



Legitimate peripheral participation and home education

L. Safran*

1 Croxley Road, London W9 3HH, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 November 2008

Received in revised form

31 May 2009

Accepted 3 June 2009

Keywords:

Community of practice

Home education

Legitimate peripheral participation

ABSTRACT

After a description of home education, Lave and Wenger's (1991) theory of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) is applied to the situation of home educators who join a neighbourhood home education group, a community of practice. Then, it is argued that the theory of LPP, with suitable modification, can also apply to and illuminate the position of home educators who are not members of a home education community of practice but who, while home educating individually, are nevertheless engaged as legitimate peripheral participants in a social learning process through reading newsletters, visiting web sites and the daily practice of home educating their children. The extension of the theory illustrates the wide explanatory power of LPP to cover social learning in many contexts.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

This article is partly drawn from a multi-disciplined empirical study of a non-school setting which emphasises Lave and Wenger's (1991) theory of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), to help understand the experience of home educating parents joining a neighbourhood home education group, a community of practice (Safran, 2008). Here it will be asked whether the theory can also be used to illuminate other forms of home education. To set the context for this, some background description of home education will be presented.

Although more and more families are choosing to home educate their children across North America (Cai, 2002; Lines, 2000; Princiotta & Bielick, 2006), Britain (Arora, 2006; Fortune-Wood, 2005, 2006) and Europe (Beck, 2002, 2006; Bloc, 2003; Fandard & Nozarian, 2001; Nilsson, 2004; Robbins, 2001; Spiegler, 2003) with small but growing numbers in Eastern European countries such as Poland (Budajczak, 2004), Estonia (Leis, 2006) and Russia (Fladmoe & Kaprov, 2006) there has been little research conducted about home education when compared to other educational models (Isenberg, 2002). What research there has been has concentrated on the experience of the child (Eddis, 2007; Lowden, 1994; Rothermel, 2002; Webb, 1989, 1990, 1999), the benefits of home education (Meighan, 1984a, 1984b, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2004; Meighan & Siraj-Blatchford, 2003; Rivero, 2002; Thomas, 1998; Thomas & Pattison, 2008), home education and the law (Finbow, 2006; Gabb, 2004; Kendall & Atkinson, 2006; Monk, 2004; Petrie, 1992, 1995, 2001), the typology of the families that home educate (Allie-Carson, 1990; Mayberry, Knowles, Ray, & Marlow, 1992), why

parents chose to home educate (Gray, 1993; Isenberg, 2002) the type of support needed for home educating families (Arora, 2006; Fortune-Wood, 2006) and the issue of home educating children with special needs (Arora, 2006; Fortune-Wood, 2007) with little research on the effects of this educational choice on the parents' lives.

For the purpose of this study, a two part definition of home education will be adopted. Home education is firstly, 'full-time education of children in and around the home by their parents or guardians' and secondly, 'where the parents are committed to their [children's] education and home-educating' (Petrie, 1998; Petrie, Windrass, & Thomas, 1999). This definition highlights the elective nature of home education as well as drawing attention to the commitment required by parents in taking this step.

It was not until the 1944 Education Act and the rise of mass public compulsory schooling that 'home education' became a distinct educational approach. John Holt was an early and influential proponent of home education in its modern guise, both in the UK and US. Holt had been influenced by the free school movement of the 1960s and early 70s represented by the writings of Goodman, such as *Growing Up Absurd* (1960), Postman and Weingartner (1971) and Illich (1971), by the experiences at different types of schools described by Neill (1961, 1966, 1967) and Dennison (1970), and by more general educational theorists such as John Dewey and Bertrand Russell. In Holt's series of publications it is possible to trace his transition from initial criticism of the school system to his final advocacy of home education. This can be seen from some of the titles of his books, for example, *How Children Fail* (1969) and *How Children Learn* (1970a), *What Did I Do Monday?* (1970b) and *The Underachieving School* (1972) to his last books, *Teach Your Own* (1981) and, published posthumously, *Learning All the Time* (1989).

* Tel.: +44 20 8969 0893.

E-mail address: lesliebarson@yahoo.com

Home education has always been legal in England and Wales (Scotland's law differs slightly) and is enshrined in the 1996 Education Act. The decision to home educate is the parents' alone. In the US, while home education has been legal since 1993, each state has its own laws (Basham, 2001). Requirements vary from state to state as to the amount of monitoring and testing required by educational authorities in order to allow families to continue to home educate (Basham, 2001; Lines, 2000).

