



Homeschooling Associated with Beneficial Learner and Societal Outcomes but Educators Do Not Promote It

Brian D. Ray

To cite this article: Brian D. Ray (2013) Homeschooling Associated with Beneficial Learner and Societal Outcomes but Educators Do Not Promote It, Peabody Journal of Education, 88:3, 324-341, DOI: [10.1080/0161956X.2013.798508](https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.798508)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.798508>



Published online: 19 Jun 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 7081



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 24 View citing articles [↗](#)

Homeschooling Associated with Beneficial Learner and Societal Outcomes but Educators Do Not Promote It

Brian D. Ray

National Home Education Research Institute

This article reviews research on homeschool learner outcomes and evaluates opposition to homeschooling. It synthesizes research on learner outcomes related to homeschooling in areas of students' academic achievement and children's social, emotional, and psychological development and the success of adults who were home educated and finds generally positive outcomes on a variety of variables are associated with homeschooling. The author identifies four classes of negativity expressed toward home-based education by the education profession, such as the claims homeschooling is bad for the collective good and that without much state regulation significant numbers of homeschooling (home schooling) parents will harm their children. The evaluation reveals that proactive opposition to homeschooling and calls for significant state control over homeschooling do not offer any empirical research evidence that homeschooling is bad for individual children, families, neighborhoods, or the collective good. The alleged harms of homeschooling or arguments for more control of it are fundamentally philosophical and push for the state, rather than parents, to be in primary and ultimate control over the education and upbringing of children so they will come to hold worldviews more aligned with the state and opponents of state-free homeschooling than with the children's parents and freely chosen relationships.

Homeschooling is a form of private education that is parent led and home based. Because of this, homeschooling does not rely on either state-run public schooling or institutional private schooling for a child's education.¹ Up until the 19th century, home-based education was common, if not the norm, for most of the nation's children (Ray, 2012, pp. 125–126). Things changed quickly, however, during the late 1800s and into the 20th century. By the 1970s, homeschooling was nearly nonexistent, with perhaps only 13,000 schoolchildren attending school at home (Lines, 1991). A dramatic change began around the late 1970s, one that resulted in slightly more than 2 million homeschooled students in grades K to 12 in the United States during the spring of 2010 (Ray, 2011).

A major part of this shift has been a change in public opinion, which has become more favorable over the past two decades. However, genuinely curious people and ideological skeptics and opponents of homeschooling continue to ask questions about home-based education, and

¹In this article, the term *state* refers to that which is of civil government, under public control, or not privately governed. When *state* in this article refers to one of the 50 United States, the meaning should be clear.

Correspondence should be sent to Brian D. Ray, Ph.D., PO Box 13939, Salem, OR 97309. E-mail: mail@nheri.org

research continues to answer some of these basic questions. The purpose of this article is to summarize research on homeschooling that addresses learner outcomes and homeschooling's effect on communities and societies, with a special focus on the author's most recent nationwide study. The article also describes and explains how and why the education profession does not promote homeschooling and often actively opposes it.

LEARNER OUTCOMES RELATED TO HOME-BASED EDUCATION

Academic Achievement

Academic achievement as measured by standardized tests is one of the most common and widely accepted ways to assess the learning of students and the effectiveness of their educational environments. Many policymakers, educators, school administrators, and parents, who are interested in test scores, wonder whether ordinary mothers and fathers, who are not government-certified teachers, are capable of continuing the teaching of their children after age 5 via what is called homeschooling.² Because of this central question, many policymakers, researchers, and even parents wonder whether it is possible for adults without specialized, university-level training in teaching to instruct children in an effective manner with respect to academics.

Numerous studies by dozens of researchers have been completed during the past 30 years or so that examine the academic achievement of the home-educated population (see reviews, e.g., Ray, 2000b, 2005). Examples of these studies range from a multiyear study in Washington State to three nationwide studies across the United States to two nationwide studies in Canada (Ray, 1990, 1994, 1997, 2000b, 2010a; Rudner, 1999; Van Pelt, 2004; Wartes, 1990, 1991). In study after study, the homeschooled have scored, on average, at the 65th to 80th percentile on standardized academic achievement tests in the United States and Canada, compared to the public school average of the 50th percentile.

I myself conducted the most recent nationwide study (Ray, 2010a). I obtained a sample of 11,739 home-educated students from various testing services around the United States. Prior to analyzing the data, I expected, if anything, a lowering of the scores compared to what was found in previous large-scale nationwide studies. I found, however, that the scores remained high and, if anything, a bit higher than in past studies. Table 1 shows the mean *z* scores and percentiles for home-educated students on the Reading Total, Language Total, Mathematics Total (with computation), Science, Social Studies, Core (with computation), and Composite (with computation) subtest scores. Core comprises a combination of a student's Reading, Language, and Mathematics scores. Composite is a combination of all subtests that the student took on the test. The corresponding percentiles shown in the table are the within-grade percentile scores for the nation that correspond to the given *z* scores. By definition, the 50th percentile is the mean for all students nationwide (last column). The homeschool students in this study scored, on average, at or above the 84th percentile in all subtest areas.

²In this article, *educator* refers to those commonly considered to be a part of the education vocation or profession, such as education professors in colleges or universities, institutional elementary and secondary school teachers, school and university administrators, and educationalists in general. The author recognizes that there are others who are rightly called educators, such as homeschool parents, music teachers, and those who teach in fields such as corporate training.

TABLE 1
Mean *z* Scores and Corresponding National Percentile by Subtest for Homeschool Students

Subtest	<i>N</i>	<i>M z</i> Score ^a	<i>SD, z</i> Score	Homeschool National Percentile <i>M</i>	National Percentile <i>M</i>
Reading Total	11,586	1.2185	0.7869	89	50
Language Total	11,388	0.9944	0.8502	84	50
Math Total	11,587	0.9986	0.8539	84	50
Science	6,929	1.0630	0.7683	86	50
Social Studies	6,906	1.0124	0.8107	84	50
Core	10,760	1.1591	0.8018	88	50
Composite	5,811	1.1079	0.7604	86	50

^aFollowing are a few *z* score/percentile equivalents: $-0.67 = 25$ th percentile; $0.00 = 50$ th percentile; $0.67 = 75$ th percentile; $1.00 = 84$ th percentile.

