote or resist change through a mixture of extrainstitutional and institutionalized means" (p. xxii, cited p. 279). Thus, social movement tactics need not necessarily be disruptive, only "extrainstitutional." We would argue that homeschoolers' creation of alternative communities through noncompliance with the public education system constitutes noninstitutional means. (p. 279)

Collam and Mitchell (2005) bolstered their thesis that homeschooling is a social movement with the work of Snow, Soule, and Kriesi (2004), who argued that social movements should

> be considered as challengers to or defenders of existing *institutional authority*–whether it is located in the political, corporate, religious, or educational practices—or patterns of *cultural authority*, such as the systems of beliefs or practices reflective of those beliefs. (p. 9)

Thus, Collam and Mitchell (2005) concluded, "Homeschoolers can be seen as challenging the state's institutional authority over public education through their nonparticipation" (p. 279). In other words, home-based education disrupts the equilibrium and group conformity state (see Kritsonis, 2004–2005).

Applications to Homeschooling

Up to this point I have provided a portrayal of school-based educators and school-based culture as harboring resistance. Jones and Gloeckner (2004), although dealing with higher education admissions, spoke to the resistance to home-based education existing in these institutions as practice in need of a change:

---

[2]See Uemura (1999) for additional comments and research reporting on both the complexity of, and resistance in, education. Also Corrales (1999).

[3]Anecdotally, I have had brief discussions with academic colleagues who espouse this stance rather vociferously [0].

> While three-fourths [of the institutions surveyed] revealed that they have admission policies in place for homeschool applicants, colleges and universities still should reevaluate their policies to ensure the removal of unnecessary barriers for these students. For example, the 35 percent of colleges and universities, which don't expect homeschooled graduates to cope socially as well as their traditional school peers, are reluctant to change their personal interview policies. However, if schools do not require certain admission criteria of other applicants, they must reassess the fairness of a policy required only of homeschool applicants. (p. 21)

More research is needed to determine how and if education institutions and educators need to improve their understanding of home-based education, purposes of education, and alternative learning.

In the past three decades, education has seen the rise of resistance as a cultural issue, championed as a pedagogical cause célèbre. Freire (1973); Giroux (1995, 1983a, 1983b); Satterthwaite, Atkinson, and Gale (2003); and others highlight this fact. In the case of these authors' work, resistance, like the actions of nationalist patriots, is perceived as an ideologically motivated or necessary reaction against the political dominance of the (perceived as evil) culture in power. That culture in power may be viewed as malevolent because, in practice, it seems to demonstrate preferences that exclude or marginalize other cultural, ideological, or political beliefs. I suggest this plausible interpretation of homeschooling as a perceived counterculture practice (see Arai, 2000; Kunzman, 2010).

SYSTEMS VIEW

In a previous study of the literature on homeschooling (Després, 2007b), I was able to determine the missing pieces in the authors' discussions. The coverage of topics on homeschooling range across different foci, from philosophical issues, to discussions of purpose, to practice. Figure 1 at least affords a beginning glimpse of some of the areas of particular focus that researchers and educators have studied and where more needs to be explored.

Figures 1, 2, and 3 depict a glimpse of the complexity of issues that compose an event—in this case, homeschooling (an event is any problem, issue, or question to be examined). The full-scale version of the FoRSE Matrix, which is a 3×3 matrix, permits finer fitting of details as each cell (in the matrix). The Matrix details provide a visual key to where authors have focused their attention on the event (Després, 2003). That is, the FoRSE Matrix can be used to situate the literature on a topic in the bigger picture on education.

The Matrix used to diagnose an event points out "holes" or missing elements. It also exposes the congruity of the elements covered. Furthermore it allows for a clearer picture of the problem or event investigated and an immediate route to deal with missing or incongruous elements. The ultimate aim is to diagnose an event—in this case, home education—for improvement, or to prognosticate outcomes and directions for new concepts or strategies. For organizations, researchers, and/or educators, the FoRSE Matrix enables the user to attend to details or depict a big picture of an event (the project or topic being investigated). The detailed steps to using the Matrix along with the schematics are found at http://www.rippledeep.com, but for here, a brief guide on its use is helpful as it refers to Figures 1, 2, and 3.