Determining exactly how many children are being home educated in England and Wales is very difficult since there is no legal requirement for home educating families to register with education authorities. Estimated numbers of home educators vary widely, from 84,000 children (Cook, 2002) to more recent estimates of 40,000 children (Fortune-Wood, 2005). In the US, despite the fact that most states require some form of notification of intent and type of home education, it is still very difficult to determine numbers (Lines, 2000). Estimates vary, with as many as two million children said to be home educated, although this was judged to be an overestimation (Bauman, 2001).

The reasons why a family begins to home educate will obviously influence their feelings about the enterprise. For example, if a family chooses to home educate because they are committed to a type of educational approach then they will see home education as a positive step. But if a family begins to home educate because their child is having trouble at school then they may see the step as a mark of failure for the family in that they and their child were not able to fit into the prevalent educational system and they may then be at a loss as to how to begin. In any case they are newcomers to the practice and must learn how to go forward in a way that suits their needs.

Research in the US suggests that neighbourhood home education groups are important to home educating families. Lyman (2000) states that in one survey of fifteen hundred home educated students, 85% attended a home education group or intended to join one. Barfield (2002) chronicles twenty-one home educating families of which fifteen mentioned using a type of home education group. There has been no research into these groups in England and Wales but from groups advertised in the national home education press, talked about on internet lists and listed by the independent home education press it can be surmised that there are many. However, it cannot be assumed that any one part of the country will have a group. In some areas there are several groups to choose from while in others, families have to travel some distance to find one to join.

1. Theoretical framework

Both the original study and this paper are informed by, critical of and built on the concepts and theory developed by Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998). The community of practice framework encompasses and interprets learning as part of an ongoing relationship between the individual and their social context. It holds that learning affects adults both objectively through practice and subjectively through changes in the individuals themselves and is the context in which LPP takes place. It will be argued here, that while LPP and the communities of practice framework are relevant to the explanation of home education and its practice, some extension of the theory is required in order to fully cover the home education structure and the legitimate peripheral participant opportunities.

Lave and Wenger (1991) describe in some depth how a newcomer joins a community of practice, concentrating on an apprenticeship model of learning. When someone becomes interested in a group they join on the periphery and move to the centre through practicing in the community. New members are integrated into the community through participating in it and they thereby at the same time, learn and affect the joint enterprise and the shared repertoire of the community of practice. Lave and Wenger coined the term 'legitimate peripheral

participation' to describe the role of newcomers to the group and their journey to becoming full participants. "Legitimate peripheral participation is intended as a conceptual bridge – as a claim about the common processes inherent in the production of changing persons and changing communities of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 55).

For the newcomer to become a full member in the community of practice two things must happen. First, the peripheral member needs to have legitimacy as a newcomer even though they are not yet a full-fledged member (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This is the only way the old timers are likely to see them as acceptable and help them through the learning process with all that this involves. Legitimacy can take many forms, from birthright, getting a job or as in this study, taking your children out of or never sending them to school (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Second, the newcomer must have some affinity, although not necessarily explicit affinity, with the three main areas of practice: the joint enterprise of the group, mutual engagement with other members, and the shared repertoire in use. The newcomer is then exposed to full participation in the form of stories, explanations, answers to questions and activities.

In the early stages of joining a community of practice newcomers can develop an idea of what the whole is about. There is no one place from which knowledge comes. This 'decentering' of learning "leads to an understanding that mastery resides not in the master but in the organisation of the community of practice of which the master is a part" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 94). This moves the focus of learning away from teaching and towards learning and the relationship of the learner to the practice.

It has been argued (Safran, 2009) that neighbourhood home education groups are clear examples of a community of practice. However, the home education group is an unusual community of practice because unlike other social organisations where the community of practice theory has been applied, home education is not a defined institution such as an office, hospital or school with formal well known structures. Nor does the neighbourhood home education group have a clear apprenticeship structure but is more like the example of Alcoholics Anonymous used by Lave and Wenger (1991). In the home education group there is no defined structure, no formal obligations, and no set way to do things. Each group will have its own version of the joint enterprise of home educating, its own way of engaging and its own shared repertoire. There are similarities between groups but unique differences as well. Therefore each home education group may be a discrete example of a home education community of practice. Through the group, members engage together in negotiating the joint enterprise, transmitting the shared repertoire by means of sharing the history, stories and lore of home education and initiating newcomers into the community. While many home educators learn through a paradigmatic community of practice, the neighbourhood home education group (Safran, 2009), others learn to be home educators through more loose affiliations.