Researchers have gone beyond simple descriptive data regarding homeschooled students' test scores. Bivariate and multivariate analyses have examined whether various factors (e.g., parent educational attainment, household income, teacher-certification status of the parent, whether parents knew their children's scores before participating in the study) are related to home-educated students' test scores. When analyzed from this perspective my analysis (Ray, 2010a), for example, found the following:

1. There were no statistically significant differences in achievement by whether the student had been home educated all his or her academic life, whether the student was enrolled in a full-service curriculum, whether the parents knew their student's test scores before participating in the study, and the degree of state regulation of homeschooling (in three different analyses on the subject).
2. The scores of all students (both participants and nonparticipants in the study for whom test scores were obtained) were only 2 to 4 percentile points (i.e., 0.10 to 0.16 *z* score) lower than the scores of only the homeschooled students who participated in the study.
3. There were statistically significant differences in achievement among homeschooled students when classified by gender, amount of money spent on education, family income, whether either parent had ever been a certified teacher (i.e., students of noncertified parents scored higher), number of children living at home, degree of structure in the homeschooling, amount of time student spends in structured learning, and age at which formal instruction of the student began. However, of these variables, only parent education level explained a noticeable or practically significant amount of variance, 2.5%, in student scores; the other variables explained 0.5% or less of the variance. Further, essentially all subgroups of students (e.g., low vs. high income) scored above public school averages.

Some observers have wondered about the representativeness of the samples in the studies and whether, for example, only the best-performing homeschooled students are included in the studies. Data from states that have legally required homeschooled students to be tested shed some light on the question. For example, several years of data from Oregon (Oregon Department of Education, 1999) consistently reveal homeschooled student scores to be above average, with medians at about the 71st to 80th percentile. Washington data (Wartes, 1990, 1991; Washington

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1985) regularly reveal scores above average, at about the 66th percentile. In a program that is public school at home (i.e., like but not the same as private homeschooling), Alaskan students in a state-run school-at-home program consistently scored above average (e.g., about the 78th percentile one of the years reported; Alaska Department of Education, 1993). Alabama homeschooled students also scored comparably to public school students in their academic achievement (Rakestraw, 1988).

Others who are especially critical of the limitations of research on home education claim that there is no research that is causal-comparative or explanatory (Johnson, 2001) in design and therefore almost nothing is known about the effects on learners of homeschooling. There are, however, some studies that are better able than others to address cause and effect. For example, Martin-Chang, Gould, and Meuse (2011) used a matched-pair design and concluded that the “evidence presented here is in line with the assumption that homeschooling offers benefits over and above those experienced in public school” (p. 200). In a similar vein, but with older students who were home educated, Cogan (2010) used multivariate analysis to conclude that homeschooled college students outperformed their peers in terms of their 1st-year and 4th-year grade point averages (GPAs).

The overall research base and state-provided data suggest the following three main things about homeschooled students’ academic achievement:

1. The home educated consistently score well above the public school national average.
2. Most demographic and other variables studied explain very little variance in the achievement scores of the home educated.
3. Parent formal educational attainment consistently explains statistically significant differences in achievement but, practically speaking, small amounts of variance, and the amount of variance explained is typically less than what this variable explains within the public school student population.

Homeschool Students’ Social, Emotional, and Psychological Development

Homeschool parents call it the “S question”—“What about socialization?”—and these S questions are asked of nearly all homeschooled parents and homeschooled teenagers. These questions arise mainly in societies in which the institutionalization of children has been the norm for several generations of children between the ages of 6 to 18.

More specifically, the first part of the S question usually asks if the child will experience healthy social, emotional, and psychological development. Numerous studies, employing various psychological constructs and measures, show that the home educated are developing at least as well, and often better than, those who attend institutional schools (Medlin, 2000, 2006; Ray, 2005, Chapter 4; White, Moore, & Squires, 2009; White et al., 2007). No research to date contravenes this conclusion. For example, regarding the aspect of self-concept in the psychological development of children, several studies have revealed that the self-concept of homeschooled students is significantly higher than that of public school students (Medlin, 2006). As another example, Shyers (1992) found that the only significant childhood social-interaction difference between the institutionally schooled and homeschoolers was that the institutionally schooled had higher problem behavior scores.

Research time and again finds that homeschooled students and their parents are very engaged in their communities, including activities such as sports teams, cooperative classes, church activities, and community service. Further, homeschooled children typically interact with a broader range of ages (of children and adults) than do most institutional school children (Smedley, 1992). Medlin (2006) wrote the following in his review of research: “In conclusion, the available studies [on social skills] show either no difference between homeschooled children and other children, or a difference favoring homeschooled children” (p. 5).

Adults Who Were Home Educated

The second question related to socialization is how the home-educated child will do once in the “real world” of adulthood. Ray (2005) provided a fairly detailed review of research on this topic. Some representative examples of studies here will suffice. Montgomery (1989) studied 10- to 21-year-olds and concluded that homeschooling nurtured leadership at least as well as does the conventional system. Sheffer (1995) and others have been concerned about “girls’ ‘loss of voice’ and increasing distrust of their own perceptions” (p. 2). Sheffer found, contrary to what appears to be happening with a large portion of public school students, these home-educated girls maintain their self-confidence as they pass into womanhood. Several researchers have found the home educated to be performing, both academically and with respect to various social-skill-related behaviors, as well or better than institutional-school graduates at the college level (Belfield, 2005; Galloway & Sutton, 1995; Jones & Gloeckner, 2004; Oliveira, Watson, & Sutton, 1994; Sutton & Galloway, 2000; White et al., 2009; White et al., 2007). Cogan (2010) conducted one of the most recent studies of home-educated adults by examining their college-entrance test and college academic performance scores. He found that home-educated students possessed higher ACT scores, GPAs, and graduation rates when compared to institutionally schooled students. Cogan further noted,

In addition, multiple regression analysis results reveal that students, at this particular institution, who are homeschooled, earn higher first-year and fourth-year GPAs when controlling for demographic, pre-college, engagement, and first-term academic factors. Further, binary logistic regression results indicate there is no significant difference between homeschooled student’s fall-to-fall retention and four-year graduation rates when compared to traditionally-educated students while controlling for these same factors. (p. 24)

Some researchers have also examined adults who were home educated without necessarily linking them to the college scene. Knowles and de Olivares (1991) and Knowles and Muchmore (1995) found that these adults tended to be involved in entrepreneurial and professional occupations, were fiercely independent, and strongly emphasized the importance of family. Furthermore, they were glad they had been home educated, would recommend homeschooling to others, and had no grossly negative perceptions of living in a pluralistic society. In 2004, I studied more than 7,306 adults who had been home educated, 5,254 for 7 or more years during grades K-12. The following are among the things I learned about this second subset of participants that are particularly relevant to this article:

1. A higher percentage of them had taken some college courses than the general U.S. population of a similar age, and a higher percentage of the home educated already had a baccalaureate.
2. Fewer homeschoolers (61%) read a newspaper at least once a week than do U.S. adults of similar age (82%).
3. More of the home educated (98%) read a book in the past 6 months than did the general population (69%).
4. More of the homeschooled (100%) read one or more magazines on a regular basis than the general population (89%).
5. Seventy-one percent of the homeschooled “participate in any ongoing community service activity” compared to 37% of the general population.
6. With the statement, “Politics and government are too complicated to understand,” 4% of the home educated agree, whereas 35% of the general population agrees.
7. For those of age 18 to 24, 76% of the homeschooled voted in the past 5 years, whereas 29% of the same-age general population in the United States voted.
8. Of those ages 18 to 24, 14% of the home-educated participated in a protest or boycott during the past 12 months, whereas 7% of the general population did so.