In Figure 1, I show a sample of writers on homeschooling (the event) that deals with only the philosophical elements as these cut across the three main categories, or system clusters,

Systemic Clusters	**PURPOSES** Conceptual-Ideal: Mission or goals, participants/stakeholders		**FORM/DESIGN** Creative-Explicit: Shape or form, site or setting	
3	State Purposes, mission, vision and/or goals:		State how the Purposes will look and where situated:	
	Communicated	Perceived	Communicated	Perceived
PHILOSOPHICAL **Rationale**	*3.1.a Examine the foundations for the choices of purposes.* *3.1.a1 What values are assumed and/or explicit in the purposes? (e.g. What is the "bottom line", or what are the essential "must-have's/be's"?)*		*3.2.a Explore the creative responses and what form/design ideas arise as a result of the purposes.* *3.2.a1 What shape or form do the purposes demand? (i.e. organizational structure, buildings, site and settings or layout, packaging, colourings, design aspects, policy format, aesthetic considerations)*	
	>Luffman (1997): reasons for HS; attributes. >Duvall, Delcuadri & Ward (2004): positive results; teacher-student ratios. >Saba & Gattis (2002): general statements. >Van Galen & Pitman (1991): HS is controversial; typically HS comprises traditional (values), middle-class families. >Rivers (1938): thorough structure, analysis of public education and importance of considering the child. >Japan Association for Women's Education (1995): key expectations.	>Guterson (1992): reasoned alternative. >StatsCan (1997): profile of HS	>Wise & Thornburn (2001): HS relationship with schools.	>Guterson (1992): alludes to homeschoolers that have different teaching styles. >Saba & Gatto (2002): general statements about the range of forms/styles of HS. > Mason (1905): views of children; experiential learning important; habits to be developed.

FIGURE 1   Sample Philosophical (Rationale) for Purposes and Form or Design coverage in publications on home-schooling. (color figure available online).

INFRASTRUCTURE Function-Practical: Governance, resources, time, action					
Governance			Resources		
State the organizational structure, timelines, resources and actions that will ensure successful implementation of the Purposes:					
Communicated		Perceived	Communicated		Perceived
3.3.a1 Examine the governance articulation as a function of purposes and form/design. *3.3.a1.1 What is the justification for the choices of governance, or why are those choices desired?*			*3.3.a2 Examine the resources to ensure achievement or success.* *3.3.a2.1 Is the articulation of resources a logical outcome of purposes and form/design?*		*3.*
>Luffman (1997): about government regs. >Guterson (1992): alludes to governance. >Stevens (2001): direct activity; background developments in US. >Wingert (1989): parental directions. >McLellan (1999): note about provincial (Canadian) laws and where to seek more info.	>		>Guterson (1992): general comments. >Stevens (2001): general comments. >McLellan (1999): discusses overview of locating resources; list of resources, curricula available, and comments on them; resource contacts in North America. >Gorder (1993): findings, contact info, assistance for specific groups (e.g. handicapped), materials and curriculum.	>	>I

FIGURE 2   Sample Philosophical (Rationale, cont'd) for Infrastructure coverage in publications on homeschooling (Governance and Resources). (color figure available online).

INFRASTRUCTURE			
Function-Practical: Governance, resources, time, action			
Time		Action	
Communicated	Perceived	Communicated	Perceived

3.3.a3 Examine the time frame articulation as a function of purposes and form/design.
  3.3.a3.1 What is the justification for the choices of timelines, or why are those choices desired?
		3.3.a4 Explore how the purposes are articulated practically.
		  3.3.a4.1 What are the necessary steps or actions in order to realize the purposes and form/design?	

>Guterson (1992): limited.	>	>Guterson (1992): day-to-day, limited. >Layne (1998): how-to guide for specific courses.	>Van Galen & Pitman (1991): styles of teaching in HS.

FIGURE 3   Sample Philosophical (Rationale, cont'd) for Infrastructure coverage in publications on homeschooling (Time and Action). (color figure available online).

Purposes, Form or Design, and Infrastructure. Infrastructure is divided into the four subheadings or categories of governance, resources, time, and action. These have been discussed elsewhere (see Després, 2008). As I was reading the writings of the listed authors in the three figures, I placed pertinent details (author name, date, and key phrase) that best fit beneath one of the system clusters. In each author's case, I delineated between whether they were communicating information (Communicated) or speaking about people's perspectives (Perceived) about the topic of their writing. Keep in mind that the Purposes cluster comprises the main goals or mission of an event along with the principal people for whom the event is directed.