2. The study

This paper is based on an empirical study undertaken in aid of understanding the learning process of parents as they strive to become 'home educators' (Safran, 2008). Data comes from thirty-four in-depth interviews of home educating parents who had been home educating for more than three years. This time period was selected in the expectation that this constituted a long enough time period for families to be settled in their choice to home educate and for them to have become more articulate and reflective about it. This may be said to bias the research towards those who found home education a successful experience. However, this was not at issue because not only was it assumed that any family home educating for

more than three years would have been happy with the choice, it is the effect of this positive experience that was being studied.

Parents were chosen from both the US and England and Wales to mitigate any objection that the results were not due to home education but to national characteristics. It was found that despite the national and cultural differences between these countries there were no appreciable differences in the attitudes of parents towards home education (Thomas, 1998). The interviewed families volunteered to be part of the research project by responding to adverts placed on home education internet lists and in the home education press or through word of mouth.

A brief outline of the background characteristics of the parents will give some idea of the diversity and similarities of the parents interviewed. Of the thirty-four parents, four were couples (three were heterosexual couples and one lesbian couple) and seven were single parents. Thirty-one were women and three were men. Thirteen of the thirty-four parents were from the US. The number of children in each family ranged from one to seven. There were eighty-seven children from the thirty families. Of the thirty families, eight families (thirty-three children) began home education without sending their children to school. Twenty-two families began to home educate after they found a problem with their eldest at school. Fewer than half the parents have a first degree at university. Three have a further degree. Four are qualified teachers. Eight parents were educated to secondary school level.

The three fathers interviewed work full time in paid employment. Their wives are the main home educators. One parent in the lesbian couple also works full time. Of the thirty-one mothers interviewed, eleven work part time in paid employment. Twenty mothers did not work in any paid employment.

The main reason for home educating mentioned was that their children were unhappy at school or that home education was a natural extension of their parenting beliefs. Religion did not play a significant part in the decision to home educate.

After transcribing the interviews in full it became apparent that analysing the interviews would be complicated (Perryman, 2007). Each interview consisted of about 5000 words leading eventually to nearly 170,000 words of interview material. The amount of data collected from the interviews therefore required some difficult decisions to firstly collate and then analyse. After emersion in the data, a matrix was created for each interview question and a distillation and collation of the data from the matrices was then compiled with answers grouped into themes (Ball, 1991). After all the interviews were collated, analysis of the issues mentioned and who indicted what issue to be relevant could be read off the matrix. The number of parents who had commented on any particular issues could be easily identified. Threads and stories were then grouped into general areas of agreement between interviewees to see if any common significant themes arose (Ely, 1991).

The numerous methodological considerations in this study have been detailed elsewhere (Safran, 2008) but some of them include how the interviews were conducted and the role of the researcher in in-depth interviews. This is far from easy and requires the “engagement in the world under study; it also implies a commitment to a search for meaning, a suspension of preconceptions and an orientation to discovery” (Ball, 1990, p. 3). The researcher must be genuinely interested, respond appropriately and remain relatively uninvolved in the setting. These requirements involve some compromise between objectively obtaining knowledge and simultaneously being friendly in order to make the interviewee feel at ease. However, this is not to say that external issues such as having children present during an interview can be ignored. Part of the researcher's skill will be revealed through how they attend to problems or navigate through distractions enabling the interviewee to feel at ease but still remain focused on the interview questions.

2.1. *Becoming a home educating parent*

When a family begins home educating their first port of call is often a community of practice in the form of a neighbourhood home education group. They can find these groups through home education internet sites, by contacting one of the national home education organisations, through informal networks of home educators or through word of mouth from a friend, relative or neighbour. Most neighbourhood groups are run in an ad hoc manner, meeting at a regular venue such as a church hall or a public place like a park or museum. The activities are planned by the families attending and what happens there depends on the interests, skills and commitment of the parents as well as the resources available to them. The neighbourhood home education group can be seen as a paradigmatic community of practice with a joint enterprise of home educating the children. It may have a more specific joint enterprise such as taking classes of some sort or doing drama together. These communities will also involve mutual engagement in that they meet together and partake in activities. These neighbourhood home education groups can be very important to new home educating parents in that they help the newcomers learn about home education from parents who are experienced, the old timers (Safran, 2009).