Research to date is consistent that adults who were home educated are faring as well or better than the general adult population on all constructs considered.

Nature of Studies on Learner Outcomes

As explained several times (Ray, 1990, 2000b, 2010a; Rudner, 1999), certain limitations adhere to most of the studies to date on the academic achievement; social, emotional, and psychological development; and success (or not) in adulthood of the home educated. First, homeschooling families and their students do not appear to be a representative cross-section of all families in the United States. One reason for this is that it is often not possible within the constraints of most studies to confirm whether samples are representative of the population of home-educated students.

The content of the standardized achievement tests used is a second major limitation of the studies. As Rudner (1999) aptly noted:

While home schools teach the basic skill areas of reading, mathematics, social studies, and science, they do not necessarily follow the same scope, sequence, or emphasis as traditional public and private schools. The primary focus of many home schools is on religious and moral values. . . . Public and private schools usually select [a standardized test] . . . due to its close alignment with their curriculum; home schools select the test primarily out of convenience. (p. 28)

It is also possible that the affective measures used with homeschooled children are not as valid as they should be with respect to the objectives that homeschooling parents have in education compared to the objectives of state institutional education systems. It is possible, therefore, that homeschooled students are at a disadvantage being measured with instruments that are aimed at the knowledge, values, skills, and behaviors state-school students are supposed to learn, internalize, and exhibit.

Finally, comparisons between home-educated students and institutional school students nationwide should be interpreted with thoughtfulness and care because most of them have been cross-sectional, descriptive studies (Johnson, 2001). They are not experiments, and readers should be careful about assigning causation to anything. At the same time, however, an increasing number of studies have employed some controls (e.g., matched-pair designs, multivariate analysis) that allow for more-causal inferences to be considered (e.g., Cogan, 2010; Duvall, Ward, Delquadri, & Greenwood, 1997; Francis & Keith, 2004; Kingston & Medlin, 2006; Martin-Chang et al., 2011; Shyers, 1992; White et al., 2007). These latter studies have found the home educated to be doing as well or better than those who were institutionally schooled.

Regarding one example of these cross-sectional, descriptive studies, Rudner (1999) wrote, “This study simply shows that those parents choosing to make a commitment to home schooling are able to provide a very successful academic environment” (p. 29). On the other hand, it may be that something about the systemic nature and typical practice of home-based education causes higher academic achievement and other positive results, on average, than does institutional state-run schooling (Ray, 1997, 2000b, pp. 91–100; 2005, 2010a). It is likely that more sophisticated multivariate and causal-comparative research designs (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Johnson, 2001) will one day reveal more about home education’s effects on academic achievement and children’s social, emotional, and psychological development.

HOW AND WHY THE EDUCATION PROFESSION DOES NOT PROMOTE AND SOMETIMES OPPOSES HOMESCHOOLING

Four Classes of Negativity Toward Home-Based Education

There are several categories of arguments that are either against the home education of children or for more state control of this private form of education. First, several scholars claim, in one way or another, that parent-led home-based education is bad for the collective good, the common good, or society as a whole (Apple, 2000, 2005, 2006; Buss, 2000; Evans, 2003; Lubienski, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Reich, 2001, 2002, 2005; West, 2009). For example, Apple (2000) is especially concerned about conservative religious homeschoolers and links them with the ills of (a) an alleged conservative restoration in education or schooling in America; (b) those who are making advances against common sense; (c) those who are antistate, antischool, and antipublic; (d) advances against common sense; (e) selfishness; and (f) a “withered sense of community” (p. 270). Evans (2003) avers the following: “The isolation implicit in home teaching is anathema to socialization and citizenship. It is a rejection of community and makes the home-schooler the captive of the orthodoxies of the parents” (para 4). As another example, Lubienski (2003b) made the following blunt assertion, “The accelerated movement toward home schooling reflects a serious threat to the collective good—a threat encouraged by organized efforts to withdraw from common endeavors such as public education” (p. 41). Apple (2006) contended that homeschooling is a bad choice for black parents because homeschooling “cannot build momentum for the large scale [sic] transformations [in society] that are necessary” and does not allow for building better “educational institutions.”

A second criticism of homeschooling is that it is a practice motivated by a fear of or not wanting to be in contact with the “Other” (Apple, 2005, 2006). That is, the claim is that parents choose

to homeschool so that they may remain “cocooned” and keep themselves and their children in social contact with persons who are more like themselves and less like those who differ with them on sundry thought perspectives and demographic features (see also Buss, 2000) and will thereby reduce the “social glue” that state schools offer (Apple, 2005, p. 81).

The third class of opinions against homeschooling—or, in some cases, in favor of state regulation of home education—is that parents may directly and obviously harm their children. For example, Lubienski (2003a) suggested that public school is good because it provides and creates “a sanctuary for those in more oppressive home environments” (p. 175). Ward (2004) quoted a professor by writing the following: “Too often it [homeschooling] is a cover for child abuse and violations of child labor laws” (para. 3). Cooper and Sureau (2007) thought state control can help “detect the situations” of “child abuse and lack of monitoring as well as other family and social issues” (p. 126). Simmons (1994) stated that parental abuse and neglect are “possible problems with homeschooling” (p. 47).

West (2009) built on this argument when she claimed that children in private home education are at greater risk for physical abuse than those in public schooling (and Ray, 2010b, dealt at length with West’s alleged harms of homeschooling). As a final example of this category, Fineman (2009) penned the following: “Moreover, the risk that [homeschooling] parents or private schools unfairly impose hierarchical or oppressive beliefs on their children is magnified by the absence of state oversight or the application of any particular educational standards” (p. 14). She believes the state should make value judgments about what is best for all children (e.g., piano lessons vs. a trip to Disneyland; p. 10). Fineman wanted the state to reign supreme in the teaching, training, and indoctrination of children and abolish any form of nonstate schooling.³

The fourth category of negativity toward home-based education is expressed by a number of academics or policymakers whose work appears to either suppress, or, at the very least, not promote, homeschooling by arguing that it needs to be controlled more by the state (Badman, 2009; Buss, 2000; Cooper & Sureau, 2007; Democratic National Committee, 2000; Kunzman, 2005, 2009; National Education Association, 2006; Reich, 2001, 2005, 2008; West, 2009; Yuracko, 2007). The reasons they give for why the state should exercise more control over these parents and their children are several. First, some argue that there must be a “balance” between the rights of the state and the rights of the parents in bringing up children, and that the state must protect its rights by enacting (state) laws and regulations. Along this line, Badman (2009) wrote that his report does not contradict or modify the “contention” that it is “parents not Government that bring up children” (p. 3). He then wrote, “However, there has to be a balance between the rights of the parents and the rights of the child” (p. 3).