Every purpose appears as something, whether virtually or physically. If the purpose of an event remains merely an abstract idea with no vision of what it might look like, I argue it is not an event yet. This stands true for the Infrastructure cluster also. The system clusters along with the Elements Categories (left-hand side—in this case, Philosophical) are intricately interconnected and their content must align. The statements below the system clusters in each of the cells, such as in Figure 1, 3.1.a *Examine the foundations for the choices of purposes*, are meant to provide finer directions in the pursuit of the critical details that compose an event. These are followed by refining questions to spark discussion and dig deeper into the event. At the end of one's research on an event, depending of course on the nature of the query, the researcher will find that there will likely be "holes" or missing details in the FoRSE Matrix. These missing details demonstrate that more needs to be researched on that particular question. Furthermore, it also suggests that

authors' closing remarks that might try to paint a big picture on their topic might not be as encompassing as presumed. The holes provide areas in need of research, thus providing graduate students, for example, with a clearer starting point for their research interests.

It should also be noted that part of the complexity of the FoRSE Matrix system is the assumption that all the cells' contents must align. That is, statements made in one cell must support statements in the other cells. Where these do not, problems arise. Adjusting content in the cells likewise causes ripple effects throughout the Matrix demanding further alterations or investigations. However, conducting research with the aid of this Matrix will enable the researcher to conduct the most thorough investigation into an event.

Purposes and Applications of the FoRSE Matrix

The Matrix demonstrates the complexity of an event and provides pertinent questions that expose areas of coverage as well as missing elements. It helps to quickly focus attention on the real problem areas. Revisiting the event and proposed solutions over the course of time or in conjunction with annual reviews will give the user a big(ger) picture understanding of the event and how well the desired goals are being achieved. The outcome of a FoRSE Matrix analysis will ensure a comprehensive or broadly deep depiction of the event while providing key areas in need of action.

I recommend using the Brief Matrix in the following ways:

- To ascertain what has already been covered in concept or discussion: This is the answer to the question, "Have we covered everything?" (e.g., the researcher can determine what has been considered and what is missing).
- To determine the locus of a search: for example, examine just the social cost of a set of actions, such as inclusion of home education as a publically funded practice (Infrastructure: Actions and Resources plus Community-Global).
- To assist with a large-scale examination of an event by setting out the main categories or subheadings to be covered (perhaps by teams), such as the success rate of home education students in postsecondary education.
- To provide a quick reference or guide for data collection. For example, researchers, including graduate students, could use the FoRSE Matrix system to "slot" their text data under specific headings.
- To act as a literature review repository (keywords or statements plus bibliographic data): This will provide a graphic depiction of how much of the event has been actually covered by the study and/or to what breadth and depth the event has been examined. In this way topic areas in need of further investigation would become quickly visible allowing for a more focused pursuit of a research topic.

Further Inquiry

The FoRSE Matrix is helpful in exposing all the critical elements, from personal to practical and philosophical, that play a part in any event. For the purposes of this discussion, the event is

the question of possible educator resistance to home-based education. The FoRSE Matrix will determine where the issues lie, which points the way toward those factors or elements in need of greater attention.[4]

A desirable outcome of this discussion is that educators and researchers alike will consider revisiting the purposes of education, including home education for the 21st century, as a systemic necessity, and not as a utilitarian or instrumentalist function for local and global economies. Instead, I hope that educators and researchers will see education as the best opportunity to achieve the highest common good for children-as-persons. A robust and comprehensive means of achieving that end is the FoRSE Matrix.

AUTHOR BIO

Blane Després enjoys his family, camping, playing guitars, motorcycling, writing, designing, building, and tinkering. Formerly Assistant Professor of Technology Education at UBC Okanagan, he now provides business and organizational consulting via an online systems thinking ("big picture") matrix (Ripple Deep). He has taught most subjects at all levels of K-12 school, though primarily French as an Alternate Language, and at a storefront school. He has graduate degrees in alternative learning (M.A.), and business and education partnerships (Ph.D.). His interests include systemic thinking and advancing it as a primary model for and analytical tool of all events (policies, status, happenings), true educational reform, leadership, purposes of education, philosophy, architecture and alternative learning approaches (e.g. homeschooling, rites of passage). His two children (ages 11 and 15) enjoy homeschooling.