Of the thirty-four parents interviewed twenty-five parents talked about the neighbourhood local group as being part of their home education experience. Those who did not use a group will be discussed later. It is being maintained here that the parents who did use a group began as legitimate peripheral participants in that group. They have legitimacy because either their children have been taken out of school or they are of school age and have not been sent to school. This was true for all the families interviewed. The act of withdrawing children from school and parents taking responsibility for their learning is an example of a “performative act of legitimation” (Paechter, 2003b, p. 544), meaning that, despite little or no previous contact, through this similarity of the home education lived practice, home educating parents recognise each other as legitimate home educators.

Further criteria for being a legitimate peripheral participant is that the family have some affinity with the joint enterprise of the group, mutually engage with other members, share the repertoire in use and are peripheral in the sense of being a newcomer to the community. This is exemplified from this study by Rosheen,¹ a married mother of one living in south east England, who described her impression of her first visit to a neighbourhood home education group. “I remember seeing [a child] sitting down with a young kid reading to the child and just thinking that was lovely, and lots of that, and I knew it was really nice.” (7.1999). Rosheen was able to articulate some impressions of her early visits that showed her attraction to that group allowing her to become a peripheral participant there both through her empathetic feelings for the group and reciprocally through the group accepting her as a legitimate peripheral participant.

Alice, a married mother of four living in Boston US, talked about how her affinity with her neighbourhood home education group changed. As soon as Alice made the decision to home educate she felt that she needed a group to home educate with. She contacted friends of friends who were also thinking about home educating and started a ‘home club’; “and that was the beginning of our home schooling and it was the first time that I had other adults around that were interested in being with their kids, at home with them...” (8.2000). Alice continued saying that after a period of time one of

¹ A pseudonym is used for each interviewee from the study. Each quotation from an interviewee is followed by the date of the interview.

the main organisers wanted to make the group into a business, paying herself a salary to run the group. “She had a lot of agendas that had nothing to do with what we were trying to do and weren’t really good for the group.” (8.2000). As the rest of the group were also business oriented, Alice no longer shared the joint enterprise. She left this group and joined another one.

Alice’s experience with her neighbourhood home education group exemplifies the point that families enter a neighbourhood home education group with some affinity to the group. Alice’s first group supported her family for a time until their joint enterprise changed and she no longer felt an affinity with it.

In summary, parents who attend some type of neighbourhood home education group are legitimate in that they have children of school age out of school, are peripheral at the time of joining the group, have affinity with the group at least for some time, participate through physically attending the group and understand the repertoire. They satisfy the criteria put forward by [Lave and Wenger \(1991\)](#) for being legitimate peripheral participant members of a community of practice.

It cannot be assumed that parents will feel the need to find other home educators even at the beginning of their home education experience. Some parents prefer to find their own way. In this case, however, it will be argued here that they are still legitimate peripheral participants learning to be a home educator through the social activity of home educating even though they are not actually meeting face-to-face with other home educators. In order to explain how social learning is possible in these cases it is necessary to look again at the notion of LPP.

Having children out of school bestows legitimacy on the family as home educators. Further, home educators, whether they attend a neighbourhood home education group or not, engage in the daily-lived practice of home education and have the same joint enterprise as other home educators. These parents gain the home education repertoire through reading newsletters and visiting internet sites which are part of the wider home education culture. It is suggested that individually, rather than collectively through a community of practice, these parents can be legitimate peripheral participants. Legitimacy consists in withdrawing children from school and taking responsibility for their education. It is this practice of home education, a constant lived activity which is the process that quintessentially develops and defines home educators. The similarity of the experiences of all home educators during this process, such as the experience of taking on the responsibility for the children’s education, choosing educational styles and facing external pressures, binds them together as home educators just as, if and when they meet, the experience of fans of a particular team or pop group binds them together as fans and enables them to recognise each other, although strangers, as members. Further, those who do home educate on their own have the same goal as other home educators, may engage in one-way dialogue through newsletters or web sites and share history and jokes learned from their common culture. They learn individually but they are sharing socially created experiences. Home educators who do not join a neighbourhood home education group have as much legitimacy as those who do and for the same reason, by having children of school age being educated out of school. However, these families are peripheral in a different way to those who join a neighbourhood home education group. They choose to stay on the periphery in that they do not engage with a community but, if they were to do so, they would be recognised as legitimate peripheral participants by old times in any home education community and reciprocally, the newcomers would recognise the old timers as practiced and practicing home educators ([Paechter, 2003a](#)).