Kunzman (2009), along this same line, appeared to ineluctably move toward recommending that the state require academic testing of the home educated. Essentially, this line of thought argues that the burden of proof that the child is receiving an appropriate education—and the definition of appropriate may be variously defined but in the end these thinkers give authority over its definition to the state—lies on the parents (e.g., Reich, 2001). Most who argue for the burden of proof being on homeschooling parents implicitly agree that the state has only to convince itself children in its schools are receiving an appropriate education; however, the state

³The author recognizes that all forms of education/schooling—whether state-run/public schooling, private institutional schooling, or parent-led home-based education—essentially entail the teaching, training, and indoctrination (“Indoctrinate,” n.d.-a; “Indoctrinate,” n.d.-b) of children and youth.

defines such. That is, if public school students are not meeting certain criteria, the state does not force them to be home educated or attend private institutional schools.

Others think that there are three stakeholders regarding a child's education—the state, the parents, and the child (Monk, 2009; Reich, 2001, 2005, 2008)—and that there must be some kind of balance guaranteed among these three. They argue, ultimately, that the state must make laws and regulations to assure that the rights, as defined by the state, of all three domains are protected and the correct balance, as defined by the state, is achieved.

Another angle some take when they argue for state control of or against homeschooling is that children cannot “get” certain things they need if they are home educated and that only institutional schools, especially state-run public schools, can provide these things. Several examples that fall into this category follow. Evans (2003) contended that “virtues and values such as respect for others, the ability to communicate and collaborate and an openness to diversity and new ideas” are offered by public schools and not by homeschooling (para. 3). Buss (2000) averred that there is not enough ideological “mixing” among these (homeschool) students and that they would get more of the needed “mixing” in state-run schools (p. 5). Lubienski (2003a) thought that “education in the public sphere also serves as a source of liberation for some groups, expanding opportunity for many who would not otherwise have advantages from their home lives” (p. 175). Reich (2002) implied state-run schools are more likely than homeschooling to cause children and youth to learn and exercise “common values as decency, civility, and respect” (p. 58).

In addition to these claims, some people think that the home educated will likely be more selfish (Stevens, 2001). West (2009) argued that institutional schools offer a “safe haven” from the alleged “unconditional love” of parents that really is conditional (p. 9). Last, on this point, Fineman (2009) believed that “[state-]certified teachers and school boards, not parents” are eminently more qualified to decide for future adult citizens “what subjects and methods of preparation are most likely to prepare the child for a future in a complex, technical, and rapidly changing world” (p. 10).

Others make arguments that becoming an autonomous, or self-determining, person is a very lofty good and that homeschool youth are less likely than those in state schools to get, or receive, the conditions and teachings they need to become autonomous (Buss, 2000; Reich, 2001, 2005, 2008; West, 2009). Therefore, they think the state must be in charge of home education. Finally, some think that the state must have power over home-based education to protect the state from the harms that “religious” people will perpetrate, via home education, on the state (Buss, 2000; West, 2009; Yuracko, 2007).

Some of the aforementioned clearly oppose parent-led home-based education (i.e., private, not state controlled). Others of the aforementioned do not favor, approve of, or promote homeschooling and they are likewise opposed to it. An academic, educator, or policymaker might say that his or her nonpromotion or nonapproval of homeschooling is not opposition but claims of neutrality without clarity about that which the person does approve or promote do not negate the reality of the law of noncontradiction; that is, contradictory statements cannot both be true in the same sense at the same time.⁴ That is, if a person is not for homeschooling as it generally exists in the United States today, then he or she is against it.

⁴See, for example, “Law of Noncontradiction” (n.d.), Ligonier Ministries (n.d.), “Noncontradiction” (n.d.), and Tahko (2009).

Evaluation of the Negativity Toward Parent-Led Home-Based Education

The preceding section indicates that most of the lack of enthusiasm or disapproval of educators toward homeschooling falls into the following four categories:

1. Parent-led home-based education harms the collective good; it is bad for the common good or society as a whole.
2. Homeschooling is fear based and anti-based (e.g., afraid of different kinds of people, anti-state, anti-common sense, anti-selflessness) and it cocoons children and parents from those in society who are different from them.
3. Home education makes children and youth susceptible to, or victims of, bad home environments, bad parents, child neglect, child abuse, child labor abuse, and problematic family and social issues.
4. Home-based education must be under considerable state control for several reasons such as (a) balancing state and parental rights over the education and upbringing of children; (b) balancing the rights of the state, parents, and children in children's upbringing; and (c) properly recognizing that children cannot get or achieve certain good things under the upbringing of their parents and that they can only be assured of getting under the rearing of institutional schools, especially state-run ones, or the nurture of the state.

Regarding the four categories just mentioned, it should be noted first that none of those persons proactively oppositional to homeschooling or promoting significant state control over homeschooling offer any empirically based evidence that home education is bad for the children, families, neighborhoods, or the collective good. Research does not show that the home educated are disadvantaged—compared to those in institutional schools—academically, socially, emotionally, or psychologically, or in terms of thriving in adulthood. Researchers also have not found that homeschooling creates more selfish persons or reduces generosity in society. No evidence is presented that the home educated become less decent, civil, or respectful than those who attend state-run schools. There is no research offered that hints that homeschool children are more susceptible to abuse and neglect than others (e.g., Kunzman, 2005; Ray, 2006). And no data are presented that more state control of home-based education will better protect the aforementioned authors' assumed rights of the state or children.

Second, all of the alleged harms of homeschooling, or arguments for state control of it, are fundamentally philosophical. All of the persons referenced in the preceding Four Classes of Negativity Toward Home-Based Education section reveal underlying worldviews (*weltanschauungs*) or theoretical paradigms that they typically do not transparently discuss or reveal. Their worldviews appear to be various versions of ones such as critical theory, existentialism, naturalism, neo-Marxism, postmodernism, secular humanism, and statism. It is beyond the scope of this article to delve into all of the implied worldviews and their presuppositions and nuances. The worldviews that opponents of homeschooling appear to espouse are generally very different from those that underpin much of the homeschool movement. The worldviews that actually underpin the concept of homeschooling are classical liberalism in a constitutional republic similar to the United States (Rothbard, 1999) and biblical scripturalism (Crampton, 2011).⁵ Whatever the

⁵The majority of U.S. homeschooling parents know that the duty of parents to be the authorities in and responsible for their children's education, upbringing, and care is addressed in the Bible in, for example, Deuteronomy 6; Proverbs 13:20,

particular worldview behind the various oppositions toward or lack of support for state-control-free home education, they assume that the state, philosopher kings, educational policy experts or elites, or a pure democratic majority should administer the education and upbringing of children in a home-based education environment, via state law and regulation, or to or increase societal pressure to convince the vast majority of parents to send their children away to institutional schools, preferably state-controlled ones, to execute the teaching, training, and enculturation of children during “school hours” rather than allow parents to do so.