REFERENCES

Arai, A.B. (2000). Reasons for home schooling in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *25*, 204–217.

Aurini, J., & Davies, S. (2005, September). Choice without markets: Homeschooling in the context of private education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *26*, 461–474.

Bacharach, S. B., & Shedd, J. B. (1989). Power and empowerment: the constraining myths and emerging structures of teacher unionism in an age of reform. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson (Eds.), *The politics of reforming school administration* (pp. 139–160). London, UK: Falmer.

Badman, G. (2009). *Report to the Secretary of State on the review of elective home education in England*. House of Commons, UK: Crown.

Brabant, C. (2004). *L'éducation à domicile au Québec: Les raisons du choix des parents et les principales caractéristiques sociodémographiques des familles* [Home schooling in Quebec: The rationale for parental choice and the principal, sociodemographic characteristics of the families]. Unpublished master's thesis, Université de Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clabough, R. (2011, May 13). Canadian judge reveals bias against homeschooling. *The New American.* Retrieved from http://thenewamerican.com/world-mainmenu-26/north-america-mainmenu-36/7471-canadian-judge-reveals-bias-against-homeschooling

Cloud, J., & Morse, J. (2001, August 27). *Home sweet school.* Retrieved from http://www.time.com/

---

[4]The FoRSE Matrix demands a much greater development than is possible in this short space. For further information on it, please contact the author.

Collom, E., & Mitchell, D.E. (2005). Home schooling as a social movement: identifying the determinants of homeschoolers' perceptions. *Sociological Spectrum*, *25*, 273–305.

Contenta, S. (1993). *Rituals of failure: What schools really teach*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Between The Lines.

Corrales, J. (1999). The politics of education reform: Bolstering the supply and demand; Overcoming institutional blocks. *The Education Reform and Management Series*, *II*(1-55). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: constancy and change in American classrooms*, 1890–1980. New York, NY: Longman.

Després, B. (2003). *Systems in tension: Perceptions of business and education in partnership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Després, B. (2007a, September). *Have we (un)covered everything? Re/connecting research through applied systemic thinking*. Paper presentation at the European Education Research Association conference, Contested Qualities of Educational Research, Ghent, Belgium.

Després, B. (2007b, September). *Home + School +? Homeschool research in light of systemic thinking*. Paper presented at the European Education Research Association conference, Contested Qualities of Educational Research, Ghent, Belgium.

Després, B. (2008). Conclusions and continued beginnings: Application of the systemic factors inventory analysis matrix. In B. Després (Ed.), *Systems thinkers in action: A field guide for effective change leadership in education* (pp. 247–267). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Education Commission of the States. (n.d.). *Homeschooling*. Retrieved from http://www.ecs.org/html/issue.asp?issueid=72

Education Week. (March 1, 2012). Tebow bill killed by Va. Senate committee. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/

Elliott, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Reconstructing teacher education: Teacher development*. London: The Falmer Press.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change: Reform, resistance, and the real-life problems of innovation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Hagerstown, MN: Harper and Row.

Giroux, H. A. (1983a). Ideology and agency in the process of schooling. *Journal of Education*, *165*, 12–34.

Giroux, H. A. (1983b). Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. New York, NY: Berin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1995). Teachers as public intellectuals. In A. C. Ornstein (Ed.), *Teaching: Theory into practice* (pp. 373–384). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Goldstein, D. (2012, February 16). Liberals, don't homeschool your kids. Why teaching children at home violates progressive values. *Slate.* Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2012/02/homeschooling_and_unschooling_among_liberals_and_progressives_.single.html

Gorder, C. (1993). *Home education resource guide* (4th ed.). Mesa, AZ: Blue Bird.

Guterson, D. (1992). *Family matters: Why homeschooling makes sense*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Hammer, K. (2011, March 10). More families are deciding that school's out—forever. *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/

Hodas, S. (1996). Technology refusal and the organizational culture of schools. In R. Kling (Ed.), *Computerization and controversy* (pp. 197–218). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Howley, A., & Howley, C. (1995). The mechanisms of anti-intellectualism in the schools. In C. B. Howley, A. Howley, & E. D. Pendarvis (Eds.), *Out of our minds: Anti-intellectualism and talent development in American schooling* (pp. 44–76). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Japan Association for Women's Education. (1995). Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. Commissioned Project FY1993/FY1994, Tokyo, Japan.