An example of someone who prioritises this minimal level of engagement is Sophie, a married mother of two in south east

England, who chose not to join a neighbourhood home education group because it was difficult to fit the meetings into her schedule. She felt the only reason for joining a neighbourhood home education group would be to find friends for her children, but since they had a full social life without it, it was not necessary:

We haven’t, for the last three years, been trying to get together with other home schoolers. It didn’t work very well because I was very aware that I was working extra hard the rest of the week to get this one day free. (8.2004)

Sophie is aware of the neighbourhood home education group network and the similarities of her educational practices with other home educating parents, but she does not require face-to-face meetings or mutual engagement with them. However, due to her sharing the same joint enterprise, engaging in the same daily practice of educating her children she would be qualified to join any home education community of practice if and when she should choose. She would immediately be recognised by other members of the community as someone who has the right to join.

Cathy, a married mother of three in north England, did not join a group because she thought it would be very difficult to feel comfortable with so many people:

There are just so many people in the group that it’s just overwhelming. When we went along I just thought, you know, we’re going to have to come here for weeks and weeks and weeks before we even learn people’s names. (8.2004)

Although she was aware of home education groups and knew that her home educating practices were similar to theirs, Cathy still preferred to practice home educating as an individual family.

Cathy provided an example of a parent who when asked about her educational style, described it first in her own words as “[my children] have always done what they wanted to do” (8.2004). She followed this by saying: “usually they say ‘you’re autonomous’ don’t they? In the [national home education organisation] magazine” (8.2004). Cathy is a parent who would not be considered a member of a home education community of practice because she does not engage with other home educators face-to-face. Despite this, she used the word ‘autonomous’ in the same way and with the same meaning. She shares the repertoire as the other parents interviewed. This is evidence that legitimate peripheral participants who do not meet others face-to-face are still able to learn and correctly use the repertoire. To some extent, she showed some reluctance to use it which seems to imply reluctance on Cathy’s part to be associated either with the other people who use this word or with other implicit meanings the word may have. However, being able to understand the repertoire is evidence of her position as a participating home educator. She is connected to a home education culture not as a peripheral newcomer but as someone who understands the repertoire although she wishes to maintain a distance from the community while sharing the enterprise, the practice and the repertoire and knowing she would be accepted if she wished to change her mind and join a group.

Maggie, a married mother of two in south east England, stopped looking for neighbourhood home education groups after experiencing unsuccessful attempts to run one at her home. She said that she felt it was her own assumptions about what her children needed socially that prompted her to start a neighbourhood home education group but after a while she realised her children did not need the group. She continued:

I left it alone. And I thought so we go a week without doing very much with other kids, does it matter? I know they’re perfect socially OK and perfectly competent and they’ll ask me if they want [to go out or have friends round]. (7.2004)

The needs of Maggie's family could be satisfied without the use of a neighbourhood home education group. Despite rejecting these groups she, like Sophie and Cathy, could still be considered to be a legitimate peripheral participant due to sharing the joint enterprise, the practice of home education, and being able, if she chose to join a home education community of practice, she would be recognised by other members of the home education community of practice as a legitimate peripheral participant.

Home education newsletters and web sites are not in themselves communities of practice because while both support the joint enterprise of home education, circulate and reinforce the repertoire and may facilitate mutual engagement, for example through advertising neighbourhood group meetings, they do not provide immediate, direct or two-way interactive engagement. Newsletters consist largely of anecdotes written by parents about home education, news about home education initiatives at local and government level, legal advice, help with exams, educational activities and so on. This contact is, for the most part, one sided in that while readers can respond by sending letters to the publication, they usually do not. Further, if they do send something to be published in the newsletter this involves some time delay. This time delay can be considerable as, for example, a national home education support group publishes its newsletter every two months meaning that a letter sent to the newsletter may take four to six weeks to be published. Internet sites, a more recent resource, can also offer anecdotal information, legal advice or educational ideas and activities and also consist of one-way engagement.