Kunzman (2005, 2009) implicitly recognized the overarching power of statism, and Ray (2000a, 2007) explicitly addressed this concept. Both authors pointed out that if the state should control home-based education by academic testing of children, controlling the values and beliefs taught in the curriculum, forcing them into “ideological mixing,” or other means, then, to be just and equitable, the state must control all private education (Kunzman, 2005, 2009; Ray, 2006, p. 11; 2007). That is, if the state should control homeschooling, then it should also control agnostic, evangelical Christian, humanist, Jewish, Lutheran, Mormon, Muslim, New Age, and Roman Catholic institutional schooling in significant ways that it does not now do.

Reich (2008) wrote the following in a discussion of the worldview underpinnings of calls against homeschooling or for more state control there of:

Unless one believes in Platonic philosopher kings, a complete blueprint of public policy is not to be derived from arguments about philosophical principle. ‘Regulations . . . are properly a matter of democratic politics, not deduction from theory . . .’ Beyond requirements like these [i.e., state controls], there is no such thing as a philosophically derived set of homeschooling regulations. (pp. 18–20)

Reich failed to recognize that all state laws, regulations, and controls and attendant punishments are philosophically based. Such cannot be avoided. He and others of his persuasion assign primary value to democratism (e.g., the majority, via the state, rules by force; i.e., what Reich called “democratic politics”), rather than something like U.S. -type constitutionalism or biblical scripturalism. In affirming the primacy of state control over a child’s education and upbringing, individuals such as Reich are inadvertently playing the role of philosopher kings by regarding who should have final authority over how children should be raised.

On top of this, opponents of parent-led home-based education appear to have more faith in the state than they do homeschooling parents. Those individuals fighting against home-based education are more confident in the values, beliefs, worldview, and behaviors of the state than they are in those of parents, extended families, and associations that are freely chosen by parents. If one did not know he wrote the following a half century ago, one might think Rushdoony (1963) were addressing the topic of this article in the following:

Statist education increasingly assumes that (1) the child is the child of the state or the property of the state, which can therefore interfere extensively with parental authority. (2) The state ‘priesthood’ of educators are best able to rear the child and prepare him for life, viewed as statist life. (3) Statist education is alone ‘objective’ and hence true, the state having the impartiality and transcendence of a god. (p. 323)

22:6; Matthew 18:1–7; Matthew 22:21; Luke 6:39–40; Romans 12:2; Ephesians 6:4; 2 Corinthians 6:14–18; 1 Timothy 5:8; 2 Timothy 3:14–17; further, scripture does not give the state jurisdiction over a child’s education, upbringing, and care.

Consistent with Rushdoony's assessment, opponents of homeschooling believe that the proper function of state-controlled schooling is much more than teaching children to read; write; arithmetically calculate; and learn some basic geographic, historical, and scientific knowledge and skills. For these opponents, public school's proper function is to, for example, inculcate particular values, attitudes, and worldviews; free children from the alleged disadvantages of the family into which they were born: feed children: offer children late-afternoon adult supervision; make sure they get all the vaccinations with which normal medicine contends they should be injected; shield children from evil behavior by their parents; and more (Apple, 2000, 2005, 2006; Badman, 2009; Buss, 2000; Cooper & Sureau, 2007; Democratic National Committee, 2000; Evans, 2003; Fineman, 2009; Kunzman, 2005, 2009; Lubienski, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Martin, 1992; National Education Association, 2006; Reich, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2008; Ward, 2004; West, 2009; Yuracko, 2007). It is clear that many of these homeschool opponents want the state to act as a preemptive dragnet to screen and catch parents before they do evil things to their children or not offer their children all the advantages that the state can allegedly offer them (via the means of compulsory attendance at institutional state-controlled schools or more-controlled home-based education).

It is also clear that many of these homeschool opponents prefer that all children attend what has become essentially an established secular church, public schools. As Carper and Hunt (2007) explained, "The public school is the functional equivalent of an established church, buttressed with religious language, expected to embrace all people, legitimating and transmitting an orthodoxy or worldview, and underwritten by compulsory taxation" (p. 4). This established church endorses something very different from, for example, biblical scripturalism, and something like postmodernism, secular humanism, neo-Marxism, or metaphysical naturalism (Baer, 1998; Nord, 1995; *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 1961). Many opponents of parent-led home-based education believe that all children should attend public school church rather than an alternative church selected and offered by parents; that is, they believe public school church, 6 to 8 hr per day for 5 days per week is better for children than parent-chosen home-based church. One example of the superiority of public school church, opponents of homeschool allege, is that it will guide them into right personal autonomy, a state-approved and state-guided version of autonomy, and home-based-education church cannot do this correctly.

As a corollary of their faith in public school and its orthodoxy, it appears that opponents of homeschooling have "a distrust of the local power of anti-democratic and methodologically uneconomic and non-functional groups, such as the family, the church, local clubs, lodges, business and other interests" (Rushdoony, 1963, pp. 311–312). They believe that state-governed education can give to children and youth things that they cannot properly and fully get from their parents, siblings, extended family, and freely chosen and non-state-run associations such as homeschool co-operatives (co-ops), other-than-public-school church (e.g., Christian, Islamic, Jewish, Mormon, or Unitarian), music teachers, mentors, scouting groups, sports leagues, and so forth. They are opposed to Skillen's (1998) warning

that every public-legal attempt to "liberate" minor children from parents makes the minors subject to whatever legal, medical or other authority is then authorized to direct or influence their actions. Thus, not only are the children not liberated from all external authorities, but one of the most important non-governmental institutions of society is thereby weakened by the overwhelming power of the state. The family as an institution suffers injustice, as does the child who was created first for family life and, via the family, for eventual adult maturity and personal independence. (pp. 3–4)