Jones, P., & Gloeckner, G. (2004, Fall). A study of admission officers' perceptions of and attitudes toward homeschool students. *The Journal of College Admission*, *185*, 12–21.

Knight, J. (2009). What can we do about teacher resistance? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *90*, 508–513.

Kritsonis, A. (2004–2005). Comparison of change theories. *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity*, *8*, 1–7

Kunzman, R. (2010). Homeschooling and religious fundamentalism. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *3*,17–28.

Layne, M. (1998). *Learning at home: A mother's guide to homeschooling*. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Sea Change.

Luffman, J. (1997). A profile of home schooling in Canada. *Education Quarterly Review*, *4*, 30–47.

Marshall, R., & Tucker, M. (1992). *Thinking for a living: Work, skills, and the future of the American economy.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Martin, M. (2007, July 12). Overview of common arguments against homeschooling. *Yahoo! Voices.* Retrieved from http://voices.yahoo.com/overview-common-arguments-against-homeschooling-431526.html

Mason, C. (1905). *Home education* (4th ed.). London, UK: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co.

McLellan, M.R. (1999). *The home schooling toolbox. Canadian* 4th Ed. *A handbook for making wise home education choices for the benefit of present and future generations*. Shelburne, Ontario, Canada: Joy Center of Learning.

Milner, A. (1994). *Contemporary cultural theory: An introduction*. London, UK: University College London Press.

National Education Association. (2007). 2007–2008 NEA resolutions, p. 10, B-75 p. 36. Retrieved from http://www.aeaonline.org/news/pdf/NEA%20Resolutions.pdf

Ray, B. D., & Weller, N. (2003). Homeschooling: An overview and financial implications for public schools. *School Business Affairs*, *69*, 2226.

Reich, B. (2002, April). The civic perils of homeschooling. *Educational Leadership*, *57*, 56–59.

Rivers, S. (1938). *Home education* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Jackson and Walford.

Romanowski, R. H. (2001). Common arguments about the strengths and limitations of home schooling. *The Clearing House*, *75*, 79–83.

Rotherham, A. J. (2012, February 16). Tim Tebow debate: Should homeschoolers be allowed on public-school sports teams? *Time Ideas.* Retrieved from http://ideas.time.com/2012/02/16/tim-tebow-debate-should-homeschoolers-be-allowed-to-play-sports/

Saba, L., & Gattis, J. (2002). *The McGraw-Hill homeschooling companion.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. (1996). *Barometers of change: Individual, educational, and social transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. (2002). *Educational reform: A self-scrutinizing memoir*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Satterthwaite, J., Atkinson, E., & Gale, K. (2003). *Discourse, power and resistance: Challenging the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Staffordshire, UK: Trentham.

Smith, J. M. (2008, February 25). Political resistance continues. *The Washington Times*. Retrieved from http://www.hslda.org/docs/news/washingtontimes/200802250.asp

Snow, D. A., Soule, S., & Kriesi, H. (Eds.). (2004). *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Statistics Canada. (1997, Winter). A profile of home schooling in Canada. *Education Quarterly Review*. Catalogue 81–003-XPB. J. Luffman, author.

Stevens, M. L. (2001). *Kingdom of children: Culture and controversy in the homeschooling movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, I. (1838). *Home education (Second American from the second London edition)*. New York, NY: D. Appleton.

Uemura, M. (1999). Community participation in education: What do we know? *Effective schools and teachers and the knowledge management system*. HDNED, The World Bank.

Van Galen, J., & Pitman, M. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Home schooling: Political, historical, and pedagogical perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Welker, R. (1992). *The teacher as expert: A theoretical and historical examination*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wenders, J. T., & Clements, A. D. (2005). *Homeschooling in Nevada: The budgetary impact*. Las Vegas: Nevada Policy Research Institute.

Wenders, J. T., & Clements, A. D. (2007). An analysis of the economic impact of home and private schooling in Nevada. *Home School Researcher*, *17*, 13–35.

Wingert, H. D. (1989). *Educational philosophies and locus of control in homeschooling and schooling parents*. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.