Sophie, Cathy and Maggie relate to the home education culture only through newsletters and internet web sites. This shows that it cannot be assumed that home educating parents will feel the need to join a neighbourhood home education group. Nevertheless, it must be noted that all of the parents that were interviewed and who did not attend a neighbourhood home education group answered an advertisement placed in the home education press. Therefore, despite not mutually engaging in a paradigmatic community of practice, these families exhibited their connection as legitimate peripheral participants through finding out about the research and by offering to take part in it.

The experience of the parents in this study, it is being argued, show that there are two types of LPP. The first, here called traditional LPP, is that of the parents who join a neighbourhood home education group, a community of practice. The second, extended LPP, comes about through those parents who do not join a neighbourhood home education group. In the case of traditional LPP parents physically go to the group and meet with other old timers in the group, learning to be a member of the community, first at the periphery, through the old timers' recognition of their legitimacy and affinity with the community of practice. They can move to the centre of the group over time. In extended LPP, parents remain as individuals and do not meet with others in a group structure. They remain peripheral by choice and only engage with the home education wider culture through newsletters and web sites. However, the parents in both groups share legitimacy through having a child of school age out of school, practice daily home education, would recognise each other as legitimate participants and both learn the home education repertoire, although in the case of the extended LPP this would only be through newsletters and web sites which constitutes engagement of a non-physical non-mutual type. Similarly to Freemasons or football fans and other interest groups where the members do not meet nor all know each other, there are signs through which people can recognise even strangers as legitimate members of a particular culture (Paechter, 2003a).

3. Discussion

As some home educating parents do not mutually engage with other home educators by meeting face-to-face they cannot be said to meet all the criteria of being a member of a community of practice. Instead, it has been argued that an extension of the framework should count them as being legitimate peripheral participants as they learn to be home educators through their daily educational practice and one-way engagement. They are legitimate through the performative act of legitimation (Paechter, 2003b) of taking their children out of school and actively home educating. They are peripheral, in a different way to newcomers to a community, in that they have not joined a group but would be accepted onto the periphery if they did go to a home education community of practice. And finally, they are participating in that they read the newsletters, log onto the web sites, and crucially pursue the same activity, home education, as those parents who chose to join a more paradigmatic community of practice.

There may be a third category of home educating family who have nothing at all to do with the home education culture: they are not members of any neighbourhood home education group, virtual, local or national, they do not read any specific home education literature and they do not go to any home education events. However, there was no family in this situation in this study. Even if such a family were open to have taken part in research, they would not have been able to find out about the research and researchers could not easily find out about them. They would not be legitimate peripheral participants until some evidence, such as shared repertoire, was found. Despite this, given that they crucially pursue the daily-lived practice of home education and thereby share the home education joint enterprise, they could still be accepted as legitimate peripheral participants of a home education organisation if they made themselves known to such a group.

An attempt has been made to extend Lave and Wenger (1991) theory of the LPP to include categories of members who, although they do not mutually engage with others, nevertheless, through their shared everyday practice and the use of home education newspapers and internet sites, learn to be part of the social whole, the culture of home education and thereby become legitimate peripheral participants.

This extension can be used to explain other social groups such as football fans, people with a specific disability or parents of children with special needs, those who practice and learn individually but are part of cultures that are socially determined. This is important as it allows this framework of learning in a social setting to help illuminate situations where the learning does not appear to be social in that the individual may not meet with others. The fact that in this case families can practice alone but still be part of a clear social grouping throws light on social learning as a wider activity than learning in an actual group. It further shows that what Lave and Wenger (1991) theorised can help explain more subtle situations than might at first be apparent.

References

- Allie-Carson, J. (1990). Structure and interaction patterns of home school families. *Home School Researcher*, 6(3), 11–18.
- Arora, T. (2006). Elective home education and special educational needs. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 6(1), 55–66.
- Ball, S. J. (1990). Self-doubt and soft data: social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(1), 3–21.
- Ball, S. J. (1991). Power, conflict, micropolitics and all that!. In G. Walford (Ed.), *Doing educational research*. UK: Open University Press.
- Barfield, R. (2002). *Real-life homeschooling*. New York, New York, US: Fireside.
- Basham, P. (2001). *Home schooling: From the extreme to the mainstream*. Public Policy Sources. A Fraser Institute Occasional Paper, 51.