Further, it appears that opponents of homeschooling would be wary of professor Michael Cole's (2010) vision for the near future in education in an article that had nothing to do, explicitly or formally, with homeschooling. With approbation, Cole referred to other authors

whose vision provides a handy alternative to that of the Assyrian classroom or the open classroom, because it envisions the disappearance of the aggregated institution called 'the school' altogether. In its place would be [quoting Stallard & Cocker, 2001] 'a nation of home-based activities organized around small neighborhood learning clubs, linked through high-bandwidth Internet software. "Teachers" would operate as independent consultants, who work from home most of the time, and occasionally meet with ad hoc groups of students at a learning club.' Lectures, what there were of them, would be available online. Project-based learning and multigenerational, overlapping, small communities of learners would converge virtually or face-to-face as conditions required. (p. 469)

Cole went on to explain one reason it is likely that schooling in most nations will not change. He thinks that, despite assertions about technological innovations and an information economy,

great masses of the American public (and I believe the same is true quite generally on the international scene as well) are not anxious to have their children at home all day. They do not want their children wresting authority from them, deciding for themselves what constitutes an interesting problem to work on; and they fear the social chaos that would result from such a change in the cultural foundations of the nation state. (p. 469)

One might also infer that opponents of parent-chosen home-based education are fearful of, or highly concerned about, the direction they see graduates of home-based education taking. For example, it appears that adults who were home educated tend to be entrepreneurial, independent minded, nonstatist, and "Other" in terms of the philosophical perspectives of the opponents of free homeschooling mentioned in this article (Knowles & Muchmore, 1995; Ray, 2004). The home educated may be more civically engaged and more participatory in community service than the general public (Ray, 2004). This would not be surprising, because Smith and Sikkink (1999) found the following:

Far from being privatized and isolated, home schooling families are typically very well networked and quite civically active. The empirical evidence is clear and decisive: private schoolers and home schoolers are considerably more civically involved in the public square than are public schoolers, even when the effects of differences in education, income, and other related factors are removed from the equation. Indeed, we have reason to believe that the organizations and practices involved in private and home schooling, in themselves, tend to foster public participation in civic affairs . . . the challenges, responsibilities, and practices that private schooling and home education normally entail for their participants may actually help reinvigorate America's civic culture and the participation of her citizens in the public square. (p. 20)

Further, Stevens (2001) found that "home schoolers arguably are exemplars of effective, grassroots activism" (p. 14). More particularly, a large portion of graduates from homeschooling appear to be, as homeschool opponents might label them, conservative, rightist, or religious (i.e., probably translated as scripture-oriented Christian). The degree of community and civic involvement of adults who were home educated supports some ideas that Lines (1994) expressed about homeschoolers about two decades ago. She asked whether homeschooling parents and their children were withdrawing from the larger public debate about education and, more generally, from social discourse that was an integral part of a liberty-loving republic. In a sense, she addressed

whether these children and youth were being prepared to be a significant part of society. Lines concluded,

Although [homeschool parents] have turned their backs on a widespread and hallowed practice of sending children to a school located in a particular building, adhering to a particular schedule and program, they have not turned their backs on the broader social contract as understood at the time of the Founding [of the United States] . . . Like the Antifederalists, these homeschoolers are asserting their historic individual rights so that they may form more meaningful bonds with family and community. In doing so, they are not abdicating from the American agreement. To the contrary, they are affirming it. (p. 25)

A Brief Note on Discussions Related to Home-Based Education in Europe

Regarding degrees of state control of home-based education, a few comments on some publications related to Europe are in order. For example, Blok and Karsten (2011), from a European and more-statist perspective, would argue for the freedom of parents to home educate their children. From the context of the liberty parents in the United States currently enjoy in directing their children's upbringing and education, it might appear that these same authors would not promote home education. Likewise, Merry and Karsten (2010) appeared to argue for parents and youth and their freedom to engage in homeschooling, from a perspective that is European, humanist, or consistent with the state's claim or right to "grant . . . freedoms" (p. 510). From a U.S. and scripturalist perspective, the state recognizes rights granted by a Creator; however, one might think Merry and Karsten were arguing, in some way, against parent-led home education.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

After 30 years of research, that is largely cross-sectional and descriptive, studies have consistently found positive outcomes associated with parent-led home-based education (a.k.a., homeschooling), and an increasing number of studies that are explanatory or causal-comparative corroborate these findings. In addition, there is no empirical evidence linking home education, in general or on average, to negative things for individuals or society. Further, there is research evidence that home-based education systemically offers an environment that is beneficial to children's and youth's academic and social, emotional, and psychological development in ways that cannot be offered in institutional schooling (Murphy, 2012, Chapters 7–8; Ray, 2000b, 2010a).

Regardless of research findings, homeschoolers think it is their fundamental duty and right to direct the education and upbringing of their children and that there should be no burden of proof (e.g., state-approved achievement test scores, state-approved values taught; Murphy, 2012, p. 134; Ray, 2000a, pp. 287–289; Ray & Eagleson, 2008) on them to be free to do this. They do not think they (or parents who choose any form of private schooling for their children) have to prove to the state that homeschooling (or any form of private education) "works" or is successful—as measured by state-devised-control criteria—for children. Many educators, policymakers, and theoreticians, however, either actively oppose home education or argue for more state control over this private form of education/schooling. It appears that most opponents of homeschooling are *not* basing their opposition on research or empirical evidence that home education harms individuals or society. Instead, it appears likely that opponents of home-based education do not

promote or argue against the practice because they either want the state to be in primary and ultimate control over the education and upbringing of all children (i.e., future adult citizens) or are upset that homeschooling is affecting children and youth to become adults who hold worldviews different than they, the opponents, and different from what home-education opponents want to promote to children and society via state-controlled education.

AUTHOR BIO

Brian D. Ray (Ph.D., science education, Oregon State University; M.S., zoology, Ohio University; B.S., Biology, University of Puget Sound) is internationally known for his research on homeschooling. He is the founding president of the nonprofit National Home Education Research Institute in Oregon, U.S.A. (www.nheri.org). Dr. Ray is a former professor of science and education at the undergraduate and graduate levels, a former classroom teacher in both public and private schools, and he has taught homeschool students. Dr. Ray does research and speaking across the United States and internationally that focuses on home-based education research and pedagogy, and serves as an expert witness in court cases and to government bodies.