- Bauman, K. J. (2001). *Home schooling in the United States: Trends and characteristics population division*. In: *Working Paper Series*, 53, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Beck, C. (2002). *Home education – New political tension? The case of Northern Europe*. Paper to the CESE-conference, London.
- Beck, C. (2006). Home education: motives, numbers and social integration: a mirror image of educational politics? *Norwegian Journal of Educational Research*, 3. Retrieved 31 December 2006. <http://folk.uio.no/cbeck/Home%20education%20-%20motives,%20numbers.%20new%20article%20Christian%20Beck.htm>.
- Bloc, H. (2003). Performance in home schooling: an argument against compulsory schooling in the Netherlands. *International Review of Education*, 50(1), 9–52.
- Budajczak, M. (2004). *Edukacja domowa*. Gdansk, Poland: Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Cai, Y. (2002). Home schooling and teaching style: comparing the motivating styles of home school and public school teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 372–380.
- Cook, S. (2002). Home Front, 10 December, The Guardian, 10 September 2007. <http://education.guardian.co.uk/schools/story/0,856754,00.html>.
- Dennison, G. (1970). *The lives of children: The story of the first street school*. New York, US: Random House Inc.
- Eddis, S. (2007). *A comparative study of attitudes towards home education, held by state officials and home educators in England and Wales, and in Florida, USA*. PhD thesis, Department of Political, International and Policy Studies Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, University of Surrey.
- Ely, M. (1991). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Fandard, J., & Nozarian, B. (2001). *Etude sur l'instruction à la maison*. France: Les Enfants d'Abord.
- Finbow, S. E. (2006). *A comparative study of perceptions held by state officials and home educators in England and Wales, and in Florida, USA: research summary report*. Retrieved 8 December 2006. <http://www.education-otherwise.org/Links/Research%20Papers/sameddis.pdf>.
- Fladmoe, H., & Kaprov, E. (2006). *Home education and family education in Russia*. Retrieved, 31 December 2006. <http://folk.uio.no/cbeck/Home%20education%20and%20Family%20Education%20in%20Russia.htm>.
- Fortune-Wood, M. (2005). *The face of home-based education 1: Who, why and how*. Notts., UK: Educational Heretics Press in Association with 'Personalised Education Now'.
- Fortune-Wood, M. (2006). *The face of home-based education 2: Numbers, support, special needs research into UK home education*. Notts. UK: Educational Heretics Press in Association with 'Personalised Education Now'.
- Fortune-Wood, M. (2007). *Can't go won't go: An alternative approach to school refusal*. North Wales, UK: Cinnamon Press.
- Gabb, S. (2004). *Home schooling: A British perspective*. University of Buckingham, unpublished. Retrieved 30 March 2008 from <http://www.seangabb.co.uk/academic/homeschooling.htm>.
- Goodman, P. (1960). *Growing up absurd: Problems of youth in the organized system*. New York, US: Random House Inc.
- Gray, S. (1993). Why some parents choose to home school. *Home School Researcher*, 9(4), 1–12.
- Holt, J. (1969). *How children fail*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.
- Holt, J. (1970a). *How children learn*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.
- Holt, J. (1970b). *What did I do Monday?* New York, US: E P Dutton and Co.
- Holt, J. (1972). *The underachieving school*. London, UK: Pitman Publishing.
- Holt, J. (1981). *Teach your own*. Hants, UK: Lighthouse Books, Liss.
- Holt, J. (1989). *Learning all the time*. Cambridge, MA, US: Perseus Books.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. London, UK: Calder and Boyars Ltd.
- Isenberg, E. (2002). *Home schooling: School choice and women's time use*. Occasional paper no. 64. New York, US: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Kendall, S., & Atkinson, M. (2006). *Some perspectives on home education*. Slough, UK: NFER. Retrieved 17 December 2006. <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-data/outlines/home-educated-children.cfm>.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Leis, T. (2006). *Home education in Estonia*. Retrieved: 30 December 2006. <http://folk.uio.no/cbeck/Estonia.htm>.
- Lines, P. (2000). Homeschooling comes of age. *The Public Interest*, 140, 74–85.
- Lowden, S. L. (1994). *The scope and implications of home-based education*. PhD, University of Nottingham, UK.
- Lyman, I. (2000). *Home schooling and histrionics*. Cato Institute.
- Mayberry, M., Knowles, J. G., Ray, B., & Marlow, S. (1992). Political and religious characteristics of home school parents: result of an ongoing study. *Home School Researcher*, 8(1), 1–8.
- Meighan, R. (1984a). Home-based educators and education authorities: the attempt to maintain a mythology. *Educational Studies*, 10(3), 273–286.
- Meighan, R. (1984b). Political consciousness and home-based education. *Educational Review*, 36(2), 165–173.
- Meighan, R. (1995). *John Holt: Personalised education and the reconstruction of schooling*. Notts., UK: Educational Heretics Press.
- Meighan, R. (2000). *Learning unlimited: The home-based education case-files*. Notts., UK: Educational Heretics Press.
- Meighan, R. (2001). *Natural learning and the natural curriculum*. Notts., UK: Educational Heretics Press.
- Meighan, R. (2004). *Damage limitation*. Notts., UK: Educational Heretics Press.
- Meighan, R., & Siraj-Blatchford, I. (2003). *A sociology of educating*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Monk, D. (2004). Problematising home education: challenging 'parental rights' and 'socialisation'. *Legal Studies*, 24, 4.
- Neill, A. S. (1961). *Summerhill*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin.
- Neill, A. S. (1966). *Freedom not license!*. New York, US: Hart Publishing Co.
- Neill, A. S. (1967). *Talking of summerhill*. London, UK: Gollancz.
- Nilsson, I. (2004). *Mother and teacher – The growing issue of home education*. Paper presented at the 32nd Congress of the Nordic Educational Research Association, Reykjavik, Iceland.
- Paechter, C. (2003a). Masculinities and femininities as communities of practice. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(1), 69–77.
- Paechter, C. (2003b). Learning masculinities and femininities: power/knowledge and legitimate peripheral participation. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 26(6), 541–552.
- Perryman, J. (2007). *Inspection and performativity: life after special measures*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Goldsmiths University of London.
- Petrie, A. (1992). *Home education and the local education authority: From conflict to cooperation*. PhD, Liverpool University.
- Petrie, A. (1995). Home educators and the law within Europe. *International Review of Education*, 41, 285–296.
- Petrie, A. (1998). Home education and the law. *Education and the Law*, 10(2–3).
- Petrie, A. (2001). Home education in Europe and the implementation of changes to the law. *International Review of Education*, 47(5), 477–500.
- Petrie, A. J., Windrass, G., & Thomas, A. (1999). The prevalence of home education in England: A feasibility study report to the department for education and employment.
- Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1971). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. Aylesbury, UK: Hazell Watson & Vinney Ltd.
- Princiotta, D., & Bielik, S. (2006). *Homeschooling in the United States: 2003. Statistical analysis report*. US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Rivero, L. (2002). Progressive digressions: home schooling fort self-actualisation. *Roeper Review*, 24(4), 197–203.
- Robbins, E. F. (2001). *Education and change: An investigation into the transformative effect of home educating*. M.A., University College, Galway.
- Rothermel, P. (2002). *Home-education: Aims, practices and outcomes*. BERA annual conference, Exeter, UK. Retrieved 31 May 2009. <http://www.dur.ac.uk/p.j.rothermel/Research/Researchpaper/BERAworkingpaper.htm>.
- Safran, L. (2008). *Exploring identity change and communities of practice among long term home educating parents*. PhD Open University, unpublished.
- Safran, L. (2009). Situated adult learning: the home education neighbourhood group. *The Journal of Unschooling and Alternative Learning*. Retrieved 31 May 2009. <http://www.nipissingu.ca/jual/NewIssue/v3262.asp>.
- Spiegler, T. (2003). Home education in Germany – an overview of the contemporary situation, evaluation and research. *Education*, 17(2–3), 179–190.
- Thomas, A. (1998). *Educating children at home*. UK: Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Thomas, A., & Pattison, H. (2008). *How children learn at home*. UK: Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Webb, J. (1989). *Home-based education: Some aspects of its practice and consequences*. PhD, Open University.
- Webb, J. (1990). *Children learning at home*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Webb, J. (1999). *Those unschooled minds*. Notts., UK: Educational Heretics Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.