REFERENCES

- Alaska Department of Education. (1993). *Centralized Correspondence School: Summary of the school district report card to the public*. Juneau, AK: Author.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). The cultural politics of home schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 256–271.
- Apple, M. W. (2005). Away with all teachers: The cultural politics of homeschooling. In B. S. Cooper (Ed.), *Home schooling in full view: A reader* (pp. 75–95). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Apple, M. W. (2006, December 21). The complexities of black home schooling. Teachers College Record. Retrieved first paragraph 5/25/07 from <http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=12903> and full article retrieved 6/22/07 from <http://cockingasnook.wordpress.com/2007/03/07/michael-apple-expert-on-black-homeschooling-now/>
- Badman, G. (2009, June). *Report to the Secretary of State on the Review of Elective Home Education in England* (Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on 11 June 2009.) London: The Stationery Office. Retrieved from <http://www.freedomforchildrentogrow.org/8318-DCSF-HomeEdReviewBMK.PDF>
- Baer, R. A. (1998). Why a functional definition of religion is necessary if justice is to be achieved in public education. In J. T. Sears & J. C. Carper (Eds.), *Curriculum, religion, and public education: Conversations for an enlarging public square* (pp. 105–115). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Belfield, C. R. (2005). Home-schoolers: How well do they perform on the SAT for college admission? In B. S. Cooper (Ed.), *Home schooling in full view: A reader* (Chapter 11, pp. 167–177). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Blok, H., & Karsten, S. (2011, March). Inspection of home education in European countries. *European Journal of Education*, 46(1), 138–152.
- Buss, E. (2000). *Without peers? The blind spot in the debate over how to allocate educational control between parent and state* (U of Chicago Public Law Working Paper No. 08). Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=224132
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Carper, J. C., & Hunt, T. C. (2007). *The dissenting tradition in American education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Cogan, M. F. (2010, Summer). Exploring academic outcomes of homeschooled students. *Journal of College Admission*, pp. 18–25. Also retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3955/is_201007/ai_n54718392/
- Cole, M. (2010). What's culture got to do with it? Educational research as a necessarily interdisciplinary enterprise. *Educational Researcher*, 39, 461–470.
- Cooper, B. S., & Sureau, J. (2007, January/March). The politics of homeschooling: New developments, new challenges. *Educational Policy*, 21, 110–131.

- Crampton, W. G. (2011, March–May). Scripturalism: A Christian worldview. *The Trinity Review*, 299. Retrieved from <http://www.trinityfoundation.org>
- Democratic National Committee. (2000, August 15). *Bush and home schooling*. Retrieved from <http://www.democrats.org/gopwatch/bushwatch/accountability/home.html>
- Duvall, S. F., Ward, D. L., Delquadri, J. C., & Greenwood, C. R. (1997). An exploratory study of home school instructional environments and their effects on the basic skills of students with learning disabilities. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 20, 150–172.
- Evans, D. L. (2003, September 2). *Home is no place for school*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2003-09-02-opposee.x.htm>
- Fineman, M. A. (2009). Taking children's interests seriously. In M. A. Fineman & K. Worthington (Eds.), *What is right for children? The competing paradigms of religion and human rights*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1516652
- Francis, D. J., & Keith, T. Z. (2004). Social skills of home schooled and conventionally schooled children: A comparison study. *Home School Researcher*, 16, 15–24.
- Galloway, R. A., & Sutton, J. P. (1995). Home schooled and conventionally schooled high school graduates: A comparison of aptitude for and achievement in college English. *Home School Researcher*, 11, 1–9.
- Indoctrinate. (n.d.-a). In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/indoctrinate>
- Indoctrinate. (n.d.-b). In *Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary*. The ARTFL Project. Retrieved from <http://machaut.uchicago.edu/?resource=Webster%27s&word=indoctrinate&use1913=on&use1828=on>
- Johnson, B. (2001). Toward a new classification of nonexperimental quantitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(2), 3–13. Retrieved from <http://www.aera.net/>
- Jones, P., & Gloeckner, G. (2004, Spring). A study of home school graduates and traditional school graduates. *The Journal of College Admission*, 183, 17–20.
- Kingston, S. T., & Medlin, R. G. (2006). Empathy, altruism, and moral development in home schooled children. *Home School Researcher*, 16(4), 1–10.
- Knowles, J. G., & de Olivares, K. (1991, April). "Now we are adults": Attitudes, beliefs, and status of adults who were home-educated as children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Knowles, J. G., & Muchmore, J. A. (1995). Yep! We're grown-up home-school kids—and we're doing just fine, thank you. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 4, 35–56.
- Kunzman, R. (2005, Summer). Homeschooling in Indiana: A closer look. *Education Policy Brief*, 3(7), 1–8. Retrieved from http://ceep.indiana.edu/projects/PDF/PB_V3N7_Summer_2005_Homeschooling.pdf
- Kunzman, R. (2009). *Write these laws on your children: Inside the world of conservative Christian homeschooling*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Law of noncontradiction. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved January 13, 2013, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_noncontradiction
- Ligonier Ministries. (n.d.). *Law of noncontradiction*. Retrieved from <http://www.ligonier.org/learn/devotionals/law-noncontradiction/>
- Lines, P. M. (1991, October). *Estimating the home schooled population* (Working Paper OR 91–537). Washington DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Lines, P. M. (1994, February). Homeschooling: Private choices and public obligations. *Home School Researcher*, 10(3), 9–26.
- Lubienski, C. (2000). Whither the common good?: A critique of home schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 207–232.
- Lubienski, C. (2003a). A critical view of home education. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 17, 167–178.
- Lubienski, C. (2003b, January 17). Does homeschooling promote the public good? *CQ Researcher [Congressional Quarterly]*, 13, 41.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *The schoolhome: Rethinking schools for changing families*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Martin-Chang, S., Gould, O. N., & Meuse, R. E. (2011, May 30). The impact of schooling on academic achievement: Evidence from homeschooled and traditionally schooled students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 43, 195–202.

- Medlin, R. G. (2000). Home schooling and the question of socialization. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 107–123.
- Medlin, R. G. (2006). Homeschooled children's social skills. *Home School Researcher*, 17, 1–8.
- Merry, M. S., & Karsten, S. (2010). Restricted liberty, parental choice and homeschooling. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 44, 497–514.
- Monk, D. (2009). Regulating home education: Negotiating standards, anomalies and rights. *Child and Family Law Quarterly*, 21, 155–184.
- Montgomery, L. R. (1989). The effect of home schooling on the leadership skills of home schooled students. *Home School Researcher*, 5(1), 1–10.
- Murphy, J. (2012). *Homeschooling in America: Capturing and assessing the movement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- National Education Association. (2006). *National Education Association resolutions 2006–2007*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/annualmeeting/raaction/images/resolutions2006–2007.pdf>
- Noncontradiction. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/noncontradiction>
- Nord, W. A. (1995). *Religion and American education: Rethinking a national dilemma*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Oliveira (de Oliveira), P. C. M., Watson, T. G., & Sutton, J. P. (1994). Differences in critical thinking skills among students educated in public schools, Christian schools, and home schools. *Home School Researcher*, 10(4), 1–8.
- Oregon Department of Education, Office of Student Services. (1999, May 20). *Annual report of home school statistics [1998–99]*. Salem, OR: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=2081>
- Rakestraw, J. F. (1988). Home schooling in Alabama. *Home School Researcher*, 4(4), 1–6.
- Ray, B. D. (1990). *A nationwide study of home education: Family characteristics, legal matters, and student achievement*. Salem, OR: National Home Education Research Institute. Available from <http://www.nheri.org>
- Ray, B. D. (1994). *A nationwide study of home education in Canada: Family characteristics, student achievement, and other topics*. Salem, OR: National Home Education Research Institute. Available from <http://www.nheri.org>
- Ray, B. D. (1997). *Strengths of their own—Homeschoolers across America: Academic achievement, family characteristics, and longitudinal traits*. Salem, OR: National Home Education Research Institute. Available from <http://www.nheri.org>
- Ray, B. D. (2000a). Home schooling for individuals' gain and society's common good. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 272–293.
- Ray, B. D. (2000b). Home schooling: The ameliorator of negative influences on learning? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75, 71–106.
- Ray, B. D. (2004). *Home educated and now adults: Their community and civic involvement, views about homeschooling, and other traits*. Salem, OR: National Home Education Research Institute. Available from <http://www.nheri.org>
- Ray, B. D. (2005). A homeschool research story. In B. S. Cooper (Ed.), *Home schooling in full view: A reader* (pp. 1–19). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Ray, B. D. (2006). Homeschooling as “educational neglect” or neglected research standards? *Home School Researcher*, 17, 9–12.
- Ray, B. D. (2007, April 17). *Statement, testimony, and paper on House Bill 2629 Home Education Equity Bill*. Paper presented to the Oregon House Education Subcommittee on Innovation, Salem, OR.
- Ray, B. D. (2010a). Academic achievement and demographic traits of homeschool students: A nationwide study. *Academic Leadership Journal*, 8(1). Retrieved from http://www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/Academic_Achievement_and_Demographic_Traits_of_Homeschool_Students_A_Nationwide_Study.shtml
- Ray, B. D. (2010b). The harms of homeschooling? Where are the premises? (2010). *Home School Researcher*, 25(3), 11–16.
- Ray, B. D. (2011). *2.04 million homeschool students in the United States in 2010*. Salem, OR: National Home Education Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.nheri.org/HomeschoolPopulationReport2010.pdf>
- Ray, B. D. (2012). Evangelical Protestant and other faith-based homeschooling. In J. C. Carper & T. C. Hunt (Eds.), *Praeger handbook of faith-based schools in the United States, K-12* (Chapter 12, pp. 123–135). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, ABC-CLIO.
- Ray, B. D., & Eagleson, B. K. (2008, August 14). State regulation of hom and homeschoolers' SAT scores. *Journal of Academic Leadership*, 6(3). Retrieved from <http://contentcat.fhsu.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/p15732coll4/id/303/rec/1>
- Reich, R. (2001, August–September). *Testing the boundaries of parental authority over education: The case of homeschooling*. Paper prepared for delivery at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from <http://pro.harvard.edu/abstracts/002/002021ReichRob00.htm>

- Reich, R. (2002). The civic perils of homeschooling. *Educational Leadership*, 59(7), 56–59.
- Reich, R. (2005). Why home schooling should be regulated. In B. S. Cooper (Ed.), *Homeschooling in full view: A reader* (pp. 109–120). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Reich, R. (2008). On regulating homeschooling: A reply to Glanzer. *Educational Theory*, 58(1), 17–23.
- Rothbard, M. N. (1999). *Education: Free and compulsory*. Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute. (Original work published 1971)
- Rudner, L. M. (1999). Scholastic achievement and demographic characteristics of home school students in 1998. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 7(8). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/viewFile/543/666>
- Rushdoony, R. J. (1963). *The messianic character of American education*. Nutley, NJ: Craig Press.
- Sheffer, S. (1995). *A sense of self: Listening to homeschooled adolescent girls*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Shyers, L. E. (1992). A comparison of social adjustment between home and traditionally schooled students. *Home School Researcher*, 8(3), 1–8.
- Simmons, B. J. (1994, February). Classroom at home: What should your board say to parents who choose home schooling for their children? *The American School Board Journal*, 181(2), 47–49.
- Skillen, J. W. (1998). Justice and civil society. *The Civil Society Project*, 98(2), 1–6.
- Smedley, Thomas C. (1992). Socialization of home school children. *Home School Researcher*, 8(3), 9–16.
- Smith, C., & Sikkink, D. (1999, April). Is private schooling privatizing? *First Things*, 92, 16–20. Retrieved from <http://www.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft9904/articles/smith.html>
- Stevens, M. L. (2001). *Kingdom of children: Culture and controversy in the homeschooling movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sutton, J. P., & Galloway, R. (2000). College success of students from three high school settings. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 33, 137–146.
- Tahko, T. E. (2009). The law of non-contradiction as a metaphysical principle. *Australasian Journal of Logic*, 7, 32–47. Retrieved January 30, 2013, from Academia.edu: http://www.academia.edu/182399/The_Law_of_Non-Contradiction_as_a_Metaphysical_Principle
- Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488. (1961).
- Van Pelt, D. (2004, March). The choices families make: Home schooling in Canada comes of age. *Fraser Forum*, pp. 15–17. Retrieved from <http://www.fraserinstitute.org/>
- Ward, L. (2004). A different kind of home room. “Northwest Voice” [of Bakersfield, CA]. Retrieved from <http://www.northwestvoice.com/page.asp?item=46415>
- Wartes, J. (1990). Recent results from the Washington Homeschool Research Project. *Home School Researcher*, 6(4), 1–7.
- Wartes, J. (1991, December). *Five years of homeschool testing within Washington State*. (Available from the Washington Homeschool Research Project, 16109 N. E. 169 Place, Woodinville, WA 98072)
- Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1985). *Washington State's experimental programs using the parent as tutor under the supervision of a Washington State certificated teacher 1984–1985*. Olympia, WA: Author.
- West, R. L. (2009, Summer/Fall). The harms of homeschooling. *Philosophy and Public Policy Quarterly*, 29(3/4), 7–12. Retrieved from <http://www.puaf.umd.edu/files.php/ipp/vol29summerfall09.pdf>
- White, S., Moore, M., & Squires, J. (2009). Examination of previously homeschooled college students with the Big Five model of Personality. *Home School Researcher*, 25, 1–7. Retrieved from <http://www.nheri.org/Volume-25-Issue-1/Examination-of-Previously-Homeschooled-College-Students-with-the-Big-Five-Model-of-Personality.html>
- White, S., Williford, E., Brower, J., Collins, T., Merry, R., & Washington, M. (2007). Emotional, social and academic adjustment to college: A comparison between Christian home schooled and traditionally schooled college freshmen. *Home School Researcher*, 17(4), 1–7.
- Yuracko, K. (2007, April 14). *Education off the grid: Constitutional constraints on homeschooling* (Northwestern Public Law Research Paper No. 07-11). Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=980100